

1979

STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF

STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF

THE HITTITE WORD FOR "TRIBE" *

Harry A. Hoffner — Chicago

Recent developments in Hittite lexicography now enable us to identify, the Hittite word which underlies the logogram (ERÍN.MEŠ) Š/S/ZUTÊ (MEŠ/HI.A)¹. This logogram, which occurs about thirty times in military contexts of the Hittite New Kingdom, appears first in the Deeds of Šuppiliuma I. In this composition it shows many variations in spelling², indicating thereby its recent inclusion in the Hittite writing system³. In the Annals of Muršili II and other later texts the spelling has become standardized to ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI^{HI.A}, or ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI.⁴

In DŠ it invariably denotes groups of enemy warriors, in all clear con-

*Research contributing to this article was carried out in connection with the Chicago Hittite Dictionary, a project currently supported in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Research Tools Division.

- 1 Discussions of this logogram known to me are Götze, AM (1933) 242, H. G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956) 62 note c, 126 s.v. Šutí, and E. von Schuler, *Die Kaššäer* (1965) 71f.
- 2 For the spellings within DŠ cf. H. G. Güterbock, JCS 10 126; outside of DŠ and important is ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TU₄ Bo 6987 obv. 2 cited by Neu in StBoT 5 183. Although the mode of writing of this word is what may be called "Akkadographic", the name itself could be West Semitic; cf. J. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie aux temps des rois de Mari* (1957) 83ff.
- 3 Compare the early variations and later standardization of the spelling of the Kaška name discussed by von Schuler, op. cit., 84f., and Hoffner, JNES 31 (1972) 30.
- 4 ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI^{HI.A}: KUB 31.10 i 8 (AM 78), KBo 16.16 iii 19 w. dupl. KUB 19.37 iii 27 (AM 174), KUB 22.25 rev. 21, 22 (oracle questions); ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI: cf. note 12 below.

texts Kaškaeans.⁵ In one passage we are told that the Kaškaean enemy which the Hittite king found in the midst of the land consisted of twelve ŠU-TI (“tribes”).⁶ On other occasions the Hittite armies encountered smaller combinations of three, six, seven or nine ŠUTÊ.⁷

Von Schuler has shown⁸ that the political and military organization of the Kaškaeans was decentralized. There existed a loose and intermittent cooperation of sub-groups, which came together in times of common threat and disassociated afterwards. In keeping with the evidence for the nature of Kaškaean society as a whole, he did not hesitate to view the ŠUTÊ groups as “tribes” (“Stämme”). Although we only see them in time of war, he does not regard these sub-groups as created only for military purposes, but as existing also in peace time within the Kaškaeans. That these ŠUTÊ were not divisions of troops under separate commanders but subject to a unified overcommandant, as would be the case, for example, with divisions in the Hittite imperial armies, von Schuler establishes by pointing to the Hittite strategy in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma of waiting for the tribes to disassociate and defeating them one by one.⁹

Furthermore, the logogram ŠUTÊ itself appears to be derived from the

5 In the broken context of DŠ frag. 14 F (JCS 10 51f. no. 3) iii 38'-57' the land of Arzawa is mentioned (lines 39, 40, 45, 47) and Güterbock restores line 49 as *p[arā-ma namma 3 Š[U-TI...]*, in my opinion with good reason (compare *parā-ma namma 6 Š[(U-TI)]* in iv 11). But this need not imply that the Arzawans themselves were ŠU-TI's. Above in iii 35 the Kaškaeans are mentioned apparently by Šuppiluliuma's father as being part of the military threat which in iii 38f. Šuppiluliuma volunteers to meet by traveling into the land of Arzawa. For this reason Güterbock restored *A-NA LÚ.KUR URU[Arzauwa...]* in iii 36 (the line following the mention of the Kaškaeans). Could the Kaškaean ŠU-TI's have allied themselves with the Arzawans against the Hittites?

6 DŠ frag. 14 F iii 16'.

7 DŠ frag. 14 F iii 49'; frag. 15 F iv 11', 13; frag. 13 D iv 6.

8 *Die Kaškäer* 71ff.

9 *Ibid.* 71f. and 73f.

name of a nomadic group, the Suteans, which like certain other nomadic groups of the early and mid Second Millennium B.C. was employed as a military arm by kings of the city states.¹⁰ At some point the earlier ethnic signification of ŠUTÊ receded, leaving only the idea of a nomadic or tribal group.¹¹ It is in this latter sense that we encounter the word in Hittite texts. Since Hittite contacts with such groups were restricted to their role in combat as foes or as Hittite mercenaries, the word which designates them has a very limited distribution in the texts.

In the later historical texts which show “tribal troops” in the employ of the Hittites¹² the pair ANŠE.KUR.RA ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI indicates that they were not chariot warriors, although the Kaškaeans employed chariotry, but probably foot soldiers of some characteristic type.

Clues to the identity of the Hittite word hidden behind the logogram ŠUTÊ/Ī came from two converging sources. In a Hittite letter found at Maşat and recently published in transliteration and Turkish translation by Sedat Alp there occurs the following passage: “The enemy has just crossed (our border) en masse in two places” *nu-kán l-iš la-at-ti-iš I-NA URU Iš-te-ru-wa za-a-iš l-iš-ma-kán la-at-ti-iš I-NA URU Zi-iš-pa za-iš* “one *latti-* crossed at Išteruwa, and one (other) *latti-* crossed at Zišpa”¹³. From Otten Alp learned of two unpublished ritual fragments, duplicates of each other, in which *latti-* in 1550/u 3', 4' corresponded to ŠUTUM in Bo 4171 2', 3'.¹⁴ Alp further stated that from occurrences of *latti-* in oracle texts he judged it to be the designation of a body part occurring in pairs. Alp's writing ŠUTUM

10 In the Mari age cf. Kupper, loc. cit.; in the Amarna period cf. Weber in Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1038, cited as analogous to the Hittite practice by Götze, AM 242.

11 Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956) 62 note c.

12 To passages cited above in note 4 add: KBo 18.39 9' and KBo 18.88 rev. (6?), 12 (letters) both written ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI without the final HI.A.

13 S. Alp, *Belleten* 41 (1977) 637ff., publishing Maşat 75/113: 3-7. See now Alp in *Florilegium Anatolicum* (1979) 29-35 and CHD.

14 *Ibid.*, note 3a.

implies that the sign ŠU is a Sumerogram. His translation (Turkish “kol”, English “arm”, “column of troops”) fits what appears to be his conception of the situation, that *latti-* and its logogram ŠU^{TUM} are primarily anatomical terms extended to the military sphere.

The equation of *latti-* and ŠU^{TUM} finds substantiation in the uses of *latti-* and ŠU^{TUM}/ŠU^{TI} in the extispicies. There both terms describe an ominous feature which “looks/faces” (Hitt. *uškizzi*, which corresponds to Akkad. *iṭṭul* in the Mesopotamian extispicy texts) in a certain direction (AT 454 i 18, 49f.; KUB 16.77 ii 29-30), and which in all but one passage (KBo 16.97 rev. 22) is either a “lefthand” or “righthand” phenomenon, but never occurs in a pair.

Indubitably the word “hand” can be written ŠU^{TUM}/TI in Hittite texts. There exists also a logogram ŠU^{TUM} in certain rituals and festivals, which Laroche (BiOr 21 1964 321) has shown to represent Hitt. *aniyatt-* “materials for a ritual”. Compare also ŠU^{TI} in this sense in KUB 32.133 i 17. But if one frees himself from the mind-conditioning transcription ŠU^{TUM}/TI, which reminds of Akk. *qātum*, and considers the possibility that *latti-* and its logogram ŠU-TU₄/TI like KASKAL “campaign”, GIŠ TUKUL “weapon” and GIŠ ŠÚ.A “throne” were not originally anatomical terms at all, but were applied to features of the body cavity significant in extispicy, then one may note that the ŠU-TU₄/TI of the extispicies and the (ERÍN.MEŠ) Z/S/ŠUTĪ^(HI.A/MEŠ) of the military narratives are in fact the same word. And the usage of *latti-* in the Maṣat letter is not substantially different from the usage of ERÍN.MEŠ ŠUTI in DŠ or AM.

The occurrences in military narratives and the extispicies share the spellings ŠU-TUM (i.e., -TU₄) and ŠU-TI¹⁵. As noted above, the writings with the signs SU and ZU belong to the initial phases of the logogram’s use. The extispicy texts come from a later period than DŠ and reflect the spelling habits of AM and Hattušili III. The prefixed ERÍN.MEŠ is omissible even in DŠ, especially when preceded by a number.¹⁶ In the oracle texts a distinc-

15 ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TU₄ Bo 6987 obv. 2 (StBoT 5 183) and KUB 5.11 i 27 (exta); ŠU-TI DŠ frag. 15 F iv 9’ (mil.) and KUB 22.70 obv. 5, 27, etc. (exta).

16 DŠ frag. 14 F iii 49f., frag. 15 F iv 11f., 13f.

tion is maintained between ERÍN.MEŠ ŠU-TI in the oracle questions¹⁷ and ŠU-TU₄/TI in the observations. If the spelling in the observation sections is not simply an abbreviation similar to *ni(pāšuriš) ši(ntahiš) ta(naniš)*, it might serve to emphasize the distinction between the real “tribal troops” and the visceral feature which was named from its association with these troops in oracle praxis relating to the king’s campaigns.

The word *latti-* like the word ERÍN.MEŠ-at- “army, troops” is always formally singular, although its logogram regularly bears the Sumerian signs denoting plurality (MEŠ or HI.A). One occurrence of *la-at-ti-uš* (KBo 16.97 rev. 22) seems to belie this assertion. But on the basis of comparison with regularly recurring phraseology in the extispicies this is probably to be corrected to the nom. sg. *la-at-ti-iš*(!). As a collective the word needed no formal plural, even when several such groups occur together of the word follows a number. Grammatical concord shows that the collective singular noun underlying (ERÍN.MEŠ) S/ŠUTĒ is common gender,¹⁸ which fits *latti-* well.

If one accepts the equation of Otten’s ŠU^{TUM} with the (ERÍN.MEŠ) ŠUTĪ/Ē of the military narratives, one can use the textual information relative to *latti-* to add to our knowledge of the tribes. The *latti-* passage in the Maṣat letter has been discussed above, as have the *latti-* extispicy occurrences. In the ritual and prayer text KUB 17.18 iii 13ff. it appears that “they write down [on a document] (the name of?) his tribe” –*nam-ma la-at-ti-en-š[i-in I-NA GIŠ.ḪUR? g]ul-ša-an-zi* (iii 14-15 – and bind the document (GIŠ.ḪUR) to something. This act appears to associate the tribe with the object labelled for purposes of the ritual magic.

Indo-Europeanists will doubtless discuss whether this word is inherited from PIE. Over a year ago Laroche explained to me in private correspondence that his inclusion of *latti-* in his Hurrian glossary (RHA XXXIV-XXXV) was based upon the observation that all the names for the exta in Hittite

17 KUB 5.1 ii 47; 6.17 ii 4; 22.51 obv. 12, 13.

18 *pankun* (DŠ frag. 10 D = KUB 19.11 i 6); 3 Š[U-TI... I]KŠUD *nankan kuen[ta]*’ (DŠ frag. 14 F iii 49’-50’); 6 ŠUTI... *apūnna kuenta* *ibid.* iv 11ff.

texts are of Hurrian origin. But while it is clear that during the Empire period Hurrian words were borrowed, such borrowings are largely confined to technical terms from the cult or from oracle praxis. *latti-* has now been found in a Maṣat letter, which surely dates from the Middle Hittite period. The subject matter is neither cultic nor oracular. And if, as I have proposed above, the term did not originate in an oracular context, but was brought into oracle terminology from its military uses, there is no reason to suspect *a priori* that it is Hurrian. To date *latti-* has not been identified in Hattic, Luwian, Palaic or Hurrian texts. While its linguistic origins for the present remain obscure,¹⁹ its significance can now be considered certain.

19 If one were to make an *a priori* judgment as to the foreign derivation of Hittite *latti-*, considering its primary, non-oracular sense, he might suppose that it was borrowed from the tribal society which the Hittites used it to describe. But since we have no Kaškaean texts, we cannot verify this hypothesis.