

(kassite 3) (BE 14 No. 12, line 41, cf. Balkan 1954:12)

1 *sirp-ame* *DUMU.MEŠ* *Šeris*
1 brown-PL child.PL Š.
“1 (pair of)¹⁷⁵ brown (horses), foals of Šeris”

(kassite 4) (Balkan 1954:224)

^mKupši-nimgir
(unknown meaning)-rescue/protect
“(Kupši) protects(??)”

(kassite 5) (from a bilingual list of king names, cf. Balkan 1954:3)

^mNimgir-abī
rescue/protect-NML/INF?
“protecting/protection”
Akkadian parallel: *^mEṭēru* (rescue/protect.INF)

(kassite 6) (Balkan 1954:227)

*Inzu-Murudaš*¹⁷⁶
king-M.
“(god) Morutaš is king”¹⁷⁷

Questionnaire

1 12 /p t ts k k^w(?)¹⁷⁸ s x¹⁷⁹ m n l r j/

¹⁷⁵ The noun *NĪĜ.LAL* “pair” is left out in this text, but the summary line of the paragraph (line 42: *PAP 7 NĪĜ.LAL piḫat Dūr-Kurigalzu* “sum: 7 pairs from the province of Dūr-Kurigalzu”) clearly states that all numbers are pairs of horses.

¹⁷⁶ The word for “king” is normally *yanzu* or *yanzi* (probably something like *yanzə*), in this name it is written *inzu*, maybe under Akkadian influence. Akkadian changed inherited word initial /ja/ to [i], maybe people were aware of that due to contact to other Semitic languages like Amurritic.

¹⁷⁷ As Balkan (1954:227) stated, it is not possible that this name means “king of Morutaš”, since M. is a god and combinations like “king of GN” are not attested elsewhere.

¹⁷⁸ /k^w/ might be a phoneme, because B and G vary in writing sometimes, cf. *Šibarru* / *Šigurra* “Šimaliya”, which was maybe pronounced like [sig^woro].

¹⁷⁹ All obstruents had voiced allophones in positions before voiced sounds (sonorants and vowels). Even the writings with D, G at the beginning of words (B and Z are not attested) are no indicators that /t d/ or /k g/ were distinguished phonemically, since *galzu* is *kaššū* and not *gaššū* in Akkadian, which did have this phonemic distinction, see also Balkan 1954:216.

- 2 5 /a e i o¹⁸⁰ u/
3 no evidence for diphthongs
4 ? probably not
5 yes /l/ occurs frequently
6 ? probably not
7 no [ŋ]?
8 /l/ yes, but occurs in only one word
 /r/ no, except for two very uncertain words of unknown origin
9 at least CCVC was possible, cf. Balkan 1954:215
11 no no evidence in writing¹⁸¹
12 probably medium/high, many affixes are found, but their meanings can not
 be determined yet, cf. Balkan 1954:224ff.
12a probably low, only a certain suffix –š“(meaning unknown)” can be observed
 on proper nouns
13a juxtaposition, dependent follows head, cf. (kassite 1)
15 ? unclear, probably none
16 probably only adjectives were marked, or phrasal marking, cf. (kassite 2)
20 probably very few, no evidence for overt grammatical cases
25 no “child” should then be marked somehow, but it is not, cf. (kassite 3)
26 at least GEN and ADJ seem to be distinguished, since there is no overt
 marking of the possession relation, but adjectives are marked for
 number, cf. (kassite 1, 2)
39 OV? cf. (kassite 4, 5)
39a N GEN, cf. (kassite 1)
43 seems so cf. (kassite 6)

5.22 Appendix 22: *Latin (lat)*

(lat 1) (cf. Bayer and Lindauer 1974:119)

<i>mult-a</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>praeclār-a</i>	<i>facinor-a</i>
many-NOM.PL.N	and	superb-NOM.PL.N	deed(N)-NOM.PL

“many superb deeds”

¹⁸⁰ A and U often vary in writing, which might be an indicator for a vowel /o/ in Kassite, cf. Balkan 1954:211.

¹⁸¹ Some words are occasionally written with double consonants, but they normally alternate with writings with single consonants.