꙰

# A HITTITE CHRESTOMATHY

BY

## EDGAR H. STURTEVANT

AND

## GEORGE BECHTEL

꙰

# A HITTITE CHRESTOMATHY

BY

### EDGAR H. STURTEVANT
*Professor of Linguistics in Yale University*

AND

### GEORGE BECHTEL
*Research Assistant in Linguistics in Yale University*

---

*WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY*
*LINGUISTIC SERIES*

---

# PREFACE

This book is intended for beginners; it assumes no preliminary acquaintance either with cuneiform writing or with the Hittite language. It does not, however, contain all the material that a beginner will need. He must consult a grammar for a systematic account of the language, and he should also use a dictionary. The book is designed to go with Sturtevant's Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language (Philadelphia, 1933) and Hittite Glossary (Baltimore, 1931). The latter book is out of date; but it will serve until a new edition can be prepared.

Although several lists of the cuneiform signs employed in Hittite texts have been published, none of them could readily be used with this book, since we frequently disagree with them in the method of transcribing the signs, especially the ideographic signs. Consequently it was necessary to include a sign-list. We have adopted Forrer's (Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift 1.25–37) device of arranging this alphabetically rather than according to the shapes of the signs, since that arrangement is more convenient for the learner. One who is actually deciphering cuneiform texts needs a list of signs arranged according to shape; but our list is not intended for that purpose. Similarly we have restricted the list to signs that occur in our texts and a few others that are more or less closely related to them. The sign list may be used as a dictionary to the ideograms, many of which the present edition of the Glossary does not include in the transcription employed in this book.

Some scholars will be shocked at the amount of help we have given the learner. One advantage of such a book as ours is that it can easily be used without the aid of a teacher. But in any case it is, in our opinion, a mere waste of time to confront the student with riddles to solve. We believe that the quickest way to learn the cuneiform system of writing is to compare a cuneiform text with its transliteration, and so we set the two on opposite pages at the beginning. There follows ample cuneiform material for the student to test his competence without having the key before his eyes. Similarly we hope that much time will be saved by confronting the transliterated text with the translation.

The texts here included have all been published in transliteration elsewhere, and we have not repeated textual discussions except where

necessary. All except the Anniwiyanis ritual are based upon more than one cuneiform tablet, and we enclose in square brackets only those parts of our text that do not appear on any of the tablets. We have indicated supplements in this way only in the transliterated text; the cuneiform text and the translation, therefore, should be used only with reference to that.

The commentary serves three purposes. First and most important, it provides information that the beginner is likely to need in order to understand the meaning and grammatical structure of the texts. Secondly, our readings and supplements are explained and justified where that seems necessary, and previously published critical apparatus are sometimes supplemented. Finally, new interpretations of words and passages are discussed as fully as seems desirable. No attempt is made to discuss the many historical, geographic, religious, and cultural questions raised by the texts. When it seems advisable to write a Hittite word in broad transcription, the system employed in the Glossary is followed; that is, only a minimum of phonetic interpretation is introduced. The more ambitious system used in HG can be defended only if constantly accompanied by syllabic transcription.

Bechtel prepared the sign list and autographed all the cuneiform texts except the Instructions for Temple Officials. Sturtevant is primarily responsible for the rest of the book. Both authors, however, have conferred about the work at all stages of its progress; it would be quite impossible to separate their contributions.

We are under obligations to the previous editors of the texts here included, and to other scholars whose names will be found in the commentary.

Eva Fiesel of Yale University has read the manuscript on the Hattusilis, the Telipinus, and the Code. E. Adelaide Hahn of Hunter College and Albrecht Götze of Yale University have read all the manuscript except the sign list and the cuneiform text. All three have made many valuable suggestions for which we express our thanks. Our obligation to Götze is particularly heavy; many of his contributions are acknowledged in the commentary, but the record is far from complete. Nevertheless we have not adopted all of his suggestions, and so he cannot be held responsible for any of our errors.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# ABBREVIATIONS

## 1. BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

*All references are to pages, except cross references and references to* HG.

AJP = American Journal of Philology, founded by B. L. Gildersleeve. Baltimore.

AO = Der Alte Orient, gemeinverständliche Darstellungen herausgegeben von der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig.

AOF = Archiv für Orientforschung, internationale Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft vom vorderen Orient. Berlin. (The first two volumes are entitled: Archiv für Keilschriftforschung.)

AOr. = Archiv Orientální, Journal of the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute. Prague.

BoSt. = Boghazköi-Studien, herausgegeben von Otto Weber. 10 parts. Leipzig. 1917–24.

BoTU = Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift, von Emil Forrer. 2 vols. = 41 and 42 Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Leipzig. 1922–6.

BSL = Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Paris.

Congr. 1 = Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistes. The Hague. 1928.

Congr. 2 = Actes du Second Congrès International de Linguistes. Geneva. 1931.

Deimel = P. Anton Deimel, Šumerisches Lexikon. Rome. 1928—.

Delaporte = L. Delaporte, Syllabaire Hittite Cunéiforme = Manuel de la Langue Hittite I. Paris. 1929.

Forrer = E. Forrer, Die Keilschrift von Boghazköi = BoTU 1.

Forrer, Forsch. = E. Forrer, Forschungen. Berlin. 1926—.

Friedrich, Vert. = J. Friedrich, Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in Hethitischer Sprache. 2 parts = Hethitische Texte in Umschrift mit Uebersetzung und Erläuterungen. Heft II, IV = MVAG 31.1, 34.1. Leipzig. 1926–30.

Glossary = E. H. Sturtevant, Hittite Glossary, Words of Known or Conjectured Meaning with Sumerian Ideograms and Akkadian Words Common in Hittite Texts = Language Monographs, pub-

lished by the Linguistic Society of America, No. 9.  Baltimore.
1931.

Glotta = Glotta, Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache.
Göttingen.

Götze, AM = A. Götze, Die Annalen des Muršiliš = Hethitische Texte
in Umschrift.  Heft VI. = MVAG 38.  Leipzig.  1933.

Götze, Hatt. = A. Götze, Ḫattušiliš, der Bericht über seine Thron-
besteigung nebst den Paralleltexten = Hethitische Texte in Um-
schrift.  Heft I = MVAG 29.3.  Leipzig.  1925.

Götze, KlH = A. Götze, Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit, eine geographische
Untersuchung = Orient und Antike 1.  Heidelberg.  1924.

Götze, Kulturgeschichte = Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients 3.1.
A. Götze, Kleinasien = W. Otto, Handbuch der Altertumswissen-
schaft.  Dritte Abteilung.  Erster Teil.  Dritter Band.  Dritter
Abschnitt.  Erste Lieferung.  Munich.  1933.

Götze, Madd. = A. Götze, Madduwattaš = Hethitische Texte in
Umschrift.  Heft III. = MVAG 32.1.  Leipzig.  1928.

Götze, NBr. = A. Götze, Neue Bruchstücke zum Grossen Text des
Ḫattušiliš und den Paralleltexten = Hethitische Texte in Um-
schrift.  Heft V = MVAG 34.2.  Leipzig.  1930.

Götze-Pedersen, MS = A. Götze and H. Pedersen, Muršilis Sprach-
lähmung, ein hethitischer Text mit philologischen und linguis-
tischen Erörterungen = Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab,
Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 21.2.  Copenhagen.  1934.

HG = E. H. Sturtevant.  A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite
Language.  Philadelphia.  1933.  [References to this book are to
paragraphs.  They are enclosed in square brackets.]

Hrozný, CH = F. Hrozný, Code Hittite Provenant de l'Asie Mineure.
Première Partie = Hethitica, collection de travaux relatifs à la
philologie, l'histoire, et l'archéologie hittites 1.1.  Paris.  1922.

Hrozný, SH = F. Hrozný, Die Sprache der Hethiter, ihr Bau und ihre
Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm, ein Entziffer-
ungsversuch = BoSt. 1, 2.  Leipzig.  1917.

HT = Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the
British Museum.  London.  1920.

IF = Indogermanische Forschungen.  Berlin and Leipzig.

JA = Journal Asiatique, recueil trimestrielle de mémoires et de notices
relatifs aux études orientales, publié par la Société Asiatique.
Paris.

JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.  New Haven.

JSOR = Journal of the Society of Oriental Research. Chicago.

KBo. = Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi. 6 parts = 30, 36 Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Leipzig. 1921–3.

KlF = Kleinasiatische Forschungen. Weimar.

Korošec, Vert. = V. Korošec, Hethitische Staatsverträge = Leipziger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien 60. Leipzig. 1931.

KUB = Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Vorderasiatische Abteilung, Keilschrift-Urkunden aus Boghazköi. Berlin. (27 Hefte have been issued. 1921–34.)

Lang. = Language, journal of the Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore.

MDOG = Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin.

MSL = Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Paris.

MVAG = Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig.

RHA = Revue Hittite et Asianique, organe de la Société des Études Hittites et Asianiques. Paris.

Sommer, AU = F. Sommer, Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden = Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Abteilung, NF 6. Munich. 1932.

TAPA = Transactions of the American Philological Association. Middletown, Conn.

VBoT = A. Götze, Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte. Marburg a.d. Lahn. 1930.

Weidner, Stud. = E. Weidner, Studien zur Hethitischen Sprachwissenschaft 1 = Leipziger Semitistische Studien 7.1,2. Leipzig. 1917.

Witzel, HKU = F. Witzel, Hethitische Keilschrift-Urkunden in Transcription und Uebersetzung mit Kommentar 1 = Keilinschriftliche Studien 4. Fulda. 1924.

### 2. OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

A = The Ritual of Anniwiyanis (below, pp. 100–26).

abl. = ablative

acc. = accusative

act. = active

adv. = adverb

aor. = aorist

Bo. = Boghazköitexte (unpublished)

C = Selections from the Code (below, pp. 202–28).

cf. = compare
dat. = dative
determ. = determinative
e.g. = for example
f. = following page
ff. = following pages
fn. = footnote
gen. = genitive
H = The Apology of Hattusilis (below, pp. 42–99).
I = Instructions for Temple Officials (below, pp. 127–74).
ib. = ibidem
imper. = imperative
ind. = indicative
infin. = infinitive
inst. = instrumental
loc. = locative
masc. = masculine
midd. = medio-passive
neut. = neuter.
NF = Neue Folge
nom. = nominative
obl. = oblique
part. = participle
perf. = perfect
pl. = plural
pres. = present
pret. = preterit
sg. = singular
s.v. = sub voce
subj. = subjunctive
Sum. = Sumerian
T = The Proclamation of Telipinus (below, pp. 175–200)
VAT = Vorderasiatische Abteilung Tontafel (unpublished)
verb. n. = verbal noun
w. = with
[ ]   In transliterated text square brackets enclose material not pre-
      served on a tablet but supplied by conjecture.   In a note they
      enclose references to paragraphs of HG.
< >In transliterated text angular brackets enclose material errone-
      ously omitted by the scribe.

( )   In transliterated text and translation line numbers are enclosed in parentheses. Bits of transliterated text enclosed in parentheses are to be disregarded; they were erroneously written by the scribe. In translation words in parentheses do not represent any specific word or words in the text, but have been inserted for clearness or for the sake of better English style. In the first column of the sign list relatively rare phonetic values are enclosed in parentheses. In the second column of the sign list words enclosed in parentheses are determinatives. Parts of Hittite, Akkadian, or Sumerian words are sometimes enclosed in parentheses to indicate that they were sometimes omitted either in writing or in pronunciation.

Sumerian words are printed in capitals and Akkadian words and sounds in Italic capitals. Hittite words and all cited words are in Italics.

Hittite nouns, adjectives, and pronouns are generally cited in the nominative, and a form not receiving a case label is nominative. If the number is not designated, it is singular. Verbs are cited either in the stem form (with following hyphen) or in the pres. 3 sg.

# INTRODUCTION TO THE CUNEIFORM SYSTEM OF WRITING.

Since this book is intended chiefly for Indo-Europeanists who have had no previous experience with cuneiform writing, and who are likely to be working without the aid of an instructor, the following paragraphs contain information which would be taken for granted by an Assyriologist but which it is hoped will save the beginner a good deal of confusion. The student should read also the chapter in HG on Writing and Pronunciation, especially pp.34-50. We shall discuss the signs from the two-fold point of view of how they are made, and how they are to be interpreted.

*Form of the Signs.* The Hittites borrowed their form of writing from the Babylonians, who got it from the Sumerians, who in turn got it possibly from a still earlier people. We can trace the varying shapes of the signs back through two millenia, but even the earliest Sumerian records that have been found show the system at a considerable stage of advancement. The signs must have been originally pictographic, as were the Egyptian hieroglyphs or the most archaic Chinese, but after becoming conventionalized they tended to lose their original shapes, and only in the case of a relatively small number can we be sure what the original picture was. Thus the sign for 'hand' 𒋗, archaic 𒀉 , is obviously a picture of a hand, though in the usual Hittite form it has lost a finger. On the other hand, the sign for 'sky' or 'god' 𒀭 gives no indication of its original picture, which is, however, shown by earlier forms (𒀭, very early ✳) to have been that of a star.

It is characteristic of any system of writing that it is affected in its external form by the nature of the writing material most commonly used, and the cuneiform is one of the best examples of this. The characters on the very earliest Mesopotamian documents are drawn with lines. The peculiar wedge-shaped symbols came in as a result of the use of clay tablets; the scribe held in his left hand the tablet moulded of soft clay, and in his right a stylus with rectangular cross-section, with which he impressed the characters. Now if such a stylus is held horizontal with its edge against the tablet, it produces

a groove in the clay; it is natural, however, to hold the stylus
at more or less of an angle, with the result that the groove is
deeper at one end and tapers out at the other; this gives the
wedge-shaped impression which very early became conventional.
A wedge thus corresponds to a straight line of the original pic-
ture-character.  A wedge looks on the tablet something like this:
▶   In modern copying of the signs, however, it is customary
to omit part of the outline of the wedge, and make a drawing
like this:▬  If the student will remember that three or four
strokes of the pen represent a single impression of the ancient
stylus, and that in turn the most complicated signs are built
up out of single wedges, the characters will appear much less
formidable.  It is suggested that, as reproducing the signs is
the best way to fix them in the memory, the learner should de-
vote considerable time to this, and as a necessary preliminary
should practice drawing single wedges until he is fairly pro-
ficient.    The best way to draw a wedge is to make two sides of
the head in separate strokes of the pen, thus:ꙮ  , and the rest
in a single stroke, thus:ꙮ  So for a vertical wedge: ꙮ

    According to the position in which the stylus was held, we
distinguish five types of wedge: 1) horizontal▶ 2 & 3) ob-
lique ⌃,✓ 4) vertical Ⲧ and 5) a wedge⟨ which the Germans
call *Winkelhaken*, formed by reversing the stylus and holding it
almost perpendicular to the tablet, so that the impression was
made by the end rather than the side-edge. Theoretically there
might be other wedges, but none actually occur. *These five*
*elements alone, singly or in various combinations, serve to*
*make up the entire cuneiform syllabary.*  Thus the student will
note that a few signs consist each of but a single wedge: ▬
*aš*, Ⲧ numeral 1, ⟨ *u* or 10.  Others consist of two wedges, of
like or unlike type, as ▶▬ *bal*, ⊨ *tap*, ⵏ *pir*,ⵏ *me*,⌃ *ni*,
ⵏ *nu*, ⵜ *be;* etc., etc.  Note that the relative position of
the wedges is also important. Signs containing three wedges
are: ⵏ *is*, ⵏ *pa*, ⵏ *kat*, ⵏ GAG, ⵏ *a*, ⵏⲦ *an*, ⵏ SAL, ⵘ KUR,
⟨ *tin;* etc., etc.  So others contain four, five, or any num-
ber of wedges. Some of the more complicated signs may be more
easily remembered by noting that they contain certain groups of
wedges which occur also in other signs; thus the group ⵏ ,which
alone is the sign *hi*, appears also in ⵏ *am*, ⵏⵏ *ne*,ⵏⵏ  *gi*,

◢◤𝍨 *im,* and ◥◤𝍨 *it;* the group 𝍦, which alone is *a,* forms also part of the signs ◥𝍦 *e,* ◥𝍦 *kal,* ◥𝍦 *kar,* ◥◤DUG. The student will discover other such groups for himself. Other signs differ .only slightly from one another, and may be learned together: Compare ◥◤ *pℓ,* ◥◤ GUD, ◥◤ *ul,* ◥◤ *ša,* ◥◤ *ga,* ◥◤ *ta,* ◥◤ DUG, ◥◤ AMAR, ◥◤ SISKUR; or ◥◤ *ki* versus ◥◤ *di.* An extreme case of this may be noted in ◥◤ *ku* and ◥◤ *ma,* which differ only in the length of the horizontal wedges. Other signs may be considered as combinations of two or more simpler signs; while in many cases this is merely a mnemonic device it often has an actual historical basis; thus a comparatively recent one is ◥◤ *ya,* made up of ◥◤ *i* and 𝍦 *a;* and ideograms of the type of KŪ 'eat', which is composed of KA ◥◤ 'mouth' and NINDA 𝍦 'bread', are shown to be combinations by both their form and their meaning.

*Variants.* The long historical development of the cuneiform signs led to modifications of them at various times and places and frequently to the use of more than one variety at the same time and place. The Hittite documents show a considerable number of such variants, a sign even assuming several forms in the course of a single tablet. This circumstance contrasts with classical Assyrian, where variants are rare.

In the texts in this book, we have not followed the original tablets slavishly in the matter of particular forms of signs, but have attempted to introduce the student to the variants gradually, by using one form until he has a chance to become familiar with it, then shifting to another, and so on. As it happens, the variants are by no means so troublesome as they might at first appear. In only a few cases (for example *li* ◥◤ and ◥◤), does a sign assume forms that are radically different from one another, though several do show a considerable number of variations. There are certain well defined types which may be noted. 1) Variation in the number of the wedges: This may be due to the omission of a wedge or more that belong to the sign in an earlier form, as ◥◤ for ◥◤ *qa,* ◥◤ for ◥◤ *šu* —in both these cases the simpler variant is more common in the Hittite texts, and *šu* is even modified occasionally to the form ◥◤. Variation in number is most frequent in the case of groups of three or more parallel wedges, where the number may

usually be three, four, five or even more indiscriminately; so
⊟ or ⊟ URU, ⊞ or ⊞ *tûk*, ⪥ or ⪥ MEŠ, ⊨ or ⊨ É.   On
the other hand, in some cases such variants are avoided by the
scribes when they would confuse two signs nearly alike; thus
⊟ *ku* and ⊟ TÚG *are* always carefully distinguished.    2) Vari-
ation in the position of the wedges: for example ⊳ or ⊳ *uš*
(similarly *iš* etc.), ⊳ or ⊳ *ša* (similarly *ta* and other signs
of the same sort); etc.  Groups of parallel wedges are likely
to be varied, as ⊟ or ⊟ *ku*, ⊨ or ⊟ URU——but on the other
hand note that ⊨ *at* and ⊨ *la* are kept distinct.  3) Substi-
tution  of one type of wedge for another: for a good example,
note the forms of *al* (most typically ⊡) in the sign list. A
horizontal wedge is likely to be substituted for an oblique
one, though the converse is rare; and a short oblique is often
not to be distinguished from a small *Winkelhaken*. The student
will further note that in a given group of wedges, the same
set of variations is likely to occur in whatever combination
the group occurs: thus the group ⊲ mentioned above, may have
the variant form ⊲ whether it occurs alone as *ḫi,* or as part
of the signs *am, ne, gi, im* or *it.*

*Interpretation of the Signs.*  In regard to meaning, we may
notice three stages in the development of any system of writing.
First are signs (pictographs) which in form are crude pictures,
intended to convey a meaning, but without any special connec-
tion with the spoken language.  In the second stage, the signs
attach themselves to particular words, first words of concrete
meaning and later also abstract ones and even derivational or
grammatical elements; and there is thus a connection with the
spoken language, insofar as its concepts, but not its actual
sounds, are concerned.  Such word signs are called *ideograms.*
The third stage comes when a sign that denotes a particular
word comes to be associated with the sound of that word rather
than its meaning, and then may be used to indicate other words
or parts of words which have nothing in common as far as mean-
ing goes, but which have a similar sound.  As such phonetic
signs are likely to stand for single syllables, we have a
*syllabic* system of writing.  The cuneiform script had already
progressed as far as this at the time of the very earliest
Sumerian documents known.  It still preserved abundant ideo-

grams, however, and never reached a fourth stage which would have dispensed with these altogether and relied entirely on phonetic signs.  In fact, even today we still employ a certain number of ideographic signs in addition to our alphabetic writing, because of their convenience: such characters as &, $, %, the Arabic numerals, and various symbols used in chemistry, astronomy, or other technical subjects, are of this nature.

A survival of the earliest stage, when a sign conveyed a general meaning without standing for a particular word, may be noted in the fact that in the writing as we have it many single signs have more than one ideographic meaning; some, in fact, have a great many: for example, the sign ⯈𝖳 means either 'sky' or 'god', similar concepts, but expressed in Sumerian by quite different words, AN and DINGIR respectively.   In other cases a multiplicity of meanings for a sign resulted from the falling together into one form of two or more originally different pictures.    Two methods were developed for a partial avoidance of ambiguity in the meaning of a sign.   In the first place, other ideograms, called *determinatives,* were appended (usually prefixed, in certain cases suffixed), without being pronounced; these denoted the general class to which the word in question belonged.   Thus the sign 𝇈𝖳 used alone, means 'omen', Sumerian IZKIM; with the sign 𝕃𝖴 'man' prefixed, it is read AGRIG and denotes a certain kind of official.   The determinative is customarily transcribed by writing it above the line: ᴸᵁAGRIG. The use of determinatives came to be standard not only with ideograms, but also with words spelled phonetically; thus LÚ is prefixed to all nouns denoting masculine occupations or professions, 𝖸 GIŠ, which alone means 'tree' or 'wood', to names of trees or wooden objects, and so forth.   The second method of avoiding ambiguity was in the use of phonetic signs, known as *phonetic complements,* appended to ideograms, and representing the last portion of the word in question.   Thus the sign ⯈𝖳 'god' is regularly followed in Akkadian texts by some such sign as 𝇈 *LUM,* showing that the combination is to be read *ILUM,* the Akkadian word for 'god'.   Hittite complements are also frequent.   A parallel in modern usage is such a writing as *1st* for 'first', the phonetic complement indicating that the ordinal instead of the cardinal is intended.

The development of phonetic values out of ideographic was
assisted by the fact that the majority of simple Sumerian words
were either monosyllables or nearly so; thus the sign ⟶Y men-
tioned above, which was pronounced AN when it meant 'sky', came
readily to be used with the value of the syllable AN regardless
of meaning.  This sort of thing is similar to the rebuses which
children today sometimes play with, where for example a picture
of the insect known as a bee is used also for the verb 'be', or
for the same syllable in some longer word.   The multiplicity
of ideographic values led naturally to a multiplicity of phon-
etic values.  The taking over of the system by the Akkadians
from the Sumerians resulted in further complications; for as
the ideograms were taken over and pronounced with Akkadian
readings, new phonetic values often became attached to the
signs from these.  Thus the sign ⧄ as an ideogram meant 'hand',
Sumerian ŠU, and had also acquired the phonetic value ŠU; now
the Akkadian word for 'hand' was qātu, whence the sign came to
have also the phonetic value qat.  The development of polyphones,
as the variant readings are called, went so far that they form
one of the greatest difficulties for modern scholars in read-
ing Akkadian texts.
     Fortunately the Hittites in taking over the syllabary sim-
plified it greatly.  Many signs still have ideographic as well
as phonetic values, but only a few maintain more than one pho-
netic value, at least in Hittite words.  In a few cases, the
Hittites added new phonetic values to the syllabary, in parti-
cular the value wi for the sign ⧅ 'wine' (Sum. GEŠTIN), and
some others which are not very common.
     Beside the employment of the same sign in more than one
value, we find also the converse of this, namely the occurrence
of more than one sign in the same value.  In the case of ideo-
grams, this was due partly to the fact thar Sumerian had a
great many homonyms, words which though pronounced alike were
represented originally by different pictures—for example, GIR
was the pronunciation of three words meaning 'foot', 'sword',
and 'asphalt', represented respectively by the signs ⧉, ⧊
and ⧋.  Further the same word might often be designated by
more than one sign, as NITA 'male' by ⧌ or ⧍.  In a similar
manner, phonetic values were often duplicated.  When we add

together both ideographic and phonetic values, the number of
readings for a given sign is sometimes extreme: Thus Thureau-
Dangin, in *Les Homophones Sumériens,* lists twelve signs in the
value *gar,* sixteen in the value *du,* most of these signs having
of course other values also.  In order to avoid confusion,
Assyriologists have adopted the practice of marking homophones
by means of diacritical marks or subscript numerals.  Unfor-
tunately, there have been almost as many systems of marking as
there have been scholars in the field; but within recent years
the system of Thureau-Dangin, which we also follow in this
book, has been widely accepted; by this system, the commonest
sign in any given value is left unmarked, the next commonest
is marked with an acute accent, the next with a grave accent,
and after that subscript numerals are used.  Thus we write GÍR
'sword', GÌR 'foot', GIR₄ 'asphalt'; or 𒉽 *šu* and 𒉼 *šú.  The
student should not be misled into thinking that these accents
have any phonetic signification; they serve merely to indicate
to the reader of a transcription which sign was employed in
the original.*  Though the Hittites eliminated most of the homo-
phones, we necessarily employ the same accentuation that is
used in Akkadian and Sumerian.

*Method of Transcribing Hittite.*  Obviously there are several
possible ways of transcribing in Latin letters a language writ-
ten in cuneiform.  One method is to ignore the exact form of
the original altogether and spell as the users of the language
might have spelled had they employed the Latin alphabet.  This,
which we call the "broad" transcription, involves more or less
phonetic interpretation, particularly in a language like Hittite
whose phonetics are so much in doubt, but it is useful in lists
of words and other places where the particular spelling is not
important.  Thus the Hittite word 𒁕𒀀𒄿 could be read *dāi,*
*dai, tāi, tai,* according to our opinion of the quality of the
consonant and the quantity of the vowel.  The alternative is
to transcribe the original sign for sign and leave the reader
his choice of interpretation; thus we write *da-a-i,* represent-
ing each sign by its normal value, and separating the signs by
hyphens.  This is the "syllabic" transcription, which is gener-
ally used, for texts and elsewhere.  The simplest form of such
transcription would be to use one reading for each sign, and

only one, but this would be actually misleading in cases where
a sign has more than one phonetic value, and it is further de-
sirable to give a certain amount of interpretation particular-
ly for those words which are not spelled out as Hittite. Hence
scholars employ as many readings for a sign as may be required,
and use such devices as writing determinatives above the line,
and different kinds of type (Roman capitals for Sumerian, Ital-
ic capitals for Akkadian, lower-case letters being reserved for
spelled-out Hittite words); but always keep distinct the indi-
vidual signs so that the original cuneiform can always be re-
constructed from the transcription. In other words, the aim is
*the maximum interpretation possible without destroying the
actual picture of the text.*

The transcription of a Hittite text is complicated by the
great amount of material which was written ideographically—not
only ideograms proper, that is single signs standing for words,
but also the numerous Sumerian and Akkadian phrases which were
spelled as such, though the Hittite equivalents must have been
substituted for them in reading the tablets. Obviously, if we
were to try and transcribe such phrases by the corresponding
Hittite, we should destroy the actual picture of the text. In
the case of single ideograms in Akkadian texts, scholars regu-
larly transcribe with the Akkadian words, the lack of hyphens
showing that the word in question is represented by a single
sign and not spelled out. This is impossible in Hittite in the
numerous cases where the Hittite readings for ideograms are
either uncertain or quite unknown; hence the custom has become
established of using the Sumerian values even in those cases
where we know the Hittite equivalents. The choice of the Sum-
erian readings is not meant to imply that the scribes knew
Sumerian; it simply provides the best means of identifying the
signs. Unfortunately, there is often difficulty in determin-
ing what the correct Sumerian reading for a given sign is, and
there has been a good deal of variation on the part of editors
of published texts. In this book we have, except in a few
cases, followed the readings of Deimel, *Sumerisches Lexikon,*
the latest standard work on the subject. A few ideograms are
read as Akkadian, for example *ŠUM* 'name', which is the construct
form of Akk. *Šumu,* and apparently developed into an ideogram

because in forms like *šum-šu* 'his name', the first syllable was
spelled with a single phonetic sign.

We may illustrate the treatment of more complex groups of
signs by the common group ⟨cuneiform⟩ which denotes the dative case
of the word for 'god', in Hittite probably *karimni*. Sign for
sign we might read *an-ši-ni*, taking the commonest values of the
three signs in question, but the result is obviously not the
Hittite word. As a matter of fact, the first sign is the ideo-
gram for 'god', Sumerian DINGIR, Akkadian (in this case-form)
*ilim*. The second sign, ⟨cuneiform⟩, has in Akkadian the additional phon-
etic value *lim*, and is here used as an Akkadian phonetic comple-
ment to identify more clearly the word intended by the ideogram.
Assyriologists would transcribe the combination ⟨cuneiform⟩ by $ilim^{lim}$,
placing the complement above the line to show that it is not to
be repeated in the pronunciation. In Hittite the two signs were
taken over as a group and a further phonetic complement added,
the *ni* which represents the last syllable of the Hittite word.
We transcribe the entire combination DINGIR-*LIM-ni*, a mixed mode
of representation which nevertheless shows exactly what we are
dealing with in the text.

*The Sign List.* A list of cuneiform signs can be arranged
in either of two ways, according to the shape of the signs or
alphabetically according to the readings. The former arrange-
ment is obviously preferable for one working directly from the
cuneiform, and Assyriologists regularly choose it for the added
reason that the numerous polyphones in Akkadian would make an
alphabetical list awkward, while in classical Assyrian, which
is taken as a standard, there are practically no formal variants.
In Hittite, on the other hand, variants in form are numerous,
and a list by readings is more practicable. The list in this
book is therefore arranged in this way, following the usual
alphabetical order for Hittite (*b* listed under *p*, *d* under *t*, *g*
and *q* under *k*, and, further, *s* and *š* together), with cross-ref-
erences for those polyphones that occur. Since all the cunei-
form texts in this book are accompanied by transliteration, we
have not felt it necessary to include an index of signs arranged
by form.

In the sign list, phonetic and ideographic values are lis-
ted in separate columns; the list is fairly complete for the