

HETTITOLOGIE

HOFFNER Jr., H.A. — Letters from the Hittite Kingdom. (Writings from the Ancient World 15). Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 2009. (23 cm, XVIII, 450). ISBN 978-1-58983-212-1. \$45.95.

Harry A. Hoffner, Prof. Emeritus at the University of Chicago and for many years editor of the Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago, has with this volume made accessible to aficionados of the Ancient Near East and neighbouring fields as well as cuneiform scholars and Hittitologists an essential selection of Hittite epistolary texts. His thorough command of the language and the sources has led to a masterful treatment of an extremely important corpus that will undoubtedly serve as an indispensable reference work for many years to come. It is also a delight to note that SBL's Writings from the Ancient World series now includes transliterations in its treatments of Hittite language texts as well those of other languages, which had not been the case until now, greatly increasing their value.¹⁾

The publication of the Hittite letter corpus is with Hoffner's contribution at a very advanced and current state, Hagenbuchner's THeth 15-16 (1989), Alp's HBM (1991), Edel's ÄHK (1994) and Mora's and Giorgieri's HANE/M 7 (2004) having already presented a large selection of letters in transliteration, translation and philological commentary. In addition to these one should note the translations of many of the Ugarit letters from and pertaining to Ḫatti by Lackenbacher, LAPO 20 (2002), as well as translations of further Hittite letters by Beckman in HDT² (1999), Hoffner in CoS 3 (2003), Bryce in Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East (2003), the selections in TUAT Erg. Heft 1 (2001) and TUAT NF 3 (2006), and most recently, Marizza's Lettere ittite di re e dignitari (2009), my review of which will be appearing in a forthcoming issue of this journal. The inevitable overlap among these treatments is fairly limited, except perhaps as regards the Mašat corpus and, naturally, those letters that take front and centre among the historically important documents from Ḫattusa.

Hoffner's volume includes over 70 pages of introductory material, rich in valuable detail, on letters and letter writing, first for the Ancient Near East as a whole (pp. 2-34) and thereafter for the Hittite Kingdom in particular (pp. 35-73), in which a wide range of topics is discussed, from the languages used in royal correspondence and literary conventions to Hittite terms for letters, notes on scribes and messengers and letter passages quoted in historical texts. The bulk of the book consists of the transliterations and translations of and brief commentaries to the letters, arranged chronologically from Old to Middle and to New Hittite sources, whereby the single extant OH document is overshadowed by 96 MH and 29 NH letters. Hoffner includes not only the sources from Ḫattusa, but those from Tapikka/Mašat Höyük (nos. 7-85), Sapinuwa/Ortaköy (86-91), Sarissa/Kuşaklı (92-93), el-Amarna (94-97), Emar/Meskene (123-124) and Alalaḫ (125-126). The volume treats only Hittite language letters, with the exception of No. 1, the

Akkadian language Tikunani Letter, and Nos. 96-97, i.e. the Amarna letters EA 41 and 44. This latter fact probably explains why, despite a significant number of texts treated from sites other than Ḫattusa, none of the letters from Ugarit are presented. The volume is concluded with footnotes, concordances, a valuable glossary, a bibliography and indices of personal names and subjects.

Naturally, as is inescapably the case with any book, no matter how well done, there are a number of points that one could take issue with as well as the occasional inconsistency or error. The remainder of this review will address a few such points, and then continue with commentary on treatments of a few select letters.

Hoffner suggests (p. 47), applying to the Hittite corpus a suggestion of Liverani regarding the Amarna letters, that the rare example of a Hittite letter with no introductory formula might be explained with reference to the envelopes that letters would have been placed in, upon which one might have expected such. This is quite unlikely, however, since there are no attested examples of letter envelopes associated with Hittite letters, the one alleged example of which should clearly be interpreted otherwise, as van den Hout and Karasu, StBoT 51, 2010, 372-377 have recently demonstrated. In summarizing Hagenbuchner's discussion of possible explanations for this dearth of Hittite envelopes, Hoffner (p. 47) refers to the 'rare but actual recovery of a clay tablet envelope', but provides no reference to any such objects. He (p. 46) also states that envelopes were used for purposes of confidentiality, but then proceeds to note that the contents of such letters were often repeated or summarized on the outside of the envelopes as well, obviously conflicting with, even negating, the proposed function of maintaining confidentiality.

No. 1: Though Hoffner (p. 75) lists Durand's recent treatment of the Tikunani Letter (Fs. Sanmartín, 2006, 219-224), he seems largely to have ignored it, to the considerable detriment of his transliteration and translation. The more substantial of Durand's suggestions include *lu-ú i-la-at*, i.e. *illatum*, 'fait un corps d'attaque', rather than *lu-ú <a>i-la-at*, 'be a man!', in l. 9; *še-pá-šu ... a-ku-ul-šu*, 'Mors-lui les pieds' instead of ŠE.BA-šu, 'food rations', in l. 10; *lu-ú 2 i-la-at*, 'deux corps d'attaque' vs. *lu-ú a-i-la-at*, 'be a man!', in 13; *ù-<lu> ìr-di húp-ti ìr-di 'é'-[ti]₄*, 'des serviteurs acquis par razzia, des serviteurs domestiques', for *ù ARAD-di kab-ti ARAD-di x x*, 'And—my important servant, my ... servant', in 22; *ká-ni-i kuš*, 'ceintures en cuir', instead of *qa<-ar>-ni i-su*, 'horn (and?) isu', in 27; *za-ab-bi*, 'queues', for *za-ap-pí*, 'hairs', in 29. Hoffner also inexplicably chooses a number of sign values without mimation (ll. 6, 19, 38), though it is likely that mimation is intended throughout the letter. Preferable to Hoffner's *pí-* and *-mi* readings is e-vocalism in *pé-te-et* in 8, *ta-ša-mé* in 33, *šu-mé-lum* in 39 and *te-eš-te-né-mé* in 40. (The preposition *a-na* between *ù* and *a-wa-ti* in l. 31 is an error in Durand's transliteration.)

No. 16 (HKM 10) l. 5, translate 'how Piḫinakki is staying in Lisipra' (*-za ... e-eš-ke-e[t-t]a-ri*, i.e. to *es-*, not *ases-*, as in the following lines) rather than 'how P. is (re)settling Lišipra'; read ^m*Kaš-ka-nu-ia* rather than ^m*Ka-aš-* in 15; *am-mu-ga-wa* (as in Alp's copy, correctly) in 27, not *am-mu-ug-ga-wa* (as in Alp's transliteration, apparently simply copied by Hoffner); read *ku-it* 'gi-im¹-ma-an-^rza' *k[i-ša]/k[i-ša-at]* and translate 'since winter is co[m]ing/has ar[r]ived', rather than *ku-it* DINGIR.MEŠ [*i*m²-ma-an-x[...]], 'Just because

¹⁾ I would like to express my gratitude to Theo van den Hout for supplying me with some photographs of a number of Mašat tablets that he had taken during a visit many years ago. Short reviews of Hoffner's volume by P. Sanders and L. Vacin have appeared in RBL 09/2010 and RBL 01/2011, respectively.

the gods already ...', in 29. In 30 perhaps 'GÜB-za' x x rather than [p]a-r[a]-a².

No. 25 (HKM 20): The *an-ni-in* in l. 6 invalidates the claim in GrHL §7.17, according to which 'From the stem *anni-* (HED A 51-55) there is only the singular nominative common form *anniš*.'

No. 26 (HKM 21): Hoffner's attempt at understanding the difficult ll. 3-7 may well be right. My own tentative attempt would interpret *apē=ia* in 5 as the pl. demonstrative pronoun rather than *apiya*, 'there', despite the resultant numerical incongruence, and try to deal with *na-an-mu* in 6 as it stands rather than emending to EGIR¹-*an-mu*, as Hoffner does; this would yield perhaps 'Concerning the matter of the troops that you wrote me about; he who gave (them) leave and also those (troops) that are (still) up above, (i.e.) the counting that you wrote to me about it, that I have heard.' The troublesome *-an* in l. 6 could perhaps refer back to 'he who gave (them, i.e. the troops) leave', so that one could translate '... I have heard about him, (or rather) the counting, that you wrote me about'. Line 9 must be read [h]a-at-ra-a-<eš> nu-za, a-pé-e-da-ni, not [h]a-at-ra-a-e[š] a-pé-e-da-ni, which also eliminates an exception to Hoffner's own rule concerning *-za* with *es-* in nominal sentences (GrHL §28.32-42). Van den Hout, Fs. Wilhelm, 2010, 398, is likely correct in reading [u]t-tar¹ in l. 13, yielding '... until I investigate the matter here by means of oracle'. Further, since [m]e- at the beginning of l. 22, according to van den Hout's collation (ibid.), is certain, one must also accept the emendation *nam-ma-aš¹(AT)-ši¹(TA)* in 21, as well as the reading *píd-da-a-an-zi* rather than *pé-* in 23, yielding, 'Read my greetings aloud to Pulli. Further, tell him!(text 'you') this: "Your tablets that they bring, I myself will read aloud."' For a number of reasons, including the otherwise consistent gemination in the verb *warriss(a)-*, the reading *a[r-h]a w[a-r]i-iš-ša-ah-ḫi* in l. 26 seems unlikely. Though I cannot offer a complete solution to the line, it seems that reading ...-ta iš-ša-ah-ḫi, might point in the right direction.

No. 30 (HKM 25): In l. 25 Hoffner restores *ḫal-zi-[an-du]*, a 3rd pl. imp., but translates 'Have it read aloud in your presence', which is at least formally a 2nd sg. imp., though this may be a loose paraphrase of intended 'They shall read it aloud in your presence'. There is probably no need to add anything in the break, however, as 'I have sent to you^(pl.) there Pise[ni's] tablet, and he will read (*ḫalzi*) it to you^(pl.)' is probably to be preferred.

No. 48 (HKM 46): In l. 17 Hoffner emends the rather clear *ma-na* to *ma-an¹*, rejecting Goedegebuure's interpretation, as he was not able 'to identify another (pre-NH) example of sentence initial potential *man* taking *-al-ma* as a clitic' (p. 383, n. 138). While certainly worth considering, Hoffner's argument can probably not be given too much weight, since the number of pre-NH attestations for *man* is quite limited. I count only 8 cases in CHD L-N, 139b, which, however, does not claim to be exhaustive. (Note that OS *ma-a-n[e]* in KBo 6.2 ii 54 should be struck from the list; see Kloekhorst, EDHIL, 551.) Thus, the failure of *man=a* to appear in a pre-NH text is statistically not overly significant.

No. 50 (HKM 47) l. 13: read *uš-ke-nu-mi*, 'I am having (oracles) observed/I will have (oracles) observed', instead of emending to *uš-ke-nu-mi<en²>*, 'we ... have carried out'; in l. 16 read nu₁-un-na-ša₁-at ki²-i² ki₁-i-it-ta-at, 'and this was revealed (lit. lay) before us', rather than [n]u²-un-na-š[a²]-at ḫa²-an²-da²-i-it-ta-at, 'and we obtained an answer'; restore

perhaps [šA² T]i₈²MUŠEN²-*ma-kán an-da ki-iš-ša-an me-mi-ia-u-en*, '[about the eag]le, though, we said the following', instead of [LÍL²-r]i-ma-kán an-da ..., 'about the campaign ...' in l. 17; read ḫal-ki-u[š]-ša-kán rather than ḫal-ki-iš-ša-kán in l. 18.

No. 55 (HKM 52): In l. 7 Hoffner reads *ḫa-at-re-eš-ke-ši*, though *ḫa-at-re-eš-ke-mi* is clear in both Alp's copy and the published photo, and Hoffner may have wanted to emend to *-ši¹(MI)*, which would indeed make sense in the context. He has also omitted 'dear' (DÜG.GA) from his translation of l. 6. In ll. 30-33 perhaps 'Further, place an armed guard before my house, so that the landsmen and townsmen do not damage it', whereby one would presumably have to emend *na-aš* at the beginning of l. 32 to *na-at¹(AŠ)*. With Hoffner's '... let the men of the land and the men of the town not oppress them', the antecedent to 'them' would be difficult to identify. In l. 37 presumably *ti-it-ta-nu₁e₁-er* rather than Hoffner's *ti-it-ta-nu-ú-er*, despite Alp's unclear copy that might suggest such.

No. 94 (EA 32 = VBoT 2): In l. 1-2 Hoffner reads [k]a-a-ša-mu ki-i te-et ^mKal-ba-ya-a[š] / [k]i-i¹ me-mi-iš-ta, translating 'Kalbaya (your messenger) has just now said this to me. He quoted (you as saying) this:'. Rost's, MIO 4, 1956, 328, readings, however ([k]a²-a-ša-mu, ki-i ku²-it ^mKal-ba-ia-aš, / ¹ut-tar² me-mi-iš-ta), are clearly preferable, based on the copies in VBoT, Winckler and Abel, Thontafelfund von el Amarna 238, and Schröder, VS 12, 202, as well as the photos published by Hawkins, BMSAES 14, 2009, 73-83, yielding 'Concerning this matter, that Kalbaya spoke of to me here.' Hoffner (n. 208), in fact, rejects Rost's reading of *ut-tar*, apparently assuming that her reading applied to *ki-i* in l. 1, where his n. 208 is placed, rather than the traces at the beginning of l. 2. At the beginning of l. 5 Hoffner reads ¹KA×U¹-ya-at me-mi-iš-ta, following Rost, but this is graphically and syntactically unconvincing. The traces visible on the photo suggest ¹ŠA¹-ia-at, and Schröder's copy shows an undamaged ŠA, while Winckler and Abel's and Goetze's drawings, while showing damage are also quite amenable to ŠA, but not to KA×U. Though very un-Hittite, it seems that this Arzawan scribe might have employed Akk. ŠA for the relative pronoun, Hitt. *kuit*, while *-ia* and *-at* can be interpreted as the conjunction and 3rd sg. nom.-acc. n. enclitic pronoun, respectively, thus '... and that which he said (was not on the tablet)'.¹

No. 95 (EA 31 = VBoT 1): Hoffner (p. 127) opts for a reading ^mNi-mu-wa-re¹-ya in l. 1, following suggestions by Albright and Gordin (n. 218), but both the copy in VBoT 1 and the photos published by Hawkins, BMSAES 14, 2009, 73-83, suggest rather ^mNi-mu-u₄-re-ia₁. (Oddly, Hoffner comments on p. 270 that 'VBoT 2 (text 94) and VBoT 1 (text 95) do not identify the Egyptian pharaoh by name', which is clearly an oversight.) There is no need to emend ^mIr-ša-ap-pa<-an> in l. 11, as Hittite orthography very commonly employs stems of PNs, GNs and DNs without flexion. Hoffner has either overlooked or rejected without comment Kühne's, AOAT 17, 1973, 96f., n. 481, suggestion, followed e.g. by Klinger, TUAT NF 3, 195 and n. 77 (though in Hoffner's literature list, p. 273), of interpreting *ag-ga-aš* in l. 24 as the 3rd sg. pret. of *ak(k)-*, 'to die', and thus: 'And thereupon they will bring you the dowry for the daughter – my messenger and a(nother) messenger; the one that came from you has died.' At the end of l. 29 ^{LÜ}ḫa-lu-g[a-tal-la-aš-ma-aš], '(in the hand) [of my] messe[nger]', would

be preferable to Hoffner's ^{LÚ}*ha-lu-g[a-tal-li-mi]*, lit. '[in my] messe[nger]'. Hoffner reads ^{GIŠ}ESI (KAL) in l. 36 (see also commentary, p. 277), again basing himself on a collation by Gordin, but this is incorrect. On the photos, which confirm the drawing in VBoT 1, one sees clearly ^{GIŠ}*šar-pa*, whereby the GIŠ was added above the line. (Gordin may perhaps have confused the '6' in l. 35 for ESI, due to the superimposed position of GIŠ.) The last paragraph of this letter in fact provides one illustration of a tendency, seen throughout the book, toward more typos and minor errors than one would expect from a volume of otherwise high quality. The square brackets seen in the transliteration have been forgotten in the translation, though they are employed in the following letter (No. 41);²⁾ and though 'small' is translated at the end of l. 35, no 'TUR' appears in the transliteration.

No. 101 (KUB 14.3): Since this notoriously challenging, so-called 'Tawagalawa Letter', in fact a letter from a Hittite king, probably Ḫattusili III, to his Ahḫiyawan counterpart concerning a certain Piyamaradu, is the subject of a new edition by S. Heinhold-Krahmer, J.D. Hawkins, J. Hazenbos, E. Rieken, M. Weeden and myself, which is to appear shortly, I will refrain from commenting here. The text was also newly edited in the recent monograph by G.M. Beckman, T.R. Bryce and E.H. Cline, *The Ahḫiyawa Texts* (2011). I might just note that Hoffner (p. 46) assumes that the tablet of the Tawagalawa Letter never left Ḫattusa, causing one to wonder if it was in fact a letter at all. Much of this riddle has recently been solved by Y. Goren and colleagues, as they were able to determine that the clay of this tablet does not come from the area of Ḫattusa at all, but from the western Anatolian coast. It seems, therefore, that Hittite scribes would have prepared the tablet while accompanying the Hittite king on his campaign to Millawanda in search of Piyamaradu, and that the actual letter sent to Ahḫiyawa would have been drafted (and translated?) on the basis of this draft, which was subsequently toted back to the Hittite capital. A preliminary report of Goren's petrographic examinations, which included many Hittite letters, appeared recently in the *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38 (2011) 684-696.

Presumably some faulty setting in a word processor is responsible for a series of entries in the indices having jumped from their correct positions (p. 399). The letters HKM 2-9, instead of appearing between HKM 1 and 10, appear before HKM 20, 30, 40, etc., respectively; and KBo 2.11 and KBo 9.82 are found following KBo 19.79+ rather than before KBo 12.62.

None of these relatively minor points or alternative suggestions detracts from the quality and import of Hoffner's volume, and all Hittitologists and students of the Ancient Near East will remain in his debt for many years to come.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Jared L. MILLER
March 2012

*
* *

²⁾ In fact, it seems that Hoffner must have changed his mind at some point on the issue of whether to include brackets in the translations, as some letters seem to employ them, some do not.