THE ACTS OF HATTUŠILI I*

H. CRAIG MELCHEET, Harvard University

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.


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 Neumann, Hans M. Kûmmel, 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 Hittological works, see, in addition, the lists in J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Wörterbuch (1902), pp. 7–13 and E. Laroche, Catalogue des textes hittites (1971), pp. ix–xii (hereafter cited as CTH).
Neither A nor H in the version we have represents the original document. The events related date from Old Hittite times, but the dactyls 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, KY, 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 (KCU H 12 and passim, AK H 19; 11), but the presence of the newer forms argues decisively for a late copy.2 The opening lines of the reverse of A (12-121) 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), ÂD (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 AS for ina and spells out the names Hatti and Arinna.3 The phonetic spellings are incomplete, while the use of AS 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.4

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 dactyls) sometimes preserve older forms. Compare the lack of phonetic complements in KBo X 2 1 6-8 versus the duplicates KBo X 31 4-5. H writes verbs in (i)ya- exclusively with -yr, never -i-, KBo X 2 expresses motion toward by IVA plus uninflected place name, while X 3 i 7 has the old directive: mv uRUr Zalpa paim.4 H regularly uses mv as the sentence connective. KBo X 2 i 11 reads n-ac, “et cors” versus the older n-ac of X 3 i 12, and X 2 i 35 uses arqa warwazi, “burn utterly,” where the duplicate KUB XXIII 29, 13 preserves the archaic arqa luktiki.

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

I 4-5: tv-an-ma-at-la [(harni)let] tv-nu-ri-e-es-ete-[tarni]ukta. The use of the connective tv-an-, the phonetic spelling of natta, “not,” and the lack of space betwen the introductory particles and what follows are all archaic features inadvertantly 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-nil. Carruba cites the use of the enclitic possessive -ni 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 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 -ni. The occurrence of URU-ri-nil is thus valid but indirect evidence for an Old Hittite original.

III 30: š-uk. Correct for “I” instead of the usual amsuk of Neo-Hittite. Note that the context with its reference to Sargon is overtly archaic.

Theme 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-ga-am. The minotation in a CV-VC spelling points to Early or Middle Bogaskijy Aakk (adivan). Likewise obv. 20 littur-am, obv. 21 šešam, obv. 22 attur-am, obv. 23 itakam, obv. 35 epram, obv. 37 p trận um ã.bâm.6


obv. 12: ku[ur]-li. a kalum-bi-su. In later Boakk “all” is regularly expressed by gabba. KUR- [ ] for expected kur. kur. meš (attested in I H 25) may also be old.

obv. 14, 28: šepu. 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, iššu (plus rev. 13 šešam, rev. 14 aššam, šetu, passim). The consistent š before t points to Early or Middle Boakk. Beginning with Suppuliunu I, Boakk shows š > š before dental.

obv. 37: p trận um bâbâm ul iššu. An old expression. Note the minotation and use of š for “and” (actually “or”).

III

Otten, MDGG 91 (1958): 84, draws the preliminary conclusion that the text was composed in Akkadian, in a North Syrian dialect, albeit “aus hehitischem Sprachgeist.” For Güterbock, JAO 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): 205, 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. Goette, JCS 16

1. H. Hoffner has suggested to me in correspondence an additional criterion for attributing the copy KBo X 2 to late Hittite: the stem bar[wa]bi(b), “become later” is spelled ku-wa[ra]-ri before Muvatalli, ku-ra-ri from Muvatattali on (including late copies of the Annals of Muršili). The spelling ku-ra-ri-s-l[ir] in KBo X 2 i 23 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 MDGG 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 Bogaskijy (see Neu-Rüster, StBoT 21 [1972]: 2, 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 diphthongs (line 5) and padeh (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.

5. This section in particular owes much to un-}.
(626): 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. 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 to colorless to mechanically calqued. H I 7 has [(s)u] kave kve akeaver ekti, “whatever sheepfolders there were.” A obv. 3 shows minama dumquman, “whatever good” (lit. “what good!”).11 One must conclude with Goetze that H has the lectio difficilior, and that A confused aknavi, “sheepfolds” with a form of akku, “good.” H I 31-32 and II 6 have: wa-mu mahhas...menalhanda auir, “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 pani-yašasi, “before (in the face of) me/him,” an accurate but colorless translation.

The sense of H I 30-31, “sowed woods 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 in H I 42-43 has only partially penetrated into A obv. 21 (see discussion below).

The phrase of A obv. 25 ana ginnat...teatis is likely a calque on the Hittite idiom appenda tiya...step behind! > “attack oneself on…” (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 misunderstanding of the Hittite (see below and Goetze, JOS 16 [1902]: 29).

H I 17 refers to “counted” days, i.e., “a few” days. A obv. 34 rather cleverly expresses this nuance with emphasizing -sa, but there can be no question as to the direction of translation. In H III 10-17 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 sicle 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 tarnasa, has to be 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, kulumšu, “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 kibba-su uttappii, “let his heart breathe” and A obv. 37 pittum a hadda ul ašš, “(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 (istuzuanna) warbšianna, “calm/appaise the mind” and wašši kappowoštuk UL biššu, “(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, STBO T 17 [1973]: 63-68). The Anitta text, while much briefer, also begins with a scene-setting description of the conquest of Neššu 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 Hašša and Haššuwa. A summary of preceding campaigns serves as an introduction, building to a suitable climax in which the destruction and sacking of Hašša 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, MODG 91 [1968]: 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, the lady of offering the smoke of a sacrifice to a god (see below), and Hittite would have a dative whatever the specific verb.

10 The corresponding Hittite verb is missing, and Kümmel, STBO T 3 (1967): 23, rightly points out that the specific collocation “show smoke” is not attested elsewhere in Hittite. There is, however, evidence for
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 (L.) and Saporetti (S.), with references to Otten’s translation of A.

12 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 Babyloni (CTh 10 and 11).

13 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.

14 On the other hand, LUGAL.GAL tabarna in rev. 1 goes with all: “I went” in rev. 2, so the presence of the third person in the above cases cannot definitively be linked to the title.

15 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; Giebelscoek, JAS 78 (1958): 237 f.) and to the Sun-goddess of Arizona (CTh 376; Gunnewy, A.A.A 27 (1940): 1 f.).
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 1 I 6 requires the restoration of more than just ([ERNM.M])ES. The syntax also calls for a sentence connective. I owe the restoration of -kıs to H. Hoffner, who cites as parallels KBo V 4 rev. 30 f. (Targašnalli Treaty), KBo IV 4 I 18 f. (d.M 114 f.), and KUB XXIII 20 I 10–11, 24. There is, however, no justification for L.'s restoration of -kıs in H I 8. It is not in the duplicate, KBo X 3 I 6, nor does the same phrase with pdi- take -kıs in I 13 and 40. Lastly, the available space does not require anything but [na-at]: cf. H III 22.


LUGAL GAL tabarnaš navšem UɾNUM ana šad-šu šakšu-šu (14) u qas-su išbat-šu ma ina panišu išpun umiššum ana iššu ([1]UɾNUM Nunašša (15) italak ina panišu išpun

A obv. 13 can be read without emendation (contra G.) by assuming a causal pecuniens: "The great king, the Tabarna, beloved of the Sun-goddess (of Arima)—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 tabarnaš in H I 27 and the sentence-initial complex of H I 28 argue for taking line 27 as a nominal sentence: "(The) great king, the Tabarna, (the) favorite of the Sun-goddess of Arima, and she..." This interpretation is also possible for A obv. 13 (with a nominative 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 šumūdā šalīt(i), compare Ulikummī (KUB XVII 7+) III 11–12: [n-an-kasu] LÀ.AŠ.KUR[um(arbi) girnus-shaš šalīt], "They placed (1) him (the infant Ulikummī) on Kumarī's lap." I have chosen the form [uššaš]iteššum šaššum šaššum šaššum šaššum "to fit the traces in the edition. The attested 3d sing. propretite is šalīt(i) šalīt(i), but šalīt(i) seems possible in view of datšat(i) from dátšat(i)."

traces in H I 29 point to šiššumu šaššum šaššum šaššum šaššum] versus the ŠU-[][as] of KUB XXIII 31 obv. 7. This leaves very little room for the expected šu-ep-ša, especially since the traces before the following -šu look more like šaššum than simply šu-. H. Kümmel has suggested DIB-ta, and H. Hoffner Iššaššum, but even one of these will hardly fit the space.

For the collocation iššum + infinitive, A obv. 14, see now von Soden, AltUr sub raššum. Since the idiom of A expresses habitual action and elsewhere equates to an še-form in H (A obv. 26 = H 11 5), one may wonder whether the original of H had a form of šuvasšum-: here as well.

A obv. 14 reads in the manuscript ana še-er-šu, 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 šīšum "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 še-šu-šu.

For some reason, G. ignores the sentence of H I 30 and tries to equate ana še-šu šušša italak to H I 31: nu-na maḫšan LÙ.MES UɾNUM Nunašša menaḫanda avir. Actually, the latter clause is rendered in A simply by ina panišu-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.I. 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."
was the presence of *menahuṣa ituur* (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 *saaru* 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 *gaqqari-su u-ul i-da-ar-ra-aš-šu attarar-šu*. Since ina *gaqqari-su*, “in its ground” matches aš-šu, we expect to find some expression of the idea “sowed weeds” in what follows. It is in fact possible to discover in i-ta-a-ar-ra-aš-šu a suffixed form of the verb erēšu, “cultivate, till.” For the OAkk vowel assimilate *trerab* obv. 48, The OAkk/OAkk treatment is das < *daas* < *das* (see von Soden, GAG §30 f.) is attested elsewhere in BoAkk: 

*KBo I 5 III 33* epnaš-sumu, *RS 17.132, 37* epnaš-sumu. The scripito plena in -ta-a-ar- is peculiar but not a compelling argument against this interpretation. Rather than assume a peculiar perfect form, it is easier to understand *itarrar-su* 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 [ZA.AH.LJAR], “weeds,” we find an inexplicable negative -a-ul. Since U is the Syllabogram for “grass,” I find attractive the emendation to U. J. HUL “vile grass” suggested to me by J. Durham. It is quite possible that a later copyist would have misread the rare U. JUL as -a-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 *attarar-su* in A obv. 18, apparently without an equivalent in H. While *nasāru* 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 larger tract (see AHw sub voces). 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. W would therefore translate “I cut it off/segregated it.” The Hittite original may have had a form of *kār-, “cut off* (cf. KUB XXIV 1 12–13 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 [EGIR] *dāḥṣu*, “di nuovo portai,” but the preverb would be EGIR-pa, and *do- does not mean “carry.” A obv. 18 has simply *ušeši*, “I sent up” without any adverb EGIR-su. Other occurrences of the phrase in the duplicates show that we should read *[ pla-da-ar-ša-na, “I carried” (see KUB XXIII 41, 3.4 and also KBo X 3 I 10). Elsewhere, KBo X 2 has substituted *pīḫušu, “I gave,” confusing “I carried it to the temple of 4X” with “I gave it to 4X.”

---

The Acts of Hattušili I

5. H I 42–45 = A obv. 21–22

nu *INA KUR UR* *Šallāhuwa pām nuna *za KUR UR* *Šallāhuwaš (43)* IZI-1 apataša kattan tarnaš apāša-ma-mu (44) IR. MEŠ-ni wāsuwa na UR* *Hattuši (45)* URU-ri-ni EGIS-PA usumum

ana *UR* *Šallāhuwa italuk UR* *Šallāhuwa ša-ma ištam (22) ištakin in šunu ana IR. MEŠ-ti-yi ituruna ana UR* KUBABBAR-ti alturan

S.’s translation is impossible. In view of H apāša, A šu-ā-ma has to be the emphatic “itself,” and the subject of the sentence is the city of Šallāhuwa (thus already O). Taken literally, H says: “The city of Š. on its own (apāša) 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 lukkiti/waru patented. Furthermore, A has ištam ištadin, “gave fire,” indicating that whatever its understanding of the Hittite it was trying to express something other than simply “set fire,” which would be ištam itadi. An emendation of ištadin to itadi 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 ištam itadi, matched in H III 35 by arḫa warûnaši (dual. arḫa lukkit), “burn utter” and in H III 39 by IZI-1 apataša kattan [.]. I. ’s restoration of [tarnaš] in the latter is dubious. First, because kattan lukki- is attested (Madduwatta, KUB XIV 1 rev. 54), second, because A has the normal and unambiguous ištatam itadi. The objection that a restored form of lukki- or warûnu,- “burn” would be redundant with IZI-1 is not valid: see KUB VIII 25 I 9 KUR-PI ašškaraš IZI-1 itwaruti, “the field(s) of the country will be burned/destroyed by fire.” We may therefore restore IZI-1 kattan [lukkuwarunu] in H III 39 after A rev. 23. This passage provides no evidence that IZI-1 kattan tarnaš- means “destroy 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 Muršili, KBo IV 4 IV 21, 24: BÈLI-NI-wa-naš - uru Hattuši kāruwaši lē maniṣahhī, “Our lord, do not hand us over to Hattuši (to plunder/[]).

The king’s response is: URU DAKKUMAN URU-1-an kāruwaša UL tarnašhānu, “I did not hand over the city of D. to be plundered.” The form of tarna- is used as equivalent to maniṣahh-, whose basic meaning is “hand over.” Compare also the usage of tarna- in III 20 of our text: n-aš AWA 1 UTU URURULAN-1 EA EGIS-AN tarnašhānu, “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 passage in A rev. 13 (already cited above).

Finally, note the following passage from the Autobiography of Hattušili III (KUB 1 I 52–55): AWA 1 KUR-1-mu piran kattu UL kuwaṣṣki tarnaš UL-na-ma-nu AWA EN...
The Acts of Hattušili I


The idiom of A obv. 24, libba nuppūšu, “let the heart breathe” = “satisfy the heart” is attested elsewhere (see AHu sub nuppūšu). H shows [yanum... which points to a causative in-nu- from a -yu- stem. I have therefore restored nu-za [ZI-an varšši]yanum, “I calmed/appessed my mind.” Compare first the Annals of Muršili, KUB XIV 15 III 26: ZI-an varššiyanum(m[um]) with a different stem, KUB XIII 4 IV 11: wa DINGIR.MEŠ ZI-an varššiyanum, “They appease the mind(s) of the gods”; finally, KBo XII 64 IV 8 (broken context): ZI-an varššiyanum.

My restoration of H I 50 is based on A and on H II 52–53: na-ša šA KUR.KUR.MEŠ anda 4TU-šu išút = A rev. 1[1] 4TU-š[ ]-ša]-išūt23 5. Von Soden, AHu sub ginnatu reads A obv. 25 as ana ginnatu kallī, “behind the mountains.” But the Hittites did not use the Semanogram KUR as “mountain,” only as “land.”24 Besides, it is hardly appropriate to the context to take the phrase in an astronomical sense: “The Sun-god stopped 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 Šanヴィ{lwa. In the other case, the Sun-god “steps into the lands” after the defeat of the army of Zippaqa 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 ginnat. . . itúatīz, which makes no sense literally and is not an Akkadian idiom, I suggest that H at this point had [EGIR-panda] išút, literally “stepped behind,” but idiomatically “attached himself to.” Compare for both the spelling and the sense KUB XXIII I 33–34; n-šaš A.NA LUGAL KUR u.màraz EGRIR-panda tiṭer, “and they stepped behind (went over to) the King of Egypt.”25 I

23 Cities conquered by the Hittite king faced two possible fates, stated explicitly in the Annals of Muršili, KBo III 4 I 29–30: “I conquered the land of Arzawa, and one part (kui) 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/ḪA) are explicitly lumped together with castile and sheep as part of the booty. Our text makes no mention of NAM.RA.MEŠ, and the removal of the people of Ḥalha (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 seeking of destroyed cities is explicitly stated in our text, while no mention is made of servitude. By contrast, Salabunna is not sacked, and its citizens become Hattušili’s servants. This again suggests that the city was not destroyed.

24 As in A rev. 1, the ti is clear, as in the first part of the ti. The double (?) vertical after the next narrow break is probably the rest of the ti. We then have a trace of the ti and the vertical of ti. The verb cannot be lāqā, which would be spelled lāq-ka-ual (cf. A rev. 48). Of the two partial signs beginning II I 50 the second is easily ud, 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 ud as the edition offers, so I believe 4TU(.-]-]-] išút remains possible.

25 Lit. “thud high up in the sky” or “up above.”
understand our passage to mean that Hattušili destroyed the city of Shanwittū, 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. In the case of Zippaša, 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 <<EGRi><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 <<dH＞In-ka-at.

7. H I 53 – II 1 = A obv. 26 – 27

[... gGIGIR (MEŠ) KUR URB Appaya (54) (hulliyanum) nu GUD.HI.A.AUDI.A.NA URB Takhānānu yīsmu ḫarī ḫadīhu

HATTUŠILÎ KUR URB Abbaia ṣabāk (27) x.x.x-šu ša URB Takhāna GUD.HI.A.AUDI.A.NA utoqaq]

S. reads URB Umnaya in A obv. 26, and I restores URB Um-ma-ya in H I 54, thus leaving the cities Takhānā in H 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-ya-ya, and the occurrence of Ap-ya-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 on, and most of a na, thus: URB Tuk-ša-an-na-ya = URB Tuk-ša-an-na-ša A obv. 27. Compare KUB XXXI 64 II 32: ANA URB Tuk-ša-an-na-na]. The two texts thus do mention the names of two cities in the same sequence as one would expect. The ghost word Umnaya disappears.

The restoration hulliyanum in H I 54 is based on KUB XXIII 33, 5 [yr] hulliyanum, which ought to equal A obv. 26: “The overturned [defeated the chariots of Appaya].” This means H must restore the verb hulliyanum 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 ū-ru-šu. This sequence makes no sense as it stands, and without an equivalent in H I can offer no likely emendation.

8. H I 2 – 10 = A obv. 28 – 30

nu INAN URB Parnammna an-an-pas (3) URB Parnammna-ma-an apēdaš ANA LUGAL. [MEŠ] (4) SAG.DU-a šu KASKAL. ḫa A-na ṣuwa apēš (5) yīṣm u taknamukšit (6) [nu]-ma-an naḫḫan menaḫḫanda (7) nu KĀ.GAL. ḫI.EGIR ya-hek na-aš-a-ša apēdaš (8)] memeni nēpiš qa[U-UTU šu-aš (a) ša] na-an-ma-nu KUR URB Alhaš kur-urṭuštita (10) nu URB Anā harkinu[s] the original image may be that of a military confrontation, where one who steps/stands behind you is your ally, while whoever foes you is a foe.

29 Caruba, ZDMG. Suppl. 1, 1 (1969): 231–32, also understands this passage as identifying the Hittite king with the sun-god). Recall the later royal title UTTA, “my sun.” See also the discussion by Neuwirth T 18 (1974): 127–31, who notes that the female Sun-goddess of Arinna is thus far not attested in a text in old cuneiform. In view of this, the omission of INAN Arinna and the masculine personal reference of A obv. 13 may be errors, but rather reflections of a Hittite original where all cases of UTU referred to the male Sun-god (probably the Indo-European *Sūnu*). In the later copies of H, most references to the solar deity were “corrected” to 4TUU URB Arinna.

30 S. translates “in the land of the city of...” but ša marks possessive.

31 S’s neglect of H leads him to mistranslate (pēnaš) UTU as “la des soleil” 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, one must opt for the male Sun-god (see n. 25 above).
them [by the hand]." The difference in number between A and H is again due to the fact that H in the preceding sentence refers to the habitants of Paronna, while A names the city in the singular. The basic idea here is that Paronna'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 Alka, which was stupid enough to resist and was destroyed (note the adverbial -ma, "but") in H II 9.

I restores H II 9 as: anda-ma-mu KUR 𒀀𒈩UrûAlḫaš [pa-a-an], "c no paesē della città di Alha [andā]." 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 -ma unaccounted for, and the interpretation of KUR _DECLS ALḪAŠ as a genitive collocation is strained. The correct restoration is given by A: ḠUrûAlḫaš tikkir, "the city of A. became hostile." This points to ku.r[i]-[u-ri]-[ya]-[a]-[a] in H: "but the city of A, became hostile to me."

9. H II 17–18 = A obv. 34

nu kapp[u]kanda; .backward [Ud. KAM. H]. 𒀀A-an-Pârun[an] (18) sîẖu[n]

ina umati-ma irti [Pârun kinna] UK. MAḪ LUGAL. GAL ittiq

H says literally "in counted days," which means "in a few days I crossed the Puruma." 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," "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 (māḫān) lubbatat-ša, "on the next day" in the Annals of Mursili.

10. H II 21–26 = A obv. 35–38


epran (36) ana maḫši-ša išta[1] pâššu ṣi mumkurr-šu KUBABBAR-ti undalli (37) KUBABBAR-hu GUSKIN pânum u bābūm u šīḏā u EN annarwa (38) U EN HULašš

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, I. 2), 19 would restore the city of Hattuša as the 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 paššum u bābūm u šīḏā. The original of H probably had some form of the expression kappurūššu LUL šīḏa, "there was no counting," as in KBo III 4 II 43. UERKUBABBABAR-šša-zi EN. MEŠ ERN. MEŠ ANŠE. KUR. RA. MEŠ-a-zi RIN NAM. RA. MEŠ uṣurē bita-luššu kappurūššu nu GUL šīḏa. "But (of) the deportees which the lords, infantry and cavalry of Hattuša brought (home), there was no counting." 20

The rest of line 25 is tentatively restored after passages like H II 10, but it must be said that the traces of signs in the edition look much more like -ṭu-a-ak than they do -ṭu-a-ni. On the other hand, it is very difficult to take the enclitic -šī at the head of the line as anything but a dative in commodi like that of I 10 or 19. One might think of reading DINGIR. MEŠ šša EKUBABBAR . . ., but this would place šari 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-ašš than they do -ḫu-a-n. A is of no help here, since it has no corresponding sentence, leaving the list of gods without a verb.

Despite their differences, the Ṣu EN annarwa of A obv. 37 and the Ṣu EN annarwa 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

1 UERKUBABBAR-šša

2 UERṢa-hu-šša

3 UERZa-šša

4 UERṢa-na-u-šša

5 UERZa-at-pa

6 UERṢa-la-šša

7, 9 UERKUBABBAR-šša

8 UERṢa-šša-šša

10 UERKUBABBAR-šša

11 UERṢa-šša-šša

12 UERKUBABBAR-šša

13 UERṢa-šša-šša

14 UERKUBABBAR-šša

15, 17 UERUL-šša-šša

20 UERUL-šša-šša

19 UERSa-šša-šša

18 UERSa-šša-šša

23, 24 UERṢa-la-šša

26 UERKUBABBAR-šša

27 UERṢa-la-šša

28 UERKUBABBAR-šša

29 UERṢa-la-šša

30 UERKUBABBAR-šša

H

1 UERKUBABBAR-šša

4 UERṢa-na-u-šša

9 UERṢa-at-pa

15 UERṢa-la-šša

16, 17 UERṢa-la-šša

17 UERṢa-la-šša

18 UERṢa-la-šša

22 UERṢa-la-šša

24 UERṢa-la-šša

30, 31 UERṢa-la-šša

34, 36 UERUL-šša-šša

41 UERUL-šša-šša

38 DINGIR-LIŠŠIŠ UERṢa-la

39 UERṢa-la-šša

42 UERṢa-la-šša

46 UERṢa-la-šša

53 (UERṢa-la-šša)

54 (UERṢa-la-šša

II 2, 3 UERṢa-la-šša

9, 10 UERṢa-la-šša

29 There is not quite enough space for this phrase, but there are other instances of writing over the edge on the west side of KBo X 3: 41, 44, 46, 48, 49. The reading sa-šša-šša . . . in H II 7 is based on a suggestion of Hoffman, who points out that the edition shows no space between -es and -es. . . . In H II 7 is based on a suggestion of Hoffman, who points out that the edition shows no space between -es and -es. . . . In H II 7 is based on a suggestion of Hoffman, who points out that the edition shows no space between -es and -es. . . . In H II 7 is based on a suggestion of Hoffman, who points out that the edition shows no space between -es and -es.

20 Hoffner has also restored the sign KUB XXIX 1 I 8–10: Ṣa-la-šša ša-šša the expression kappurūššu LUL šīḏa, "there was no counting," as in KBo III 4 II 43. UERKUBABBABAR-šša-zi EN. MEŠ ERN. MEŠ ANŠE. KUR. RA. MEŠ-a-zi RIN NAM. RA. MEŠ uṣurē bita-luššu kappurūššu nu GUL šīḏa. "But (of) the deportees which the lords, infantry and cavalry of Hattuša brought (home), there was no counting." One could consider other possibilities for both A and H: Ṣa-la-šša ša-šša in A, or in a different direction "Ku-šša" in H. Arriving as a common denominator is not simple.
The Acts of Hattušili I

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 [ ] in A, we must equate this to MU I. KAM of H II 45, and likewise itakak[en to tarab[am] (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 Haššu. Since we need to explain the final -u of itakak[en anyway, it seems advisable to assume that A used a pronominal object. The reference to Ḥaššu(wa) is clear from the preceding context. The verb in itakak[en has apparently been lifted from it-ka-ki-ištes, "he cut off" in the next line, which matches kueršum in H II 48. One would expect Akkadian lēd as the equivalent of Hittite tarb- (see specifically von Soden, AHw, and Friedrich, Wt).

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 si and restore "He (Hattušili) cut off his head." The form kueršum of H II 48 is unique. Hittite elsewhere shows either kuer- or kar- 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 UBU, but also preceded by UBU-put. The misplaced ATALU GUSKIN 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 tiyašan, "I entered" of H II 51. However, the full Hittite sentence reads "I entered into battle against them," which can hardly be rendered by anda nu-\[\ldots\] itarab. The latter must be read and must read as anda nuna-\[\ldots\] si itarab, "entered in the night." This sentence in A thus matches H II 49–50: nu-\[\ldots\] Zippaššan GE\[\ldots\] karb̄ pušun. 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 un\[\ldots\] KUR. H I or a similar phrase equating to SAK 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 the hand has been accidentally transposed.

The syntax of H II 49–50 is unusual: nu-\[\ldots\] Zippaššan GE\[\ldots\] karb̄ pušun. I translate: "he verso la città di Z. proprio di notte andai." If the text read IN\[\ldots\] Zippaššan, 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 Elementenbuch, 2nd ed. [1960], §521). The present text consistently uses IN\[\ldots\] everywhere else. Analytic use of accusatives with compounds of pāš- and iya-, "go" is attested. For karb̄ pāš-, "ascend" (a mountain)

22 In H II 26 the partial sign could be ba\[\ldots\] as well as the sign assumed above, so either ba-la or ba-la-ap is possible.
23 The reading of H is assured by the duplicate KUR XXIII 26, 41\[\ldots\] (UBU-put)
24 KUR XXIII 31 rev. 9 has Ḥaššu-ḫi-šu.
compare KUB XIX 18 I 42 and V I 1 I 43. The combination ištarna arba pāṭi-kiya- with an accusative means "cross, pass through": KBU 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 INAT URUZA.Zippusna, 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 INAT URUZA.Zippusna (again!). Finally, he destroys it, while holding the city of Haha as bay.

Given the accusative and the odd sequence of events, I suggest that the sentence with šarā means "I ascended the country of Z., in the dead of night," despite the absence of KUR (for the latter compare KBU V 8 I 27 f. cited above). Hattušili defies 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 SAHAR ČI A-tā 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 -iš or a late Hittite nominative plural used as an accusative.

Read LUGAL, GAL in H II 54, not L. LUGAL-ma-ād. For the gal sign with only three horizontals, compare H I 1.

G.'s restoration [at-ta-na]-ak-la-ma-su, "I continually glory at it (Haha)." Ntn to nekâlmâ, is surely correct. For the transitive use of the verb see now von Soden, âHw 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 Zippusna while fending off the troops of Haha. The verb tarkuwoiti- means "dance," also "rage" (see Goetz, Lg 15 [1939]: 116). The extended stem trakwoluqqua- undoubtedly has a similar connotation: "gesticulate violently" or the like. The addition of arba, "away/off" transitive the verb: "(scare) away with violent gestures."

12. H III 23-24 = A rev. 15
kattan-â kattan ărâzi(1)-ya [24] IŠTU KUBABBAR halluquyuqan

īgāra ša kidding ešēnu(2) KÁ kidding ina KUBABBAR šabbâš

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

It is easier to read ša-ra-zi(1)-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 È. The tentative reading e-tek-ē-n, "up(ward)"(1) in A rev. 15, after a suggestion of H. Kimmell, fits the traces of signs very well and would provide an equivalent to kattan ărâzi-ya. However, its position between the two objects is odd, and one would properly expect ana ēšēnu to mean "up(ward)."

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.

ERIN MEŠ URÜ/HAḪHITIḪ ḫallît-at [34] UL ukiti iqi[t UL-an IZI-im] (35) arâzi wawânu [uḫulwxuš-kś-at ](1) [36] nepištâ qa-ni Ul/L-šame(n)i(1) (37) LUGAL, GAL tabarnâ-UŞI[Hâkkuwu]n (38) URULUḪHITIḪ-Kâ-n/ham[ni(2)] (39) n-as IZI-as kattan [ukkuw1]n (40) uḫulwxuš-nâ nepištâ qa-ni(1) tekkuuš-an(1) [41] na LUGAL-ULUḪHITIḪ Kâ-n/ham[ni(2)] (42) ANÂ AŠMAR.GID. DA TÂr[šau(1)](1)

ERIN MEŠ URÜ/HAḪHITIḪ (21) [iš]-išak URULUḪHITIḪ wénnu a ilaču šášiš ná šášiš (22) [gụtra anu ] UU źišši(1) iqati(1) LUGAL, GAL tabarna LUGAL-URULUḪHITIḪ < URULUḪHITIḪ > (23) LUGAL-URULUḪHITIḪ ḫakkuwuš-kś-at šášiš či šášiš a gụtra (24) anu ĄTU šañe(1) UU akkiššin LUGAL-URULUḪHITIḪ (25) anu AȘMAR. GID. DA aṣṣa a<s<s>m> mish

Based on the hâllît-at of H III 33 and a comparison with A obv. 26 = KUB XXIII 33, 5, one should restore [iš]-iš-ša-ak in A rev. 21. For the space compare the iš-ša- of obv. 48 and rev. 29.

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 gụtra anu ĄTU ša-L-ša-ša-ak in line 22 and gụtra anu ĄTU šañe(1) UU akkiššin in line 24. The latter clearly means "I showed smoke to the Sun-god of Heaven and to the Storm-god." The use of anu to mark the recipient betrays the Hittite origin of the phrase, since kullumus in Akkadian normally takes a double accusative. The expected Hittite verb is tekkuuš-an, "I showed." There is no space in KBo X 2 for such a verb, but one must assume that line III 40 ran over the edge no matter which verb one restores. The collocation tekkuuš-kś-at is not attested, but for the idea of offering the smoke from a sacrifice to a god, compare KBo XV 7, 9' (Kimmell, StBoT 2 [1987]: 30-37); [uḫulwxuš-nâ waš kël SÁ] GUD MAH ĄTU ANZU anü[1]ašš [du], "But may the Sun-god of Heaven see the smoke of this bull."

Götterbuch, ĽCS 18 (1984): 2, and I. restore an accusative uḫulwxuš in H III 35 after III 40 and A rev. 22. However, the duplicate KUB XXIII 30, 14 shows [ ḫ]-uḫulwuš in A rev. 15, after a suggestion of H. Kimmell, fits the traces of signs very well and would provide an equivalent to uḫulwxuš-kś-aš-ša-ya, "do without, disappear." The corresponding causative šamenâ, "make disappear" is used in 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 [uḫulwxuš-kś-at] n(epišš) qa-ni(1) Ul/L-šame(1)-išš, "and no smoke was dispersed (into the air) to/from the Storm-god of heaven."
heaven need not be identical either, and the ści-li-ka-al-li of A rev. 22 may not be an error for ści-ukallim—an assumption which requires the scribe to have both dropped the final // and misread u as i. I have tentatively read ści iqallî, 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 tufâ�wâsāk šâmênta is correct, then A necessarily transposed this into the corresponding transitive form, as shown by the accusative qutra. That is, A translated tufâ�wâsak šâmênta. Since the object of šâmênta in such cases is usually the material burned (cedarwood, incense, etc.), the translator might well have inferred that šâmênta šâmênta—meant “burn” in ritual usage, and qutra iqallî would be a mechanical rendering of the Hittite. I readily admit that the spelling with -qâ- is unusual, and iqallî 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 ści-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 ṣuru Haššu. 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 ṣuru Haššuwa LUGAL ṣuru [[Haššuwa LUGAL ṣuru Haššu]] (9) [ṣuru] Ḥahhina-[ma [barni-ku-...]]. The accusative ending on Ḥahhina shows that more than just the rulers were mentioned, while LUGAL [ṣuru] Haššuwa- argues for the rulers’ being present. The restoration [LUGAL G]AL- ma in XXIII 31 rev. 8 by Güterbock is certain, despite J.’s objections. KUB XXIII 31 also uses LUGAL GAL- ma for LUGAL GAL- tabarnâš in line 2: [LUGAL GAL-]al-[ma]. For the form of GAL compare KBo X 2 I 27. KBo X 2 III 41 omits LUGAL before ṣuru 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 Goetz’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.