

JOURNAL OF
Near Eastern Studies

JANUARY 1978 . VOLUME 37 . NUMBER 1

NINETY-FIFTH YEAR

THE ACTS OF HATTUŠILI I*

H. CRAIG MELCHERT, *Harvard University*

I

THE text known variously as the "acts," "annals," or "autobiography" of Hattušili I exists in both Akkadian and Hittite versions, hereafter A and H respectively. Text A, published as *KBo* X 1, consists of a single one-column tablet, almost entirely preserved. The best-preserved copy of H is that of *KBo* X 2, a two-column tablet with a nearly continuous text but significant lacunae. For the other fragmentary copies of H, see the summary by Laroche under *CTH* 4. References to H in the following are to *KBo* X 2 unless otherwise indicated.

A preliminary translation of A was published by Otten, *MDOG* 91 (1958): 73-84, accompanied by photographs of both A and H. Goetze dealt with both versions at some length in his review of *KBo* X in *JCS* 16 (1962): 24-28. Güterbock in *JCS* 18 (1964): 1-6, established a reference to Sargon of Akkad in H III 32-36 = A rev. 20-22. Carruba, *ZDMG*, Supp. 1, 1 (1969): 231-34, discussed the text in connection with the problem of dating Hittite texts (cf. also Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83 [1969]: 264-65 and 282). Finally, Imparati and Saporetti, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 14 (1965): 40-85 offered a complete transcription and translation with commentary.

Since the treatment of Imparati and Saporetti is for the most part correct, a complete new edition would be gratuitous. However, both transcription and translation call for correction and elaboration of detail. While no single point is of great significance, taken together the suggested changes materially alter the interpretation of a historically important document. The linguistic interest of a bilingual text is also self-evident. Hence the justification for the following reevaluation.

* I am indebted to Professors Calvert Watkins, William L. Moran, Erich Neu, Hans M. Kümmel, and Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., and especially to John Durham, for many helpful suggestions and criticisms. This should not be taken to imply approval on their part

of all the views expressed, some of which they do not share. Final responsibility for the content, including any errors, is naturally mine.

Bibliographical abbreviations are those of von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. For Hittitological works, see, in addition, the lists in J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (1952), pp. 7-13 and E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (1971), pp. ix-xii (hereafter cited as *CTH*).

II

Neither A nor H in the version we have represents the original document. The events related date from Old Hittite times, but the ductus of both *KBo* X 1 and X 2 shows them to be Neo-Hittite copies of the thirteenth century B.C. Note in particular the late forms of the signs LI, KÜ, URU, ŠAR, and AL (see the tables in Rüster, *StBoT* 20 and Neu-Rüster, *StBoT* 21). As in other Neo-Hittite texts, both originals and copies, one also finds instances of older sign variants (KÜ H I 12 and passim, AK H II 19), but the presence of the newer forms argues decisively for a late copy.¹ The opening lines of the reverse of A (1-12?) seem to be by a different hand from that which copied the rest of the text. Note the shape of LUGAL (rev. 1, 9, 11), AH (rev. 2, 4, 5, 8, 10), IN (rev. 4), GA (rev. 5), ŠA (rev. 6), and TA (rev. 9, 11). The second scribe also uses AŠ for *ina* and spells out the names Hatti and Arinna.² The phonetic spellings are inconclusive, while the use of AŠ and the shape of the signs are consistent with the evidence for a late copy provided by the forms of the signs observed elsewhere in the text.³

The spelling and language of H (*KBo* X 2) are for the most part also those of Neo-Hittite, but the duplicates (likewise with newer ductus) sometimes preserve older forms. Compare the lack of phonetic complements in *KBo* X 2 I 6-8 versus the duplicate *KBo* X 3 I 4-6. H writes verbs in *-(i)ya-* exclusively with *-ya-*, never *-i-e-*. *KBo* X 2 expresses motion toward by *INA* plus uninflected place name, while X 3 I 7 has the old directive: *nu URU Zalpa pāun*.⁴ H regularly uses *nu* as the sentence connective. *KBo* X 2 I 13 reads *n-aš*, "et eos" versus the older *n-uš* of X 3 I 12, and X 2 III 35 uses *arḫa warnuzzi*, "burn utterly," where the duplicate *KUB* XXIII 20, 13 preserves the archaic *arḫa lukkit*.

Carruba also points out several places where *KBo* X 2 itself shows traces of an Old Hittite original:

I 4-5: *ša-an(-)na-at-ta [(ḫarni)kt]a nu(-)ut-ni-e-eš-še-et ḫarnikta*. The use of the connective *šu*, the phonetic spelling of *natta*, "not," and the lack of space between the introductory particles and what follows are all archaic features inadvertently taken over from an Old Hittite archetype. The appearance of such isolated archaisms at the beginning of a copy is also typical (see Carruba, pp. 234-35).

I 45, III 10: *URU-ri-mit*. Carruba cites the use of the enclitic possessive in *-it* with a locative as an archaism, but Otten has recently noted, *StBoT* 17 (1973): 55-56, that such use seems to be a typical of *copies* of Old Hittite texts, not originals. It probably reflects a misunderstanding of the use of the enclitic possessive, which is no longer

¹ H. Hoffner has suggested to me in correspondence an additional criterion for attributing the copy *KBo* X 2 to late Hittite: the stem *kururi(y)ahḫ*, "become hostile" is spelled *ku-u-ru-ri-* before Muwatalli, *ku-ru-ri-* from Muwatalli on (including late copies of the Annals of Muršili). The spelling *ku-ru-ri-ahḫ-ri-ir* in *KBo* X 2 I 25 would thus confirm the evidence of the ductus for a late copy.

² H. Hoffner has pointed out to me that the photo accompanying Otten's article in *MDOG* 91 (1958): 73-84 also shows clearly that the second scribe held his stylus at a different angle and left more space between lines.

³ While *KBo* X 1 may safely be regarded as a late

copy, it is unlikely that the dating criteria based on the ductus of Hittite texts may be applied without modification to Akkadian texts from Boğazköy (see Neu-Rüster, *StBoT* 21 [1975]: 2, n. 6).

⁴ One could claim accidental omission of the preposition, but since *KBo* X 3 seems generally to be closer to the Old Hittite original, the directive is probably real. Besides the phonetic complements mentioned above, X 3 also shows correct *dalaḫḫun* (line 5) and *pedaḫḫun* (line 10). E. Neu has indicated to me in correspondence that the ductus of *KBo* X 3, while still Neo-Hittite, also appears older than that of X 2, but the size of the fragment precludes a definitive statement.

current in Neo-Hittite. Note that our text shows no other form of the enclitic possessive except the neuter nom. acc. singular which is also *-it*. The occurrence of *URU-ri-mit* is thus valid but indirect evidence for an Old Hittite original.

III 30: *ú-uk*. Correct for "I" instead of the usual *ammuk* of Neo-Hittite. Note that the context with its reference to Sargon is overtly archaic.

Thematic parallels with the Anitta text cited by Carruba will be discussed shortly.

Version A also contains instances of archaic spelling and language which argue for the existence of an older Akkadian text alongside that in Old Hittite.⁵

obv. 3: *du-um-qá-am*. The mimation in a CV-VC spelling points to Early or Middle Boğazköy Akk(adian). Likewise obv. 20 *ittur-am*, obv. 21 *išātam*, obv. 22 *attur-am*, obv. 23 *tāḫāzam*, obv. 35 *epram*, obv. 37 *pānam u bābam*.⁶

obv. 9: *URUTi-iš-ḫi-ni-ya*. The use of *ti* is distinctly O(ld) Ass(yrian). Compare I H 18 *URUTa-aš-ḫi-ni-ya*.

obv. 12: *KUR.ḫi.A kalu-šunu*. In later BoAkk "all" is regularly expressed by *gabbu*. *KUR.ḫi.A* for expected *KUR.KUR.MEŠ* (attested in H I 25) may also be old.

obv. 14, 28: *irḫup*. The verb is well attested at Mari and seems to be typical of western Old Babylonian. It is not attested in later BoAkk.

obv. 18: *ištēt* (plus rev. 13 *ištakan*, rev. 14 *aštakan*, *ištu*, passim). The consistent *š* before *t* points to Early or Middle BoAkk. Beginning with Šuppiliuma I, BoAkk shows *š > l* before dental.

obv. 37: *pānam u bābam ul iṣá*. An old expression. Note the mimation and use of *ú* for "and" (actually "or").

III

Otten, *MDOG* 91 (1958): 84, draws the preliminary conclusion that the text was composed in Akkadian, in a North Syrian dialect, albeit "aus hethitischem Sprachgeist." For Güterbock, *JAOS* 84 (1964): 108, it has become a "fact" that the text was first written in Akkadian and translated into Hittite only several centuries later "during the New Kingdom." Kammenhuber, *KZ* 83 (1969): 265, expresses a similar view, although less dogmatically. The idea of a late translation is contradicted by the archaisms in H cited above, which demonstrate that an Old Hittite version did exist. Goetze, *JCS* 16

⁵ This section in particular owes much to unpublished notes on A kindly made available to me by J. Durham.

⁶ The chronological distribution of CV-VC spellings may be seen from the following examples (taken from John W. Durham, "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian [Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1976], pp. 483 f.): *bi-ši-im KBo* I 11 obv. 13, *ta-ḫa-za-am* *ibid.*, obv. 11 f., *ṭe-a-ma-am* *ibid.*, rev. 10 (Siege of Uršu, *CTH* 7); *ku-uš-ši-im KUB* IV 76, 7 (Treaty with Išputahšu, *CTH* 21); *le-mu-ut-ta-am KUB* XXXIV 1 + 12 (Treaty with Pattatišu, *CTH* 26); *ki-it-ta-am KBo* I 5 I 39, *šu-ul-ma-na-am* *ibid.*, III 61, *ta-ḫa-az-za-am* *ibid.*, III 10 f. (Treaty with Šunaššura, *CTH* 41); *pi-ir-a-am KBo* I 3 + rev. 46 (Treaty of Šattiwaza with Šuppiliuma I, *CTH* 51); *ur-ra-am* Land Grants passim (see *MIO* 6 [1958]: 321-81 and *CTH*

222), *RS* 17.368 rev. 9 (Decree of Muršili II, *CTH* 65), *KBo* I 6 obv. 5 (Treaty with Talmi-Šarruma, *CTH* 75); *še-e-ra-am* Land Grants passim; *še-ra-am KBo* VIII 27 + rev. 1 (Land Grant = *LSU* 20, *CTH* 222), *RS* 17.237 rev. 4, *ibid.*, rev. 9 (Decree of Muršili II, *CTH* 65), *KBo* I 6 obv. 5 (Treaty with Talmi-Šarruma, *CTH* 75). The Hittite version of the Šunaššura Treaty has been shown to be Middle Hittite (see Otten and Rüster, *StBoT* 20 [1972]: x, and Houwink ten Cate, *Records of the Early Hittite Empire* [1970], pp. 44, 81). The Akkadian version also shows other features besides mimation pointing to Middle BoAkk (e.g., it always has *š* before a dental, never *l*; see below). All examples of CV-VC mimation are thus from before the time of Šuppiliuma I, except *pi-ir-a-am* and *urram šeram*, which as a fixed phrase in treaties and protocols survived into late texts.

(1962): 26–27, argues for a Hittite original, claiming that the mistakes of the Akkadian version are typical of a translation. He points out that the other famous bilingual of Hattušili I, his “testament,” was also composed in Hittite.⁷ Since we have also seen archaic features in A pointing to an older Akkadian version, some of the errors ascribed by Goetze to the act of translation might be charged instead to the later copyist of A, who misunderstood the archaic Akkadian forms.

Nevertheless, even if we allow for copying errors in A, evidence remains for a translation from Hittite to Akkadian. There are numerous instances where H has a very specific idiom, rendered in A with varying degrees of success ranging from idiomatic through colorless to mechanically calqued. H I 7 has [(*nu*) *kwe* *k]we ašawar ēšta*, “whatever sheepfolds there were.” A obv. 3 shows *mīnam dumqam*, “whatever good” (lit. “what good?”).⁸ One must conclude with Goetze that H has the lectio difficilior, and that A confused *ašawar*, “sheepfolds” with a form of *aššu*, “good.” H I 31–32 and II 6 have: *nu-mu mahḥan . . . menahḥanda awir*, “when they saw me opposite” = “when they saw me coming.” In A obv. 15 and 29 this collocation has been reduced to a simple *ina pāni-ya/šu*, “before (in the face of) me/him,” an accurate but colorless translation.

The sense of H I 36–37, “sowed weeds in its stead” is clear both grammatically and contextually. The corresponding A obv. 17–18 makes no sense as it stands. For a possible emendation see below. The fact that the later copyist of A so badly misunderstood the passage suggests that what stood in the Akkadian original was not exactly ordinary Akkadian phraseology. Similarly, the admittedly peculiar expression of H I 42–43 has only partially penetrated into A obv. 21 (see discussion below).

The phrase of A obv. 25 *ana qinnat . . . ittaziz* is likely a calque on the Hittite idiom *appanda tiya-*, “step behind” > “attach oneself to” (see details below). In H II 4–5 we find a Hittite idiom “smooth out the ways before” = “direct the behavior of”, expressed in A by “administer, govern,” once again an accurate but pale reflection of H. A obv. 29 has an instance of *ana balat*, “in the following year,” which makes no sense in context and can only reasonably be taken as a misreading of the Hittite (see below and Goetze, *JCS* 16 [1962]: 25).

H II 17 refers to “counted” days, i.e., “a few” days. A obv. 34 rather cleverly expresses this nuance with emphasizing *-ma*, but there can be no question as to the direction of translation. In H III 16–17 Hattušili removes the hands of his maid-servants from the grindstone and the hands of his servants from the sickle.⁹ In A rev. 11–12 the second clause has been inverted, destroying the parallel structure: “and he removed the sickle of his servants from their hands.” Note also that the complex idea of “releasing” the servants into the service of the Sun-goddess, expressed in H by the verb *tarna-*, has to be

⁷ This “fact” could also benefit from a thorough review, but Sommer, *HAB* 202, does present arguments for a Hittite original, and even Güterbock, *JAOS* 84 (1964): 108, concedes original composition of the testament in Hittite as well as Akkadian.

⁸ For the interrogative as an indefinite relative, see *KBo* I 5 I 46: *mannam DUMU-šu UTU-ši iqabbi*, “whichever son of his His Majesty designates.” Less certain is *HAB* I 23 (see *HAB* 51). A similar usage is attested in Mari: see Finet, *ALM* 44.

⁹ For URUDUKIN, “sickle” see Goetze, *JCS* 14 (1960): 116. O. and I. read the KIN of our text as “daily work,” presumably because the determinative URUDU is missing, but the parallelism is better

with an implement matching “grindstone”: see Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum*, p. 29, n. 135 and p. 133, n. 44. A. rev. 12 has *u ša IR.MEŠ-šu ka-ta-am-[m]a AŠ qāti-šunu uddappir*. Reading *qatamma*, “likewise” is difficult both orthographically (Boğazköy texts use exclusively *qa-* in this word) and syntactically (the *ša* presupposes an object possessed). Besides, if one translates “and likewise he removed (them) from the hands of his servants,” this implies that the servants also held grindstones, which are elsewhere an exclusively feminine attribute. S. cites *katamma*, “ein Bronzegerät” (*AHW* 464), but this word apparently means “lid, cover” (*CAD* sub *katammu*). Our word remains hapax.

glossed in A rev. 13–14 by adding an extra clause: “I placed them in the temple of the Sun-goddess and established their freedom under heaven.” Finally, Goetze points out that the expression (more precisely, the concept) “show smoke” of A rev. 24 = H III 40 is distinctly un-Akkadian. Furthermore, *kullumu*, “show” would take a double accusative in good Akkadian. The dative of recipient is surely copied from the Hittite.¹⁰

In the face of all these examples of Hittite idioms handled variously by A, there are no clear cases of distinctly Akkadian expressions being bowdlerized or misunderstood in H. There are only two possible instances: A obv. 24 *libba-šu uttappiš*, “he let his heart breathe” and A obv. 37 *pānam ū bābam ul išū*, “(The gold and silver) have neither beginning nor end.” Unfortunately, both of these passages are matched by lacunae in H. However, well-established Hittite equivalents exist for both these expressions: *ZI-an (ištanžanan) waršiyanu-*, “calm/appease the mind” and *nu-ššan kappuwawar UL eš-*, “(Of them) there is no counting” (see attestations below). In neither case is there a word-for-word equivalence between the Akkadian and Hittite, and we have no basis for deciding the direction of translation.

The use of peculiarly Hittite idioms proves that the writer of the original text at least composed in Hittite. The skill with which the writer of A translates some of the Hittite expressions suggests a good command of Akkadian, while his mechanical rendering of others would argue for less than a native competence in Hittite. It is difficult to reconcile these facts with the assumption that the author of the original and that of A were one and the same. The state of affairs of A makes a good deal more sense if we assume that an Akkadian speaker with some knowledge of Hittite was asked to translate a Hittite original. Since the extant version of H is a late copy, it is not surprising that in a few cases A indirectly preserves more of the original.

IV

The literary composition of the text is also of a well-known Old Hittite type: an extended historical narrative culminating in a particular triumph of the Hittite king. In the Old Hittite account of the destruction of Zalpa, the final Hittite victory is preceded by a long description of the relations between Zalpa and the Hittite capital which reaches back even into prehistoric times (see Otten, *StBoT* 17 [1973]: 63–66). The Anitta text, while much briefer, also begins with a scene-setting description of the conquest of Neša by Anitta’s father, then proceeds to the more recent deeds of Anitta himself. In our text the high point is the conquest and destruction of Hahha and Haššuwa. A summary of preceding campaigns serves as an introduction, building to a suitable climax in which the destruction and sacking of Hahha and Haššuwa are described in considerable detail. The glorious account of the victory is enhanced by an allusion to the legendary Sargon of Akkad (cf. Otten, *MDOG* 91 [1958]: 84).

Our text shares not only overall structure, but also specific thematic parallels with the Anitta text. The sowing of weeds on the site of Ulma (H I 36–37) recalls the same act perpetrated on Hattuša in Anitta 48. Carruba also points out the image of the lion,

¹⁰ The corresponding Hittite verb is missing, and Kümmel, *StBoT* 3 (1967): 23, rightly points out that the specific collocation “show smoke” is not attested elsewhere in Hittite. There is, however, evidence for

the idea of offering the smoke of a sacrifice to a god (see below), and Hittite would have a dative whatever the specific verb.

H II 18 and III 1 and Anitta 26, as well as the use of captured booty to adorn temples (Anitta 58 and H II 30, III 24, each with the verb *hališšiya*-, "adorn, face [with metal]"). His reconstruction of H II 6 f. after Anitta 20 f., however, must be rejected, because it ignores the parallel in A (see below).

Anitta describes his own acts in the first person, as do the later Hittite kings in their annals. Yet the Zalpa narrative is a prosaic third-person report.¹¹ Each of these narrative formats appears to have contributed to the shape of the present text as we have it. H employs the third person in I 1-5, then switches to the first person, which it uses consistently thereafter to refer to Hattušili. Text A in its extant form alternates between first and third person throughout, without apparent motivation.¹² Since the first person is the regular, productive usage in later Hittite, the uniformity of most of H tells us nothing about the original. Although the usage of A is chaotic, it is hard to see why the Akkadian translator would have used the third person at all if H had consistently had the first person.

Our text must represent the fusion of a prosaic third-person historical report and a more vivid first-person account of the campaign culminating in the conquest of Hahha and Haššuwa. There would have been a tendency from the beginning to extend the use of the first person back into the introductory historical narrative, and it is impossible to know how far this process had been carried in the first version of our text. However, the intercalation of consciously "literary" passages, such as the allusion to Sargon, might have been an additional source of third-person forms. J. Durham has pointed out to me that A shows third person in obv. 13-14 (image of the king as the favorite of the Sun-goddess), obv. 34-35 (image of the lion), as well as rev. 18 f. (comparison with Sargon). The first two of these have the appearance of stock literary formulas, while the last is an independent unit appended to the main text (note that the description of the campaign against Hahha and Haššuwa is complete without it). This episode is tied into the main text by adding a final sentence describing the humiliation of the kings of Hahha and Haššuwa (in the first person, A rev. 25). It may not be accidental that the title LUGAL.GAL (*tabarna*) appears in all three passages just cited, and in A it is most easily construed as the subject.¹³ Since it is clear that both A and H have gone through several redactions, it is scarcely surprising that the original distribution of first and third person forms is no longer recoverable.¹⁴

V

Further details of the relationship between A and H supporting the above conclusions will be discussed in the following commentary, which takes as its starting point the edition of Imparati (I.) and Saporetti (S.), with references to Otten's translation of A

¹¹ The Zalpa text is not the only example of an Old Hittite historical narrative in the third person. We also have fragments dealing with campaigns of Muršili I against Aleppo and Babylon (CTH 10 and 11).

¹² Any attempt to rationalize the overall use of first and third person actually observed in A requires excessive emendation and arbitrary division of the text. The reader may observe this for himself in the excerpts given below: see, e.g., A obv. 2-3, obv. 15-17, obv. 48-rev. 2.

¹³ On the other hand, LUGAL.GAL *tabarna* in rev. 1 goes with *allik* "I went" in rev. 2, so the presence of the third person in the above cases cannot definitively be linked to the title.

¹⁴ For the general form of composition in which elements from different sources are fused into a unified whole compare the Hittite prayers to the Sun-god (CTH 373; Güterbock, JAOS 78 [1958]: 237 f.) and to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376; Gurney, AAA 27 [1940]: 1 f.).

(O.) and Goetze's commentary (G.). Since all these works are arranged by line number, page references have been omitted as superfluous.

1. H I 1-8 = A obv. 1-3

[LUGAL.GAL *tabar*]na ^mHattušili LUGAL.GAL (2) [LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Hatti]ti LÚ ^{URU}Kuššar KUR ^{URU}Hatti (3) [LUGAL-e(zz)ia]t ŠA 'Tawannanna DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU (4) [(IN)A ^{URU}Š]anawitta pait š-an(-)natta (5) [(harni)kt]a nu(-)utnē-ššet harnikta (6) [nu-kan [(ERÍN.M)]EŠ 2 AŠRA ašandulanni da[la]hhyun (7) [(nu) kwe k]we ašawar ēšta (8) [(n-(at)] ANA ERÍN.MEŠ ašanduli pihyun

LUGAL.GAL *tabarna* ina ^{URU}KUBABBAR-ti LUGAL-utta itepuš ša 'Taw[annanna] DUMU ŠEŠ-ša/-šu (2) ina ^{URU}Šahwitta allik-ma ul uḫalliḫ u KUR.ḪI.A-šu uḫ[alliḫ] (3) ERÍN.MEŠ ummanati-ya 2-šu itezib mīnam dumqam addin-šunuti

I. and O. restore [UMMA *tabar*]na in H I 1, assuming the common opening of Hittite texts: "Thus (speaks) so-and-so." Several facts argue for the restoration [LUGAL.GAL *tabar*]na instead. First of all, A begins with a simple statement: "The great king, the Tabarna, exercised (lit. made) the kingship in Hatti—the nephew of (the) Tawannanna." Despite the variations of A and H (recall that both are copies), we should assume parallelism unless evidence points to the contrary. Furthermore, the verbs of H I 3-5 are in the third person (it being precisely lines 4-5 which show isolated archaisms). If the text of H began with UMMA, the following direct speech should be in the first person throughout: "Thus speaks the Tabarna: I . . ." On the other hand, if the text began with a narrative in the third person, as A confirms, then the third person forms of H I 3-5 would follow logically. With line I 6 the writer (at least of the copy) lapsed into the usual first person form which he retained thereafter. For the narrative opening compare not only the Zalpa text cited earlier, but also the beginning of the testament of Hattušili: L[LUGAL.GA]L *tabarna* . . . *memišta*, "The great king, the Tabarna, spoke . . ."¹⁵ Note also that all other occurrences of *tabarna* in our text are preceded by LUGAL.GAL (I 27, II 54, III 15, 30, 37). The redundancy of two LUGAL.GAL's is accounted for by the fact that the entire phrase ^mHattušili LUGAL.GAL KUR ^{URU}Hatti LÚ ^{URU}Kuššar is a late insertion to accommodate the titulature to the Neo-Hittite pattern (cf. O.). This view is supported by the spelling *Kuššar* versus *Kuššara* of the Old Hittite Anitta text (see Neu, StBoT 18 [1974]: 55). Without the above phrase H corresponds exactly to A.

The space at the beginning of H I 3 requires the restoration with G. of [LUGAL-e(zz)i-a]t, after the duplicate KBo X 3 I 1. Less likely, but also possible in view of the archaisms of lines 4-5, is the old form [ha-aš-šu-e-e]t, proposed by Watkins, Transactions of the Philological Society 1971 (1973): 77-78. I.'s [LUGAL-u-i]t is far too short.

A obv. 2 employs the conjunction *u* with an adversative sense: "Going into Šahwitta, I did not destroy it, but its lands I did destroy." H I 5 has *nu*, which is also adversative in Anitta 50 and occasionally elsewhere (see Neu, StBoT 18 [1974]: 101-2). A stronger equivalent of adversative *u* appears in H I 24 and 43, where *-ma*, "but" equates to the *u* of A obv. 11 and 22 respectively. In each case the adversative sense is translated correctly

¹⁵ Sommer-Falkenstein, HAB 20. According to their collation, the last horizontal of GAL is visible, eliminating U[M-M]A as a possible reading. The

restoration LUGAL.GAL *tabarna* . . . *memišta* is also supported by other occurrences of the phrase in the same text.

by O., ignored by S. The Hittite use of the Akkadian conjunction *u* deserves a separate discussion of its own. I content myself here with reemphasizing the adversative usage, which has not always been properly recognized in Hittite studies.¹⁶

C. Watkins first pointed out to me that the space at the beginning of H I 6 requires the restoration of more than just [(ERÍN.M)]EŠ. The syntax also calls for a sentence connective. I owe the restoration of *-kán* to H. Hoffner, who cites as parallels *KBo V 4 rev. 30 f.* (Targašnalli Treaty), *KBo IV 4 II 18 f.* (*AM* 114 f.), and *KUB XIII 20 I 10–11, 24*. There is, however, no justification for I.'s restoration of *-kán* in H I 8. It is not in the duplicate, *KBo X 3 I 6*, nor does the same phrase with *pāi-* take *-kán* in I 13 and 40. Lastly, the available space does not require anything but [*na-at*]: cf. H III 22.

2. H I 27–32 = A obv. 13–15.

LUGAL.GAL *tabarnaš NARĀM* ⁴UTU ^{URU}Arinna (28) *nu-mu-za-kan an[da ginuwaš-šaš ha]u[ī]š[t]a(?)* (29) *nu-mu kešš[arta DIB-ta/ISBAT](?) n]a-aš-mu MĒ-ya piran* (30) *ḫuwaiš nu INA* ^{URU}Ninašša *MĒ-ya pāun* (31) *nu-mu maḥḥan LÚ.MEŠ* ^{URU}Ninašša *menaḥḥanda* (32) *awir nu EGIR-pa ḫeššir*

LUGAL.GAL *tabarna narām* ⁴UTU *ana sūni-šu iškun-šu* (14) *u qās-su iṣbat-ma ina pani-šu irṭup alākam ana ir(!)ti* ^{URU}Nenašša (15) *ittalak ina pani-šu iptatu*

A obv. 13 can be read without emendation (contra G.) by assuming a simple casus pendens: "The great king, the Tabarna, beloved of the Sun-goddess (of Arinna)—him she put in her lap" (thus O. and S.). For the incorrect use of the possessive *-šu* with feminine reference compare H I 3 (but see also n. 25). On the other hand, the nominative form *tabarnaš* in H I 27 and the sentence-initial complex of H I 28 argue for taking line 27 as a nominal sentence: "(I) the great king, the Tabarna, (am) the favorite of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, and she . . ." ¹⁷ This interpretation is also possible for A obv. 13 (with a nominal sentence in the third person). For the asyndeton compare lines 14–15 and also below A obv. 28, where the nominal sentence is certain.

The Akkadian permits restoration of the sense of H I 28–29, but the precise wording is uncertain. The very tentative restorations suggested above are based on A and other parallels and on the partial signs visible in H. For the expression *ginuwaš ḫalā(i)-* compare Ullikummi (*KUB XVII 7+*) III 11–12: [*n-an-kan ANA* ⁴K]um[arbi] *ginuwaš ḫalāir*, "They placed (?) him (the infant Ullikummi) on Kumarbi's lap." I have chosen the form [*ha-l]i-[-i]š-[-t]a* to fit the traces in the edition. The attested 3d sing. preterite is *ḫalāiš*, but *ḫališta* seems possible in view of *dališta* from *dala-* "leave, let alone."¹⁸ The

¹⁶ Most egregiously in translations of the Hittite Laws. Friedrich, Neufeld, and Imparati translate *u* uniformly as "and," ignoring instances where the sense clearly is adversative. To cite but one example, §81a of table 2 (Hr. §195a) runs in the later version: *takku LÚ-aš MAḤAR DAM ŠEŠ-ŠU šeškizzi ŠEŠ-ŠU-ma ḫwišwanza . . .*, "If a man sleeps with his brother's wife, but his brother is (still) alive . . ." *KUB XXIX 36 rev. 8* in old ductus has *Ū ŠEŠ-ŠU*. The latter does not mean "and" (pace Friedrich) but testifies to the adversative use of *u* in Old Hittite, replaced by the productive *-ma*, "but" in the later version (at least graphically).

¹⁷ The lack of *-za* in a nominal sentence with the first person, against the rule of Hoffner, *JNES* 28 (1969): 225 f., is not a compelling counterargument. He states explicitly that the rule does not hold for Old Hittite, and the usage in our text may have been copied from the original. Furthermore, as noted earlier, the formula may have originally stood in the third person, as suggested by A.

¹⁸ H. Hoffner also recalls *KUB XXIV 7 IV 40 n-an-za-kan ŪR-ši dāiš*, but it is very hard to reconcile the traces in the edition of *KBo X 2* with *da-a-iš*.

traces in H I 29 point to *ḫi-eš-ša[r-ta]* versus the *ŠU-[it/az]* of *KUB XXIII 31 obv. 7*.¹⁹ This leaves very little room for the expected verb *e-ep-ta*, especially since the traces before the following *-mu* look more like *n]a-aš-* than simply *nu-*. H. Kümmel has suggested *DIB-ta*, and H. Hoffner *ISBAT*, but even one of these will hardly fit the space.

For the collocation *irṭup* + infinitive, A obv. 14, see now von Soden, *AHw* sub *raṭāpu*. Since the idiom of A expresses habitual action and elsewhere equates to an *-šk-* form in H (A obv. 26 = H II 5), one may wonder whether perhaps the original of H had a form of *ḫuwaiš-* here as well.

A obv. 14 reads in the manuscript *ana še-er-ti*, which S. understands as "for the punishment" (of the city of Nenašša), implying that N. was a vassal city in revolt. This is not impossible, but the expression is peculiar, and H has simply "I went into battle against N." The emendation to *ana irti* "against" in A suggests itself, and this suggestion finds support in the fact that the same error occurs in obv. 28, where four wedges have been erased before *ir-ti-up*.

For some reason, G. ignores the sentence of H I 30 and tries to equate *ana «še» irti* ^{URU}Nenašša *ittalak* to H I 31: *nu-mu maḥḥan LÚ.MEŠ* ^{URU}Ninašša *menaḥḥanda awir*. Actually, the latter clause is rendered in A simply by *ina pāni-šu*, "before/in the face of him." This equation is confirmed by H II 6–7 = A obv. 29 (see below).

I. restores KÁ.GAL.ḪI.A in H I 32 after II 7, but it is interesting that the corresponding A obv. 15 also omits the word for "gates." We may have a permissible syntactic deletion instead of a copying error. The overt object is not necessary for the sense: "When the men of N. saw me coming, they opened up."

3. H I 33–37 = A obv. 15–18

[EGI]R-*anda-ma INA KUR* ^{URU}Ulma *zaḥḫiya pāun* (34) *nu-mu LÚ.MEŠ* ^{URU}Ulma *MĒ-ya menaḥḥanda 2-ŠU uer(!) n-aš 2-ŠU-pat ḫalliyannun* (36) *nu KUR* ^{URU}Ulman *ḫarninkun nu-šši-kán pidi-šši* (37) [ZĀ.AḪ.L]I^{SAR} *sunniyanun*

ana ^{URU}Ullumma *ana MĒ illik* (16) *u 2-šu (ras.)* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *ana pani-ya ubla u 2-šu-ma damda-šu aduk* (17) ^{URU}Ullumma *uḫalliq-šu-ma ina qaqqari-šu Ū.ḪUL(!?) itarraš-šu attaşar-šu*

S.'s restoration of *-ma* (over an erasure) after the first 2-*šu* of A obv. 16 is unnecessary. The *-ma* after the second 2-*šu* is emphasizing, corresponding to the *-pat* of H: "They came against me in battle two times, and those very two times I defeated them." That is, "I defeated them each and every time." The *a-ú-ir* of H I 35 is surely a mistake for *ú-e-er* (thus G.). This is confirmed by the *ú-it* of the duplicate, *IBoT III 134, 1*, despite I.'s assertions. The verb must refer to the city of Ulma. First, because H uses the first person exclusively for Hattušili after the opening lines (admitted by I. herself ad I 43). Second, because the direction expressed by *uit*, "came" would be appropriate only for the enemy, not for Hattušili himself. Finally, note that A refers to the city of Ul(lum)ma in the singular, rather than the "men of Ulma" as in *KBo X 2*. Besides, *zaḥḫiya . . . uer*, "they came in battle" is the only reasonable equivalent for ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *ubla*, "bore arms." The error need not be taken as a simple mishearing of *uer* as *awir*. A likely source of confusion

¹⁹ The Hittite idiom for "take someone by the hand" employs accusative of person and "hand" in either the instrumental or ablative. The use of *šar*

presupposes the older form *keššarta*, since *keššarit* or *keššaraz* would be spelled with *-ša-ri/a-*.

was the presence of *menahḫanda auir* (in a correct context) only three lines above in the same position in the line (see above H I 31-32).

As noted above, the sowing of weeds on the site of Ulma, H I 36-37, recalls the same deed perpetrated on Hattuša in Anitta 48. The following context in Anitta 49-51 makes it clear that the purpose of the act is to make the site *sacrum* in the double sense of this word: "sacred" to the gods, but "accursed" (off limits) to men (on this notion see Benveniste, *Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 2.187 f.). In Anitta 20 f., it is stated explicitly that a city is handed over to the Storm-god and that no one is to settle there again. The sense of H is thus quite clear.

The problem then becomes how to understand A, which reads in the manuscript: *ina qaqqari-šu ú-ul i-da-a-ar-ra-aš-šu attašar-šu*. Since *ina qaqqari-šu*, "in its ground" matches *pedi-šši*, we expect to find some expression of the idea "sowed weeds" in what follows. It is in fact possible to discover in *i-tá-a-ar-ra-aš-šu* a suffixed form of the verb *erēšu*, "cultivate, till." For the OAss vocalism *compate itarab* obv. 48. The OAss/OAkk treatment -šš- < -š+š- (see von Soden, *GAG* §30 f.) is attested elsewhere in BoAkk: *KBo I 5 III 33 eppuš-šunuti*, *RS 17.132, 27 ippuš-šunute*. The scriptio plena in *-tá-a-ar-* is peculiar but not a compelling argument against this interpretation. Rather than assume a peculiar perfect form, it is easier to understand *itarraš-šu* as Gtn preterite, despite the lack of an -šk- form in H. We now have a suitable verb, but instead of an object corresponding to [ZÄ.AH.L]I^{SAR}, "weeds," we find an inexplicable negative *ú-ul*. Since *Ú* is the Sumerogram for "grass," I find attractive the emendation to *Ú.ḪUL* "vile grass" suggested to me by J. Durham.²⁰ It is quite possible that a later copyist would have misheard the rare *Ú.ḪUL* as *ú-ul*. A obv. 17 would thus originally have read: "He planted vile grass in its ground." This interpretation based on H has the merit of fitting the word division in A, which is otherwise consistent.

We are left with *attašar-šu* in A obv. 18, apparently without an equivalent in H. While *našāru* is commonly used to mean "take away, confiscate," it is also employed with *eqlam* to mean "cut off" a field or part of a field from a large tract (see *AHw* sub voce). As noted above, the whole point of this passage is that the site of the defeated city is to become sacred to the gods and inaccessible to men. I would therefore translate "I cut it off/segregated it." The Hittite original may have had a form of *karš-*, "cut off" (cf. *KUB XXIV 3 II 11-12* for this verb used of setting aside animals for the sacrifice). However, it is also possible that the additional phrase in A was an explanatory gloss (cf. above ad rev. 13-14).

4. H I 38 = A obv. 18

I. reads [EGI]R *dahḫun*, "di nuovo portai," but the preverb would be EGIR-*pa*, and *da-* does not mean "carry." A obv. 18 has simply *ušeli*, "I sent up" without any adverb EGIR-*šu*. Other occurrences of the phrase in the duplicates show that we should read [pi]-*ē-da-aḫ-ḫu-un*, "I carried" (see *KUB XXIII 41, 3.4* and also *KBo X 3 I 10*). Elsewhere, *KBo X 2* has substituted *piḫḫun*, "I gave," confusing "I carried it to the temple of ⁴X" with "I gave it to ⁴X."

²⁰ For *Ú.ḪUL* in a curse, compare perhaps "Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur" line 37 (Kramer in *ANET*, 3d ed. [1969]: 612), "for vile grass to grow up on the banks of the Tigris and

Euphrates." The overall context, however, is quite different from the present one, which agrees with that in Anitta 48.

5. H I 42-45 = A obv. 21-22

nu INA KUR URUŠallahšuwa pāun nu-za KUR URUŠallahšuwaš (43) IZI-it apašila kattan tarnaš apūš-ma-mu (44) IR.MEŠ-ni waḫnuir nu URUHattuši (45) URU-ri-mit EGIR-pa uwanun

ana URUŠallahšuwa ittalak URUŠallahšuwa šū-ma išātam (22) ittadin u šunu ana IR.MEŠ-ti-ya itturu ana URUKUBABBAR-ti atturam

S.'s translation is impossible. In view of H *apašila*, A *šu-ú-ma* has to be the emphatic "itself," and the subject of the sentence is the city of Šallahšuwa (thus already O.). Taken literally, H says: "The city of Š. on its own (*apašila*) let itself (-*za*) down by (means of) fire." This is a peculiar way to express "it set fire to itself" or "it burned itself down" (O. reads the latter). One expects *nu-za arḫa lukkit/warnut*. Furthermore, A has *išātam ittadin*, "gave fire," indicating that whatever its understanding of the Hittite it was trying to express something other than simply "set fire," which would be *išātam ittadi*. An emendation of *ittadin* to *ittadi* would admittedly be quite easy, but it is not sound method to emend out of existence a peculiarity in A matched by an equally unusual phrase in H.

In A rev. 21 and 23 we find the usual *išātam ittadi*, matched in H III 35 by *arḫa warnuzzi* (dupl. *arḫa lukkit*), "burn utterly" and in H III 39 by *IZI-az kattan* []. I.'s restoration of [*tarnahḫun*] in the latter is dubious. First, because *kattan lukk-* is attested (Madduwatta, *KUB XIV 1 rev. 54*). Second, because A has the normal and unambiguous *išātam ittadi*. The objection that a restored form of *lukk-* or *warnu-*, "burn" would be redundant with *IZI-az* is not valid: see *KUB VIII 25 I 9 KUR-yaš A.ŠA kuraš IZI-it warnutari*, "the field(s) of the country will be burned/destroyed by fire." We may therefore restore *IZI-az kattan [lukkun/warnunun]* in H III 39 after A rev. 23. This passage provides no evidence that *IZI-it kattan tarna-* means "destroy by fire, burn down." Aside from these grammatical considerations, how plausible is it that the city would burn itself to the ground? This would be a rather extreme response to the approach of the Hittite king.

I therefore propose to read: "The city of Š. on its own delivered itself by fire." The idea of "deliver, hand over" is reflected in the "gave" of A, but the reflexive object and the role of "fire" were garbled. For the use of *tarna-* to mean "deliver, hand over," compare the Annals of Muṣili, *KBo IV 4 IV 21, 24: BĒLI-NI-wa-naš . . . URUHattuši šāruwanzi lē maniyaḫti*, "Our lord, do not hand us over to Hattuša to (be) plunder(ed)." The king's response is: *URUDakkuman URU-an šāruwanzi UL tarnahḫun*, "I did not hand over the city of D. to be plundered." The form of *tarna-* is used as equivalent to *maniyaḫḫ-*, whose basic meaning is "hand over." Compare also the usage of *tarna-* in III 20 of our text: *n-aš ANA UTU URUTÚL-na EGIR-an tarnahḫun*, "and I delivered them back to the Sun-goddess of Arinna." As O. points out, the subjects are being transferred from one sort of servitude to another, and *tarna-* is doing double duty as "release" and "hand over." Note the paraphrase in A rev. 13 (already cited above). Finally, note the following passage from the Autobiography of Hattušili III (*KUB I 1 I 52-55*): *ANA LU KUR-mu piran katta UL kuwapikiki tarnaš UL-ma-mu ANA EN*

DĪNI-YA LÚ.MEŠ^{ar}šanatallaš kuwapikki piran katta tarnaš: "(The goddess) never delivered me to my enemy. Never did she deliver me to my opponent at law (or) my enviers." The presence of *piran* and the difference of *katta* versus *kattan* make this less than a perfect parallel, but the sense "deliver, hand over" again imposes itself (cf. Götze, *Hatt.* 11 "überließ," Sturtevant, *Chrest.* 67 "abandoned"). The same passage employs *tarna-* without preverb (line 38) and with *parā* (line 41), also with the sense "hand over, deliver to."

One may fairly ask just what it means to "deliver oneself by fire." Elsewhere in the text the cities either open their gates to Hattušili or decide to resist, in which case they are destroyed. Let us suppose a third possibility. The rulers/elders of the city decide to fight, but some faction prefers serving the Hittite king to destruction in battle. It betrays the city by setting a large enough fire to make resistance impossible and thus deliver the city to the enemy. This scenario obviously assumes a great deal, and if this were the case, one might expect a more explicit statement of it. However, I see no other reasonable way to interpret what H says. What would have been the motivation for the inhabitants' burning their own city to the ground? If they intended resistance by "scorched earth," they would not then meekly have become Hattušili's servants. If the latter were their intention, they could simply have thrown open the gates and surrendered, as others did.

H continues: "but they (the citizens) turned to my servitude" = "they became my servants" (with a late nom. pl. *apūš* and an intransitive *wahnuir* as *KBo* IV 4 II 7). G. interprets *İR.MEŠ-ti-ya* in A as the abstract *wardutti-ya*, "my servitude" after *İR.MEŠ-ni*, which is the likelier solution. However, he himself attributes the presence of the plural marker *MEŠ* to confusion between the abstract in *-uttu/-ūtu* and the adjective plural marker *-ūtu*, which is attested with nouns at Boğazköy (see e.g., Labat, *AkkBo* sub *amēlu*). Since *ana X tāru* is attested elsewhere as "become X" (e.g., *KBo* I 10 I 7), one should consider reading *wardūti-ya* and translating "they became my servants" (thus S.). Both usages are found with the transitive *turru* at Boğazköy: *KBo* I 1 Vs 19 *ina šanutti-ya ana İR.MEŠ-ya utter-šunuti*, "For a second time I turned them into my servants" versus *KUB* III 14 obv. 3 *abu-ya ana İR-utti-šu utter-šu*, "My father turned him to his servitude." The translation "habe/hat zurückgebracht" by Weidner, *PD* 7 and 77, is erroneous and based on a false interpretation of *nakāru* as "revolt" rather than simply "become hostile." In the first example the sense of "again" is already contained in the phrase *ina šanutti-ya*. As shown by the attestations in Labat, *AkkBo*, pp. 219–20, the verb *tāru* at Boğazköy means "turn" as well as "return," both intransitive and transitive. There is no contextual support in our text for the interpretation "they returned to my servitude," for which H would surely have *EGIR-pa wahnuir*. Note finally that there is no mention of deportation, which one would expect if the city had truly been burned to the ground.²¹

²¹ Cities conquered by the Hittite king faced two possible fates, stated explicitly in the Annals of Muršili, *KBo* III 4 III 29–30: "I conquered the land of Arzawa, and one part (*kuit*) I brought home to Hattuša, and the other (*kuit*) I subjugated on the spot." As a rule, cities which resisted were sacked and destroyed, and their population deported, while those cities which surrendered were permitted to continue their existence as vassals of the Hittite king. In the Annals of Muršili the deported citizens (NAM.RA.MEŠ/ĪI.A) are explicitly lumped together with

cattle and sheep as part of the booty. Our text makes no mention of NAM.RA.MEŠ, and the removal of the people of Hahha (H III 16–20 = A rev. 11–13) does not seem to be a typical case of deportation. This may indicate that the later imperial practice of mass deportation had not yet developed. On the other hand, the *sacking* of destroyed cities is stated explicitly in our text, while no mention is made of servitude. By contrast, Šallahšuwa is not sacked, and its citizens become Hattušili's servants. This again suggests to me that the city was not destroyed.

6. H I 48–50 = A obv. 24–25

nu-za LUGAL.GAL (49) [ZI-an warši]yanunun *nu-kan* ŠÀ KUR.KUR.MEŠ (50) [EGIR-panda ^aUTU(!)-u[š] tiyat

LUGAL.GAL *libba-šu uttappiš* (25) *ana qinnat* KUR.ĪI.A ^aUTU *ittaziz*

The idiom of A obv. 24, *libba nuppušu*, "let the heart breathe" = "satisfy the heart" is attested elsewhere (see *AHw* sub *napāšu*). H shows []-yanunun, which points to a causative in *-nu-* from a *-ya-* stem. I have therefore restored *nu-za* [ZI-an warši]yanunun, "I calmed/appeased my mind." Compare first the Annals of Muršili, *KUB* XIV 15 III 26: *ZI-an waršiyannu<nu>n*; with a different stem, *KUB* XIII 4 IV 11: *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ZI-an waršanuanzi*, "They appease the mind(s) of the gods"; finally, *KBo* XII 64 IV 8 (broken context): *ZI-an waršiyannuzi*.

My restoration of H I 50 is based on A and on H II 52–53: *n-ašta* ŠÀ KUR.KUR.MEŠ *anda* ^aUTU-uš *tiyat* = A rev. 1 [] ^aUTU *it-ta(!)-z[i-i]z*.²² Von Soden, *AHw* sub *qinnatu* reads A obv. 25 as *ana qinnat šadē*, "behind the mountains." But the Hittites did not use the Sumerogram KUR as "mountain," only as "land."²³ Besides, it is hardly appropriate to the context to take the phrase in an astronomical sense: "The Sun-(god) stepped behind the mountains" = "set" (?). There is no reason to refer to nightfall at this point in the text.

The difficulty is that in the first occurrence we have the preposition "behind" in A and a missing preverb in H, while the second time we have the preverb "into" in H and a missing prepositional phrase in A. Are we to take the difference between "behind" and "in" seriously and assume a contrast in meaning? Or should we take the expressions of A and H as equivalent? The contexts of the two occurrences are analogous but not identical. In the first instance, the Sun-god "steps behind the lands" after the destruction of the city of Šanhwitta. In the other case, the Sun-god "steps into the lands" after the defeat of the army of Zippašna but before its destruction. One last point to be considered: there is too much space in H I 50 for the restoration of just *an-da*.

Since A obv. 25 has *ana qinnat . . . ittaziz*, which makes no sense literally and is not an Akkadian idiom, I suggest that H at this point had [EGIR-panda] *tiyat*, literally "stepped behind," but idiomatically "attached himself to." Compare for both the spelling and the sense *KUB* XXIII 1 I 33–34: *n-at-kan ANA* LUGAL KUR^{URU} Mizzari EGIR-panda *tier*, "and they stepped behind (went over to) the King of Egypt."²⁴ I

²² In A rev. 1 the *it* is clear, as is the first part of the *ta*. The double (?) vertical after the next narrow break is probably the rest of the *ta*. We then have a trace of the *zi* and the vertical of *iz*. The verb cannot be *itarab*, which would be spelled *i-tā-ra-ab* (cf. obv. 48). Of the two partial signs beginning H I 50 the second is easily *uš*, but the first shows only parts of two wedges, nothing of the expected vertical of *ud/UTU*. The photograph, however, does indicate more space between the two wedges and the beginning of *uš* than the edition offers, so I believe ^aUTU(!)-u[š] remains possible.

²³ Labat, *AkkBo*, p. 200, cites a single occurrence of KUR = *šadā*: *KBo* I 2 rev. 29, where KUR.MEŠ *İD*.MEŠ stands for the ĪUR.SAG.MEŠ *İD*.MEŠ of the duplicate *KBo* I 1 rev. 53. But in the present

instance we have KUR.KUR.MEŠ in H as well, which would be unparalleled as "mountains" in a Hittite context.

²⁴ It may be noted in passing that the expression *appan(da) tiya-jar-*, "step/stand behind" = "attach oneself to, be on someone's side" forms a semantic pair with *hanti tiya-*, which is literally "step in front (of)," but more often means "step apart from" and then "betray, denounce." It is true that *hanti tiya-* is usually construed with an accusative object, but this is surely secondary. The original construction with a dative in incommodi is attested in *KUB* XXVI 12 II 6–8, where the contrast with the opposite member EGIR-an *tiya-* is explicit: EGIR-a[n-wa-šši] *UL tiyami hanti-ya-wa-šši UL tiyami*, "I shall neither join him nor betray him." P. Tatò has suggested to

understand our passage to mean that Hattušili destroyed the city of Šanhwitta, but the surrounding countryside came under the protection of the Sun-god (who "attached himself" to it). This amounts to saying that it came under the control of the Hittite king.²⁵ In the case of Zippašna, Hattušili apparently defeated its troops outside the city (see below), and the Sun-god entered the (surrounding) lands. One could emend the text of H to <EGIR>anda and make the two cases identical, but this is unnecessary. The phrase "the Sun-god entered the lands" can just as well imply "took them under his control/protection." Hattušili then proceeded to Z. itself and destroyed it. We thus arrive at the same general sense for A obv. 25 as G. and S., without the emendation to *ki-<di>-in-na-at*.

7. H I 53-II 1 = A obv. 26-27

[... ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ ŠA KUR ^{URU}Appaya (54) [(*hullīyanun*) nu GUD. ^{HI}.A UDU. ^{HI}.A ANA ^{URU}Takšān[an]aya piran šarā dahhun

^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ-šu ša KUR ^{URU}Abbaya itabak (27) x x-x-šu ša ^{URU}Takšanā GUD. ^{HI}.A-šu UDU. ^{HI}.A-šu iltaqe

S. reads ^{URU}Ummaya in A obv. 26, and I. restores [^{URU}Um-ma]-ya in H I 54, thus leaving the cities *Takšanā* of A obv. 27 and *Appaya* of H I 53 without parallels. But even without H, the form of A obv. 26 could just as well be read *Ab-ba-ya*, and the occurrence of *Ap-pa-ya* in H at the same point virtually forces this reading (for the Hittites the two spellings would be equivalent). Furthermore, H I 54 shows traces of a *ša*, a clear *an*, and most of a *na*, thus: [^{URU}Ták-š]a-an-[n]a-ya = ^{URU}Ta-ak-ša-na-a of A obv. 27. Compare *KUB XXXI 64 II 32'*: ANA ^{URU}Ták-ša-an-na(-)x[]. The two texts thus do mention the same two cities in the same sequence as one would expect. The ghost word *Ummaya* disappears.

The restoration *hullīyanun* in H II 54 is based on *KUB XXIII 33, 5 [-y]a hullīyanun*, which ought to equate to A obv. 26: "I/he overturned/defeated the chariots of Appaya."²⁶ This means we must restore the verb *hullīyanun* at the beginning of line 54 of *KBo X 2* before the objects of the next sentence restored above. This leaves no room for the phrase of A obv. 27, which appears as x *ub-ra-šu*. This sequence makes no sense as it stands, and without an equivalent in H I can offer no likely emendation.

8. H II 2-10 = A obv. 28-30

nu INA ^{URU}Parmanna andan paun (3) ^{URU}Parmannaš-ma-kan apedaš ANA LUGAL. [MEŠ] (4) SAG.DU-aš ēšta KASKAL. ^{HI}.A-aš-šmaš apāš (5) piran takšanīškit §(6) [(nu)]-mu-kan mahhan menahhanda a[uir] (7) nu KÁ. GAL. ^{HI}.A EGIR-pa hešer n-aš-z[a apedani (?) (8) memieni nepišaš ^{UTU}[TU-uš ŠU-az/it ēpta] (9) anda-ma-mu KUR ^{URU}Alhaš kur[uriahṭa] (10) nu ^{URU}Alhan harninku[n]

me that the original image may be that of a military confrontation, where one who steps/stands behind you is your ally, while whoever faces you is a foe.

²⁵ Carruba, *ZDMG*, Supp. 1, 1 (1969): 231-32, also understands this passage as identifying the Hittite king with the sun-(god). Recall the later royal title ^{UTU}Ši, "my sun." See also the discussion by Neu, *StBoT* 18 (1974): 127-31, who notes that the female Sun-goddess of Arinna is thus far not attested in a

text in old ductus. In view of this, the omission of ^{URU}Arinna and the masculine pronominal reference of A obv. 13 may not be errors, but rather reflections of a Hittite original where all cases of ^{UTU} referred to the male Sun-god (probably the Indo-European ^{Šiuš}). In the later copies of H, most references to the solar deity were "corrected" to ^{UTU}^{URU}Arinna.

²⁶ S. translates "in the land of the city of . . .," but *ša* marks possession.

[u] ^{URU}Parmanna SAG.DU-ad LÚ.MEŠ šunu<ti> irṭup itabbula (29) ^{URU}[P]ar[ma]nna ^{GIŠ}KÁ. GAL-šu ana pani-ya iptate ana balat (30) ^{UTU}qa[ss]u iššabat ^{URU}Alahḫa ikkir-ma allik-ma ^{URU}Alahḫa uḫalliḫ-šu

Here again S.'s translation ignores H, which must be taken as the starting point, since it has a very specific idiom: "but Parmanna was chief (lit. head) among those kings; it smoothed out the paths before them." For SAG.DU, "head" in the meaning "chief" applied to cities, compare *KBo III 4 I 32-33*: nu ŠA ^{URU}Gašga kuiēš SAG.DU.MEŠ KUR.KUR.MEŠ ^{URU}Halilaš ^{URU}Duddušaš-a ešir n-aš GUL-un, "And I attacked (those) which were the chief lands of the Gašga country, Halila and Dudduša." G. plausibly takes our passage to mean that the city of Parmanna, being preeminent, directed the behavior of the other local rulers. For A he reads *itappula(m)* as *atappula(m)*, Dtn to *apālu*, "answer": "it continually made them respond to each other." W. Moran has called my attention to the use of the Gtn of *wabālu* to mean "govern, administer" (see *CAD* sub *abālu* A7b). We may therefore read *irṭup itabbula(m)*, "used to govern, administer." This arrives at the sense of H more directly and eliminates the irregular vocalism.

The use of LÚ.MEŠ in A for LUGAL.[MEŠ] in H is probably not an error. It rather reflects the widespread use of LÚ + X (place name) to mean "the ruler of X," attested at Mari, Alalakh, and El Amarna (see *CAD* sub *amīlu* 4d). The demonstrative *apedaš*, "those" in H argues that *šunu* must be taken likewise in A, not as a possessive, despite its nominative form. Furthermore, there is simply no antecedent for "their." A here as elsewhere refers to the city in the singular. One may interpret LÚ.MEŠ *šunu*<ti> as a genitive and translate: "But Parmanna was the head of those rulers." This matches H exactly, but it implies that *irṭup itabbula* has no overt object: "it used to hold sway." Alternatively, one may construe SAG.DU-ad (*qaqqad*) as a predicate state and assign LÚ.MEŠ *šunu*<ti> to the second clause: "but Parmanna was head/chief; it used to govern those rulers." One expects *šunuti* in either case. It is likely that the entire passage made no sense to the later copyist of A, who may have "corrected" *šunuti* to *šunu* for reasons of his own. Note the correspondence of *irṭup* + infinitive and an -šk- verb in H to express iterative (habitual) action.

Just as above, H I 31-32 = A obv. 15, the Hittite collocation "when they saw me opposite" in H II 6 is reduced in A obv. 29 to a simple prepositional phrase *ana pāni-ya*, "before me." As usual, H refers to the inhabitants of the city ("they opened the gates"), while A speaks of the city ("Parmanna opened its gates before me").

The *ana balat* of A obv. 30 must, with G., be taken as a misunderstanding of a *me-mi-an-ni* as MU.IM-an-ni. A reference at this point to "in the next year" makes no sense. We are still dealing with Parmanna and its surrender. The restoration of [*apedani*], "that" in H II 7 is uncertain. A simple *memianni/memieni*, "in the affair" seems abrupt, but the absence of the demonstrative in the original would help account for the error in translation. Based on the *qa-a[s-s]u iššabat* of A, we may restore [*ŠU-it/az e-ep-ta*] in H II 8: "In [that]/the affair (their decision to surrender) the Sun-god of heaven²⁷ [took]

²⁷ S.'s neglect of H leads him to mistranslate (*nepišaš*) ^{UTU} as "la dea sole" wherever it occurs (obv. 25, 30, rev. 1, 24). But the Sun-goddess of Arinna is consistently identified as such in H (and

usually in A). If one is going to obliterate the distinction between the two solar deities, then one must opt for the male Sun-god (see n. 25 above).

them [by the hand]."²⁸ The difference in number between A and H is again due to the fact that H in the preceding sentence refers to the inhabitants of Parmanna, while A names the city in the singular. The basic idea here is that Parmanna's decision to surrender was a wise one, and the Sun-god is credited with motivating it. That this is the real meaning of the passage is confirmed by the contrast with the fate of Alha, which was stupid enough to resist and was destroyed (note the adversative *-ma*, "but" in H II 9).

I. restores H II 9 as: *anda-ma-mu* KUR ^{URU} *Alhaš* [*pa-a-un*], "e nel paese della città di Alha [andai]." This is impossible on all counts. It ignores the traces of signs before the break, the first of which cannot be *pa*. It leaves the enclitic *-mu* unaccounted for, and the interpretation of KUR ^{URU} *Alhaš* as a genitive collocation is strained. The correct restoration is given by A: ^{URU} *Alahha* *ikkir*, "the city of A. became hostile." This points to *ku-r[u-ri-(ya)-ah-ta]* in H: "but the city of A. bec[ame hostile] to me."

9. H II 17-18 = A obv. 34

nu kapp[u]wanda<š> UD.KAM.HI.A-*aš* ^{ID} *Pūrun[an]* (18) *ziḥḥu[n]*

ina umati-ma irti [^I] ^P *Puran kima* UR.MAḤ LUGAL.GAL *itetiḡ*

H says literally "in counted days," which means "in a few days I crossed the Puruna." G. says that this nuance is lacking in A, and both O. and S. translate "in (those) days." But this view ignores the *-ma* of A, which is emphasizing: "within *days*," i.e., "within a matter of days" (not weeks or months), a subtle but accurate reflection of the sense of H. The point of the passage is not the time at which the action took place, but rather the speed with which Hattušili accomplished his military maneuver. Compare the hyperbolic use of (*maḥḥan*) *lukkatta-ma*, "on the next day" in the Annals of Muṣili.

10. H II 21-26 = A obv. 35-38

[*nu-šši* SAḤAR.HI.A-*u*] *š* *šer arnunun* (22) [*aššu-ma-šši ḥū*] *man šarā dah[ḥun]* (23) [(*nu* ^{URU} KUBABBAR-*š*) *an šu*] *naḥḥun* §(24) [(*nu-kan* KUBABBAR GUŠKI)N x x x x]-*un* (25) [(*namma-šši* DINGIR.MEŠ *š*) *arā dahḥu*] *u[n]* (26) [(^U EN *arruzza* ^U EN ^{URU} *Ḥala*)] *p*

epram (36) *ana muḥḥi-šu išta(!)* *pak-šu u makkur-šu* ^{URU} KUBABBAR-*ti* *undalli* (37) KUBABBAR-*šu* GUŠKIN *pānam u bābam ul iṣū* ^U EN *armaruk* (38) ^U EN ^{URU} *Ḥalap*

The restorations in H are based on A, the duplicate *VBoT* 13 and parallel passages in H. For line 21 compare first of all A obv. 36: "he heaped dust upon it." The same phrase is also attested in H II 51-52 (see below). Line 22 may be restored from H I 19 and III 8. Based on A obv. 36 (and *VBoT* 13, 1!),²⁹ we should restore the city of Hattuša as the

²⁸ There is not quite enough space for this phrase, but there are other instances of writing over the edge in *KBo* X 2: II 39, 46, III 19, 20. The reading *na-as-z[a...]* in H II 7 is based on a suggestion of H. Hoffner, who points out that the edition shows no space between *-aš-* and what follows. The use of *-za* with *ŠU-az/it ep-* is rare but attested at *KUB* VII 6, 5-8.

²⁹ The second sign of *VBoT* 13, 1 is rather clearly URU, not GİR (I.). The lack of a paragraph line between lines 1 and 2 of *VBoT* 13 is insignificant, since copies often differ in this respect. It is also possible that the text read ^{URU} KUBABBAR-*ti*, but this does not affect the meaning.

object of "I filled" in line 23, not "my house" after I 20. The passages are parallel but not identical. Part of lines 24-25 may be restored from *VBoT* 13, 2-3. *KBo* X 2 has no room for expressing the "without beginning or end" or "beyond counting" reflected in A by *pānam u bābam ul iṣū*. The original of H probably had some form of the expression *kappuwawar UL ēšta*, "there was no counting," as in *KBo* III 4 II 43: ^{URU} KUBABBAR-*aš-ma-za* EN.MEŠ ERÍN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-*ya kwin* NAM.RA.MEŠ *uwatet nu-ššan kappuwawar* NU.GÁL *ēšta*, "But (of) the deportees which the lords, infantry and cavalry of Hattuša brought (home), there was no counting."³⁰

The rest of line 25 is tentatively restored after passages like H I 10, but it must be said that the traces of signs in the edition look much more like *-t[u-u][k-* than they do *-ḥ[u-u][n]*. On the other hand, it is very difficult to take the enclitic *-ši* at the head of the line as anything but a dativus incommodi like that of I 10 or 19. One might think of reading DINGIR.MEŠ *š*[^U *Ḥaššuwa* . . .], but this would place *šarā* or the beginning of the verb at the point where the partial signs appear, and the latter look even less like *ša-ra-a* or *da-aḥ-* than they do *-ḥu-un*. A is of no help here, since it has no corresponding sentence, leaving the list of gods without a verb.

Despite their differences, the ^U EN *armaruk* of A obv. 37 and the ^U EN *arruzza* of *VBoT* 13, 4 must be equivalent. The differences in the spelling of names between A and H throughout the text are sometimes rather striking:

A		H	
obv. 1	^{URU} KUBABBAR- <i>ti</i>	I 1	KUR ^{URU} <i>Ḥatti</i>
2	^{URU} <i>Ša-ḥu-it-ta</i>	4	^{URU} <i>Ša-na-u-i-it-ta</i>
4	^{URU} <i>Za-al-pá-ar</i>	9	^{URU} <i>Za-al-pa</i>
6	^{URU} <i>Al-ḥa-al-ḥa</i>	15	^{URU} <i>A-[a]-al-ḥa</i>
7, 9	^{URU} KUR <i>Ur-šu</i>	16, 17	^{URU} <i>Wa-ar-šu-wa-(az)</i>
8	^{URU} <i>I-ga-ka-li-iš</i>	17	^{URU} <i>I-ka-ka-li</i> 18 <i>-la-az(!)</i>
9	^{URU} <i>Ti-iš-ḥi-ni-ya</i>	18	^{URU} <i>Ta-aš-ḥi-ni-ya</i>
10	KUR <i>Ar-za-ú-i</i>	22	^{URU} <i>Ar-za-u-wa</i>
11	KUR <i>Ḥa-ni-gal₉-bat</i>	24	^{URU} <i>Ḥur-ri</i>
14	^{URU} <i>Ne-na-aš-ša</i>	30, 31	^{URU} <i>Ni-na-aš-ša</i>
15, 17	^{URU} <i>Ul-lu-um-ma</i>	34, 36	^{URU} <i>Ul-ma-(an)</i>
20	^{URU} <i>Ul-lu-um</i>	41	^{URU} <i>Ul-ma-za</i>
19	^U <i>Šal(!)</i> ("NI")- <i>ka-ti-ti</i>	38	DINGIR ^{LIM} SAL ^{TUM} <i>Šal-ka-ti-ti</i> ³¹
19	ḤURSAG <i>A-ra-an-ḥa-pi-la</i>	39	ḤURSAG <i>A-ra-an-ḥa-pi-la-an-ni</i>
21	^{URU} <i>Šal-la-aḥ-šu-wa</i>	42	^{URU} <i>Šal-la-aḥ-šu-wa-(aš)</i>
23, 24	^{URU} <i>Ša-na-ḥu-ut</i>	46	^{URU} <i>Ša-na-aḥ-ḥu-it-ta</i>
26	KUR ^{URU} <i>Ab-ba-ya</i>	53	[^{URU}] <i>Ap-pa-ya</i>
27	^{URU} <i>Ta-ak-ša-na-a</i>	54	[^{URU}] <i>Ták-š</i>] <i>a-an-[n]a-ya</i>
28	^{URU} <i>Pa-ar-ma-an-na</i>	II 2, 3	^{URU} <i>Pár-ma-an-na-(aš)</i>
29	[^{URU}] <i>ár-[ma-a]n-na</i>		
30	^{URU} <i>A-la-aḥ-ḥa</i>	9, 10	^{URU} <i>Al-ḥa-aš/-an</i>

³⁰ H. Hoffner has also reminded me of *KUB* XXIX 1 II 9-10: *wittann-a kutreš-šmit kappuwawar-šamet UL duggāri*, "of the years (their) shortness and (their) counting are not seen" (for the translation see Neu, *StBoT* 5 [1968]: 178).

³¹ One could consider other possibilities for both A and H: ^U *Zal-ka-ti-ti* in A, or in a different direction ^U *Ka-ti-ti* in H. Arriving as a common denominator is not simple.

- 31 URU *Za-ru-un-ti*
 32 URU *Ha-aš-šu*
 35 URU *Ha-aš-šu-wa*
 32, 38 URU *Ha-la-ap*
 33 ^{URSAG} *A-tá-lu-ur*
 34 ^{ID} *Pu-ra-an*
 37 ^U EN *ar-ma-ru-uk*
 38 ^A *Al-la-tum*
 38 ^A *A-tá-lu-ur*
 38 ^A *Li-lu-ri*
 43 URU *Ha-[aš]-šu*
 44 (lacuna)
 46 URU *Ta-ú-na-ga*
 47 URU *Zi-ip-pa-aš-na*
 rev. 2 URU *Ha-aḫ-[ḫ]i* + rev. 4, 8, 10
 3 URU *Zi-piš-na*
 16 URU *Dim-ma-na-ya*
 18 ^{ID} *Pu-ra-at-ta*
 20 LUGAL-*ki-ni*
 20, 21, 23, 24 URU *Ha-aḫ-ḫi*
 22 URU *Ha-aš-ši*
- 11, 12 URU *Za-ru-na-(an)*
 13, 18 URU *Ha-aš-šu-wa*
 15 URU [*Hal-pa*] (acc. to space)³²
 (no corresponding sentence)
 17 ^{ID} *Pu-u-ru-n[an]*
 VBoT 13, 4 ^U EN *ar-ru-uz-za*
 13, 5 ^A *Al-la-tum*
 II 27 ^A *A-ta-al-lu-ur*
 27 (lacuna)
 36 [^{URU} *H*] *a-aš-šu-wa* + II 45
 38 DUMU.SAL ^A *Al-[la-ti ^A]Hé-bat*
 46 ^m *Ta-wa-an-na-ga-aš*
 48, 49, 54 URU *Zi-ip-pa-aš-na-(an)*
 III 1 URU *Ha-aḫ-ḫa-(an)* + III 6, 8, 14
 3 URU *Zi-ip-pa-aš-ša-na-an*
 25 URU *Ti-ma(!)-na*³³
 29 ^{ID} *Ma-a-la-an* (acc.)
 32 LUGAL-*g[i-na-š(a)-]*
 33 URU *Ha-aḫ-ḫi-aš* (gen.)
 38 URU *Ha-aḫ-ḫa-an* (acc.)³⁴
 41 URU *Ha-aš-šu-wa*

A also consistently uses URUKUBABBAR-*ti* for the city URUHattuša-: A obv. 12, 22, 36, rev. 6 (*Ha-at-ti*) = H I 26, 44, VBoT 13, 1 and III 9. Both A and H normally write URUTÚL-na for URUArinna: A obv. 5, 18, 43, rev. 13, 14, 17, 18 = H I 11, 37, III 20, 22, 26, 28. H I 27 and 51 have the phonetic spelling *A-ri-in-na*: in the first instance A obv. 13 omits the city name, while A rev. 26 has URUTÚL-na. As indicated earlier, the scribe who wrote A rev. 4 spells Arinna phonetically, while the corresponding H III 5 has TÚL-na.

11. H II 44-III 3 = A OBV. 46-REV. 3

kima INA É ^U ped[a]ḫḫun §(45) nu-za KUR URUHaššuwa INA MU.1.KAM tarahḫun (46) «AYALU GUŠKIN» *nu ^mTawannagaš māri[n](?)* (47) *arḫa peššer LUGAL.GAL-ma-an-kan SAG.DU-SU* (48) *kweršun nu INA URUZippašna pāun* (49) *nu-kan URUZippašnan GE₆-az-pat* (50) *šarā pāun nu-šmaš MĒ-ya* (51) *anda tiyanun nu-šmaš SAḪAR.ḪI.A-iš* (52) *šer arnunun n-ašta ŠA KUR.KUR.MEŠ* (53) *anda ^UUTU-uš tiyat §(54) LUGAL.GAL tabarnaš INA URUZippašna* (55) : [*p*]āun (1) ^{URU} *Haḫḫan-ma-za-kan UR.MAḪ maḫḫan* (2) *arḫa tarkuwalliškinun* (3) *nu URUZippaššanan ḫarninkun*

(46) [*annutum ana É ^U ušeli ina MU*].1.KAM *ittakisu* [*-n*]a(?) URU-*lim* ^{URU} *Taunaga* (47) [*x x x x x x x x SAG.D]U-su ittaki[s ana URUZippašna* (48) [*illik-ma x x x x x x*] *ša-šu ana mū[ši-ma] itarab* (1) [*ina KUR.ḪI.A*] ^U *UTU ittaz[i]z LUGAL.GAL [ta]barna*

³² In H II 26 the partial sign could be *ḫa*[*l*] as well as the *a*[*p*] assumed above, so either *Hal-pa* or *Ha-la-ap* is possible.

³³ The reading of H is assured by the duplicate KUB XXIII 20, 8: [^{URU} *Ti-ma-na*].

³⁴ KUB XXIII 31 rev. 9 has *Ha-aḫ-ḫi-in*.

(2) [*ana URUZipišn*]a *allik-ma u URUHah[ḫ]i kima UR.MAḪ* (3) [*attana*]klamu-šu URUZipišna uḫalliq

Despite some unresolved difficulties, a fair portion of A can be restored from H. For the beginning of line 46 compare not only H II 44 but also H II 36-37 = A obv. 43. Given a clear [*l*]1.KAM in A obv. 46, we must equate this to MU.1.KAM of H II 45, and likewise *ittakisu* to *tarahḫun* (with the usual change of person). However, with the preceding restoration in A (which can go nowhere else), there is no room for a direct object URUHaššu. Since we need to explain the final -u of *ittakisu* anyway, it seems advisable to assume that A used a pronominal object. The reference to Haššu(wa) is clear from the preceding context. The verb in *ittakis(s)u* has apparently been lifted from *it-ta-ki-i[s]*, "he cut off" in the next line, which matches *kweršun* in H II 48. One would expect Akkadian *le'á* as the equivalent of Hittite *tarḫ-* (see respectively von Soden, *AHw*, and Friedrich *Heth. Wb.*).

In the face of H II 47-48, "But I the great king cut off his head," we can safely read the first extant sign of A obv. 47 as *sú* and restore "He (Hattušili) cut off his head."³⁵ The form *kweršun* of H II 48 is unique. Hittite elsewhere shows either *kwer-* or *karš-* to mean "cut (off)." Just whose head was cut off is not clear. H gives Tawannaga as a personal name, while in A it is not only marked by the determinative URU, but also preceded by URU-*lim*. The misplaced AYALU GUŠKIN at the beginning of H II 46 suggests that H is corrupt at this point, while A is incomplete. The problem seems at present insoluble.

The *itarab*, "he entered" of A obv. 48 would at first glance seem to equate to the *anda tiyanun*, "I entered" of H II 51. However, the full Hittite sentence reads "I entered into battle against them," which can hardly be rendered by *ana mu-x[] itarab*. The latter must be restored and read as *ana mu-u-[ši-ma] itarab*, "entered in the night."³⁶ This sentence in A thus matches H II 49-50: *nu-kan URUZippašnan GE₆-az-pat šarā pāun*. As will be discussed shortly, the interpretation of the Hittite is problematic, and I forego a restoration of the remainder of the Akkadian. What is clear is that the next two sentences in H are missing in A: "I entered into battle against them, and I heaped dust upon them." The short gap at the beginning of A rev. 1 has room only for *ina* KUR.ḪI.A or a similar phrase equating to ŠA KUR.KUR.MEŠ (*anda*) of H II 52-53 (see discussion above ad H I 50). According to both edition and photograph, the end of the tablet is preserved for half its length, making it unlikely that another line stood on the obverse. We have already noted that the first lines of the reverse are by a different hand from the rest of the text. In the change-over from one scribe to another one line seems to have been accidentally omitted.

The syntax of H II 49-50 is unusual: *nu-kan URUZippašnan GE₆-az-pat šarā pāun*. I translates: "e su verso la città di Z. proprio di notte andai." If the text read *INA URUZippašna*, that would be fine. But a simple verb of motion "go up (to)" should not take a direct object in the accusative, and examples of an accusative expressing a goal are rare in Hittite (see Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementerbuch*, 2d ed. [1960], §201). The present text consistently uses *INA URUX* everywhere else. Annalistic use of accusatives with compounds of *pāi-* and *iya-*, "go" is attested. For *šarā pāi-*, "ascend" (a mountain)

³⁵ There is a trace of a vertical before the *sú* arguing for [SAG.D]U-*sú* instead of [*qa-qa-a*]-*sú*.

³⁶ I have read the single wedge before the break

as *u* because of its size and the lack of any trace of a following vertical. One could also read *mu-š[i-ma]*. The -*ma* is called for by the space and the -*pat* of H.

compare *KUB XIX 13 I 42* and *V 1 I 43*.³⁷ The combination *ištarna arḥa pāi-/iya-* with an accusative means "cross, pass through": *KBo V 8 I 27 f.*, *KUB XIX 37 III 18*, etc. However, all these instances seem to imply traversal of space, not motion towards.

A close examination shows that the sequence of events in this section is also peculiar. The king goes *INA URU Zippašna*, then "goes up" the city in the dead of night, enters into battle with "them," heaps dust upon "them," and the Sun-god "enters the lands." Then the king goes *INA URU Zippašna* (again!). Finally, he destroys it, while holding the city of Hahha at bay.

Given the accusative and the odd sequence of events, I suggest that the sentence with *šarā pāi-* means "I ascended the country of Z. in the dead of night," despite the absence of *KUR* (for the latter compare *KBo V 8 I 27 f.* cited above). Hattušili defeats the army of Z. outside the city, and he (under the aegis of the Sun-god) takes control of the surrounding countryside. He then proceeds to the city itself and destroys it.

The reading of *SAḪAR.ḪI.A-iš* in *H II 51* and the meaning of the phrase become certain as soon as one compares *H II 21 = A obv. 35* (see above). The ending *-iš* is either a mistake for *-uš* or a late Hittite nominative plural used as an accusative.

Read *LUGAL.GAL* in *H II 54*, not *I.'s LUGAL-ma-aš*. For the sign *GAL* with only three horizontals, compare *H I 1*.

G.'s restoration [*at-ta-na*]-*ak-la-mu-šu*, "I continually glower at it (Hahha)," Ntn to *nekelmū*, is surely correct. For the transitive use of the verb see now von Soden, *AHw* sub voce. The image here is that of a lion holding a rival at bay with a threatening gesture while devouring his kill. In the same way Hattušili finishes off Zippašna while fending off the troops of Hahha. The verb *tarkuwa(i)-* means "dance," also "rage" (see Goetze, *Lg* 15 [1939]: 116–19). The extended stem *trakuvalliya-* undoubtedly has a similar connotation: "gesticulate violently" or the like. The addition of *arḥa*, "away/off" transitivizes the verb: "(scare) away with violent gestures."

12. H III 23–24 = A REV. 15

kuttann-a kattan šarazi(!)-ya (24) *IŠTU KUBABBAR ḥališšīyanun*
igāra ša kidānu el[ēn]u(?) KÁ *kidānim ina KUBABBAR ūtahḥiz*

I. reads *ša-ra É-še-ya*: "e la parete dal basso in alto nel suo tempio d'argento incastonai." This reading produces an unexplained enclitic *-ya*, "and" (ignored by I. in her translation). Furthermore, the writing of the possessive as *-še* would be an unexpected archaism in this text. Finally, the text writes the signs from *ša* to *ya* together, implying one word. I. herself admits that the spelling *ša-ra* would be unusual and the form of the sign *É* aberrant.

It is easier to read *ša-ra-zi(!)-ya*, also a natural opposite for *kattan*: "and I plated the wall with silver from top to bottom" (lit. "down and up"). The appearance of *-ya* is now natural, and the *ZI* sign, while it has two extra verticals, is far less abnormal than the proposed *É*. The tentative reading *e-l[e-n]u*, "up(ward)" (?) in *A rev. 15*, after a suggestion of H. Kümmel, fits the traces of signs well and would provide an equivalent to *kattan šarazi-ya*. However, its position between the two objects is odd, and one would properly expect *ana elēnu* to mean "up(ward)."

³⁷ I owe these references to H. Hoffner.

14. H III 33–42 = A REV. 20–25

ERÍN.MEŠ ^{URU}*Hahḥiaš ḥul[liyat] (^{URU}Hahḥi-ma)* (34) *UL kuitki iya[t UL-an IZI-it]* (35) *arḥa warnuzzi [tuḥḥwaišš-a(?)]* (36) *nepišaš ^aU-ni U[L šame(anta)](?)* (37) *LUGAL.GAL tabarnaš ^{URU}[Haššuwān]* (38) ^{URU}*Hahḥann-a ḥarni[nku(n)]* (39) *n-aš IZI-az kattan [lukkun(?)]* (40) *tuḥḥwain-ma nepi[šaš ^aU-ni(?)] tekkuššanun(?)* (41) *nu «LUGAL» ^{URU}Haššuwā LUGAL ^{URU}Ha[ḥa/i-ya]* (42) *ANA ^{GIŠ}MAR.GÍD.DA tūri[yan(un)]*

ERÍN.MEŠ *ša ^{URU}Hahḥi* (21) [*ita*]bak ^{URU}*Hahḥi mimma ul ipuš išātam ul ittadi* (22) [*q*]utra ana ^aU *ul(!) iqalli(?)* *LUGAL.GAL tabarna LUGAL ^{URU}Hašši <^{URU}Hašši>* (23) *LUGAL ^{URU}Hahḥi ^{URU}Hahḥi ki uhalliqqi(!) išātam ittadi u qutra* (24) *ana ^aUTU šamē u ^aU ukallim u LUGAL ša ^{URU}Hahḥi* (25) *ana ^{GIŠ}MAR.GÍD.DA ašša<m>mid*

Based on the *ḥul[liyat]* of *H III 33* and a comparison with *A obv. 26 = KUB XXIII 33, 5*, one should restore [*i-tá*]-*ba-ak* in *A rev. 21*. For the space compare the *i-tá* of *obv. 48* and *rev. 20*.

Since the entire point of the passage *H III 32 f.* is that Hattušili accomplished what Sargon did not, one would expect *H III 35–36* to be parallel to *III 40* except for the presence of a negative in the former. The same should hold for *A rev. 22* versus *rev. 24*. What we actually find in *A* is *qutra ana ^aU ú-li-ka-al-li* in line 22 and *qutra ana ^aUTU šamē u ^aU ukallim* in line 24. The latter clearly means "I showed smoke to the Sun-god of heaven and to the Storm-god." The use of *ana* to mark the recipient betrays the Hittite origin of the phrase, since *kullumu* in Akkadian normally takes a double accusative. The expected Hittite verb is *tekkuššanun*, "I showed." There is no space in *KBo X 2* for such a long form, but one must assume that line *III 40* ran over the edge no matter which verb one restores.³⁸ The collocation *tuḥḥwain tekkuššai-* is not attested, but for the idea of offering the smoke from a sacrifice to a god, compare *KBo XV 7, 9'* (Kümmel, *StBoT* 3 [1967]: 36–37): [*t*]uḥḥwain-ma-wa *kēl š[A] GUD.MAḪ ^aUTU AN^E auš(!)[du]*, "But may the Sun-god of heaven see the smoke of this bull."

Güterbock, *JCS* 18 (1964): 2, and I. restore an accusative *tuḥḥwain* in *H III 35* after *III 40* and *A rev. 22*. However, the duplicate *KUB XXIII 20, 14* shows []-*in-ta*, which must be the end of the verb whose object would be the restored *tuḥḥwain*. The verb cannot be a form of *tekkuššai-*, or *tekkuššanun-*, or any other appropriate transitive verb. In fact, a verb with a third singular preterite in *-inta* is hard to find. One verb which would fit is *šamen-* "do without, disappear." The corresponding causative *šamenu-*, "make disappear" is used of incense in the ritual, i.e., "cause to go up in smoke" (e.g., *KBo II 4 IV 26*). I therefore raise the possibility that *H III 35–36* read [*tuḥḥwaišš-a*] *nepišaš ^aU-ni U[L ša-me-(in-ta)]*, "and no smoke was dispersed (into the air) to/for the Storm-god of heaven."

The lack of parallelism with *III 40* is at first surprising, but note that the expression for "burn down" has at least a different preverb in *H III 35* and 39 (also in the duplicate *KUB XXIII 20, 13* [*a*]rḥa *lukkūt* vs. 15 *IZI-az kat-[]*). Also compare *III 34 UL kuitki iya[t]* (not *UL ḥarnikta*) with *III 38 ḥarni[nku(n)]*, although in this case one might not expect the same verb anyway. Therefore the two expressions for sending smoke up to

³⁸ The proposed restoration is after *H III 36*. If one restores both Sun-god and Storm-god after *A rev. 24*, *H III 40* runs far over the edge.

heaven need not be identical either, and the *ú-li-ka-al-li* of A rev. 22 may not be an error for *ul ukallim*—an assumption which requires the scribe to have both dropped the final *m* and misheard *u* as *i*. I have tentatively read *ul iqalli*, understanding “He did not burn smoke for the Storm-god.” This is a peculiar expression as it stands, but as a translation of the Hittite proposed above it makes some sense. If the restoration *tuhhwaiš šamenu* is correct, then A necessarily transposed this into the corresponding transitive form, as shown by the accusative *qutra*. That is, A translated *tuhhwain šamenu*-. Since the object of *šamenu*- in such cases is usually the material burned (cedarwood, incense, etc.), the translator might well have inferred that *šamen*-/šamenu- meant “burn” in ritual usage, and *qutra iqalli* would be a mechanical rendering of the Hittite. I readily admit that the spelling with *-qà-* is unusual, and *iqalli* would be a present (durative), while A uses consistently preterite and perfect forms (of the G conjugation). Given the state of the text, the restoration and interpretation just proposed must remain conjectural, but they do attempt to account for the troublesome []-in-ta and *ú-li-ka-al-li*, which cannot simply be wished away.

The mention of both the rulers of Hahha and Haššuwa and the cities themselves caused the copyists of both A and H much difficulty. *KBo* X 2 simply omits mention of the kings in III 37–38, while A rev. 22 omits the second ^{URU}*Hašši*. The fact that both ruler and city were in the original is shown by the duplicate *KUB* XXIII 31 rev. 8–9: [LUGAL.G]AL-ma LUGAL ^{URU}*H[aššuwa]* ^{URU}*Haššuwan* LUGAL ^{URU}*Hašši*] (9) [^{URU}*Haššin*-ma [*harninkun* . . .]. The accusative ending on *Haššin* shows that more than just the rulers were mentioned, while LUGAL ^{URU}*H[a-* argues for the rulers’ being present. The restoration [LUGAL.G]AL-ma in XXIII 31 rev. 8 by Güterbock is certain, despite I.’s objections. *KUB* XXIII 31 also uses LUGAL.GAL-ma for LUGAL.GAL *tabarnaš* in line 2: [LUGA]L.GAL-m[a]. For the form of GAL compare *KBo* X 2 I 27. *KBo* X 2 III 41 omits LUGAL before ^{URU}*Haššuwa*; its presence is guaranteed by *KUB* XXIII 20, 16. A rev. 24 omits the king of Haššuwa entirely.

VI

Copying errors and lacunae in both A and H prevent a complete reconstruction of the original text. Nevertheless, a close comparison of the Hittite and Akkadian versions not only confirms Goetze’s view that the original document was composed in Hittite, but also reveals that the two versions are much nearer to one another than previously acknowledged. The text is a genuine bilingual, one of the most extensive which we have from Boğazköy. Given its relatively good state of preservation, albeit in a late copy, the text is one of the most valuable documents of Hittite that the historian and the linguist possess.