The Egyptian Transliteration of Hittite Names

Author(s): H. R. Hall

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 8, No. 3/4 (Oct., 1922), pp. 219-222

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853703>

Accessed: 05-11-2015 14:36 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE EGYPTIAN TRANSLITERATION OF HITTITE NAMES

BY H. R. HALL, D. Litt.

Among the more recent results of Hittite linguistic research is the apparent fact that in the ordinary language of the Hittite cuneiform tablets of Boghaz Kiöi, the "Kanisian" as Forrer calls it¹, which seems to be if not actually "Indo-European" at any rate a first cousin of the Indo-European tongues², proper names usually end in *-s*, whether *-as*, *-is*, or *-us*, which is evidently a masculine nominative case-ending, like the Greek *-os*, Latin *-us*, etc. In Semitic cuneiform and in Egyptian this nominative case-termination is usually omitted. Thus Ḫattušiliš becomes in Semitic cuneiform Ḫattušili, and in Egyptian Khetasil(e) or ³. Muršiliš in Egyptian is Marusil(e) for Mursil. Muwattališ or Mutallu is *Mewatalo (or some such pronunciation). Dudḫaliyaš is further reduced, if, as seems most probable, it is represented in Egyptian by Tod'al(e), the name of one of the "great

¹ *M. D. O. G.* 61 (Dec. 1921); *Ausbeute aus den Boghazkioi-Inschriften*, p. 26.

² It should be clearly understood that this judgment rests entirely at present on the authority of Messrs HROZNÝ and FORRER, who however have given reasons for their belief that are distinctly impressive. Prof. ZIMMERN accepts (*O. L. Z.* 1922, 297 ff.), but Prof. SAYCE does not accept HROZNÝ's claim in *Die Sprache der Hethiter*, 1917, and *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte*, 1919 that the Hittite of the tablets (FORRER's "Kanisch") is Indo-European. SAYCE prefers to believe ("The Hittite Language of Boghaz Keui," in *J. R. A. S.*, 1920, p. 49 ff.) that the language is Asianic, with an Indo-European element. Nor would he presumably accept FORRER's description of it as a "sister" of "Urindogermanisch." Dr. COWLEY in his Schweich Lectures "The Hittites" (1918) p. 46 f., took much the same view as SAYCE, but was not so positive in rejecting HROZNÝ's results. The late Prof. L. W. KING writing in 1917 (*Journ. Eg. Arch.* IV. p. 190 ff.) considered it premature to pronounce judgement then, but confessed that he was impressed, as I am, by the cumulative effect of HROZNÝ's instances, and had he lived it would have been interesting to see how the matter presented itself now to his mind, which, though cautious, was flexible, and always ready to give up preconceived ideas and adapt a new orientation without demur, if necessary. F. SOMMER (*Boghazköi-Studien* 4 (1920) and *O. L. Z.* 1921, 314 ff.) accepts HROZNÝ's "Hethitisch" as Indo-European, although with many non-European elements in the vocabulary. HROZNÝ (*Boghazköi-Studien* 5; "Über die Völker und Sprachen des alten Chatti-Landes") considers that the Indo-European language of the tablets (FORRER's "Kanisch"), which he called "Hethitisch", is not really the language of Ḫatti. This, the "Chattisch" or true Hittite (FORRER's "Protohattisch"), was not Indo-European. BORK (*O. L. Z.* 1916, 290 ff., 1920, 60 ff., 211 ff.), WEIDNER (*ibid.*, 114 ff.), BLOOMFIELD (*J. A. O. S.*, 1921, 195 ff.), and PRINCE (*ibid.*, 210 ff.), oppose the conclusions of HROZNÝ and FORRER with regard to "Kanisian" Hittite. Whether they be right or wrong, the fact of the nominative ending in *-as*, *-is*, or *-us* remains, independent of any theory of philological relationship and unaffected by it.

³ In all these names I have omitted the immaterial final determinative, which varies, being sometimes , sometimes , and so on.

men of valour" ( ) of Khattusil's army at the battle of Kadesh. It may also be represented by , *Tydul(e) or *Ty'dwal, the name of the Hittite general of archers at the same battle. The identification of the name of Tod'al with Dudḫal(iyaš) was made by Prof. SAYCE¹. I think that Ti'dul is probably the same name, differently spelt. It is considerably rubbed down, of course. Apart from the loss of the nominative termination (which also disappears in Semitic cuneiform, leaving the name as Dudḫaliya), and a hypocoristic or patronymic(?) -iya[š] (= *ius*), the medial guttural of the name itself, while apparently preserved in the form Tod'al, has gone in Ti'dul. Dudḫaliya has been identified by SAYCE with the Biblical name Tid'al, king of the Goyyim (GEN. XIV)². If the Tid'al of the Hebrews = Dudḫal(iya), so may Tod'al or Tid'ul. There is no other candidate in the Egyptian texts relating to the Hittites for identification with the name of Dudḫaliyaš.

, which may be vocalized as Sapalel(e) or Sapelulu, is the Egyptian form of the name of the great Hittite conqueror usually known now, on Semitic cuneiform authority, as Shubbiluliuma. The Egyptian form would seem to be a very drastic reduction of the original. But it is explicable. The name was one that was handed down among the Hittites, and in the ninth century B. C. we find a chief in the Carchemish region named Sapalulme³, and, what is still more remarkable, at the beginning of the Christian era a prince of Edessa named Saplul⁴.

This looks as if the -ma or -me syllable were separable from the rest of the name. As a matter of fact this very syllable was often used as a sort of emphatic particle added to names; thus at this time we find Ḫattušili-ma, and a king of Aleppo is regularly called Rimišarri-ma instead of plain Rimišarri⁵. This would seem to explain the Egyptian transliteration of Šubbiluliuma or Šuppiluliuma (the *b* and *p* were constantly confused) satisfactorily, but for the fact that HROZNÝ and FORRER give a "Kanisian" Hittite form Šubbiluliumaš⁶, in which the Hittite nominative case-ending seems to be tacked on after the emphatic. This looks as if, as in other Hittite names, the full form was really Šubbiluliuš or Šuppiluliuš; shortly (in the vocative, so to speak), Šuppilul. And this corresponds closely to the Egyptian transliteration. We should therefore perhaps speak in future not of Shubbiluliuma but of Šuppilul or Šuppiluliuš.

¹ SAYCE, in GARSTANG'S *Hittites*, p. 324, no. 4. He does not give the hieroglyphics: I assume that his Tid'al is Tod'al.

² *Ibid.* He reads the Egyptian form as Tid'al also, which is not quite correct for . The guttural is not ' (𐎗) but 𐎗, and (a matter of taste, perhaps) the Egyptian is better vocalized to than *ti*. In Ti'dul the first syllable is definitely *ti* or *ty*, . Prof. SAYCE probably, having Ti'dul also in his mind, combined the two.

³ R. III 7, I 42, 52; SCHROEDER, *Keilinschr. Bibl.* I, p. 156-9. This is no doubt the origin of W. M. MÜLLER'S form *Sapalulvi* or *Sapalulmi* (*Asien und Europa*, pp. 333, no. 1; 395), for which he quotes no authority. The identity of the names Šubbiluliuma and Sapalulme has been pointed out by GUSTAVS, *O. L. Z.* 1917, 323.

⁴ HALÉVY, *Rech. Bibl.* I, p. 279; C. J. BALL, *P. S. B. A. X* (1888), p. 428.

⁵ *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, I, no. 6.

⁶ HROZNÝ, *ibid.*, V, Übersicht; FORRER, *M. D. O. G.* 61, p. 31. Neither scholar has yet published the cuneiform text in which the name occurs in this form. It is to be regretted that the example set by WINCKLER in publishing the results of researches without the texts on which they are based, so that they cannot be controlled by others, is being followed, to some extent by FORRER.

This content downloaded from 132.210.236.20 on Thu, 05 Nov 2015 14:36:29 UTC
All use subject to [JSTOR Terms and Conditions](#)