A HURRIAN LETTER FROM TELL BRAK

By G. Wilhelm

During the 1990 season of excavations at Tell Brak, the lower part of a cuneiform tablet (TB 11021) was found in the “Mitanni palace” in Area HH. The fragment was immediately identified as Hurrian by Dr. Jesper Eidern, who kindly ceded his primary rights to the present author. I am much indebted to Dr. Eidern for his generosity as well as for his readiness to supply his hand-copy of the tablet for study and publication (Fig. 1). I should also like to thank the Directors of the excavations at Tell Brak, Professor David Oates and Dr. Joan Oates, who gave the permission to publish the important new find and provided excellent photographs (Plate XXXII). I am also grateful to Dr. Diana Stein for reading my text and improving my English.

The text runs as follows:

Obverse (beginning destroyed)

1’ [ x x x x ]
2’ [ x x x x ]-nu-e-en u-1[u-
3’ ma-a-nu(-)la(-)-i-ri-e-en z[u-
4’ hi-il-lu ši-li-ša-an ur-ha-nu]
5’ a-ru-u-ten

6’ ḏs-ki-ra-a-nu-uš-ten-na-ma[a n
7’ ēw-ri-lw-wu-ša-an-na-a-an
8’ ša-šu-u-ši x x x x μš-[e-nu-ši-an

lower edge

9’ a-ū i่า [ x x x x -k[u2-šu-na-]

reverse

10’ ša-šu-u-ši-[i x x x x] x x-a-nēš?[n
11’ nu-šu-lw-[a] x [ x x x x ] ha-[š[a-
12’ na-aš-ku-[ša-a-ši ni x x /š]-š[e x]
13’ ūw-šu-u-šu-li] ēw-ri-lw-wa-ša-m[a-a-an]?
14’ μš-e-nu-u-šu-e-e-we la-a-an [ ]
15’ ku-ša-a-am[ ] ša-lš-a-la-am-ki [ ]
16’ [x]¬u2-ši-[i]-ma-a-[a]n ēw-ri-lw-wa[ ]

The text under consideration shares some formal features with the so-called “Mitanni letter” of Tusratta found at Tell el-Amarna [Mit.]: Just as Mit., it is divided into paragraphs by double lines, and words are divided by spaces.

Also from a palaeographic point of view, our fragment closely resembles the letters of Tusratta and other texts which may be traced back to Mittanian origins, such as letters from

---

kings of Hanigalbat and several literary texts in Akkadian language found at Bogazköy. Characteristic sign forms of the Mittani (Mittanni) ductus are (among others) ša and ta, both in contrast with Middle Assyrian palaeography which otherwise displays a high degree of conformity. A minor difference consists in the sign ni (4') insofar as the vertical wedges cross the upper horizontal wedge, which is not the case in Mit.

The text is written syllabically throughout, mostly with simple CV-, VC- and V-signs. tin = ten (5', 6') and gis = nēš (10') are the only CVC-signs. Although Mit. uses more than forty different CVC-values, this does not constitute a difference in writing habits, because our text contains no further closed syllables which would match one of these values. Both tin and gis ( = nēš) are used in Mit. as well; cf. tin: III 23, 27, 28, IV 44, nēš I 106, III 7, IV 122, 125.

The signs ū and ū are both attested. There is only a limited number of cases in which they are part of morphemes or lexical units known from Mit., where ū and ū represent a phonemic opposition pair /a/ and /u/. All these cases (7': -ū-ā'- [ = dative suffix -uwa-], 8'-10': -u-ū-š- [preterite suffix -uwa-], 12': -a-ū [verbal suffix I ps. sg. ergative -ay], 13': -u-ū-úa-š- [verbal suffix ol-] show full agreement with the usage of Mit.

The re-definition of ki and gu, ku and gu as representations of phonemic /ki/ and /ke/ vs. /ko/ and /ka/, typical for Mit., is not obvious in our text because gu and gu are missing. The few attestations for ki and ku, however, stand for /ki/ and /ko/ only (3': -ki-?₁-s₁, 6': -ki-ś₁- [verbal suffix -ś₁-], 9': -ka?₂-un-na [possibly to be related to the suffix group -kko-nna], 12': -ku-ś₁-[ [verbal root complement -ol]-, 15': 'ku-ś₁-[ [verbal root koc₁-], cf. Mit. IV 40 ku-ś₁-].

The CV- and VC-signs avoided by the orthography of Mit. are also lacking in our text: ba (for a possible exception see commentary for l. 3'), da, ga, qa, di, tu, es, and ne. The otherwise highly economizing system of Mit. orthography allows, however, one redundancy among VC-signs, namely ăš and āš. It cannot be said whether the new text shares this feature, because there is only one attestation of the closed syllable /ăš/ (6': āš). On the other hand, the sign ša, which is excluded from the Mit. repertory, is used here (3').

Plene-writings are employed as frequently as in Mit. In Mit., there are very consistent plene-writings without any degree of variation, especially in lexemes (e.g. šēna “brother” written še-ē-nē- without exception, tān- “to make” always ta-a-nē- etc.), whereas many suffixes may be written plene or simple without a rule of distribution always being obvious. Thus, it has to be admitted that the patterns of plene-writings in Mit. are not yet fully understood. The new text uses plene-writings very much the same way, cf. 6': -a-a-nē- cf. -a-a-nē-. Mit. II 16, regularly in keb-ān- “to send”, vs. -a-a-nē-. Mit III 22, regularly in tiq-ān- “to show”); 12': -u-ī-p₁- , 13'-u-ū-u-u-p₁- [verbal root complement -ol-], cf. -u-ī-p₁- Mit. III 63, regularly in keb = ān = ol-, -u-ī-p₁- Mit. III 22, regularly in tiq =  ān = ol- (for the double plene-writing cf. commentary to l. 13'). If the forms ending with -i-e-en in l. 2' and 3' are jussive trans., they differ from the orthography of Mit., where this form never shows a plene-writing. In Mit., the enclitic connective -an is written plene only after the long allomorphs of the enclitic pronouns (-tā, -nā, -tilla, -illa), whereas the new text also uses a plene-writing for the short form in l. 4': -a-an ( = ă = ān; an erroneous omission of -il- might, however, be indicated by the long erasure visible in this line). The correct spelling of this pattern in terms of the Mit. use is represented in 7': -u-na-a-ān ( = un(a) = ān, enclitic personal pronoun 3 pers. sg. plus enclitic connective).

Sign forms, syllabary and orthography of the new fragment thus are largely in agreement with Tushratta's "Mittani letter." A remarkable difference, however, is the use of the vertical wedge not only as an indicator of personal names, but also in connection with evr (i) = īfso "my lord" (cf. infra).

Commentary:

2': The first word most likely is a transitive jussive in =i=en just as the second word in the following line.
ul-l[u]- is possibly to be connected with the root ull-. The meaning "to destroy" for the root ull- has already been inferred by Güterbock from the name of the giant Ulli-kummi destined
to destroy Teşšup and his cult centre Kumme. ² Salvini called attention to the Hurrian fragment KUB XLV 61 where Kumbari explains the name Ulli-kummi with the words kun-
mı-nı-im ul-lu-li-ıš “Kumme shall be destroyed”. ³ He was also able to link the verb with an Urartian isogloss (ul- “to destroy”). In the light of this evidence, the suggestion of a Semitic etymology by Astour (‘l ‘to destroy’) ⁴ does not hold. The first syllable, however, is ambiguous with regard to Hurrian phonology, representing [ol] as well as [ul]. Bush has forwarded the assumption of a root ıl- beside ıll-. ⁵ There are several derivatives from one or the other root, none of them clear in their meaning. ⁶

3’: ma-a-nu(−) possibly belongs to the pronominal root màn-n. ⁷ This root fits well into the paradigm of many pronouns such as anni, anid, ani, akki−aqiti, ⁸ -iš contracting with ‘everybody’. The meaning seems to be “everybody” (sg.) and “all” (pl.). The absolutive and essive forms have only been attested so far in idiomatic expressions of assertion or emphasis.

The form ma-a-nu without a case ending, however, could not be explained within this framework. ma-a-nu in ChS 1/1, 11 obv. 15, is no clear parallel, because there is no space between -nu and the following ne-es-ši. ¹¹ Since the text otherwise separates words by space, we here probably deal with a larger formation which cannot be convincingly analysed yet.

The sign following ma-a-nu is to be read ša, not “4”, because this figure appears as “” in the Akkadian gift lists of Tušratta, whereas in the Hurrian Mit. all numerals are written syllabically. There is a small space between nu and ša, and ša is immediately followed by the next sign. If ša is connected with the following syllables, we not only face the difficulty of the oblique form màn-nu- without a case ending, but also the problem of the following verbal form, which in this case contains an unattested root-complement -ir-. ¹² If, on the other hand, we link ša to the preceding ma-a-nu, we could explain the resulting form as an ergative màn-nu- “everybody”. If this is right, the following -a has to be regarded either as a part of the pronoun -na which together with the ergative suffix -z becomes -ša, or as the enclitic connective -an, or both. This, however, cannot be assumed without difficulties: In the first case, we would have to accept a scriptio defectiva or a mistake instead of -ša-ša, in the second case the final -n would have disappeared. A parallel for the lack of final -n before a consonant

---

⁴ M. Astour, Semitic Elements in the Kumbari Myth, JBES 27 (1968), 174–5.
⁵ Bush, GLH, 360 n. 76.
⁶ Cf. Laroche, GLH, 279–80 and add ul-lu-ıš Mit. III 44, 75; ul-le-ḫu-ıš Mit. 138:31 (a totally), and—may be even from another stem with a long vowel—ul-la-ıš-ıš in -ıš-an-ıš ChS 1/1, 2 Vs. 7 (term of profession following the pattern of ašš = ašš = i = šaš = man “sacrificer”).
⁸ Cf. Wilhelm, SMEA 24 (1984), 221–2; idem, Or 54 (1985), 490, 496 (both pronouns with final -n, not -a).
⁹ Cf. Wilhelm, Or 54 (1985), 488.
¹⁰ The independent pronoun of the 1st ps. sg. also should be mentioned here, though it displays some peculiarities: Absolutive: ša(i), oblique cases ša/-a except ergative šaša.
¹¹ The same applies to more supposed attestations of šaša in this paragraph: e-ch-ša-ne-eša (13, 16).
¹² For the remote possibility of such a root-complement cf. Spieser, IH, §191, who cites the form a-ni-tu KUB XXVII 38 IV 25. The recently established participle ending -iri, however, has to be taken into account there; cf. G. Wilhelm, Gedanken zur Frühgeschichte der Hurriter und zum hurritisch-urartäischen Sprachvergleich, in HuHurr, 56.
in Boğazköy Hurrian jussive forms has recently been described by I. Wegner, but this rule seems to be restricted to jussive forms ending in -en, and it does not apply to the Hurrian of the Mittani letter.

If—despite all these uncertainties—sā belongs to the preceding word, the following word is easy to analyze. The first sign, it is true, has to be emended, since it is neither identical with šu nor with ku or ki otherwise attested in this text. The most probable emendation is kšt, because morphological reasons suggest a sign ending in -i. The form resolving under these premises is kšr = i = en, which is a jussive 3rd ps. sg. from the verb kšr-. This verb has been shown by E. Neu to denote “to let, to release” on the basis of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual from Boğazköy found in 1983. The first two words of 1. 2 thus could be translated: “May everybody ([?] release ([?]) him ([?])!” It is, however, evident from our arguing that this analysis cannot be considered more than a learned guess.

The last sign in 1. 3 could be BA or ZU. Since BA is not used in Mit., ZU seems preferable.

4: The first word is a verbal form based on the well known root hille- “to say, to speak, to inform”. The form is to be analysed as “anti-passive”, a transitive verb in a construction without explicit reference to the direct object. The tense is marked by the preterite suffix -ož-, which here, contrary to 1. 8’, is written non-plene. In Mit., -ož- is never written plene in connection with hille-. The distribution rules of -ož- vs. ož- (presumably conditioned by stress patterns) have not yet been studied. -ož- is followed by the transitive marker -i, the enclitic personal pronoun 1st ps. sg. absolutive -d ~ -ta, and the enclitic connective -an. In Mit., the combination of the short allomorph of the pronoun and the connective becomes -ta-an, whereas the long allomorph plus -an appears as -kl-ta-a-an, with a plene writing of the vowel, presumably indicating length by contraction. The new text has a single dental despite the plene-writing. This might be a mistake or a writing practice deviating from the strict rules of Mit. chanceller orthography. If the analysis of the first word of 1. 2’ is correct, the scriptio defectiva of presumed /šš/ as -šā would be a parallel.

The second word, urba-ni[], contains the adjective urgi “true, sincere” known as an element of personal names such as Urša-tiššu (Urša-šēššub), Uršu-tilla, etc. Although the combination of urgi with hille- is not attested, urgi repeatedly refers to words spoken (kad-, kul-) in Mit. (II 103, 106, IV 23, 29). In our context, an adverb would be required, such as the essev (in adverbial use) urgi = a Mit. II 106, or the adverbial instrumental urgi = ae, as it is attested at Nuzi: Add 382 (= HSS XVI 259) 2–7: 211 <udd.meš> (3) mu-a d-du-šu I 74 PN (5) LÚ.SPA ur-ja-c-e-l-lu-a (6) PN (7) na-wa-[a] /a “21 <sheep>, muddu” obligation of the shepherd PN, PN will duly 19 pasture.” The ending -ni could be the suffix of the ablative-plural -ang-; for a root-complement -ang- cf. pšr = ang = umma “to flee” (inf.) AASOR 16, no. 32:18.

5 urgi = ae = lla with the enclitic personal pronoun 3rd pl. ps. referring to the object in an ergative construction, i.e. in the given case to “sheep”.

6 na-wa-[a] /a is to be connected with the noun naggi “pasture” attested in the Hurrian Hittite bilingual from Boğazköy KBo XXXII 14 Vs. 15; cf. E. Neu, in: HuHill, 101. According to Neu’s transliteration, the text says: a-a-i na-a-ni-e e pa-a-pa-an-ni a-me-la-a-an-ni ta-ar-tr-il, which, with regard to the Hittite version, has to be translated “May the fire burn the mountain (serving as) pasture!” In a personal communication from Dec. 1985, E. Neu kindly informed me of the attestation of naggi in the Boğazköy bilingual and indicated the possibility of a relationship between naggi- and Akkadian nāwī “steppe pasture”. Neu, loc. 102, explains the difficult ending -i-e as the enclitic possessive pronoun 3rd ps. sg. -i = e in combination with the genitive -xe, which, according to Spieser, III 69, and Bush, GHL 118, becomes -i-xe in a-ix-ei Mit. III 28, 29 and evi-xe Mit. 191, 98, II 64, IV 19, 25, 28. This, however, is questionable, because forms like at-ti-i-xe (alti-t-i-xe “his wife’s”) Mit. III 76 show that the rule established by Spieser is not valid. In my view (cf. already G. Wilhelm, Ot n.s. 54 (1985) 494 sub lem)
in instrumental case, which, however, has not yet been observed in clearly adverbial use.

5': The form a-ru-š-en is attested here for the first time. Evidently, it is derived from the well-known root ar- "to give." The suffix -ud- (also -ud- and -od-) has been illuminated recently by the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual from Bogazköy already mentioned above. Here, forms with -ud- like a-mu-laš-š-ša-um (am = ol = ud = ol = m) KBo XXXII 14 IV 17, a-mu-du-um (am = ud = m) KBo XXXII 14 I 37, and pu-ru-du-um (für = ud = m) KBo XXXII 14 I 38 are translated by Hittite negative forms (Ú-UL a-uš-zi III 166 f., a-ar-š-UL-UL II 37, a-e-mi-it Ù-UL II 38). The final -en has to be the suffix of the jussive 3rd ps. sg. The form, then, may be translated "He shall not give!"

The following word is not well enough preserved for a reliable restoration. One of the few known words beginning with uš- is uššunu "silver," which would fit the meaning of the preceding verb. If uš- [...] was the direct object of the phrase, the verb would stand in topic position, which is not unfamiliar in Hurrian.

6': This line only contains a jussive form with the suffix -en attached to a root compound ašk-ir-š=ma-en = aššunu. A root ašk- or ašš- is rather frequently attested, often with a root-complement-ol-. The Hurro-Akkadian tablet IM 70923 from Tell al-Fahîl/Kurruḫanni uses the infinitive ašk=umma in the sense of "to demand compensation." ašk = ol-sometimes refers to "a word" or "words" (t-t = na) ChS I/1 41 III 44, 76), and in some cases it appears in connection with verbā dicendi such as kal- (ChS I/1 41 III 43) and kad- (ChS I/1 41 IV 5). It is a vague chance that ašk = ā(l) corresponds to Hittite puwaš- "to ask" in the bilingual ritual of Ṣalašu. It is not clear, however, whether the form in the new text from Tell Brak derives from this same root ašš-, because the possibility of a difference in vowel quantity has to be taken into account. But even if the root is the same, the form of the new text contains further grammatical elements which are unparalleled in Bogazköy and which might change the meaning of the verb considerably. As has already been stated above (n. 12), -ir- most likely does not rank among the root-complements, but forms participles of the pattern tabiri "someone who has cast (metal)", kebiri "someone who has set up (a trap)", etc. An ari-participle of a root ašk- is attested in aššitušu, the name of "an item of feminine

---

21 In the Hurrian Hittite bilingual from Bogazköy, a variant form of this word, i-ta-š-š-š-š (iš anni), is attested; cf. Neu, Das Hurritische, 16 n. 39; idem, Zur Grammatik des Hurr. auf der Grundlage der hurritisch-hehitischen Bildung aus der Bogazköy-Grabungskampagne 1983, in Hadlur, 99.
22 For this case cf. E. Neu, in: V. Haas / H. Giesebrecht, Die urartäischen Texte im aššunu-Seram, 298 - 47.
finery”, 30 a kind of container closed by a lid, 31 attested at Amarna and Alalah. asširuššu is a formation ending in -ššu 32 well known for all kinds of utensils, especially vessels. 33 The meaning of the basic *asš = ir = i, however, is not elucidated by the derivative *asš = ir = a = ššu. The verbal noun is, again, verbalized 34 by the causative suffix -an. 35

The causative suffix is followed by the suffix -Vš- which is the last in the chain of root-complements. 36 Its vowel is usually determined by the vowel of the preceding syllable, but there are some unexplained exceptions such as *pīr = aššu, and *ūššu and *tššu to which the new form now may be added.

The next suffix is the jussive ending -en. The writing with -en instead of *i-en suggests the absence of the transitive class-marker -i which precedes -en in transitive jussive forms. Consequently, the form is intransitive and the enclitic personal pronoun 3rd ps. sg. -mna, directly attached to -en, 38 functions as subject.

The final position is taken by the sentence particle -man (not to be confused with -mān “and”) whose meaning has not been established yet. 39

7: The determinative for masculine personal names is used here and in l. 13’ (presumably also in l. 16’) in connection with inflected forms of cpr(e) = iff- “my lord”. This is a deviation from the practice of Mit., where the vertical wedge is restricted to personal names.

The form and spelling of the dative suffix -ea after the possessive suffix 1st ps. sg. -iff- is the same as in Mit.: /ya/, written -u-ū-a-. 107

The address “my lord” shows that the letter is directed to a person superior to the writer. Considering the fact that the letter was found in a palace, it’s addressee is likely to be a high state official or the king himself.

The form cpr(e) = iff = ya- is followed by the long allomorph of the enclitic personal pronoun 3rd ps. sg. -mna and the enclitic connective -an. The regular plene-writing of the vowel /a/ probably denotes lengthening by contraction. 40

30 CAD x, 2, 444b.
32 The form tupp- = ag = ššu = na Mit. II 21 shows that the suffix may be analysed as the derivative vowel -a/-e and a suffix -ššu, which supposedly is formed of the two well known suffixes -ššu- and -ššu-ššu.
34 Denominal verbs are not rare in Hurrian; cf. e.g. *alt = ugar- “to establish a relationship by marriage” (only attested in alt = ugar- “relationship by marriage”) from alt- “woman, wife”, evarumma “to inherit” from *evar- “heir” (attested as Akkadianized evaru; īlimu “to swear in” from īlimu, evar “oath”; naššumma “to buy” from maššu < maššu “purchase price”; nikkassamanna “to account” from nikkass < Akk. nikkassu “account”; tāšamanna “to adopt as daughter” (2) from tāša “daughter”; aššu-u “to keep faith” from aššu “true”.
35 The two root-complements -an and -mna, which Speiser, IH, § 176 (1) and (10), had still kept apart, were taken as variants by E. Laroche, Études hurrriennes, RAS 54 (1960), 201. Laroche’s view has been adopted by later scholars such as Bush, GHL, 179 (“tentatively grouped together”), Friedrich, Churritschi, HUH 1/2 (Köln, Leiden, 1969), 17, Diakonoff, HuU 114, and M. L. Khačikyan, Khurritski, 60. The reason for the assumed allomorphy has been seen in a dissimilation of -an-to-an roots ending in -e like enman and -in- (Laroche, i.e., Friedrich, i.c.,) and, as Bush, GHL, 180, added, also in roots containing an -e such as tun- and tge. The appearance of -an- in the verb nikkass = an- or misakk = an- attested at Nuzi (“to account”, derived from Akk. nikkassu), however, is not explained by these dissimilation rules. It is more likely that (following an oral suggestion of M. Krebernik) -an- and -an/ni- have to be kept apart, the first being a factitive suffix (emman = an- “to make tenfold”, tin = an- “to double”, nikkass = an- “to make an account”) and the second a causative-suffix (keb = an- “to make (s.o.) bring”, corresponding to Akk. šébu; cf. G. Müller, Zu einem hurritischen Verba mittendi, Mesopotamia 21 (1956), 230–3; an “to make” (s.o.) give”); cf. Laroche, i.e., -an- is consistently written plene in connection with the root keb (16x), but always non-plene after tge- (6x).
36 Cf. Bush, GHL, 184–6; Diakonoff, HuU, 117, separates it from the group of root-complements, but leaves its function open.
37 Also in Mit., -as- follows -en without the connecting vowel -i- which is present between -en and the pronoun 3rd ps. pl. -la; cf. a-ra-na-e-nu-na-an (ar = an = e(n) = na = man “he may order it to be given (to him)”) Mit. III 41, but a-ra-an-na-e-ni-in-an (ar = an = e(n) = na = an = an “and he may order them to be given (to him)”) III 39.
38 Speiser, IH, § 212a; Bush, GHL, 264–5; Diakonoff, HuU, 150 f. Lastly, C. Girbal, ZA 78 (1989), 135, argued that the sentence particles ("associatives") -an and -mna are allomorphs of one and the same morpheme. Although it is true, that the use of -an and -mna seems to be conditioned by preceding elements (e.g. -an never appears after another vowel than -e, -mna never after the short forms of the enclitic pronouns), there is, however, no strict complementarity; cf. anammi = ila = ila = man etc.
8': The first form is a preterital antipassive (cf. commentary on l. 4') with the subject presumably lost at the end of l. 7'; *ha·z-€z·i·" [he/1] heard". The *plene*-writing of the preterite suffix is not unusual in Mit., but again the distribution of *plene* vs. *non-plene* is open to discussion. The ending *-li* can be analysed as a sequence of the root-complement *-ol* and the transitive marker *-i*, which again would lead to an antipassive. The form can, however, also be explained as a volutative in *l=I= e*.

The third unit of the line can be restored from l. 14', cf. infra.

9': The first word could be the interjection an "behold!" attested at Boğazköy. The second word seems to be the relative pronoun ya/e-; the context, however, is too broken to be reconstructed.

If the reading of the last preserved sign of the line is correct, the pertinent form is to be analysed as an ergative (*-ξ*) of a definite noun (article sg. *-ne*).

11': *mu-ā-lāw-w* [A undoubtedly contains the possessive pronoun 1st ps., either sg. (*-iffa*, *-iffi*, *iffu*; cf. commentary to l. 3 with n. 8) or pl. (*-iff = aξ*), which leads to the noun nui already attested several times in religious context in Boğazköy. In the prayer ChS I/1 41, the same word appears, also with the possessive suffix 1st ps. sg. in the ergative case and in connection with the verb *ha·z* "to hear": *ga-ā-ii-[a-ā]-zi·fi·" (25) [ ] i=ep-ša-ri nu-ω₁-lū-i-ip-pu-ūs ha-ā-ši-ia-an*, morphemic transcription: *kād=i=is =e tep=sari nui=iffu=ξ ha·z=xi·i·an* "The words he speaketh my ear (?) shall hear!" obv. I 24 sq. A passage of the 10th tablet of the itkalzı-ritual uses *nui* in a similar context and leaves no doubt about the thematic vowel *-i* which in the previous example is obscured by the initial *-i* of the possessive suffix; ChS I/1 9 313 30 with duplicates: *ha-az-zi-zi-(-pal) sal-hu·(ur)-le-(-e)ēs nu-u-ia-āl* [better: *nu-(ū)-i-se, -a-]-al-'ā] *ha-(-a-)ša-(-a-)ši-le-(-e)ēs*, morphemic transcription: *hassissi=v=a=l salg=o=l=e=ξ nui=v=a=lll ha·z=aξ·i·i·i·an* "Your mind may listen to them, your ear may hear them." The parallelism suggests that *nui* is a synonym of *hassissi* (< Akkad. *hasissu*), meaning "ear", "mind" etc., as it has already been seen by M. Salvini. The same parallelism of *nui* and *hassissi* is further attested in the substitution ritual ChS I/5 63 obv. 7': *n|[u-ū]-is nu-ω₁-i-ia-an ha-az-[zi-ši ša-zi-zi-ia-an],* morphemic transcription: *nui=ξ nui=dan hassissi[ζi=ξ hassissi=dan]* "Ear from ear, mind from mind!" (sc.: "may take the sin" or likewise). The combination of *nui* and *hassissi* also appears when used as sacrificial terms (Oppftertermini) in connection with bird offerings in the Hittite ritual KUB XL 79 rev. 12, 16.

*ha-s[a]- again is a form of the verb *haž*- "to hear". The combination of *nui* and *haž*-corresponds to the Boğazköy passages and confirms the semantic definition of *nui*. The restoration of the verbal form, however, is difficult. It is tempting to restore *ha·z=ay* "I hear" on the basis of the first form of the next line. On the other hand, the Boğazköy passages show *nui* as agent of *haž*-*. This could apply here, too, but in this case the verb would have to be restored with the root-complement *-aξ*, which has only been attested with non-indicative forms so far.

92 (1988) 64; for older views cf. E. Laroche, GLH, 187 f. s.v.; V. Haas/G. Wilhelm, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna, (AOATS 8, Kevelaer) Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974, 93 with reference to luw. *nu*(i)- which, however, has to be kept apart according to CHD v-n 471, 476 f.

41 The restoration was rightly suggested by the editors V. Haas and I. Wegner.

40 M. Salvini, RA 82 (1988) 64; for older views cf. E. Laroche, GLH, 187 f. s.v.; V. Haas/G. Wilhelm, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna, (AOATS 8, Kevelaer) Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974, 93 with reference to luw. *nu*(i)- which, however, has to be kept apart according to CHD v-n 471, 476 f.


47 ChS 1/5 87 Rs. IV 8-29 passim, 88 Rs. III 4'; cf. H.-J. Thiel, Überlegungen zu einigen Demonstrativa und Partikeln des Hurritischen, in Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of Ernest R. Lachmann (Winona Lake, 1981), 355; the relationship between *au* and the pair of alternative pronouns *nudda* *-nusa* postulated by Thiel can no longer be sustained after these pronouns have been identified as *t*-stems; cf. supra n. 8.

45 Cf. G. Wilhelm, Zur hurritischen Gebietsliteratur, D. R. Daniels et al., Ernten, was man sät, Festschrift Klaus Koch (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991), 57-47.

44 M. Salvini, RA 81 (1987) 59 f.; V. Haas/Y. van den Heuvel, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna, (AOATS 8, Kevelaer) Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974, 93 with reference to luw. *nu*(i)- which, however, has to be kept apart according to CHD v-n 471, 476 f.

48 The restoration was rightly suggested by the editors V. Haas and I. Wegner.
12: The root nakk- means “to dispatch” and corresponds to Akkadian \( w\)//mašṭu\( u\).47 The root-complement -\( ol\)- has not yet been attested in conjunction with nakk-. The broken context does not allow a closer semantic definition. The ending -\( ay\) (1st ps. sg. ergative) shows a plene-writing, as it is the case in approx. 40% of all its attestations in Mit.

13: The verbal root fas\( z\) in Mit. III 112 has been tentatively translated as (French) “envahir”.48 This has been confirmed by the Hurrian Hittite bilingual which gives Hittite andan \( usga\) - “to come in” as the equivalent.49 The ending is difficult to define without the help of an intelligible context. The root-complement -\( ol\)- might be present again, though there is no Mit. parallel for the double plene-writing.50 The general meaning of the text would suggest a voluntaive in \( \dot{e} = \dot{e} = \), but this could only be reconciled with the assumption of the root-complement -\( ol\)- if we accept a scriptio defectiva of -\( ol\)-, for which see commentary to l. 4’.

The second word of this line—\( e\)\( en\) “lord” with suffixes—presumably opens a new sentence. Unfortunately, the possessive ending of the 1st ps., following the noun, is ambiguous; it could be singular or plural. In the first case, we would have to read the sign \( w\)\( a\) as \( \dot{w} = (i\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon)\), in the second \( w\)\( a\) as \( \dot{w} = o\varepsilon = \). If the suffix is sg., the form stands in the ergative case, if pl., in the dative. Lines 4’, 7’, and 12’ show that the sender refers to himself, not to a group of “we”. This would tell in favour of the first solution. Difficulty, however, arises from the subsequent suffixes. The last preserved sign \( m\)\( a\) should be restored as one of the sentence particles (“associatives”) -\( m\)\( a\\)n “and” or -\( m\)\( a\)n (meaning unknown). In Mit., however, there is no ergative form to which one of these associates is attached directly or with the help of a meaningless connecting vowel.51 Consequently, in accepting the solution suggested by context we are forced into grammatical interpretations ad hoc whereas the less likely solution (“to our lord”) poses no such difficulties.

14: Š\( e\)n\( n\)i is a personal name well attested in tablets from Nuzi, but also from Nippur and Assur.52 It is based on the noun Š\( e\)na “brother”, which in personal names often appears as Š\( e\)n\( n\)i (in Old Hurrian personal names: Š\( e\)n\( n\)i). The same name is probably to be restored in l. 8’. There are parallels for the derivational type in \( a = n = n ( n) i\), e.g. \( m\)\( a\)d\( d\) = \( o\)\( m\)i “(Ea,) the wise” (from \( m\)\( a\)d “wisdom”).53 The name carries the genitive ending -\( ve\) without any further suffix. The absence of Suffixaufnahme suggests that the following word is a noun in the absolute case. \( t\)\( a\)n is a word of unknown formation and meaning attested in Mit. in unclear context (II 9).

15: The two words ending in -\( am\).\( k\)\( i\) do not fit into any known grammatical features. Probably they are place-names with the determinative \( k\)\( i\). It should be kept in mind, however, that this kind of writing place-names, well-known from the Old Babylonian period,54 would be an archaism here.55 The other tablets from the Mittani palace at Tell

---

47 Cf. Müller, *Mesopotamia* 21 (1986), 233-6; Wilhelm, *ZA* 79 (1989), 131. The Hurrian Hittite bilingual from Bogazköy provides further attestations of nakk-, this time in the context of manumission; cf. E. Neu, *Or* 59 (1990), 226 f. It seems difficult, however, to arrive at the basic meaning of nakk- through the correspondence of Hurr. nakk- and Hitt. iga-, offered by *KBo* XXXII 15 1119 f. The phrase nakk- kirenz “to promptulc a manumission” (Hitt.: iga- par\( i\) tarm\( u\)mar) could easily derive from the basic meaning “to dispatch, to release, to let go;” etc., comparable to the Old Assyrian phrase *pa\( p\)a\( m\)a\( s\)t\( a\)l\( t\)\( a\)naram “to send a letter”.


49 KU# XXXII 15 1 37 \( w\)\( a\)g\( u\)m\( m\)a\( s\)i (II 4-5 ma-\( ak\) -\( ha\) -\( an\) -\( an\) -\( an\) -\( an\) -\( at\) “when he came in”; cf. Neu, *Herrtische Verbalformen auf\( - a\)i*, 515 n. 40; idem, in *Fr. Othen* 1988, 245 n. 39.

50 Mit. IV 69 should be divided into sukku “one” and a\( l\) “another” (contra J. Friedrich, Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler, 29).

51 Either the ergative suffix is not followed by an associative at all (by far the most cases), or by -\( an\) (Mit. IV 14, 57). Only when the ergative suffix is followed by an enclitic pronoun ending in a vowel, the associatives -\( an\) and -\( man\) appear fairly frequently; cf. with an attempt of explanation C. Girbal, *ZA* 78 (1988), 135.

52 Spelling: Se-en-\( m\)u-\( n\)u-\( n\)i and Se-en-\( m\)u-\( n\)u-\( n\)i; cf. *NPN*, 131b, AAN, 126a.

53 Cf. also *NPN*, 240b with more personal names of this type.

54 Cf. B. Groneberg, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit* (RGTC 3; Wiesbaden, 1980), passim.

55 During the Middle Babylonian period, double determination with *u\( ru\)* and *k\( i\) is fairly common; cf. K. Nashef, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittelassyrischen Zeit* (RGTC 5; Wiesbaden, 1982), passim. This pattern is also found in the letter of a king of Mittani (the so-called “Säutatar-letter”) from Nuzi: *ur\( u\)* pa-\( ak\) -\( ha\) -ar-ra-\( k\)\( i\) HSS IX 1 obv. 3; *u\( ru\)* a-\( t\) -\( l\) -\( l\) -\( k\)\( i\) ibid. 8.
Brak as well as the Mittani letter only use the determinative uru to designate place names. Apparently there are no attestations of these toponyms outside our text.

16': The last line presumably starts with a verbal form, maybe a non-indicative form in \( =l\sim e \), to which the enclitic connective \(-\text{män} \) is attached. It is not clear whether the second word, \( \text{e}vr(e) = \text{i}ff[\ ] \), is the subject resp. agens (absolutive or ergative), the patients (absolutive) or an indirect participant (iative, directive or comitative) of the sentence.

The fragmentary state of the text turns the attempt to translate it into an extremely hazardous enterprise which nevertheless is undertaken here with all reservations:

"(2') He may [...]. . . destroy (??) (3') May everybody (??) release (??) him (??) (4') And I have duly informed [...]. (5') He shall not give si[lver (??)]!  
(6') He may . . . (7') And to my lord he/him/it [...]. (8') I/he have/has heard . . . (9') Behold! [...]. . . (10') I/he have/has heard . . . (11') My ear [...]. . . (12') I am dispatching ... (13') I will/shall come in to our lord (or: my lord [agens]) (14') . . . of Šēnōni (15') (the towns of) Kusam (and) Satayam (16') and I will/he may (??) (17') . . . my lord [(...)]."
Hurrian letter from Tell Brak (TB 11021).