

This is the version of the chapter accepted for publication in *talugaeš witteš* : *Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* published by Zaphan

Accepted version downloaded from SOAS Research Online: <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/32845>

## Hurrian in the Tignūnum tablet MS 1805<sup>1</sup>

*Mark Weeden*

### 1. Introduction

Stefano de Martino has written so much on so many different topics that any Hittitologist should be able to find something to write about that they know about that would interest him. I have chosen to write about an area that I do not claim to be an expert in, but I have been able to enlist the help of those who know a great deal more than me while doing so.<sup>2</sup> I first read the tablet under discussion back in 2006, while Andrew George was preparing it for publication in what eventually became the volume of omens from the Schøyen collection.<sup>3</sup> It was reasonably clear at the time that some elements of the texts were words that seemed to be Hurrian, but it was not clear what all of them meant or how they functioned syntactically, especially as some of them really do not look like Hurrian forms. So this is something I have had at the back of my mind for some time, and it is fitting that it be written up in a Festschrift celebrating Stefano's work, as I am sure it is something he will have an opinion on.

---

<sup>1</sup> This contribution was written during a research semester at the Kollegforschungsgruppe 2615: "Rethinking Oriental Despotism" at the Freie Universität Berlin.

<sup>2</sup> I am particularly grateful to Sebastian Fischer for devoting a number of hours of his time to discussing points of Hurrian grammar with me in relation to these texts, as well as making a number of suggestions for interpretation reached in discussion that he has graciously allowed me to use. Joost Hazenbos also kindly read through a draft of the manuscript and also made some useful suggestions. Responsibility for any errors or misunderstandings remains with me.

<sup>3</sup> CUSAS 18 = George 2013.

The story of the Tigonānum tablets in as far as it is known does not need to be recapitulated in great detail here, but the basics should be mentioned.<sup>4</sup> There are the three tablets and one prism with names of Habiru in a private collection published by Mirjo Salvini, who has also recently published a further administrative prism;<sup>5</sup> Ten tablets in the Schøyen Collection have been published by Andrew George (five omen compendia, and five administrative tablets), and a further lexical tablet by Miguel Civil;<sup>6</sup> Fifteen omen tablets in the Hirayama collection in Japan await publication by Akio Tsukimoto;<sup>7</sup> one administrative tablet from a private collection was published by Rukiye Akdoğan and Gernot Wilhelm;<sup>8</sup> one further tablet with omens has been published by Nicola de Zorzi.<sup>9</sup> Then there are the some 400 tablets of which the late Wilfried Lambert made transliterations when he saw them in London with a dealer and again with their owner in the Middle East, which are preserved among his papers.<sup>10</sup> Of these seventeen transliterated omen texts were published by Andrew George.<sup>11</sup> Discussion continues as to the location of Tigonānum and thus of the archive's point of origin, with the main point of contention being whether it was to be found north (perhaps in the area of Bismil) or south of the Tur Abdin.<sup>12</sup> The date of the archive is established more or less by the letter exchanged between the king Tunip-Teššub (Tuniya) and Labarna/Hattusili I relating to his campaign against Hahhum: thus some time around 1630 BC.<sup>13</sup>

In his edition of one of the Tigonānum texts with a local variant tradition of *šumma izbum* omens, Andrew George draws attention to facets of the language, such as a confusion of masculine and feminine, that are typical for speakers of an underlying language that does not make these distinctions and points out that unintelligible sequences occur in the text which are likely to be in the Hurrian

---

<sup>4</sup> Overviews at George 2013: 101-102; De Zorzi 2016: 126-127; George 2017: 97-100.

<sup>5</sup> Salvini 1994; 1996; 1998; 2018.

<sup>6</sup> George 2013: 101-128; George 2017: 97-100; Civil 2010: 127-128.

<sup>7</sup> George 2013: 102.

<sup>8</sup> Akdoğan and Wilhelm 2010.

<sup>9</sup> De Zorzi 2017.

<sup>10</sup> Josue Justel has apparently announced that he is working on these (Lecture at Institut für Altorientalistik, Freie Universität Berlin, 13.07.2017, information courtesy Christian Hess). Andrew George kindly sent me scans of the respective folios, which I have thus been able to include in preparing this note.

<sup>11</sup> George 2013: 285-319.

<sup>12</sup> De Zorzi 2016: 126 fn. 3; George 2017: 97.

<sup>13</sup> Salvini 1994; 1996; 1998.

language.<sup>14</sup> For one of these he is able to suggest a meaning based on context and interchangeability with Akkadian terms in the rest of the Tigonānum omen corpus, but no interpretation of their grammar is offered.<sup>15</sup> The lines where the allegedly Hurrian words occur are marked with the sign kúr in the margin, a convention that is usually employed to indicate that a mistake has been made.<sup>16</sup> In these cases, however, the sign kúr is exclusively used where words occur that are possibly Hurrian. This reminds one of the use of the Glossenkeil in Hittite texts to indicate words that are predominantly but not always in the Luwian language, although these tend to be written directly before the words rather than in the margin.<sup>17</sup> In the following an attempt will be made to understand the items on this tablet from the point of view of Hurrian grammar.

## 2. *ḥarv*- “to copulate with/fuck/penetrate”

The relevant omina are CUSAS 18, no. 19, §3 obv. 10’–19’ and §5 rev. 27’–33’. Let us start with §5, where the meaning of the word concerned is somewhat clearer. Transliteration is used rather than *scriptio continua*, as the reading of one key sign is different to that suggested by the primary editor:

### Text No. 1: MS 1805

§5 27’ *šum-ma* <sup>f</sup>*a-wi-il-tum iz-ba-am ul-dam-ma* <sup>f</sup>*sí-in-ni-iš<sub>7</sub> tu-ú-le<sup>1</sup>-e-ša*  
 28’ *i+na sú-uh-si-ša ki-la-al-tu šu-uk-ku-na ù bi-iš-šú-ur-šu*  
 29’ *i+na i-ir-ti-šu ša-ak-na ù iš-ku-um i-ša-ru-um i+na ma-aš-ka-an*  
 30’ *bi-iš-šú-ri-ša ša-ak-na ša-am-nu-um<sup>meš</sup> di-iš-pu<sup>meš</sup> ša i+na*  
 31’ *ma-ti-i-ni i-il-li-ku i-ka-al<sup>ḫ</sup> lu-<ú> ma ḫ-at na-ak-ri<sup>ḫ</sup> ni ḫ*  
 32’ kúr *ša ki-ma* <sup>f</sup>*sí-in-ni-iš<sub>7</sub>-ti ḥa-ar-wu-ú-til-la-e ka-ak-ka-am*  
 33’ *da-an-na-am a-na pa-ni-šu i-na-aš-ši*

<sup>14</sup> MS 1805 (CUSAS 18, no. 19).

<sup>15</sup> George 2013: 107. Reference is made here to two of the tablets in Japan which also make use of this convention.

<sup>16</sup> George 2003: 867.

<sup>17</sup> Yakubovich 2010: 367-396 with previous literature. In a series of articles Marina Zorman has advanced the thesis that these Glossenkeil words in Hittite are marked in this way as expressions of linguistic taboo (Zorman 2007; 2010; 2016). It is unlikely that the use of kúr here corresponds to any taboo, as the Tigonānum scribes seem to have had no problem talking about various possibly “taboo”-topics involving sexuality elsewhere. A different explanation for the use of these words in this text is sought in the conclusion to this essay.

If a lady miscarries a foetus and it is female, both her nipples are placed in her crotch and her' (text: his) vulva is placed in her' chest and a testicle (and) penis is placed in the position of her vulva, oil (and) honey, which were flowing in our land, will stop (flowing). The land of our enemy that *penetrates* (us) / that *we penetrate* like a woman will raise a mighty weapon in front of it' (masc. pron. for fem.).

Andrew George translated the relative clause in the apodosis as “that like a woman *ḥarwū belae* (we are raping?)”, due to the fact that this collocation of signs seems to alternate with Akkadian *ninikku* elsewhere in the Tigunānum corpus.<sup>18</sup> Before proceeding to the grammatical analysis of the Hurrian one should qualify this statement a little. From the Lambert folios there is one omen apodosis in one of the unpublished *šumma immeru izbam* texts which uses *ninikku* “we copulate with”, but this appears in a context which seems to be a negative version of this apodosis at least in one feature. This is Lambert Folio 7792, and the text is labeled no. 182 of the tablets from Tigunānum that Lambert had seen. In this case it is a sheep (*immeru*) rather than a woman (*awīltum* “lady) that is giving birth:

**Text No. 2: Lambert Folio 7792**

18     *šum-ma i-im-me-ru iz-ba-am ul-dam-ma si-in-ni-ìš i-ša-ar-šu i-ri-  
ik-ma a-di i-ir-ti-šu ik-šu-ud*

---

<sup>18</sup> George 2013: 119. The English expletive “fuck” takes a direct object and combines separate usages as a colloquial word for sexual intercourse and for doing violence to people or things without any hint of sexual intercourse taking place. This is an unfortunate state of affairs for the English language, but it seems to be paralleled in Akkadian if this evidence is anything to go by, although here it is specifically the intercourse that appears to be an expression of domination. The fact that the English word is currently not used in polite society is of no relevance, but perhaps makes it inappropriate for translation purposes, especially in a contribution to a respected colleague’s celebratory volume. De Zorzi (2016: 131 with fn. 66) suggests the translation “penetrate” rather than George’s “rape”. This distinction captures the fact that it is actually perfectly normal intercourse that is considered as dominating and oppressive (of the female) in the world-view of the omen collection.

- 19 I-en<sup>2</sup> tu-lu<sup>2</sup>-ša i-na ra-pa-āš-ti ša e-le-nu ša-ak-nu ma-a-tum ša ki-  
ma si-in-ni-iš-ti  
20 ni-i-ni-ik-ku ka-ak-ka-am a-na pa-ni-ne i-na-aš-ši ti-iš-bu ù ša-am-  
nu ša i-na li-ib-bi  
21 ma-a-ti-ni il-li-ku-ú-ni i-ka-al-lu-ú

“If a sheep has miscarried a foetus and it is female, her<sup>1</sup> (text: his) penis is long and reaches her<sup>1</sup> (text: his) chest, her one<sup>2</sup> nipple has<sup>1</sup> (text: have) been placed on the upper haunch: the land that we are penetrating like a woman will raise a weapon in front of us. The honey and oil that flowed in our land will stop (flowing).”

Nicla de Zorzi has demonstrated in detail the aggressive masculine world-view that these omens stem from, and made comparisons with phraseology from neighbouring cultures.<sup>19</sup> An abusive attitude to women appears to be part of the hermeneutic framework in which these omens work. Over and above the possibility that there is gender confusion happening on the basis of a lack of grammatical gender in an underlying language, here it also appears that there may have been some confusion of textual traditions, unless it was considered normal for female lambs to have a penis - as seems to be the assumption here.<sup>20</sup>

It is perfectly possible to argue, as George seems to imply, that *ninikku* occurs in a set phrase here: “the land that we are penetrating”. However, note the reversal of the pronoun from “in front of it” (*ina pānīšu*) to “in front of us” (*ina pānīni*, spelled with *-ne* if I have interpreted Lambert’s handwriting correctly). It is thus possible, but not necessary, that in CUSAS 18, no. 19 rev. 32’ the word that is hidden by *harwūtillae* is in fact standing in for “the land of our enemy that is *penetrating us* like a woman”. The Akkadian would in this case thus be expected to be something like *inīak-niāti* or more likely *inēk-nēti*. This may be

---

<sup>19</sup> De Zorzi 2016.

<sup>20</sup> This is not as flippant as it might seem. Patriarchal language famously promotes the grammatically masculine form as the default norm, and patriarchal world-views tend to promote the male bodily form as something normal, from which the female bodily form is an aberration. However, I would opt for seeing this example as a confusion that has arisen from the re-arrangement of textual traditions in this case, rather than as evidence for a particular world-view.

of relevance for the interpretation of the Hurrian, but does not need to be, as we shall see below.

Andrew George read *harwū belae* for the Hurrian word. It is very difficult to get any sense out of this in Hurrian. An alternative would be to read NU instead of BE, which would also give us a recognizable and relevant Hurrian word (*nulae* “with troops(?)” in the instrumental),<sup>21</sup> but even if this form of BE is slightly different to most of the others on this tablet, the very large Winkelhaken after the small horizontal does make the reading of the sign as BE most likely. Here one is also confronted by the problem that the verb is not at the end of the phrase, which one would expect in Hurrian, although this is theoretically a surmountable problem. The ending *-ō/ū* on the verb would also be problematic, being either a modal form or a verb-ending in *-u*.<sup>22</sup>

If we can read BE as *til*, however, then we already have much better chances of extracting some recognizable Hurrian morphology. CVC signs do occur at Tigonanum according to Lambert’s transliterations and the already published material (*lim, tal, pur, šum, tum, dam, tam, šal, din, har, lam, tim, kum, mar, dan, kal, bat*), although I confess I have been unable to find a secure use of BE with the value *til* in Tigonānum Akkadian or in Hurrian personal names from there. This value only occurs sporadically in a place name and a lexical list.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, we are looking for Hurrian and Hurrian language material is in short supply in this archive, with the exception of personal names, so there is little material to compare.<sup>24</sup> If recognizable Hurrian morphology that makes sense in context can be salvaged from *harwūtillae*, then this is the evidence for the use of BE = *til* in Hurrian from this archive.

---

<sup>21</sup> *nuli* “soldier” (?); Campbell 2015: 91 fn. 135: “The *nōli* is probably some sort of troop.” See also Richter 2012: 281-282.

<sup>22</sup> On modal forms in *-ō* see Campbell 2015: 244-248. For the verbal ending in *-u*, see e.g. Giorgieri 2000: 228; Wegner 2007: 130.

<sup>23</sup> *til-la<sup>ki</sup>* in a letter (Folio 8166). A lexical text (Proto-Lu, Folio 8098) has Sumerian *gù-til-la* in its left column spelled out as *gu-ti-il-la* in its right column. In fact the common word *tillatum* “auxiliaries” in the omen compendia is always spelled *ti-il-la-*. The sign BE is used occasionally with the value *úš* in Akkadian words at Tigonānum (George 2013: 108).

<sup>24</sup> There is the one fragmentary Hurrian tablet published by Salvini in 1996; cf. George 2013: 104-105.

One suggestion for a Hurrian reading, given the fact that the text might be rendering the opposite of the phrase *mātum ša kīma sinništi ninikku*, would be to read: *ḫarv-ō=dilla <<e>>*, where the form =dilla is the 1<sup>st</sup> plural absolutive enclitic pronoun. There are at least two major problems with this suggestion: The *-e* at the end of the word would have to be considered a mistake, or an otherwise unattested spelling. It would be very difficult to explain the verbal ending *-ō/-ū* without it being a modal form. The writing *t* for *d* would follow the practice observable in Hurrian texts of writing consonants that correspond to a lax or voiced stop (or something like it) with a single consonant, whereas those that correspond to a tense or voiceless stop (or something like it) are written doubled.<sup>25</sup> This is not a problem in Hurrian texts more generally, but does not correspond to the distribution of stop signs on this tablet. This fact could perhaps be taken as evidence that the sound indicated by the single writing is not exactly the same as that indicated by using a sign for a voiced stop in Akkadian.

Sebastian Fischer suggests to me an alternative explanation, which could take into account all elements of this writing, namely using a morphemic analysis which may or may not be related to the Hurrian category of the “purposive” in *(-l)-ai/ae*, so-called by Dennis Campbell on the analogy of similar syntactic constructions in Australian languages.<sup>26</sup> This category of verb can indicate a desired consequence of an action expressed by another verb, and can also be used in a deontic sense.<sup>27</sup> However similar looking morphemes are also used to form verbal nouns (“gerund” *-m-ai*, only occurring in combination with finite verbs) as well as relative clause-like formations *(-l)-ai*, occurring free-standing).<sup>28</sup> The verb which is expressed by *ḫarvūdillae* occurs in an Akkadian relative clause, which may thus be relevant for its interpretation.

ḫarv-ūd-il(-i)-l-ae  
R-RC-RC(-ACT)-l-“PURP”

In this parsing we would have the root complement *-ūd-*, of unclear meaning, which is homophonous with the negative *-ūd-* (which is impossible in this

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Giorgieri 2000: 186 with fn. 45; Wegner 2007: 43-44; Campbell 2015: 10.

<sup>26</sup> Giorgieri 2000: 243; Campbell 2015: 183-184.

<sup>27</sup> Campbell 2015: 266-267.

<sup>28</sup> Giorgieri 1999: 236; Campbell 2015: 189-192; 266-267.

position),<sup>29</sup> along with a further root complement *-il-*,<sup>30</sup> the active marker *-i-* and then the (not always) modal form *-l-ae*, with syncope of the active marker between two l-sounds.<sup>31</sup> There are currently four proposed examples of the construction where something that looks like the purposive morpheme might have a subordinating function, as recognized in Hittite translations, three involving the verb *naḥḥ-* “to seat, install”, and one the verb *fud-* “to give birth; to sire”.<sup>32</sup> One example will suffice to illustrate the point:

**Text No. 3: Hurrian Parables KBo 32.14**<sup>33</sup>

Hurrian

iv 24 *ma-a-an-ni tar-šu-wa-a-ni*  
*ḥa-zi-ia-na ma-a-an-n[i] e-eb-re-eš na-aḥ-ḥi-la-a-i*  
*mānmi tarḫuwāni*  
*ḥaziyan-a mānmi evri-ž naḥḥ-i-l-āi*

Hittite

iii 30 *nu an-tu-wa-aḥ-ḥa-aš<sup>LÜ</sup> ut-ni-ia-aš-ḥa-an ku-in BE-EL-ŠU i-e-zi*  
*nu antuwahḥas utniyashan kuin ishās=sis iezi*

<sup>29</sup> Giorgieri (2010: 931-936) discusses the different functions of the suffix *-ud-* in detail. He reckons with three separate *-ud-* suffixes: (1) one which indicates a transitive negative; (2) one which changes the meaning of the verb into its opposite; (3) one which is separate from the previous two, but is currently of unclear meaning. Either the second or third is likely to be the one we are dealing with here, as the first is excluded due to the fact that it would need to come after the root complement (Wegner 2007: 100), and while we think we know roughly what *ḥarv-ūd-* means, we do not know whether the meaning of *ḥarv-* is being turned into its opposite.

<sup>30</sup> Giorgieri 2010: 941.

<sup>31</sup> Conceivably the inchoative-ingressive morpheme *-ill-* might be in play here (Wilhelm 1992: 136; Giorgieri 2010: 941), corresponding to an Akkadian durative (*ninikku*). One would not like to exclude at this stage of research that the morpheme *-ae* could correspond to a Hittite sentence with a relative clause without being prefixed by *-l-*. Campbell (2015: 198 fn. 79) tentatively suggests analysing the inchoative-ingressive morpheme as *-il(-i)-l-*, i.e. identically to

<sup>32</sup> Campbell 2015: 190-192; 202-203; Fischer 2018: 71-72.

<sup>33</sup> Neu 1996: 86-87.



Hurrian: “That (is) a man. As mayor (his) lord installed him”  
 Hittite: “(It is) a man, whom his lord makes a country-lord.”

The example of *harv-ūd-il(-i)-l-ae* thus gives us a further example of the Hurrian construction in *-il(-i)-l-ae* being used in a relative clause, without any particular intentional or purposive action being indicated. The “purposive”, in as far as it has been investigated thus far, does not indicate person. There is also no personal pronoun or Hurrian word indicating the subject or the object. However, all other phrases that are translated in the Hittite with a relative clause in the Hurrian Parables text and do not use the *-l-āi* form have the relative in the nominative: *kuis*.<sup>34</sup> For the moment it is formally unclear whether it is “which we are penetrating like a woman” or “which is penetrating (us) like a woman”, but the consistent (albeit only in three cases) use of the accusative relative pronoun to translate Hurrian forms in *-l-āi* might suggest that Akkadian *ša* is the object of the verb in its relative clause.

As pointed out by Andrew George, the same semantic root *harv-* occurs in another of the omens on this same tablet, although this time in the protasis. Again, the relationship between protasis and apodosis seems to be based around the idea of the sexual act being one of domination. Here there is no reason to propose a different reading of a sign, so I will dispense with the transliteration. It is important to cite the whole context.

#### Text No. 4: MS 1805 §3

##### §3 Protasis

- 10' *šumma awīltum izbam uldamma sinnišat*  
 11' *qātāša kilallū ana wurkīša šubburū īšipū*  
 12' *u šēpāšu ana qerbēnu īšipūma ittaṭṭalū*  
 13' *izbum šanūm ina irtīša šakinma u kayyānīm*  
 14' *ha-ar-wa-tu-ū-ša qaqqad la kayyānīm ša nētīm*  
 15' *u ina qātīšu pī kayyānīm šabit*

##### §3 Apodosis

<sup>34</sup> KBo 32.14 obv. i 19: Hurr. *dūri* = Hitt. *kuis arḫa ḫuwais* “who ran away”; rev. iv 3 Hurr. *teḡ-ešt-a-b* = Hitt. *kuis kurur* “who (was) hostile”; rev. iv 48 Hurr. *teḡ-ešt-a-b* = Hitt. *kuis* ... <sup>LÜ</sup>KÜR-*aš* “who (was) an enemy” (Neu 1996: 74-97).

- 16' *ina libbi mātīni ʔarīdu nakru ina lā mūdēm*  
 17' *irrubma u mātum ana ʔarīdimma imaqquṭū*  
 18' *kussi šarrī ʔarīdum iṣabbatma u rābiṣū*  
 19' *mannum ašar libbišu iṣaddadu ittallakū*

Protasis: “If a lady miscarries a foetus and it is female, both her hands are broken and twisted behind her and her feet are twisted inside and face each other, another miscarried foetus is located on her chest and *harwatūša* (is penetrating?) the normal one, the head of the abnormal one (is) that of a lion<sup>1</sup> and it holds the mouth of the normal miscarried foetus in its hands ...”

Apodosis: “... into our country an exiled stranger will enter without being noticed, and the land will fall (pl.!) to the exile. The exile will seize the throne of kings and the bailiffs will keep walking about, each where his heart pulls him.”<sup>35</sup>

The Hurrian word here can be analysed far more easily than the previous one:

ḥarv-ad-ōž-a  
 R-RC-PST-3ERG.SG

A root complement *-ad-* may be attested in the following words on a cursory glance through the bibliographical collection in Richter 2012: ag-ad-;<sup>36</sup> am(m)-ad-;<sup>37</sup> ḥenz-ad-?;<sup>38</sup> hev-ad-;<sup>39</sup> ḥibr-ad-;<sup>40</sup> kav-ad-;<sup>41</sup> mul-ad-;<sup>42</sup> nan-ad-;<sup>43</sup> šin-ad-;<sup>44</sup> šir-ad-.<sup>45</sup> Even if this list is incomplete or contains a couple of examples that

<sup>35</sup> Translation largely after George 2013: 118.

<sup>36</sup> Richter 2012: 5.

<sup>37</sup> Richter 2012: 20.

<sup>38</sup> Richter 2012: 151. *ḥé-en-za-a-du* KBo 32.15 obv. i 4' = Hitt. *sissiyanit dammeḥanza* “in Not geraten” (Neu 1996: 288, 300-303). ḥenz-ād- Hazenbos 2010: 992.

<sup>39</sup> Richter 2012: 153.

<sup>40</sup> Richter 2012: 153.

<sup>41</sup> Richter 2012: 186-187.

<sup>42</sup> Richter 2012: 253.

<sup>43</sup> Richter 2012: 265.

<sup>44</sup> Richter 2012: 380.

<sup>45</sup> Richter 2012: 392.

can be interpreted differently, it shows that there is likely to be good evidence for a root complement *-ad-*, meaning currently unknown.<sup>46</sup>

The spelling of the preterite morpheme *-ōž-* as *-ūž-* should not cause too much consternation outside of the Mittani Letter. The preterite transitive morpheme *-ōž-* and the ergative subject marker *-a* are well placed in the protasis of an omen, corresponding in tense to Akkadian preterites *īšipū*, *ittaṭṭalū*. The patient of the active-transitive verb is expressed by Akkadian *kayyamānim*, “the normal one”, strangely in the genitive, which is probably a mistake for the accusative.<sup>47</sup> As explained by de Zorzi the “lion-headed extra foetus ... parasitically located on the chest of the regular *izbu* represents an exiled intruder who enters the land and seizes the throne.”<sup>48</sup> One expression of the relationship between the usurper and the land too weak to defend itself is that the former is sexually penetrating the latter. While much remains unclear in both of these cases, the above grammatical interpretations in combination with the consideration of the contexts certainly offer arguable proposals for understanding the Hurrian morphology and syntax.<sup>49</sup>

### 3. MS 1805 §4: *ḥurvēna, ārgi, pīledaḥ(h)a?*

The fourth paragraph of the tablet contains no less than three elements which do not belong to the Akkadian language but that are likely to be Hurrian, even if they do not all appear to be easily analyzable at first sight. Once more the context should be reproduced, and there are no too great problems with identification of signs, although their readings are sometimes problematic.

#### Text No. 5: MS 1805 §4

§4    20'        *šumma awīltum izbam uldamma zikar šārātum*  
       21' kúr    *ina rēšīšu ḥu-úr-be-e-na illūni ubānāt qātīšu*

<sup>46</sup> Giorgieri 2010: 939.

<sup>47</sup> George 2013: 106.

<sup>48</sup> De Zorzi 2016: 134.

<sup>49</sup> One of the Tigunānum tablets now in Japan also displays a related word according to George (2013: 107), which is also signaled as being kúr, literally “wrong”: *ḥa-ar-wa-a-te-ta*, which allows an easy analysis as *ḥarv-ād-ed-a*, a transitive future form of the same verb, also with the same root complement *-ād-*. The rest of the context is unknown.

- 22'      *ša iššūri šilāḫim irassu ana qaqqad nēšim*  
 23' kúr    *īpuš wurdūt šarri kīma nēšim a-ar-ḫi*  
 24' kúr    *ù kīma<sup>50</sup> rīmim bi-ta-aḫ-wa kakkūšu idanninūma*  
 25'      *pānī kakkūšu mamman ul utār irassu*  
 26'      *iḫē<sup>2</sup> ušaqqi u mutēr irtīšu ul ibašši*

If a lady has miscarried a foetus and it is male, the hairs - *ḫurvēna* - are coming up on its head,<sup>51</sup> the fingers of its hands are (the talons) of a quail(?), (it) has made its chest into a lion's head: the vassals of the king will *argi* (rampage/snort?) like a lion, and *pidahwa* (gore?) like a wild bull. His weapons will grow strong and faced with his weapons no one will turn him aside, he will raise arms(?) high and there will be none who will turn him aside.

*ḫurvēna*: The interpretations thus far have taken the first term, *ḫurvēna*, in an adverbial sense. Andrew George translates “the hair on its head is emerging *hurbēna*”<sup>52</sup> while Nicola de Zorzi tentatively suggests that the hair is standing up “on end”.<sup>53</sup> These are fine as translations from the point of view of Akkadian, and it is very likely that something like “on end” is the practical meaning, but if *ḫurvēna* is supposed to be functioning according to Hurrian syntax, as the Hurrian word was in the previous cases, and as the words seems to be doing in the next two cases, then an adverbial usage is pretty much excluded.<sup>54</sup> The form is most likely absolutive plural of a word *ḫurve/i* or *ḫōrve/i* and can as such only be understood as in some way subject of the intransitive verb *illūni* “rise up, emerge”. This can either be standing in apposition to *šārātum* “the hairs - *ḫurvi*'s - are emerging on his head” or *šārātum* is to be understood as removed from the direct verbal syntax in *casus pendens*: “as for the hair, *ḫurvi*'s are emerging on his head”. Possibly there is not a great deal of semantic difference.

<sup>50</sup> Tablet reads *dī-ma*.

<sup>51</sup> Or “as for the hairs, *ḫurvēna* are coming up on his head”.

<sup>52</sup> Translation largely following George 2013: 118.

<sup>53</sup> De Zorzi 2016: 132-133 with fn. 74.

<sup>54</sup> It is theoretically possible that an essive case is being used adverbially with a singular stem *ḫurven(i)-a*, or possibly *ḫurve-n(e)-a*, but this kind of syntactic use of the essive without any adnominal relationship in the rest of the sentence would be very rare.

We have a number of further contexts for a noun *hurvi*.<sup>55</sup> Unfortunately none of them is particularly helpful in narrowing down the semantic field, but they are of interest.<sup>56</sup>

There was a collective formation for a word that looked very much like this: *ḫu-u-ur-wa<sub>a</sub>-a-te*, *ḫōrv(i)-āde*. This occurs in one of the tablets of the Hurrian-language Ullikummi myth, but the context is unclear.<sup>57</sup> An interesting spelling occurs in an otherwise incomprehensible context as part of the Hurrian parables from Boğazköy, suggesting that the vowel of the first syllable might have been *ō*, and that the *be* was likely to be pronounced *ve/i*, if the words are in fact connected: *ḫu-u-ur-wi<sub>i</sub>-ni(-)[...]*.<sup>58</sup> A further example of this spelling, likely to be the same word despite a break, occurs in an incantation from Boğazköy against an ant(?)-swarm (Hittite *lalakuessar*): [*ḫ*u-ur-wi<sub>i</sub>-na *ḫé-bar-we*<sub>e</sub><sup>?</sup>-na<sup>?</sup>] ... *ki-ip-ša*.<sup>59</sup> *kipš-a* is likely to be an intransitive verbal predicate of unknown meaning, and *ḫevarve*<sup>?</sup>[-na] could be another absolutive phrase parallel with *ḫurvina*.<sup>60</sup>

A Hurrian incantation against *gergiššum* disease known from both Tell Bi'a/Tuttul and Mari also mentions *še-na ḫu-ur-bi-na*, in the closest form to the one attested here.<sup>61</sup> Most likely these are “two *hurvi*’s” which are also in the

<sup>55</sup> Richter 2012.

<sup>56</sup> The phrase LÚ *ḫu-ur-bé-we* AIT 166 (BM 131523), 20, translated as “man of the ritual cup” by Oliva (2006: 330) based on collation is to be regarded with caution. Von Dassow (2002: 870) transliterates LÚ *ḫu-ur-nu<sup>i</sup>-we* (also after collation) and comments that NU appears to be written over an erased NI. My own collation (09.05.2019) supports the reading of von Dassow. Possibly Oliva has read the Winkelhaken on the sign PI (= *we*) twice: once attached to the end of a putative BI and once to the PI where they belong.

<sup>57</sup> KBo 27.217 obv. i 24'; Salvini, Wegner 2004: 43. Reference courtesy Sebastian Fischer.

<sup>58</sup> KBo 32.12 obv. 1: *zu-zu-u-un-ni ne-e-ra ḫu-u-ur-wi<sub>i</sub>-ni-[...]* (Neu 1996: 56, 62 *zuzonni* “Tierjunges?”). The only known word here is *nēra* “mother”. See Görke 2010: 90; Richter 2012: 422.

<sup>59</sup> ABoT 1.38, 5'-6'; Haas, Wegner 1988: 420-421, no. 104.

<sup>60</sup> Richter’s bibliographical glossary (2012: 153) lists a *ḫeb/v-ad-* and also a *ḫeb/v-ar-* attested at Nuzi, which may have something to do with “travel, make the rounds” (CAD H 178). For *kipš-* see Richter 2012: 210. The form could also be explained as *kepše* “delivery” in the essive: *kepš(e)-a* “as a delivery”. But this is all unclear.

<sup>61</sup> KTT 379; Krebernik 2001: 157-159 with score transliteration additionally of the Mari tablet.

absolutive and are subject of the intransitive verb *kalz-a-b*, also of unknown meaning.<sup>62</sup> The *gergiššum* disease, which is mentioned in the colophon from Tell Bi'a, affects the head according to late collections of medical prescriptions, which is obviously relevant for the present context.<sup>63</sup> One might think of “lumps” or “growths” in the case of the incantation, but it is unclear how this is going to give a vigorous masculine connection that will trigger the apodosis in our omen from Tigonānum, where mountain peaks, a lion's mane, swords, spears or even (bull's) horns might be more effective things to be growing out of the head where the hair is. Indeed if one was to understand *hurvēna* as “horns”, this might trigger the goring activity of the bull in the apodosis as the lion-headed chest of the miscarried child triggers the lion-like activity (see below). However, where we are already so much in the dark, this can only be a very tentative and desperate help.

The Hurrian word for “horn” has been tentatively proposed to be *havūži* on the basis of an alleged alternation with *SI-ŠU* on a broken bilingual tablet from Hattusa.<sup>64</sup> All that remains of the end of KBo 32.16 i 15 is [*h*]a-wu<sub>i</sub>-ú-ši, while all that remains of the beginning of the next line in the Hittite translation (KBo 32.16 ii 16) is *SI-ŠU*. This is a slender basis for an equation that would require further supporting evidence.<sup>65</sup> If this *havūži* should in fact turn out to be the word for “horn”, then perhaps *hurvi* is a word for something else related to bulls, possibly the reproductive organs, which (whether male or female) sometimes appear misplaced in these omens,<sup>66</sup> or the hooves which kick or trample.<sup>67</sup> For the moment “horns” give a natural association with the head, and are thus given a slight preference in the interpretation.

<sup>62</sup> Krebernik (2001: 157) interprets *šena* as “brothers”, rather than as a writing of *šinelšina* “two”. For the number “two” see Giorgieri 2000: 222; Wegner 2007: 81; Fischer 2017: 38 fn. 65.

<sup>63</sup> Geller 2006: 7-8.

<sup>64</sup> Neu 1996: 299

<sup>65</sup> See Richter 2012: 131-132, who notes that the proposal has not been taken up in some of the literature.

<sup>66</sup> See e.g. MS 1805 §6, George 2013: 119. Note also Hurr. *hu-ri* = Sum. *ÚR*, Akk. *sūnu* “lap”, but also used for “genitalia”, in the trilingual word-list from Ugarit, RS 94-2939 iv 7' (André-Salvini, Salvini 1998: 7, 12; *hōri* Giorgieri 2001: 137)

<sup>67</sup> Note association of donkey's hooves and Adad in southern Mesopotamia (George 2013: 63, 69), and the omens from Tigonānum on the basis of severed fetlocks and hooves (George 2013: 103, 292-293).

A similar looking word also occurs apparently in one of the unpublished Tigonānum documents according to Lambert’s transliterations, Folio 8070. This is a damaged administrative document which mentions (ll. 1-7): “PN, grandson of a merchant, man of GN, *ša ina* <sup>urru</sup>[GN] *ḫu-ur-bi-ta awātam ušteneššū*”.<sup>68</sup> If we can understand this as a Hurrian directive *ḫurvi-da*, then we have “who regularly sends out word from the town [X] to the *ḫurvi*” or (less likely) “to the *ḫurvi* in the town [X]”. Is this a person, a place, a landmark, an activity or a compass-direction?<sup>69</sup> And can this be related to the other words we have been considering?

Only further texts will help us decide this. However, it is also important to consider the relationship between the different text components in the omen. De Zorzi has emphasized the way the omen-compendia from Tigonānum have practically disengaged from the paradigmatic/vertical level of compendium organization and instead concentrate on the syntagmatic relations between the content in the protasis and the apodosis.<sup>70</sup> We will consider this again when looking at the next two words. However, it is also possible that the trigger of “horns” in the protasis, if this can be accepted, has an etymological, or at least folk etymological background. As Sebastian Fischer points out to me, one occasionally finds cases of alternations in root-formation that revolve around the presence or absence of /r/. Thus for example with the verb *urb/v-* “slaughter”, which also seems to occur in a form without /r/: *ub/v-*.<sup>71</sup> One might wonder

---

<sup>68</sup> Lambert seems to have hesitated at first to read -ta instead of -ša, but in a presumably later note on the same page, he decided for -ta quite emphatically.

<sup>69</sup> Diakonoff (1990: 62) thought *ḫurve* was the word for “morning, East” and that the ethnic term “Hurrian” *ḫurv(i)-ō-ḡe* was to be connected (i.e. “Easterners”). However, the interpretation of *ḫurve* as the word for “morning” on the basis of Caucasian comparanda “hat sich nicht bestätigt” (Haas, Wegner 1996: 287). For further literature see Richter 2012: 170-171. However, note the terminology for “horns” of celestial bodies, particularly the moon but also the sun, listed under CAD *qarnu* 3, (Q 136-138). Such terms could also have been used for directions. One should also not exclude that *ḫurv(i)-ō-ḡe* is somehow related to this complex. This question would require a much larger investigation. There is also the word *ḫōbri* that seems to be a part of the head (Giorgieri 2001: 138). Volkert Haas refers to a ritual substance *ḫurbi* in Hittite rituals, that he thinks could be related to *ḫu/obri* (Haas 2003: 351, no. 177, 178).

<sup>70</sup> De Zorzi 2016: 138-139.

<sup>71</sup> Richter 2012: 499-500. A similar phenomenon was identified by Wilhelm (1992: 135) for three verbal roots: *urv-* : *uv-* “schlachten”; *ḫalv-* : *ḫav-* “umfrieden” (Nuzi), *ḫubl-* :

whether something similar was happening with the root *ḫurb/v-* that we have before us in the word *ḫurvi* that we are tentatively identifying as horn. As Fischer suggests, there is also a verb *ḫub/v(-l)-* that appears to mean “zerbrechen”, corresponding to Hittite *arḫa duwarnāi*.<sup>72</sup> From here it is not far to the word *ḫubidi*, the “bull-calf” of Teššob associated with Šarruma, and thus to the content of the apodosis.<sup>73</sup> However, an investigation of the possible relationships between these words (e.g. horns as “breakers, gorers”?) lies beyond the scope of this essay.

*a-ar-ḫi* and *bi-ta-aḫ-wa*: In the case of the two remaining words that occur in a line marked with *kúr* and have been thought likely to be Hurrian, some intimation of their meaning has been suggested on the basis of comparanda from the rest of the Tigonānum omen corpus. The problem here is rather one of finding a way that they can be made to look Hurrian from an orthographic, grammatical or syntactic point of view. *a-ar-ḫi* and *bi-ta-aḫ-wa* are supposed by Andrew George to correspond respectively to *naḫīrīšū ittanappah* “flaring his nostrils (like a lion)” and *ittanakkip* “keep goring (like a wild bull)”.<sup>74</sup> The form *ārḡ-i* is a regular Hurrian antipassive formation, which we should expect to find being used when a primarily transitive verb is “detransitivised”. That fits the circumstances here very well: Akkadian *napāḫum* means “to blow, to light or kindle”. One can blow something, through something, or on something, or one can simply produce a blowing action through the nostrils as in the case cited by George. In this case the vassals of the king are “snorting/growling” like a lion, without the nostrils being mentioned.<sup>75</sup> The other evidence for the meaning of a

---

*ḫub* “zerbrechen”, which involves the root under consideration, although with a different “errant” liquid in a different position.

<sup>72</sup> Literature at Richter 2012: 164.

<sup>73</sup> Richter 2012: 164-165. For *ḫubidi* as a Hurrian personal name in Hittite texts (written <sup>1</sup>AMAR-*ti*) see de Martino 2011: 27-28, 35, 53. An etymological connection between *ḫub-* “zerbrechen” and *ḫubidi* “Jungstier” is made at Wilhelm 1998: 183 fn. 22. There is a Hurrian name *ḫurbi-Teššob* at Nuzi (Schwemer 2001: 471): “Teššob x-es”. This may indicate that *ḫurv-i* (R-ANTIP), possibly the verbal root from which *ḫurvi* is derived, is precisely the kind of action which Teššob the bull performs: is he butting, goring, smashing or trampling? See further Richter 2016: 424, without translation.

<sup>74</sup> George 2013: 121.

<sup>75</sup> The Hurrian intransitive verb can be singular or plural. However, one does not necessarily need to understand *wurdūt šarri* as a grammatical plural, even if it has the



root *ārg-* has been collected by Susanne Görke, but it is unclear whether the meaning adduced here is helpful.<sup>76</sup>

*ārg-i*  
snorts?-ANTIP.

The final element for consideration is *bi-ta-aḥ-wa*. At first sight this form seems un-amenable to analysis as a Hurrian verb corresponding to anything either syntactically or semantically relevant. The Hurrian dative nominal ending is in *-va*, which makes no sense, either syntactically or morphologically (we would expect a nominal form *\*pidaḡi-va*). We do not need a noun in the dative, when in fact we expect a correspondence to *ittanakkip* “is constantly going”. However, an intransitive verb in *-a* or an antipassive in *-i* are precisely what we do want, although there is unlikely to be any such thing as a root complement to a verb that takes the form *-aḥf-*. As a way out of this situation we may have to use the value *à* of the sign PI, which is attested in at least one Old Babylonian literary text.<sup>77</sup> A transliteration *pi-ta-aḥ-à* would indicate a reading that may make some sense.

*pid-aḥ(ḥ)-a*  
gores?-RC-INTR.

---

determinative MEŠ (George 2013: 120-121). The form *wurdūt* could be an abstract form referring to the collective group, and thus grammatically singular: the “servantry”.

<sup>76</sup> Görke 2010: 113, 119-120. Ritual der Aštu III. Fassung C 16: *ḥa-a-a-it e-še-ni en-na ar-ḥa-an-ti-en*, analysed as *ḥā-i=d eže-ni en(i)-na arḡ-an-d-en* translated “Nimm mich von/aus der Erde! Die Götter möge er *arḡ-an-d-en*.” Campbell (2014: 323) has this as a nominal form: “Oh gods, take me from the earth, from the *arḡandi*”. See further Richter 2012: 181.

<sup>77</sup> Borger 2004: 165 (no. 586); von Soden, Röllig 1991: no. 223. *ba-ni-à-a ši-im-ta-à-ša* “her (Ištar’s) adornments are beautiful” OB Ištar 12 (Lenzi 2011: 114). A number of names in the Tigunatum corpus (particularly the prism) and elsewhere have the form X-WA-RI, such as *Aranziḥ-WA-RI* or *Kušuḥ-WA-RI*. One might have thought these could be further examples of names spelled X-à-tal. However, the names are read consistently as X-ew-ri, “X (is) lord” in modern publications. For the prism see the collection at Zadok 1999: 353; further Richter 2016: 399-400. For discussions of the relevant names on the prism: *ibid.* 59, 65, 108-109, 138, 168, 173, 184.

This *pid-ah(h)*- might have a slightly different meaning in Hurrian to the Akkadian word *ittanakkip*. Indeed a Hurrian rendition of *ittanakkip* is precisely where we might once more expect an antipassive, given the fundamentally transitive meaning of Akkadian *nakāpum* beside its frequent “detransitivised” usage.<sup>78</sup> Thus we should probably not completely exclude the possibility that one should read *pi-ta-ah-wi* for *pid-ah(h)-i*, even if this is straining the orthography to its limits. However, there is a good deal of evidence for the meaning of similar-sounding roots in Hurrian, albeit using different root complements, and none of it has to do with “goring”. In fact a basic intransitive verb form in *-a* would be precisely what is required by some of the meanings available.

The root complement *-ah(h)*- is essentially unknown in its meaning.<sup>79</sup> A stem *pid-uff*- is attested in the Hurro-Hittite bilingual from Hattusa in the meaning “turn round”, corresponding to Hittite *weh*- “turn”.<sup>80</sup> If we want to establish a connection with bovine activity, and thus both with the vehicle of the comparison as well as the hypothetical triggering elements in the protasis, this is perhaps the basic action of an ox pulling a plough back and forth in the boustrophedon manner, although in the Bilingual it refers to the goddess Allani going back and forth in reaction to Teššob’s arrival in the underworld. In this case the meaning could be “wanders/spins around like a wild bull”. We should also remember that the Hurrian word for “bull, ox” is *pedari*, which sounds similar to the verb.<sup>81</sup> We would thus have *hu(r)vi* (- *hub/v* - *hubidi*) pointing forward into the apodosis from the protasis, and *pid-ah(h)*- (- *pedari*) pointing backward from the apodosis into the protasis.<sup>82</sup> However, this is drifting further

<sup>78</sup> CAD N/1, 157-158.

<sup>79</sup> See last Fischer 2018: 47-48 with further literature.

<sup>80</sup> KBo 32.13 i 11: *pi-du-ub-wa<sub>a</sub>* (pid-uff-a) = Hitt. *ú-e-ḫa-at-ta* (Neu 1996: 251).

<sup>81</sup> The root *pid*-, if it also has the meaning “turn” without the suffix root complement *-uff*-, may also be related to the Hurrian word for “bull, ox” *pedari*, which could well be understood as a transferred epithet from the activity of ploughing in the boustrophedon manner: “that which goes round and round” (*pid-ar-i* with the iterative suffix *-ar-*). Giorgieri (2010: 938-939, with previous literature) prefers to regard the suffix in *pedari* as functionally unidentified rather than iterative. Richter 2012: 318-319.

<sup>82</sup> Daniel Schwemer (2001: 486 fn. 3969) contrasts *hubidi* as the “Jungtier” with *pedari* as the “Stier, Rind”. Teššob is called the *pedari* <sup>d</sup>*Ani-ve*, “the bull of Ani” (KUB 47.78 i 10; Schwemer 2001: 454). Šarruma is the *hubidi* of Teššob. There is no need for these divine implications to be carried into the context of our omen, the use of the words for

into speculation, and given our poor knowledge of the semantics it is just as valid to use this reading of this attestation, if it can be accepted on the basis of the orthography, as possible and indeed insecure evidence for a *pid-ah(h)*-meaning “gore, butt”, although with the above reservations in mind. Furthermore, *pid-uff*- “turn” is not the only comparable root. One could also consider *ped-ešt*- from the Mittani letter, where it seems to have the meaning “spread out, lay out”, and is used of gifts.<sup>83</sup> In this case the wild bull could be “flattening” (people), but this would almost certainly require an antipassive in *-i*.

#### 4. Conclusion

Despite a number of difficulties, it has proven possible to demonstrate that the foreign language words in the tablet MS 1805 can be interpreted in such a way that they correspond to legitimate Hurrian grammar. None of these conclusions are certain, merely proposals for further discussion. Particularly in the area of semantics we are unable to come much further, although the study of omen texts in their hermeneutic context may prove a useful way forward, i.e. with an understanding of the kind of meanings that are required to trigger the relationship between protasis and apodosis.

What was the status of these Hurrian words in these texts? Andrew George drew attention to aspects of the Akkadian of the omen texts which muddle conjugation and tense, agreement in number and gender between nouns, adjectives and verbs.<sup>84</sup> These are phenomena that could have resulted if the composers/scribes of these documents were native speakers of Hurrian, or were otherwise working from a Hurrian tradition, as these are the kind of errors that could very well have arisen from a Hurrian substrate. However, word-substitution occurs very rarely, being thus far identified in only three of the twenty-four published omen tablets from this archive. And the fact that other tablets seem to write corresponding terms in Akkadian (*ninikku*, *ittanappah*, *ittanakkip*) shows that it is not necessarily a matter of a scribe having forgotten the appropriate word in a foreign language. We have further seen that the

---

the respective members of the divine family merely indicates the relations between the words.

<sup>83</sup> Tentative suggestion courtesy Sebastian Fischer. Richter 2012: 318.

<sup>84</sup> George 2013: 106.

Hurrian words as interpreted here fit quite well into the syntax of the Akkadian sentences, they have not just been written in as glosses or random items, an effort has been made to make them agree. Quite possibly we are dealing with recourse to a language that makes the hermeneutic connections between the protasis and the apodosis clearer for the purposes of interpretation and exegesis by the diviner. This will be a matter for further study.

## Bibliography and Bibliographical Abbreviations

### Akdoğan, R. and Wilhelm, G.

2010 Ein Täfelchen über Gerstenrationen aus Tigunanu(?). *AoF* 37, 159–62

### André-Salvini, B. and Salvini, M.

1998 “Un nouveau vocabulaire trilingue sumerien-akkadien-hourrite de Ras Shamra,” *SCCNH* 9, 3–40.

### Borger, R.

2004 *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*. Münster.

**CAD** = Chicago Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago

### Campbell, D.

2014 Review of Görke 2010. *JAOS* 134/2, 321–324.

2015 *Mood and Modality in Hurrian*. Winona Lake.

### Civil, M.

2010 *The Lexical Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 12. Winona Lake.

### De Martino, S.

2011 *Hurrian Personal Names in the Kingdom of Hatti*. Eothen 18. Firenze.

### De Zorzi, N.

2016 “Teratomancy at Tigunānum: structure, hermeneutics and Weltanschauung of a northern Mesopotamian omen corpus,” *JCS* 69, 125–150.

2017 “Another Teratomantic Tablet from Tigunānum,” *WZKM* 107, 11–18.

### Diakonoff, I.

1990 “Language Contacts in the Caucasus and the Near East,” in T.L. Markey and A.C. Greppin (eds.), *When Worlds Collide: The Indo-Europeans and the Pre-Indo-Europeans*. *Linguistica Extranea, Studia* 19. Ann Arbor, 53–65.

### Fischer, S.

2017 “Erste Ergebnisse einer Untersuchung der hurritischen Emar-Texte,” *Mesopotamia* 52, 31–53.

2018 *Raumrelationen. Die Lokalkasus im Hurritischen*. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World. Berlin.

### Geller, M.

2006 “Les maladies et leurs causes, selon un texte médical paléobabylonien,” *Journal des médecines cuneiformes* 8, 7–12.

**George, A.R.**

- 2003 *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts.* Oxford.
- 2013 *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection.* CUSAS 18. Bethesda, MD.
- 2017 “Babylonian documents from North Mesopotamia,” in A.R. George (ed.) *Assyrian Archival Texts in the Schøyen Collection and Other Documents*, Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology, 34. Bethesda, Md, pp. 95–108.

**Giorgieri, M.**

- 1999 “Die hurritischen Kasusendungen,” in D. Owen and G. Wilhelm (eds), *Nuzi at Seventy Five, SCCNH 10*, Bethesda, pp. 223–256.
- 2000 “Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica,” in G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *La civiltà dei Hurriti* (La Parola del Passato 55), Napoli, pp. 171–275, 390–420.
- 2001 “Die hurritische Fassung des Ullikummi-Lieds und ihre hethitische Parallele,” in G. Wilhelm (ed.) *Akten des IV. internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. StBoT 45, Wiesbaden, pp. 134–155.
- 2010 “Zu den sogenannten Wurzelerweiterungen des Hurritischen. Allgemeine Probleme und Einzelfälle,” in L. Kogan, N. Koslova, S. Loesov and S. Tishchenko (eds), *Language in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Volume I*, Babel und Bibel 4, Winona Lake, pp. 927–947.

**Görke, S.**

- 2010 *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boazköy/Hattuša.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 40. Leiden-Boston.

**Haas, V.**

- 2003 *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica. Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient.* Berlin–New York.

**Haas, V. and Wegner, I.**

- 1988 *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* <sup>SAL.ŠU.GI</sup>. ChS 1/5. Rome.
- 1996 “Stern, Tag und Segen(?) im Hurritischen,” *SCCNH* 8, 285-290.

**Hazenbos, J.**

- 2010 “Hurritisch und syntaktische Ergativität,” in L. Kogan, N. Koslova, S. Loesov and S. Tishchenko (eds), *Language in the Ancient Near East*.

*Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Volume I, Babel und Bibel 4, Winona Lake, pp. 989–997.*

**Krebernik, M.**

2001 *Tall Bi'a / Tuttul II: Die Altorientalischen Schriftfunde.* Saarbrücken.

**Lenzi, A.**

2011 *Reading Akkadian Prayers and Hymns: An Introduction.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

**Neu, E.**

1996 *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Text-ensemble aus Ḫattuša.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 32. Wiesbaden.

**Oliva, J.**

2006 “Collations of Middle Babylonian Alalakh Tablets in the British Museum,” in G. del Olmo Lete, Ll. Feliu, A. Millet-Alba (eds.), *šapal tibnim mû illakû. Studies Presented to Joaquin Sanmartin on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, AuOrS 22, Barcelona, pp. 325–332. L  
SEP

**Richter, T.**

2012 *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen.* Wiesbaden.

2016 *Vorarbeiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch: Erster Teil: Personennamen altbabylonischer Überlieferung vom Mittleren Euphrat und aus dem nördlichen Mesopotamien.* Wiesbaden.

**Salvini, M.**

1994 Una lettera di Ḫattusili I relativa alla spedizione contro Ḫahhum. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 34, 61–80

1996 *The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani.* Documenta Asiana 3. Rome: Istituto Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.

1998 Un royaume hurrite en Mesopotamie du Nord à l'époque de Ḫattusili I. *Subartu* 4, I, 305–11.

2018 “Tikunani. Il prisma delle città,” in A. Vacca, S. Pizzimenti and M.G. Micale (eds), *A Oriente del Delta. Scritti sull'Egitto ed il Vicino Oriente antico in onore di Gabriella Scandone Matthiae*, Contributi e Materiali di Archeologia Orientale 18, Roma, 591–609.

**Salvini, M. and Wegner, I.**

2004 *Die mythologischen Texte*, ChS 1/6. Rome.

**Schwemer, D.**

2001 *Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens.* Wiesbaden.

**von Dassow, E.**

2002 Lists of People from the Alalah IV Administrative Archives, *UgaritForschungen* 34, 835–911.

**von Soden, W. and Röllig, W.**

1991 *Das akkadische Syllabar*, 4., durgesehene und erweiterete Auflage.  
Rome.

**Wegner, I.**

2007 *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. 2., überarbeitete Auflage,  
Wiesbaden.

**Wilhelm, G.**

1992 “Hurritische Lexikographie und Grammatik: die hurritisch-hethitische  
Bilingue aus Boğazköy,” *Orientalia* 61, 122–141.

1998 Notes on the Mittani letter. MitN no. 9-1: Mit. IV 52, *SCCNH* 9, 181–  
185.<sup>[SEP]</sup>

**Yakubovich, I.**

2010 *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden–Boston.

**Zorman, M.**

2007 Sprachtabu als Motiv der Verwendung von Glossenkeilen I. Wörter  
von A bis I, in D. Groddek and M. Zorman (eds), *Tabularia  
Hethaeorum – Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65.  
Geburtstag*, DBH 25, Wiesbaden, 753–769.

2010 Über die Gründe für die Verwendung von Glossenkeilen im  
Hethitischen. In A. Süel (ed.), *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi  
Bildirileri, Çorum 25-31 Ağustos 2008 – Acts of the VIIth  
International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25-31, 2008*,  
Ankara, 1029–1046.

2016 Sprachtabu als Motiv der Verwendung von Glossenkeilen II. Wörter  
von K bis Z. Ideogramme. Akkadische Wörter. In S. Erkut, Ö. Sir  
Gavaz (eds), *ANTAŞSUM<sup>SAR</sup> “ÇİĞDEM” – Eski Anadolu  
Araştırmalarına ve Hititlere Adanmış Bir Hayat / Studies in Honour of  
Ahmet Ünal = Ahmet Ünal Armağanı*, İstanbul, 575–602.