



# HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW



**VOLUME 5 | ISSUE 2 | 2024**





HUNGARIAN  
ASSYRIOLOGICAL  
REVIEW





**ON THE COVER:**

Kesikkaya (Hattuşa / Boğazkale, Türkiye).  
Photo: Gábor Kalla

# HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW



VOLUME 5, ISSUE 2  
2024



**ELTE**  
EÖTVÖS LORÁND  
UNIVERSITY

Institute of Archaeological Sciences  
Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies  
Eötvös Loránd University  
Budapest



# HUNGARIAN ASSYRIOLOGICAL REVIEW

## HAR – Hungarian Assyriological Review

Journal of the Institute of Archaeological Sciences and the Institute of Ancient and Classical Studies (Department of Assyriology), Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

HAR is a peer-reviewed electronic journal (HU ISSN 2732-2610) published in two issues per year. The journal covers the philology and the archaeology of the Ancient Near East, publishing research articles, brief notes, and field reports.

Papers in HAR are published under the platinum open access model, which means permanent and free access in downloadable format (pdf) for readers and no publication fees for authors. The issues can be both downloaded for free and ordered as printed volumes at own cost.

For article submission guidelines, see <https://harjournal.com/author-guidelines/>

### **Editor-in-chief** (*szerkesztésért felelős személy*):

Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

### **Associate editors:**

Zsombor J. Földi, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München*

Zsolt Simon, *Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona*

### **Editorial board:**

Tamás Dezső, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

Gábor Zólyomi, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

### **Journal manager and technical editor:**

Attila Király ([attila.kiraly@harjournal.com](mailto:attila.kiraly@harjournal.com))

### **Publisher** (*kiadó és kiadásért felelős személy*):

Gábor Kalla, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*

### **Registered office** (*a kiadó székhelye*):

Institute of Archaeological Sciences, Múzeum krt. 4/B., 1088 Budapest, Hungary

### **Email address:**

[info@harjournal.com](mailto:info@harjournal.com)

### **Design and typesetting:**

Attila Király ([attila@litikum.hu](mailto:attila@litikum.hu))

using Noto font family by Google Inc., under the terms of the SIL Open Font License.

---

# CONTENTS

**Hungarian Assyriological Review**

**volume 5, issue 2, 2024**

|                                                                                                                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Revisiting the Child Burials of Old Babylonian Ur: the Funerary Rite and its Spatial Aspects<br><i>Kamilla Kersánszki</i>                | 91  |
| Preserving the Word of the King and the Word of the Father:<br>New Joins to the Political Counsel of Mursili I<br><i>Jared L. Miller</i> | 125 |
| Einige inneranatolische Wortverknüpfungen<br><i>Diether Schürr</i>                                                                       | 181 |
| Neues zum epichorischen Namen der Stadt Side in Pamphylien<br><i>Diether Schürr</i>                                                      | 193 |
| Hungarian Assyriological Review author guidelines                                                                                        | 197 |







# Preserving the Word of the King and the Word of the Father: New Joins to the Political Counsel of Mursili I

Jared L. Miller\*

\* – Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. Email: [jared.miller@lmu.de](mailto:jared.miller@lmu.de)

**Abstract:** Several joins among well-known Hittite texts and fragments from Ḫattusa / Boğazköy reveal that the composition hitherto known as The Edict of Ḫattusili I (KBo 3.27) and a text variously regarded as a fragment of the Palace Anecdotes or as an edict of Mursili I (KBo 3.28) in fact belong to a single tablet containing what one might now call the Political Counsel of Mursili I. The primary purpose of the Political Counsel is to underline Mursili's authority and legitimacy, in large part through a repeated emphasis of the necessity of observing the 'word(s) of the father' or the 'word(s) of the king', invariably referring to traditions and precedents established by the author's (adoptive) father and predecessor, Ḫattusili I. Most of the events narrated in the text thus occurred during the reign of Ḫattusili and are told in retrospect, partly from the vantage point of Mursili's day, partly as if narrated by Ḫattusili himself. While many details of philology and history must remain open for discussion, the newly reconstructed text sheds light on a number of issues of early Hittite history. It is seen, *inter alia*, that there is no need to posit any Tawannanna in the Old Kingdom other than the queen of Labarna I, the aunt of Ḫattusili I. The succession to the throne of Ḫattusili I is likely to have been the result of a *coup d'état* rather than the desire of Labarna and Tawannanna, whose sons Ḫattusili apparently eliminated or outmaneuvered. And the so-called Purušanda Episode referred to here and in KBo 3.46+ can likely be placed in the reign of Ḫattusili I and may well reflect one episode of the disenfranchisement of Labarna's and Tawannanna's lineage.

**Keywords:** Political Counsel of Mursili I (Edict of Ḫattusili I), Hittite Old Kingdom, Labarna I, Tawannanna

**Cite as** Miller, J. L. 2024: Preserving the Word of the King and the Word of the Father: New Joins to the Political Counsel of Mursili I. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 5: 125–180. <https://doi.org/10.52093/hara-202402-00041-000>

© This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

---

## Introduction

In 2005, while preparing the fragments 533/v and 1131/v for publication as KBo 50.6 and 50.7, respectively, a number of striking similarities between them caught my eye, and I suggested that they might belong to the same tablet.<sup>1</sup> In November 2018, I discovered that one of these fragments, KBo 50.7, directly joins KBo 3.28, a largish fragment that had been catalogued among the

---

<sup>1</sup> Miller 2006, iv. Bibliographical abbreviations used here can be found in The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (CHD), also available online at <https://isac.uchicago.edu/research/publications/chicago-hittite-dictionary>. For signs and conventions employed, see Miller 2013, xv–xvi. This paper was submitted to HAR in February, 2025, and thus, it was no longer possible to take account of Marazzi 2024, which appeared in May, 2025.

Palace Anecdotes by Laroche (CTH 9.6). In his classification of KBo 3.28 Laroche was followed among others by the CHD,<sup>2</sup> while some, such as Soysal,<sup>3</sup> Dardano<sup>4</sup> and Marazzi,<sup>5</sup> have argued for its being a royal edict, perhaps of Mursili I. In February 2020, while examining some of the well-known similarities between KBo 3.28(+KBo 50.7) and KBo 3.27, the text commonly known as the Edict of Ḫattusili I (CTH 5),<sup>6</sup> I realized that these fragments belong to the same tablet and in fact join directly. Shortly thereafter I concluded that KBo 3.24, to which Soysal<sup>7</sup> had joined KBo 53.275, probably belongs to this same tablet, and that they should likely be situated slightly above KBo 3.27. Where KBo 50.6 might belong one can only speculate at present; I will assume as a working hypothesis that it might belong to the first part of obv. ii.

I then realized that in fact Emil Forrer had already assumed in his treatment of the Bo fragments published as KBo 3.24, 3.27 and 3.28 that these would have belonged to a single tablet, which he thus presented as BoTU 2.10 α, β and γ. He assumed KBo 3.24 and KBo 3.27 would belong to obv. i, KBo 3.28 to obv. ii. However, Güterbock,<sup>8</sup> having collated the fragments, rejected Forrer's suggestion, though he did not detail his observations<sup>9</sup> or provide any reasons for his conclusion,<sup>10</sup> writing merely, '[n]ach Kollation gehören die Stücke 2BoTU 10 α, β, γ nicht zu einer Tafel'. Güterbock was followed essentially by all<sup>11</sup> subsequent authors, either explicitly or implicitly.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, shortly before I was ready to submit this paper, James Burgin discovered that Bo 8421 (DBH 43.117) directly joins Bo 2556 as well, thereby providing the ends of obv. i 7"–8", and he kindly informed me of his welcome discovery and provided me with a photo montage (email of 14 July 2023).

That the main fragments (i.e. Bo 2423+Bo 2556+1131/v) do indeed join is now ensured, among other details, by <sup>UR</sup>[<sup>U</sup>Ḫa-a]t-[t]u-ša-an in obv. i 26" and *pe-eš-ši-at* in 29" as well as the paragraph dividers that align nicely below §§6", 7" and 8". Bo 2423 might well join Bo 2556 and 1131/v directly, but it is difficult to be certain without collating the fragments themselves; there might be a millimetre or two between them. Unfortunately, most of the fragments cannot be physically joined at present, as they are housed in different museums (Istanbul: Bo 2423, Bo 2556, Bo 3413; Ankara: Bo 8421, 1699/u, 533/v, 1131/v).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>2</sup> E.g. CHD Š, 70b, 526b.

<sup>3</sup> Soysal 1989, 31–33, 90–91, 125–126, 136–137.

<sup>4</sup> Dardano 1997, 15.

<sup>5</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>6</sup> Other designations of KBo 3.27 found in the literature include 'Das Ächtungs-Edikt auf die Tawannanna' (Haas 2006, 65) and similar.

<sup>7</sup> Soysal 2006a.

<sup>8</sup> Güterbock 1938, 99 n. 2.

<sup>9</sup> In contrast, Forrer (BoTU 2, p. 4\*), who had obviously examined the originals as well, had noted 'die gleiche Handschrift und den gleichen eigentümlich kalkartigen und innerlich und äußerlich eigenartig gefärbten Ton' of the three Bo fragments, which surely speaks for their attribution to a single tablet.

<sup>10</sup> I can only assume that Güterbock was led astray by the fact that the fragments from obv. i, i.e. Bo 2423 and Bo 3413 (and now 1699/u) have a rather different surface appearance than that (or those) of obv. ii, i.e. Bo 2556 (and now 1131/v and 533/v?), presumably due to different deposition conditions. Such variation among fragments belonging to a single tablet, however, is not uncommon, and can indeed be quite deceiving.

<sup>11</sup> Bin-Nun 1975, 74 with n. 86 assumed that BoTU 2.10 α and β belonged to a single tablet, while BoTU 2.10 γ would have belonged to another tablet. At the same time Bin-Nun 1975, 75 referred to BoTU 2.10 α and β as 'these two documents of Ḫattušili I', and did not otherwise treat them as belonging to a single tablet.

<sup>12</sup> More recently Forlanini suggested that KBo 3.27 and KBo 3.28 'may be fragments of the same composition' (2010, 124 n. 49) or that they might belong 'to the same text' (2017a, 242 n. 45; cf. also 2017b, 132–133 and n. 50; 2020, 152 n. 36).

<sup>13</sup> For photographs of each fragment as well as a join sketch (not including 533/v) see the documentation in the *Konkordanz*. I had planned to visit the museums in Istanbul and Ankara in order to collate and photograph the fragments before presenting my results at the 11<sup>th</sup> Congress of Hittitology in Çorum during the first week of September 2020, but was not able to do so due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Collation of

It seems quite likely, but is not entirely certain, that we are dealing with the obverse. All three Bo fragments were published in KBo 3 as *Vorderseite* (i.e. KBo 3.24, 3.27, 3.28); and the fact that there is no colophon at the bottom of the left column suggests, but does not assure, that it should be regarded as obv. i, not rev. iv. And if KBo 3.24 does in fact belong to this tablet, then it would all but clinch the assumption that at least this portion represents the obverse, as in the edition we find the comment: ‘Die Rückseite der Tafel, soweit erhalten, ist unbeschrieben; am linken Rande ist nur ein kleiner Stück einer Randleiste erhalten.’

The tablet is clearly a New Hittite copy<sup>14</sup> of an Old Hittite composition.<sup>15</sup> The findspots of 1699/u, 1131/v and 533/v (Grabungsschutt in L/19) suggest that the tablet stems from the storerooms on the eastern side of the Temple I complex.

The present paper offers a renewed treatment of the reconstructed text, with transliteration,<sup>16</sup> translation and philological commentary, followed by a discussion of its contents. Of course, all these fragments, and especially KBo 3.27 and 3.28, have been treated extensively by many scholars, so that their content as well as most of their challenges are already well documented.<sup>17</sup> I will therefore limit the discussion to some potential gains in understanding that the new joins seem to suggest along with a few considerations concerning passages that have resulted from my work with the texts. Extensive bibliography can be found in Silvin Košak’s *Konkordanz*, sub 533/v, and in Detlev Groddek’s *Liste*<sup>18</sup> under the numbers of the respective text editions. I thank them both for their tireless efforts and their selfless sharing with colleagues.

the principal fragments is now prohibited for the foreseeable future by the closure of the museum in Istanbul due to a restoration project.

<sup>14</sup> Probably a IIIa (ca. Suppiluliuma I to Mursili II) or a IIIb (ca. Muwattalli II to Hattusili III) copy, though caution is always called for when dealing with late copies of older texts, as the copying scribe can be and often is influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the sign forms in the text from which he is copying. In any case, I see no indications that it might be a IIIC copy (ca. Tuthaliya IV to Suppiluliu/ama II). The designation of KBo 3.27 and 3.28 as Old Hittite originals by Kammenhuber 1969, 259–260, followed by Bin-Nun 1975, 108, is obsolete.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Groddek 2008, 5–6; Gilan 2015, 110.

<sup>16</sup> The transliteration is based primarily on the photos available in the *Konkordanz*, and secondarily on the hand copies of the KBo and DBH editions.

<sup>17</sup> The more extensive treatments and/or translations of the substantial individual fragments published within the last 50 years or so, all with previous literature, include Laroche 1973, 186–189 (KBo 3.28); Soysal 1989, 31–33, 90–91 (KBo 3.28); 2006a (KBo 3.24+53.275); de Martino 1991 (KBo 3.27); Carruba 1992, 77–82 (KBo 3.27); Haas 2006, 65–66 (KBo 3.27); Dardano 2002, 365, 383–384, 388 (KBo 3.28); 2010, 47–50 (KBo 3.28 and 3.24+); Marazzi 2010, 212–216, 222–227; 2011–2012 (KBo 3.28); Gilan 2015, 99–103, 110–115 (KBo 3.27 and 3.28); Klinger 2020 (KBo 3.27). Of course, Forrer’s (BoTU 2.10) and Sommer and Falkenstein’s (1938, 211–214) highly influential early work must be mentioned as well.

<sup>18</sup> At <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/grodlist/>.

## Transliteration

### Obv. I

|     |     |                                                                                                                                |                                       |
|-----|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|     |     | (probably not much more than ca. 8 lines missing)                                                                              |                                       |
| §1' | 1'  | [x]- <sup>ˈ</sup> wa <sup>ˈ</sup> [                                                                                            | KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275                   |
|     | 2'  | [DU]MU <sup>ˈ</sup> /[L]Ú <sup>ˈ</sup> MEŠ[                                                                                    |                                       |
| §2' | 3'  | -----<br><sup>ˈ</sup> ku <sup>ˈ</sup> -w[a <sup>ˈ</sup> -                                                                      |                                       |
|     | 4'  | GI[Š <sup>ˈ</sup>                                                                                                              |                                       |
|     | 5'  | ḥu-w[a <sup>ˈ</sup> -                                                                                                          |                                       |
| §3' | 6'  | -----<br>LUGAL-a[n~                                                                                                            |                                       |
|     | 7'  | e-eš-k[e <sup>ˈ</sup> ~                                                                                                        |                                       |
|     | 8'  | le <sup>ˈ</sup> -e <sup>ˈ</sup> [                                                                                              |                                       |
|     | 9'  | i <sup>ˈ</sup> -e-x[                                                                                                           |                                       |
| §4' | 10' | -----<br><sup>ˈ</sup> Ta-wa-n[a-an-na~                                                                                         |                                       |
|     | 11' | at-ta-aš-š[a~                                                                                                                  |                                       |
|     | 12' | ut-ni-ia-an-d[a~                                                                                                               |                                       |
|     | 13' | ú-ga DUMU.MUNUS-TI [                                                                                                           |                                       |
|     | 14' | da-aḥ-ḥu-un DUMU.MU[NUS-TI <sup>ˈ</sup>                                                                                        |                                       |
|     | 15' | ša-na-aš-ta URUḪa-a[t-tu-š <sup>ˈ</sup> ~                                                                                      |                                       |
|     | 16' | ú-*e*-em-ia na-at-ta x[                                                                                                        |                                       |
|     | 17' | az-zi-ki-i ak-ku-uš-ki-ia URUḪa-a[t-tu-ši-ma <sup>(?)</sup> LUGAL-wa-aš <sup>(?)</sup>                                         |                                       |
|     | 18' | ša-a-ku-wa le-e a-ú-u[t <sup>ˈ</sup> -ti                                                                                       |                                       |
| §5' | 19' | -----<br>ku-i-da DUMU.NITA-na e-ep-p[u-un] x x [                                                                               |                                       |
|     | 20' | a-pa-ša ma-am <sup>ˈ</sup> -m[a <sup>ˈ</sup> -an <sup>(?)</sup>                                                                |                                       |
|     | 21' | iš <sup>ˈ</sup> -ḥa-aḥ-ru-u[š-ši-it <sup>(?)</sup>                                                                             |                                       |
|     |     | (break of probably only a few lines)                                                                                           |                                       |
| §6" | 1"  | [...]x UN <sup>ˈ</sup> x[                                                                                                      | KBo 3.27+KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7+DBH 43.117 |
|     | 2"  | [... ~l]a <sup>ˈ</sup> -an-ta-a-e <sup>ˈ</sup> ŠA <sup>ˈ</sup> ~x x[                                                           |                                       |
|     | 3"  | [t]a ki-*še*-ra-aš-ša-an e-ep-z[i                                                                                              |                                       |
|     | 4"  | [ú-w]a-te-ez-zi ta ú-ez-zi URUḪ[a-at-tu-ša-an <sup>(?)</sup> URU-an <sup>(?)</sup>                                             |                                       |
|     | 5"  | [ta]-mi-u-ma-an i-e-zi ta eš-ḥa-na-aš [URU-an <sup>(?)</sup> i-e-zi <sup>(?)</sup>                                             |                                       |
|     | 6"  | UR <sup>ˈ</sup> -RA-AM ŠE-RA-AM <sup>ˈ</sup> Ta-wa-na-an-na-aš š[UM <sup>ˈ</sup> -šU <sup>ˈ</sup>                              |                                       |
|     | 7"  | le-e ku-iš-ki te-ez-zi šA DUMU <sup>MEŠ</sup> -ŠU [DUMU.DUMU <sup>MEŠ</sup> /DUMU.MUNUS <sup>MEŠ(?)</sup> ]-šU                 |                                       |
|     | 8"  | ŠUM-ŠU-NU le <sup>ˈ</sup> -e ku-iš-ki te-ez-zi ták-ku DUMU <sup>M</sup> [EŠ <sup>ˈ</sup> -an <sup>ˈ</sup> i]š-tar-na ŠUM-ŠU-NU |                                       |
|     |     | ku-iš-ki [te-ez-zi]                                                                                                            |                                       |
|     | 9"  | kap-ru-uš-še-et ḥa-at-ta-an-ta-ru na-an a-aš-k[i-iš-ši]                                                                        |                                       |
|     | 10" | *kán*-kán-du ták <sup>ˈ</sup> ku ÌR <sup>MEŠ</sup> -am-ma-an iš-tar-na ŠUM-š[U-NU]                                             |                                       |
|     | 11" | ku <sup>(QA)</sup> -iš-ki te-ez-zi ÌR-mi-iš le-e kap-ru-u[š-še-et]                                                             |                                       |
|     | 12" | ḥa-at-ta-an-ta-ru na-an a-aš-ki-iš-ši kán-kán-[du]                                                                             |                                       |
| §7" | 13" | -----<br>ka-ša-at-ta-aš-ma-aš mMu-ur-ši-li-in pé-eḥ-ḥu-un [ Ø ]                                                                |                                       |
|     | 14" | [GI]šŠÚ.A A-BI-ŠU a-pa-aš da-a-ú DUMU-mi-ša NU DUMU-aš [ Ø ]                                                                   |                                       |
|     | 15" | [šu]-mi-in <sup>ˈ</sup> -za-na ÌR <sup>MEŠ</sup> -am-ma-an UR.BAR.RA-aš ma-a-an pa-an-g[ur-ša-me-e]t <sup>ˈ</sup>              |                                       |
|     | 16" | 1-EN <sup>ˈ</sup> e-eš-tu nu <sup>ˈ</sup> ku-*i*-e-ša ḥu-ur-ta-li-an-zi [ Ø <sup>ˈ</sup> ]                                     |                                       |
|     | 17" | A-WA-A-AT LUGAL <sup>ˈ</sup> LÚ <sup>MEŠ</sup> ME-ŠE-DI-eš LÚ <sup>MEŠ</sup> pa <sup>(GAD)</sup> -aḥ-ḥur-zi-e-eš               |                                       |
|     | 18" | Ú <sup>(MA)</sup> LÚ <sup>MEŠ</sup> MU-ŠA-A ḥ[u-u]r-ta-li-an-zi ke-e ḥu-u[r-ta-an-ta-ru <sup>(?)</sup>                         |                                       |

## Translation

### Obv. I

§1' 2' [me]n/[so]ns [

§2' (no translation possible)

§3' 6' The king [  
7' do/make [  
8' must not [  
9' do/make [

§4' 10' Tawan[anna  
11' an[d] the father/father's [  
12' the population [  
13' I, however, my daughter [  
14' I took. [My] daugh[ter  
15' and [...] her<sup>(acc.)</sup> Ḫa[ttusa  
16' find! Not [  
17'–18' Eat<sup>(sg.)</sup> and drink<sup>(sg.)</sup>! [In] Ḫat[tusa, though], y[ou shall] not regard the eyes [of the king!]

§5' 19' But as for the son (whom) [I] took, [  
20' That one, however, *even if*  
21' h[is] tears [  
(break of probably only a few lines)

§6" [...] <sup>19</sup> (3") [the]n *she* will take *his* hand [...] <sup>(4"–5")</sup> *she* will [br]ing, and thereafter *she* will make Ḫ[attusa a city] of [an]archy, [*she will make (it) a city*] of blood. <sup>(6"–8")</sup> In the future no one shall speak Tawananna's *n[ame]*! No one shall speak the name(s) of her sons (or) *her* [*grandsons?/daughters?*]! 'If anyone among the prince[s speaks] their name(s), <sup>(9"–12")</sup> they shall slit his throat and they shall hang him a[t his] gate! If anyone among my servants speaks th[eir] name(s), he shall not be my servant! They shall slit [his] throat and they sha[ll] hang him at his gate!

§7" <sup>(13")</sup> I have hereby presented Mursili to you<sup>(pl.)</sup>, <sup>(14")</sup> It is he who shall take the throne of his father. My son, however, is no (longer my) son! <sup>(15"–16")</sup> But your, my servants', clan must be one like the wolf's!  
But they who confound <sup>(17")</sup> the words of the king, (i.e.) the royal bodyguard,

<sup>19</sup> In 2" perhaps '[If? ...] s[EEKS?/at[tempts? ...-l]antae, ...'? See commentary.

- 19" DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL *lu-r*[i<sup>?</sup>-a]h<sup>?</sup>-[h<sub>a</sub>-an-zi<sup>(?)</sup> u]t<sup>?</sup>-tar<sup>?</sup>-ši-it DUMU<sup>(I?)</sup> É.GAL *ku*-[iš]  
 20" *hu-ur-ta-li*-[iz-zi kap-ru-uš-ši-i]t *ha-at-ta-a*[n-ta-ru]  
 21" *na-an a-aš-k*[i-iš-ši kán-ká]n-[du]  
 -----  
 §8" 22" *ma-a-an ud-da-a-a*[r-me-et p]a-a<sub>h</sub>-š[a-te-ni<sup>(?)</sup> nu<sup>?</sup> URU<sup>!</sup> H]a<sup>?</sup>-a[t<sup>?</sup>-tu-ša-a]n<sup>?</sup>  
 23" *ut*<sub>2</sub>-né-em-me-et-t[a pa-a<sub>h</sub>-ša-n]u-ut-te-n[i ma-a-an-ša-an h]a-aš-ši-[i]  
 24" [p]a-a<sub>h</sub>-hu-ur pa-ra-iš-t[e-ni n]a-at-ta-kán<sup>?</sup>(Á) u[d<sup>?</sup>-d]a<sup>?</sup>-a<sub>2</sub>-ar-me-e[t]  
 25" šar<sup>?</sup>-ra-at-tu-ma m[a-a-an]-ša-an ha-aš-ši-<sup>?</sup>i<sup>?</sup> p[a-a<sub>h</sub>-h]u-ur [ Ø ]  
 26" [n]a-at-ta pa-ra-iš-<sup>?</sup>te<sup>?</sup>-ni ta ú-ez-zi<sup>?</sup> UR<sup>?</sup>[<sup>U</sup>H]a-a[t-t]u-ša-an  
 27" <sup>?</sup>MUŠ<sup>?</sup>-aš hu-la-a-li-az-zi  
 -----  
 §9" 28" [L]Ú<sup>?</sup> URU<sup>!</sup> Za-al-pu-u-ma-aš at-ta-<sup>?</sup>aš<sup>?</sup> ut<sup>?</sup>-tar pé-eš-ši-at ka-a a-pa-aš  
 29" [<sup>URU</sup>Z]a-al-pa-aš LÚ<sup>?</sup> URU<sup>!</sup> Ha-aš-šu-<sup>?</sup>u<sup>?</sup>-ma-aš at-ta-aš ut-tar pé-eš-ši-at  
 30" [ka]-<sup>?</sup>a<sup>?</sup>-aš a-pa-aš URU<sup>!</sup> Ha-aš-šu-wa-aš na-aš-ma LÚ<sup>?</sup> URU<sup>!</sup> Hal-pu-u-ma-aš-ša  
 31" [at-t]a-aš ut-tar pé-eš-ši-at URU<sup>!</sup> Hal-pa-aš-ša ha-ra-ak-zi  
 -----  
 -----

## Obv. II

- (probably only a few lines missing)  
 §10" 1' [n]a<sup>?</sup>-<sup>?</sup>at<sup>?</sup> x[ KBo 50.6  
 -----  
 §11" 2' ki-nu-na [L]UGAL<sup>?</sup> DU[MU<sup>?</sup> / [L]UGAL<sup>?</sup>.G[AL<sup>?</sup>  
 3' ku-e zi-ke-e[z-zi  
 -----  
 §12" 4' *ták*<sub>2</sub>-ku DUMU.MUNUS<sup>MEŠ</sup> LUGAL DUMU<sup>ME</sup>[<sup>Š</sup> LUGAL<sup>?</sup>  
 5' [n]e ke-et-ti i-d[a-l<sup>?</sup>~  
 6' [ták]-ki-iš-ši i-da-lu x[  
 7' [ku]-e-da-ni-ik-ka x[  
 8' [k]i-iš-šar-ta ša-ku-i-i[t  
 -----  
 §13" 9' [A]-NA DAM-KA i-da-lu l[e<sup>?</sup>-e<sup>?</sup>  
 10' [h]a-aš-ši-i ha-an-za-aš-ši i<sub>2</sub>-d[a<sup>?</sup>-lu<sup>?</sup>  
 11' [k]u-iš-ki ták-k[i-iš-zi  
 -----  
 §14" 12' [tá]k<sub>2</sub>-ku<sub>2</sub> MUNUS.LUGA[L<sup>?</sup>  
 13' [<sup>LÚ</sup>h]a<sup>?</sup>-pí-aš<sup>?</sup>[  
 14' [ ]x L[I<sup>?</sup>  
 15' [ ]x[  
 (break of probably only a few lines)  
 §15" 1" [ x ] x x x [ KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7  
 2" [ x ] x x-an x x x x [ x x x ] x <sup>?</sup>IŠ<sup>?</sup> x x x x [  
 3" [i]š-ta-ma-aš-ta URU<sup>!</sup> Ha-at-tu-ši ku-u-ru-ur e-e[p-ta<sup>?</sup> ... ]  
 4" [š]a-kán-zi <sup>?</sup>LUGAL<sup>?</sup>-un URU<sup>!</sup> Ha-at-tu-ša-an na-at-ta [ ... ]  
 5" <sup>?</sup>eš<sup>?</sup>-\*ša<sup>?</sup>\*-i URU<sup>!</sup> Pu-ru-uš-ha-an-du-um-na-an da-a-er ke-e[š<sup>?</sup>-ri-mi-an<sup>(?)</sup> da-i-er<sup>(?)</sup>]  
 6" ke-e-da-am-mu a-pa-a-aš i-ez-zi šu-mu DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup> DUMU URU<sup>!</sup> Pu-r[u-uš-ha-an-d<sup>?</sup>...]  
 7" ki-iš-ri-mi da-i-er LUGAL-uš A-NA DAM-ŠU ne-ga-aš-š[a<sup>?</sup>-a]š-ša [ Ø ]  
 8" i-it-te-en az-zi-ket<sub>9</sub>-te-en ak-ku-uš-ket<sub>9</sub>-te-en LUGAL-wa-ša x<sup>?</sup>[ Ø ]  
 9" ša-a-<sup>?</sup>ku<sup>?</sup>-wa-me-et le-e uš-te-ni  
 -----

those not in the line of succession <sup>(18")</sup>or! the *m.-men*<sup>20</sup> confound (them), these [*shall be* *acc[ursed]*! <sup>(19"–20")</sup>They *dis[grace]* the courtiers! The courtier *wh[o]* confound[s] his [w]ord, [they shall] slit [hi]s [throat] <sup>(21")</sup>and [they shall hang] him [at his] gate!

§8" <sup>(22"–27")</sup>If [you<sup>(pl.)</sup> p]reser[ve my] words, [then] you<sup>(pl.)</sup> will [preserve *Ḫa[ttusa]*<sup>(?)</sup> and] my land. [If] y[ou<sup>(pl.)</sup>] fan the [f]lames in the [h]earth, you<sup>(pl.)</sup> will not transgress my [wo]rds. I[f] you<sup>(pl.)</sup> do not fan the f[lam]es in the hearth, then eventually a/the snake will strangle [Ḫa]t[t]usa!

§9" <sup>(28")</sup>The Zalpaeon [ru]ler spurned the word of the father: Here (is) he <sup>(29")</sup>of [Z]alpa! The Ḫassuan ruler spurned the word of the father: <sup>(30")</sup>[Th]is (is) he of Ḫassu! *Also* the Ḫalabeon ruler <sup>(31")</sup>spurned the word of the [fath]er: Ḫalab, too, will perish! (probably only a few lines missing)

## Obv. II

§10" 1' [an]d they/it [

§11" 2' Now, though, *the king* ... [  
3' those whom/which [s/he] places/undertakes [

§12" 4' If the daughters of the king, the sons [*of the king*<sup>(?)</sup>  
5' [an]d they [...] ev[il] *for this one* [  
6' you<sup>(sg.)</sup> [con]coct, evil [  
7' to/for [wh]om/[wh]atever [  
8' with the/(his/her) hand, with the eye [

§13" 9' [...] *shall n[ot] ...* evil [ag]ainst your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife [  
10' ev[il] against grandchildren, great grandchildren [  
11' whoever conco[cts]

§14" 12' [I]f the *quee[n*  
13' [a *ḫapiya*-cult official [  
(break of probably only a few lines)

§15" [...] <sup>(3")</sup>he heard. In/Against Ḫattusa [*he*] *beg[an]* hostility. [...] <sup>(4"–5")</sup>they [re]cognize/will [re]cognize. The king<sup>(acc.)</sup> (and?) Ḫattusa<sup>(acc.)</sup> *he will not make/treat* [...].<sup>21</sup> They took the Purušhandean (and) [*they placed him in my*] *ha[nd]*. <sup>(6"–7")</sup>*This is how* the guy behaves toward me! (So) the gods placed the prince *of* Pur[ušanda] in my hand. (I), the king, (said) to his wife and his(/her) sist[er]s: <sup>(8"–9")</sup>Go! Eat! Drink! But you<sup>(pl.)</sup> shall not see my, the king's, eyes!

<sup>20</sup> Perhaps 'night watchmen'. See commentary.

<sup>21</sup> Perhaps rather, 'They will [re]cognize [*him*], (as) king<sup>(acc.)</sup>! (But) Ḫattusa<sup>(acc.)</sup> he will not treat [*well*]!' See commentary.

- §16” 10” *ki-nu-na ma-a-an DUMU-aš A-NA SAG.DU LUGAL ú-wa-aš-ta-i ku-it-ki*  
*a-pa-ša<sup>(SI?)</sup>-an* <sub>A</sub> <sub>1</sub> <sub>7</sub> <sup>[NA<sup>(?)</sup> d<sub>1</sub><sub>7</sub>-ia<sup>(?)</sup>]</sup>  
 11” *[ħa]l-za-a-i na-aš pa-it-tu<sup>9</sup> ma-a-na-aš pár-ku-eš-zi nu ša-a-ku-wa-at-te-et ú-uš-[ket<sub>9</sub>-tu]*  
 12” *[t]ák-ku* <sub>1</sub> <sub>7</sub> <sup>[a-m]a mi-im-ma-i na-⟨aš⟩</sup> *é-ši-pát e-eš-tu ge-en-zu-wa-<sup>9</sup>i<sup>9</sup>-[š<sup>9</sup>i<sup>9</sup> ma-a-an<sup>(?)</sup>]*  
 13” *na-an ka-pu-u-e-ši na-an ka-pu-u-i ták-ku na-at-ta-ma ka-pu-u-e-ši*  
 14” *na-aš é-iš-ši-pát e-eš-tu* <sub>A-NA</sub> <sub>É</sub> <sub>EN</sub> <sub>NU</sub> <sub>UN</sub> *le-e da-it-ti*  
 15” *i-da-lu-ma-an le-e i-ia-ši ħé-en-kán-še le-e ták-ki-iš-ši uš-<sup>9</sup>ša<sup>9</sup>-n[i<sup>9</sup>-ia-ši-an<sup>(?)</sup>]*  
 16” *le-e ne-pí-ši* <sub>DINGIR</sub> <sup>DIDL<sub>1</sub></sup> *iš-tar-ni-ik-ši ták-na-a-ma mi-e-nu-uš iš-tar-ni-i[k<sup>9</sup>-š<sup>9</sup>i<sup>(?)</sup>]*

- §17” 17” *at-ta-aš-ma-aš ħar-ša-ni-i* <sub>1</sub> <sub>7</sub> <sup>ia</sup> *me-ek-ke-eš pa-ap-re-eš-ker šu-uš* <sub>A-BI</sub> <sub>LUGAL</sub>  
 18” *na-at-ta ħu-iš-nu-uš-ke-e-et* <sup>m</sup> *Ki-iz-zu-wa-aš-pát* <sub>A-NA</sub> <sub>SAG</sub> <sub>DU</sub> <sup>A-BI-<sup>9</sup>IA<sup>9</sup></sup> <sub>1</sub> <sub>7</sub> <sup>ia</sup>  
 19” *pa-ap-ri-it-ta ša-an at-ta-aš-<sup>9</sup>mi-iš<sup>9</sup>* <sup>m</sup> *Ki-iz-zu-wa-an na-at-⟨ta⟩ ħu-<sup>9</sup>iš<sup>9</sup>-nu-ú-ut*

- §18” 20” *ki-nu-na* <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sub>uš</sub> *i-da-lu me-<sup>9</sup>ek<sup>9</sup>-ki u-uh-ħu-un ta* <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sub>wa-⟨aš⟩</sub> *ud-da-a-ar-ra-me-et*  
 21” *le-e šar-ra-at-tu-ma a-ši* <sub>MUNUS</sub> <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sup>URU</sup> <sub>HU</sub> <sub>RU</sub> <sub>MA</sub> <sup>\*É\*</sup> <sub>GI</sub> <sub>4</sub> <sub>A</sub>  
 22” *e-eš-ta ad-da-aš-mi-ša-aš-še ke-e-da-ni a-ra i-ia-an ħar-ta*

- §19” 23” *[na<sup>9</sup>-aš<sup>9</sup>]-<sub>1</sub> <sub>7</sub> <sup>ta<sup>9</sup></sup> <sub>MUNUS</sub> <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sub>aš</sub> <sub>DUMU</sub> <sub>MUNUS</sub> <sub>É</sub> <sub>Ti</sub> *ku-wa-ta-an pé-ta-at-te-ni n[u<sup>9</sup> le-e<sup>(?)</sup>]*  
 24” *[ú<sup>9</sup>-w]a-<sup>9</sup>at-te<sup>9</sup>-ni ku-in* <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sub>uš</sub> <sup>GIŠ</sup> <sub>ŠU</sub> <sub>A</sub> <sub>mi</sub> *a-ša-aš-ħé* <sub>MUNUS</sub> <sub>LUGAL</sub> <sub>[- ... ]</sub>  
 25” *nu ma-ni-ia-aħ-ħi-<sup>9</sup>iš<sup>9</sup>-\*ke<sup>9</sup>-et-{E}-tu\** <sup>m</sup> *Ga-ri-ia-an~\*še<sup>9</sup>\*~x[ ... ]*  
 26” <sub>ANŠE</sub> <sub>GÌR</sub> <sub>NUN</sub> <sub>NA</sub> <sup>HI.A</sup> *ar<sup>9</sup>-ma-na-an-te-eš a-ša-an-du [ ... ]*  
 27” *a-ra e-eš-tu* <sub>LÚ</sub> <sup>MEŠ</sup> <sub>GIŠ</sub> <sub>GIDRU</sub> <sub>LÚ</sub> <sup>MEŠ</sup> *pa<sup>9</sup>!* <sub>(DUR)</sub> <sub>aħ</sub> <sub>ħur</sub> <sub>zi</sub> <sub>eš</sub> <sub>š</sub> <sub>[a ... ]</sub>*

- §20” 28” *nu-uz-za* <sub>URU</sub> <sup>DIDL<sub>1</sub></sup> <sub>ŠU</sub> *ħu-wa-iš-ket<sub>9</sub>-tu [*  
 29” *UDU,“SÍG+MUNUS”* <sup>HI.A</sup> <sub>ŠA</sub> <sup>\*KÙ</sup> <sub>BABBAR</sub> <sub>ŠA</sub> <sub>KÙ</sub> <sub>G</sub> <sub>[I<sup>9</sup>!\*  
 30” *le-e ku-iš-ki ša-li-[ga*  
 31” *le-e ku-iš-ki ħu-u[r-ta-li-iz-zi<sup>(?)</sup>/ħu-u[r-d/ta-i<sup>(?)</sup>]*  
 32” *i-iš-ša-i nu-uš-še [*  
 33” *a-ap-pa-li-iš-še<sup>9</sup>(BU)-et ku-w[a<sup>9</sup>-*  
 34” *ku-e-da-ni-ik-ka ta-i[t-ta<sup>9</sup>/ti<sup>9</sup>]*  
 35” *na-aš-šu-ma na-ak-ki-ta [*  
 36” *[nu<sup>9</sup> n]a<sup>9</sup>-[a]š<sup>9</sup>-š<sup>9</sup>u<sup>9</sup> ša<sup>9</sup>-ku-i-it x[*</sub>

Rev. III

KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7

1 ]x <sub>1</sub> <sub>KU<sup>9</sup></sub> x[

...

1’ ]-š<sup>9</sup>i/-Li

- §16” <sup>(10”–11”)</sup>Now, though, if a prince transgresses against the person of the king somehow, (and) he (the king) [c]ites *him t[o the divine river (ordeal)]*, then he (the offender) must go. If he is shown to be innocent, then [he shall contin]ue to see your<sup>(sg.)</sup> eyes (i.e. remain at the royal court). <sup>(12”)</sup>[I]f, however, he refuses (to undergo) the divine river (ordeal), then <he> shall remain (lit. be) in his own house (i.e. placed under house arrest). [If you<sup>(sg.)</sup> are] lenient, <sup>(13”)</sup>and you<sup>(sg.)</sup> *can keep tabs on* him, then *keep tabs on* him. If, however, you<sup>(sg.)</sup> cannot *keep tabs on* (him), <sup>(14”)</sup>then he shall remain in his own house. You<sup>(sg.)</sup> shall not put (him) in prison, <sup>(15”–16”)</sup>neither shall you<sup>(sg.)</sup> do him evil. You<sup>(sg.)</sup> shall not seek death for him. [You<sup>(sg.)</sup>] shall not *sel[l him]* (into slavery). (Otherwise), in heaven you<sup>(sg.)</sup> will aggrrieve the gods, while on earth [you<sup>(sg.)</sup> will] *aggrrieve* the *mienu*-(beings).
- §17” <sup>(17”–19”)</sup>Many proved guilty before the person of my father (in) the divine river (ordeal). But did the father of the king not let them live? Kizzuwa, for one, proved guilty before the person of my father (in) the divine river (ordeal). But did my father not let him, Kizzuwa, live?
- §18” <sup>(20”–22”)</sup>But now I, the king, have seen much evil, so do not transgress<sup>(pl.)</sup> my, the king’s, words, too! That queen of Ḫuruma *was a bride*.<sup>22</sup> My father, though, had acted justly in this (affair) toward her (saying):
- §19” <sup>(23”–24”)</sup>To whatever house you<sup>(pl.)</sup> bring the daughter of the queen, you<sup>(pl.)</sup> [*shall not co]me*. He whom I, the king, place on my throne, the queen [...] <sup>23</sup> <sup>(25”)</sup>and *he* shall govern. *Gari(ya)* [...] <sup>(26”)</sup>mules shall be *ill*. [...] <sup>(27”)</sup>shall be just. The scepter bearers a[nd] those not in the line of succession [...].
- §20” 28” And his/her cities shall run/escape/function/spread [  
 29” the ewes of silver (and) of go[ld]  
 30” no one shall approa[ch]  
 31” no one shall *con[found/cu[rse]*  
 32” s/he does/makes, and to/for him/her [  
 33” his/her trap [  
 34” [you] *pla[ce]/pla[ced]* to/for whomever/whatever [  
 35” or else important [  
 36” [*and eit]her* with the eyes [  
 ]

Rev. III

(No translation possible.)

<sup>22</sup> Perhaps to be emended to ‘That queen of/from Ḫuruma remained (in) her estate.’ See commentary.

<sup>23</sup> Presumably something along the lines of ‘the queen [shall recognize him]’ is to be understood here; see commentary.

## Philological Commentary

### *Obv. I*

#### *KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275*

KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275 clearly show, in my view, the same hand as KBo 3.27. (Comparison with KBo 50.6(+KBo 50.7+KBo 3.28 is more difficult due to the differing condition of their surfaces.) As far as the available photos allow one to judge, other details, such as the shape of the left edge and the lightly impressed paragraph dividers, support the assumption that KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275 belong to this tablet. It does, of course, remain an assumption. Carruba argued against KBo 3.24 belonging to CTH 5 (i.e. KBo 3.27), ‘da die Rückseite, soweit erhalten, leer ist: weil sie sprachlich älter sein dürfte (enthält Z. 15 *s-an-asta*); und schließlich nach Kollation H.G. Güterbock’.<sup>24</sup> Carruba added, ‘Stimmt die Angabe Forrers Vs. für beide Texte und stand 10α (Rs. leer) vor 10β (Rs. nicht erhalten; Doppelstrich als Ende), so könnte die Tafel kaum nur auf der Vs. beschrieben worden sein.’<sup>25</sup> If I am not mistaken, however, Carruba’s considerations concerning the obv. and the rev. are simply confused. There are numerous tablets that show a significant amount of blank space in rev. iv or are even mostly or completely blank in rev. iv (or vi), such as the NH copy of the Annals of Hattusili I (KBo 10.2), to name just one example; thus, the likelihood<sup>26</sup> that the rev. of KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275 will have been uninscribed, i.e. that this tablet’s rev. iv may have been at least largely uninscribed, constitutes no argument for or against its belonging to KBo 3.27+.<sup>27</sup> (Again, collation of KBo 3.24 might allow one to ascertain, based on the shape of the edge, whether the fragment belongs to the upper or to the lower part of a tablet.) Also Carruba’s assertion concerning the linguistic dating of the two fragments can be dismissed: Both are clearly NH copies of OH documents, and the existence of the conjunction *s(u)-* or the particle *-asta* certainly does not demonstrate an earlier date for KBo 3.24 *vis-à-vis* the archaic forms in KBo 3.27, even apart from the fact that the new joins yield the conjunction *s(u)-*, in ii 6”, 17” and 19”. Concerning Güterbock’s collation, cf. above and n. 10.

Ca. 8 lines are missing between the traces in line 1’ and the top of the fragment. As portions of 52 lines are preserved in KBo 3.24(+KBo 3.27 (traces of 51 lines are preserved in KBo 50.6(+KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7), and since at least some few lines are presumably lost between these two fragments, it is unlikely that a great many more than these ca. 8 lines preceded line 1’ of KBo 3.24. Examination of the shape of the edge of KBo 3.24 might give one a better idea of how much of the top of the column is missing.

3’: While the copy (KBo 3.24) might suggest <sup>m</sup>A[r- or <sup>m</sup>Š[i-, one sees even here that the vertical is set further to the right than one would expect, and the copyist has indicated some damage before the vertical. Examination of the photos suggests that perhaps some now largely abraded horizontals might have filled the space between the vertical and the edge, so that ‘*ku-*’ suggests itself; thereafter perhaps *-w[a-*.

<sup>24</sup> Carruba 1992, 81.

<sup>25</sup> Carruba 1992, 81 n. 19.

<sup>26</sup> The remark in the edition, KBo 3.24, quoted above, does not indicate how much of the rev. is preserved or where exactly the preserved part is located, leaving uncertain how much and what portion of the rev. of KBo 3.24 is uninscribed. According to Forrer’s remark to his BoTU 2.10α (= KBo 3.24), it seems that enough uninscribed surface is preserved to ensure that at least roughly half of the rev. of KBo 3.24 was indeed originally uninscribed: ‘Von der Spalte IV (Rückseite) ist nur ein Rest der linken Randleiste(!) & schriftfreier Raum von etwa 13 Zeilen erhalten.’

<sup>27</sup> Neither does its rev. iv possibly being largely uninscribed suggest that the tablet would have been inscribed ‘nur auf der Vs.’ (Carruba 1992, 81, n. 19), as there is no reason to assume that its rev. iii would have been uninscribed. But again, I assume that Carruba was simply confused on this point, and would not have maintained such a claim if asked.

6': Presumably either an OH gen. (whether sg. or pl.)<sup>28</sup> or a short form of the dat.-loc. from *ḥassueznatar*, i.e. *ḥassueznanni*.

7': While the copy would seem to suggest rather *e-eš-š[i~]*, examination of the photos suggests perhaps *e-eš-k[e-]*, which is indeed how Forrer (2 BoTU) read the traces. Thus maybe a *-ske*-form of either *ēs-* or *iya/e-*.

11': *attas* presumably nom. or gen. sg., while gen. or dat.-loc. pl. are also theoretically possible. The *-š[a]* can of course be geminating 'and; also' or the beginning of a number of enclitic possessive personal pronouns. Given what few clues remain regarding the paragraph's context, perhaps *at-ta-aš-š[a-aš]*, 'of his/her father', would be the most likely restoration and translation. The father would perhaps be that of Tawannanna in 10' or, since her father is not often the topic of discussion in OH historical texts, maybe the father of the daughter mentioned in 13' and 14', i.e. Ḫattusili himself.

17': Pointing to the parallel construction in ii 8"–9", Soysal suggests the plausible restoration, <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-a[t-tu-ši-ma<sup>(?)</sup> LUGAL-wa-aš<sup>(?)</sup>]*, yielding, '[But in] the city of Ḫat[tusa] yo[u shall] not regard the eyes [of the king]!' <sup>29</sup>

18': As Soysal notes,<sup>30</sup> examination of the photos available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv – in fact, both the old black and white photo B 8311 and the colour photo that I took in the summer of 2005 (Phb 11114c) – suggests that the *-u[t-* is partially preserved. Indeed, while preparing KBo 53.275 for publication I initially drew these traces as such based on the photo B 08311, but upon collating the original in Ankara decided, rightly or wrongly, that what had seemed like the remains of an *-u[t-* based on the photos were in fact only scratches.

19': The translation and analysis follow Goedegebuure, who notes that this would seem to be the only example of clause initial *kuid=a* (which she identifies as marking left-dislocated contrastive topics) in a verbal clause, raising the question whether *kuid=a* holds scope over the entire clause or solely over the NP.<sup>31</sup> Prior to seeing her paper I had translated 'But since I took a son, too, [...]', taking *ku-i-da* (*kuit=a*) as causal *kuit* with topicalizing *-ma/-a*;<sup>32</sup> and further, *DUMU.NITA-na* as an acc. sg. with the particle *-ia/-a*, 'and', here without the overt gemination expected with phonetically written words, as is sometimes attested with logograms in OH texts.<sup>33</sup>

*KBo 3.27+KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7+DBH 43.117*

1"–5": My translation tentatively assumes that the subject of these initial lines would also have been Tawannanna, though she is first mentioned unambiguously in line 6". Cf. e.g. Haas, who either assumes some other subject in 1"–5" or does not consider the issue: 'Und es wird geschehen, daß er Ha[tusa] zu einer [and]eren (d. h. zu einer veränderten Stadt) machen wird. Dann werden die Bluttaten [zahlreich werden]!' <sup>34</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Cf. GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §3.27 and 141 n. 143, and Goedegebuure 2019, who argue for pl. only, vs. Kloekhorst 2017.

<sup>29</sup> Soysal 2006a, 15.

<sup>30</sup> Soysal 2006a, 15 n. c.

<sup>31</sup> Goedegebuure *in press*. I also wish to thank Petra Goedegebuure for patiently discussing this matter with me in a series of emails.

<sup>32</sup> According to GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §30.63, causal *kuit* is found only beginning with MH texts, so that such an interpretation would assume the influence of the copying NH scribe; neither, of course, should causal *kuit* appear in clause initial position.

<sup>33</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §29.25.

<sup>34</sup> Haas 2006, 65.

2”: (1) The traces have generally been read [... *l*a-an-ta-a-*e*-eš-ša’ [...],<sup>35</sup> or similarly,<sup>36</sup> for which no interpretation has been given. The copy in KBo 3.27 does show three clear tails of wedges suggesting the eš-, but I see no traces of such on either of the photos available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv.<sup>37</sup> Thus, pending collation, I have not included them in the transliteration. The traces following the -ta-a- could be either an -un or, perhaps more likely, an -e, as this scribe’s UN always includes the inset vertical (i 1”?, 13”, ii 14”, 20”). I find nothing searching in my files for -d/ta-a-un, but there is a *l*x-la-an-da-a-e-ma le-e ša-aḫ-te-[ni in the OH/OS fragment KBo 16.45 obv. 6. Here the *l*x-la-an-da-a-e-ma seems to be something negative that one should not seek or attempt. So here in 2” perhaps ‘[If someone] se[leks/att[empt]s ...-l]antae, ...’ Unfortunately, I find nothing in the dictionaries that I am able to connect with -land/tae. Neither do the faint traces following the ŠA allow one to confidently confirm or reject any suggestion of ‘ša-aḫ-z[i or the like, though the possibility is tempting.<sup>38</sup> (2) Forlanini’s reading *l*ḫ-an at the beginning of the line<sup>39</sup> would be a possibility considering these traces in isolation; they would, however, hardly fit with the following context, as there is no further suggestion of a river ordeal in this paragraph, and there would seem to be no reason to connect it with the mention of a river ordeal in ii 10”–19”.

3”: (1) Space is insufficient for Steiner’s *[nu-u]š*.<sup>40</sup> (2) As has often been noted, the -še- is written over two horizontals, so that the scribe may well have (originally) intended the expected *ki-iš-še-ra-aš-ša-an*, but for some reason ended up writing the non-geminate form. This would have been worth noting in the list of unexpected non-geminate writings in GrHL.<sup>41</sup>

4”–5”: Similarly HW<sup>2</sup>,<sup>42</sup> but without URU-an at the end of 4”, followed, e.g. by Dardano.<sup>43</sup>

5”: (1) On *tamiuman* see most recently Marazzi’s considerations,<sup>44</sup> and cf. the further attestation in Bo 6109, 4’.<sup>45</sup> (2) Bin-Nun suggested *ta eš-ḫa-na-aš* [*ud-da-a-ar pa-an-ga-ri-ḫa-an-ta-ri*], ‘and bloody [deeds will become numerous]’, on the basis of parallels in KBo 3.1++ ii 31, 47 and KUB 11.1+ iv 19 (Telipinu Edict).<sup>46</sup> Such a restoration would have bled significantly into the column divider, which, of course, would have been no reason to exclude it entirely at the time of Bin-Nun’s writing, but Burgin’s recent join with DBH 43.117 shows that nothing bled into the column divider from l. 5”. Cf., similarly, Carruba’s suggestion, where no restoration is found in the transliteration, only in the translation: ‘... und die Blut[(taten) werden zahlreich? werden.]’<sup>47</sup> Steiner’s [*ud-da-a-ar e-eš-ša-i*] for the end of the line<sup>48</sup> is also worth considering, though the attestations in HW<sup>2</sup>,<sup>49</sup> to which he refers, would rather suggest the verb *iya-* as opposed to *essa-*.

6”: There are in fact traces as the line breaks off that are not rendered in the copy. They might fit a ŠUM, but do not seem unequivocally to be a ŠUM, if one compares with the clear ŠUM at the

<sup>35</sup> E.g. already by Forrer in BoTU and most recently Gilan 2015, 100.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. de Martino 1991, 55.

<sup>37</sup> It must be admitted, though, that the lower tails of several of the wedges in the rest of Bo 2423 can be rather difficult to see on the two photos available in the *Konkordanz*.

<sup>38</sup> An anonymous reviewer was rather more sanguine about the possibility, writing regarding reading ‘ša-aḫ-z[i, ‘... this actually looks really good ... based on the photos’; and that if ‘you (have)-landae=ma ša(n)ḫ- in another OH text, you should go ahead and make the restoration here’.

<sup>39</sup> Forlanini 2010, 124 n. 49.

<sup>40</sup> Steiner 1996, 609.

<sup>41</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 16 n. 21.

<sup>42</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> E, 119b.

<sup>43</sup> Dardano 2002, 348.

<sup>44</sup> Marazzi 2014.

<sup>45</sup> Soysal 2021.

<sup>46</sup> Bin-Nun 1975, 112.

<sup>47</sup> Carruba 1992, 77–78.

<sup>48</sup> Steiner 1996, 609.

<sup>49</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> E, 119b.

beginning of 8”. Collation might be helpful in this case.<sup>50</sup> One might also consider  $\$[UM^2-an^2]$ ,<sup>51</sup> since the PN Tawannanna is spelled phonetically in the gen. and is thus not preceded by  $\$A$ , as are  $DUMU^{ME\check{S}}-\check{S}U$  (and  $[DUMU.DUMU^{ME\check{S}}/DUMU.MUNUS^{ME\check{S}(?) }]-\check{S}U$ ) in 7” and preceding  $\check{S}UM-\check{S}U-NU$  at the beginning of 8”.

7”: Of course, there are a number of conceivable restorations for the gap, the  $-\check{S}U$  now being assured by Burgin’s join with DBH 43.117. Pringle, e.g., signalled this fact with ‘Of her children [and grandchildren (or sons [and daughters?])]<sup>(sic)</sup> ...’;<sup>52</sup> Goedegebuure has  $\$A DUMU.ME\check{S}-\check{S}U [DUMU.DUMU.ME\check{S}-\check{S}U] / \check{S}UM-\check{S}U-NU le-e ku-i\check{s}-ki te-ez-zi$  ‘let no one mention the names of her children [and grandchildren].’<sup>53</sup> Freu opts for ‘les noms de ses fils ou de ses files’,<sup>54</sup> unfortunately without brackets, question marks, etc.

8”: Burgin’s recent join with DBH 43.117 renders moot nearly all of the previous discussion of what should be restored.<sup>55</sup> With the  $-an$  of  $DUMU^M[^{E\check{S}}-an$  I have assumed an OH gen. pl., based on the assumption that  $^{\check{r}}IR^{ME\check{S}}-am-ma-an$  in 10” is more likely to be the assimilated form of a gen. pl.  $^{\check{r}}IR^{ME\check{S}}-an=man$  than of a gen. pl.  $^{\check{r}}IR^{ME\check{S}}-as=man$ .<sup>56</sup> One might further consider whether one might want to restore following *tezzi* something akin to what is found (or was intended) in KBo 3.45+ obv. 14’ or the  $^{\check{r}}IR-mi-i\check{s} le-e$  here in 11”, i.e.  $DUMU-a\check{s}-mi-i\check{s} le-e$ : ‘If anyone among the prince[s speaks] their name(s), [he shall not be my son!] They shall slit his throat and they shall hang him a[t his] gate!’

11”: (1) In the copy (KBo 3.27) the line begins with a clear, undamaged KU, but on both photos I can see only a seemingly unadulterated QA. Collation of the original might clarify the matter. (2) In the copy, KBo 3.28, traces are seen in the column divider to the left of *i-da-lu-ma-an* of line 15” of obv. ii that look like one or two wedges and that would probably align with the end of line 11” of obv. i here. I am unable to see any hint of these traces on the photos and thus have not included them in the transliteration, pending collation. If they are indeed confirmed, perhaps *kap-ru-u[š-še-et-pá]t* would be the most likely reading.

8”–12”: Soysal and Alparslan noted that UBT 34, 1’–5’ duplicate lines 8”–12” here,<sup>57</sup> and James Burgin has recently joined UBT 34 to KBo 3.45. I suspect that KBo 3.45+ has nothing to do with *Ḫantili*, as is often assumed, but is rather more closely related to our present text. The *damnatio* in KBo 3.45+, 12’–17’ is thus presumably directed against Tawannanna and her seed, not against Mursili.<sup>58</sup> These matters, as well as whether KBo 3.45+ represents a further composition of Mursili or whether it might belong to the present text, or perhaps even to the rev.<sup>?</sup> of KBo 3.27++, will have to be examined in future studies and by collation.

<sup>50</sup> Bin-Nun 1975, 52 n. 7 writes, ‘much more than only  $\check{S}UM.\check{S}U$  must be missing after *ta-wa-na-an-na-aš* because of the space. Perhaps her husband was mentioned in the broken part.’ While something further might have followed  $\$[UM^2-\check{S}U^2]$ , one can hardly reasonably claim that ‘much more ... must be missing ... because of the space’, as even in this tablet and this column, space in any given line is not always filled completely. (Not to mention the fact that before the discovery of the joins one had little or no indication of the width of the column.)

<sup>51</sup> Or even  $l[a-ma-an]$  or  $l[a-ma-an-še-et]$ , depending on collation, though based on the photos  $l[a-$  seems perhaps less likely than  $\$[UM-$ .

<sup>52</sup> Pringle 1993, 29.

<sup>53</sup> Goedegebuure 2012, 431 and n. 72.

<sup>54</sup> Freu 2007, 67.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. e.g. Carruba 1992, 79; Steiner 1996, 609–610; Goedegebuure 2012, 431 and n. 72; Freu 2007, 67; Forlanini 2017b, 134; Gilan 2015, 100; de Martino 1991, 55; Bin-Nun 1972, 74.

<sup>56</sup> So e.g. GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §1.129.

<sup>57</sup> Soysal 2005, 144; Alparslan 2016, 115.

<sup>58</sup> Thus lines 12’–13’, rather than referring to the death of Mursili, presumably originally had *Ḫattusili* speaking, ‘Mursi[li is now my son]; whoever speaks [Tawannanna]’s name ...’, or similar.

13”: For *ka/āsatta* and related as deictic particles, see Rieken’s recent contribution,<sup>59</sup> followed by Steitler and Melchert.<sup>60</sup> I doubt whether Marazzi’s<sup>61</sup> use of this example in an attempt to restore the temporal to Rieken’s deictic analysis succeeds. (Whether his other cases do so must await renewed examination.) Steiner’s *ka-ša at-ta-aš-ma-aš*<sup>62</sup> must be rejected, as *kāsa* is always spelled *plene*; neither does the lack of space between the *-ša* and the *at-* support his reading, though admittedly spacing between words on this tablet is minimal.

15”–16”: Though all commentators agree on the basic import of this line, i.e. that the royal family should be united, they diverge on a number of details. Syntactically there seem to be two possibilities, i.e. seeing nom. *pang[ur=sme]t* as congruent with *[su]minzan=a*<sup>63</sup> and *ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-amman* (< *ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-a(n)=man*), yielding the translation ‘But your, my servants’, *cl[an]* shall be one like the wolf (pack)’; or taking gen. *pang[awa]s* as congruent with gen. *ur.BAR.RA-aš*, thus ‘But your, my servants’, (clan) must be one like the wolf *pa[ck]!*. The joins should help solve the dilemma, as it can now be seen that the trace in the column divider just before line 19” of obv. ii in fact represents the last portion of, presumably, either *-e]t* or *a]š* at the end of 15” here in obv. i, i.e. either *pa-an-g[ur-ša-me-e]t*<sup>64</sup> or *pa-an-g[a-u-wa-a]š*<sup>65</sup>. In the copy (KBo 3.28) the traces seem to indicate the head of a vertical, and indeed this is the impression one gets from the one photo available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv (B 545c). The other photo (BoFN 6608), however, seems to suggest rather an *-a]š*.<sup>65</sup> Pending collation I will assume *pa-an-g[ur-ša-me-e]t*. I do so grudgingly, however, since for this interpretation, i.e. a so-called split genitive usually, but not always, expressing inalienable possession,<sup>66</sup> one would have preferred to have found *pangur=smet* directly following *[su]minzan=a* and *ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-amman*,<sup>67</sup> not separated from these elements by *ur.BAR.RA-aš ma-a-an*. (That said, the alternative interpretation faces the similarly discomfiting difficulty of having *ur.BAR.RA-aš* separated from *pa-an-g[a-u-wa-a]š* by *mān*.) Indeed, this is presumably what has led some to see *pangur* as relating to *ur.BAR.RA-aš* instead of *[su]minzan=a* and *ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-amman*, e.g. Puhvel’s *[su]minzan-a ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-amman ur.BAR.RA-as mān pangur[r] 1-EN ēstu*, ‘let your, my subjects’ (family), like a wolf’s family, be united!’<sup>68</sup> For variants of the assumption of congruence between *[su]minzan=a* and *ir<sup>MEŠ</sup>-amman* with *pangur*, cf. ‘May the *p.* of [y]ou, my servants, be unified like (the *pankur* = pack?) of a wolf’;<sup>69</sup> ‘But let your clan, my subjects, be one like the wolf’s’;<sup>70</sup> *[su]minzan=a ARAD<sup>MEŠ</sup>-am=man ur.BAR.RA-as mān panku[r]=semet] 1<sup>EN</sup> ēstu* ‘Und [eure] Sippe, die meiner Diener (\*-an=man), sei Eins, wie die des Wolfs.’<sup>71</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Rieken 2009, 270–271.

<sup>60</sup> Steitler 2019; GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §17.50; cf. e.g. HW<sup>2</sup> A, 543b: ‘Siehe, ich habe dich, M., ihnen gegeben; er soll den Thron seines Vaters bekommen’; HEG W, 546.

<sup>61</sup> Marazzi 2011 [2015], 64.

<sup>62</sup> Steiner 1996, 593.

<sup>63</sup> For *[su]minzan=a* instead of *[am]minzan=a*, see GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 190 n. 11, with refs.

<sup>64</sup> Gilan 2017, 35 n. 22 has simply *pa-an-g[u-ur]* (cf. his preferable *pa-an-g[ur-ša-me-et]* in Gilan 2015, 101), but *g[u-* is impossible, as there are two clear horizontals at the break.

<sup>65</sup> How much space might be available cannot play any significant role in the debate at present, as the precise spatial relationship between the fragments Bo 2423 and Bo 2556 cannot be determined without collation.

<sup>66</sup> Garrett 1998; GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§16.31–33.

<sup>67</sup> Craig Melchert (email of 15 November 2022) agrees, suggesting that ‘like the wolf’s’ will have been topicalized, while ‘your, my servants’ will have been placed in contrastive focus.

<sup>68</sup> HED M, 40; but cf. HED H, 353, ‘let my subjects, like a wolf’s family, be united!’; and Puhvel 2009, 59; 1986, 55.

<sup>69</sup> CHD P, 93a.

<sup>70</sup> CHD L-N, 145a.

<sup>71</sup> HEG W, 546; cf. also Pringle 2010, 197; Melchert 1983, 9 n. 23; Carruba 1992, 78–79; Marazzi 2013, 76; Starke 1996, 176 n. 151; Beckman 1986b, 23; Beal – Collins 1996, 309; Laroche 1965, 35.

16”–20”: The translation essentially mirrors Gilan’s,<sup>72</sup> which closely follows Carruba’s:<sup>73</sup> ‘Denn welche auch immer sich dem Königswort widersetzen werden – (ob) sich die MEŠEDI-Leute, die Nebensöhne (oder) etwa die MUŠA-A-Leute<sup>(sic)</sup> widersetzen – werden diese [ver]fluch[t sein?]. Die Palastleute sch[änden?] sein Wort.’

16”: The unexpected *nu kuies=a* here can be added, it seems, to the short list of attestations in the CHD<sup>74</sup> of *nu* and *=(m)a* found in the same sentence but not indicating double questions. Whether this might be a further case of our NH scribe having trouble with whatever he might have found in his OH *Vorlage* is, of course, another question.

17”: With the *plene* writing of *A-WA-A-AT* – otherwise found only in OH/OS KBo 22.1, 4’, 31 – the scribe presumably wanted to express a plural; cf. pl. *ud-da-a-ar-* in i 22” and ii 20”.

18”: (1) At the beginning of the line clearly a MA, essentially undamaged, just the heads of the horizontals being somewhat abraded. It is surely errant, the simplest solution being perhaps a straightforward emendation to *ū*.<sup>75</sup> Carruba has *ma<n>*, adding ‘Man mag *ma<an>* oder *ma<a-an>* emendieren, die Interpretation bleibt schwierig.’<sup>76</sup> (2) Carruba, opting in the end for *m<ān>*, ‘wie’, writes, ‘Im Graphem LÚ<sup>MEŠ</sup> MU-ŠA-A möchte man ein Wort für eine geringere bzw. verachtete soziale Klasse sehen. Wäre eine Beziehung etwa zu akk. *maša’u* “rauben” möglich, so ergäbe sich eine “Übersetzung” “die MEŠEDI-Leute und die Pahhurzi werden wie Räuber rebellieren?”’.<sup>77</sup> Cf. the treatment of de Martino, <sup>lú.meš</sup>MUHALDIM-ša-a, ‘i cuochi,’<sup>78</sup> as well as those of the CHD and Gilan, who read <sup>lú.meš</sup>MU-ŠA-A but offer no interpretation.<sup>79</sup> I certainly have no significantly more convincing explanation, but I wonder if a connection with Akk. *mūšu*, ‘night’ might be a possibility. I find no directly comparable Akkadian usage (Akk. for ‘night watchman’ is *ḫāṭu* or *dēkū*), but I do find *sāhir du-ri = maššar mūši*<sup>80</sup> as well as *muttallik mūši*<sup>81</sup> for ‘night watchman’, obviously not enough to secure the very tentative interpretation here, but perhaps enough to warrant mentioning the possibility. If so, maybe the *plene* writing MU-ŠA-A is trying to express a plural. (3) The restoration of *ḫu-u[r-ta-an-ta-ru]*<sup>(?)</sup> at the end of the line and the resulting translation follow Carruba,<sup>82</sup> in part, but there are grounds for caution. Above all, *ḫurt-ḫuwart-* is otherwise never attested in the medio-passive. An alternative might be to restore *ḫu-u[r-ta-li-an-zi]*,<sup>83</sup> as in 16”, in the middle of 18” and in 20” (presumably in the sg.), despite the resulting rather long and clumsy syntactical construction.<sup>84</sup> It would yield a complex subordinate clause from *nu kuies=a* in 16” through *ḫurtali[zzi]* in 20”, followed by the main clause in 20”–21”, i.e. ‘But they who confound the

<sup>72</sup> Gilan 2015, 101.

<sup>73</sup> Carruba 1992, 79.

<sup>74</sup> CHD L-N, 93a, end of § a 1’ b’ 4”.

<sup>75</sup> Might the (copying) scribe have been thinking of the Akkadian enclitic conjunction *-ma*? Which he thought could be used independently? Or was the front portion of *ū* broken away in his *Vorlage*, so that he unthinkingly copied only the latter portion, which resembled MA?

<sup>76</sup> Carruba 1992, 78–79.

<sup>77</sup> Carruba 1992, 79–80.

<sup>78</sup> De Martino 1991, 55–56. Marazzi 2013, 76 presumably also read MUHALDIM, but was apparently thinking rather of <sup>lú.meš</sup>GIŠBANŠUR when he translated ‘addetti alle mense’.

<sup>79</sup> CHD P, 17b; Gilan 2015, 101 and n. 379.

<sup>80</sup> CAD D, 193–194.

<sup>81</sup> CAD A/I, 302a; CAD E, 410b.

<sup>82</sup> Carruba 1992, 80. Carruba also mentions the possibility of restoring *ḫurkel* here, e.g. ‘*kē hur[kēl iyanzi]*’, ‘sie machen etwas Greuliches’, or ‘*kē hur[kilas (asanzī)]*’, ‘sie (sind) des Greuels’, which, however, as he notes, ‘in anderen Zusammenhängen und bei anderen Vergehen gebraucht wird’. Indeed, *ḫurkel* seems rather to be associated with crimes of a sexual nature (HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 754–756).

<sup>83</sup> Indeed, this seems to be the assumption behind Marazzi’s (2013, 76) translation, ‘... o che quelli che tras[grediscono siano] i funzionari di palazzo [ ] ...’.

<sup>84</sup> For this reason, Craig Melchert (email of 15 November 2022) suggests that one might want to restore [*ták-ku*] or [*ma-a-an*] at the end of 16”, for which there would be just enough room, yielding, ‘Whoever creates confusion, [if] the royal bodyguard, those not in the line of succession, or the *m*-men confound

words of the king, (i.e.) the royal bodyguard, those not in the line of succession or<sup>i</sup> the *m*.-men con-found (them), (should) these *con[found]* (them), they *dis[grace]* the courtiers.’ Another possibility, suggested by Craig Melchert,<sup>85</sup> would be to restore a substantive along the lines of *ḫu-u[r-ta-le-eš]*, ‘confoundings’,<sup>86</sup> i.e. ‘these *con[foundings]* *dis[grace]* the courtiers’.

19”: (1) The oft restored *lu-ri-[ia-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi u]t-tar-ši-it*<sup>87</sup> is a fair bit too long for the break. Eliminating the IA would bring it down to approximately the right length, though even this might be a bit tight. Also likely speaking against the reading is what seems to be a wedge after the *lu-*, which perhaps explains the *ū* in Carruba’s<sup>88</sup> *lū[riahhanzi]*, i.e. he would have assumed *lu-ū*-. Carruba<sup>89</sup> mentions *luluwai-* ‘stützen; fördern’ as an alternative. (2) On both photos available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv the first sign of the obviously intended DUMU É.GAL seems to be a clear I, while the hand copy shows an unmistakable DUMU. (3) One might also consider *ku-[iš-ki]*, ‘wh[over]’, i.e. ‘whi[chever] courtier’ (presumably behind Marazzi’s<sup>90</sup> ‘qualun[que]’).

22”: Hitherto read and restored as *ma-a-an ud-da-a-a[r-me-et p]a-aḫ-š[a-nu-ut-te-ni n]u-k[án]*, or similarly.<sup>91</sup> The traces toward the end of the line as preserved in KBo 3.27 might perhaps do as *n]u-* and *-k[án]*, but are not overly convincing as such when one compares closely with other NU and GÁN signs in these lines. In fact, they suggest more of a *Ḫ]A* and an *A[T]*, which of course leads one to think of *Ḫ]a<sup>2</sup>-a[t<sup>2</sup>-*. Moreover, the join with 1131/v shows that these are not the last signs in the line, as a further vertical, seemingly with a horizontal before it, is to be seen at the end of the line in the column divider, which in fact fits nicely with *Ḫ]a<sup>2</sup>-a[t<sup>2</sup>-tu-ša-a]n<sup>2</sup>*. This reading is also preferable when one considers that *paḫs*-<sup>92</sup> and *paḫsanu*-<sup>93</sup> never take *-kan* when referring to a land or a border, not to mention the fact – for what it’s worth – that *-kan* never appears as a particle in the present text. Contextually, the suggested reading also fits nicely with the ‘and my land’ at the beginning of 23” and with the occurrence of *Ḫattusa* as object in 26”, though neither of these actually present a problem for the reading *n]u-k[án]*. Naturally, if one does opt for *Ḫ]a<sup>2</sup>-a[t<sup>2</sup>-tu-ša-a]n<sup>2</sup>*, then there is no longer enough room in the break for *p]a-aḫ-š[a-nu-ut-te-ni* or even *p]a-aḫ-š[a-nu-te-ni*, let alone the additional expected conjunction *nu* thereafter. The suggested *p]a-aḫ-š[a-te-ni nu* would fill the available space fairly well, though perhaps just slightly on the long side. Of course, the form *pa-aḫ-ša-te-ni* is not entirely satisfying, as for a 2nd pl. pres. one would expect the only attested writing *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-te-ni*.<sup>94</sup> One does find for a C<sub>1</sub>A<sub>2</sub>C<sub>3</sub>- verb the writings *ša-an-ḫa-at-te-ni* and *ša-an-ḫa-te-ni*,<sup>95</sup> but of course this is only partially comparable. If *pa-aḫ-ša-te-ni* is found to be entirely unacceptable, then my suggested reading and restoration will probably have to be abandoned, as *pa-aḫ-ša-nu-te-ni* and the more common *pa-aḫ-ša-nu-ut-te-ni* would surely be too long. Dispensing with the *nu* would certainly also be ill advised.

23”: There are a few options for the restoration of the verb in the middle of the line, each yielding a similar meaning. HW<sup>2</sup> suggests *udni=mitt[=a TI-nu-]ut-te-ni*,<sup>96</sup> which would be a bit short for the

the words of the king, ...’. Presumably, this passage is yet another example of our NH scribe having difficulty with his OH *Vorlage*.

<sup>85</sup> Email of 15 November 2022.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 772; HED H, 437–438; cf. also Raman 1973, 62.

<sup>87</sup> E.g. Gilan 2015, 101.

<sup>88</sup> Carruba 1992, 78.

<sup>89</sup> Carruba 1992, 80.

<sup>90</sup> Marazzi 2013, 76.

<sup>91</sup> E.g. by de Martino 1991, 55; HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 657a, which even gives *nu=kan* without brackets.

<sup>92</sup> CHD P, 5.

<sup>93</sup> CHD P, 8–9.

<sup>94</sup> CHD P, 2; cf. also pret. *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-te-en*, *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ti-en*, *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-tén*, *pa-aḫ-aš-te-en*.

<sup>95</sup> CHD Š, 163.

<sup>96</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 657a.

available space, but *ḫu-iš-n]u-ut-te-ni* would fit quite nicely. Sommer and Falkenstein, followed by Giorgieri, consider *warasn]utteni*, too.<sup>97</sup>

24”: Following the *[n]a-at-ta* is a clear, even if slightly irregular, *Á*, i.e. *-it/id*. Opinion has been divided on whether to attempt to explain this as a unique but somehow acceptable form or simply to emend it to something more palatable. Melchert read *n]atta=it* and connected the particle with *imma* < *\*id-mō*, seeing in it an emphasizing function,<sup>98</sup> but he informs me that he has since abandoned this suggestion,<sup>99</sup> as ‘both Hittite and Luwian *imma* reflect *\*im-mo*’. Carruba, in contrast, wrote:

Das Zeichen IT ist rätselhaft und stellt m.E. die Korruptel eines alten DA: *\*na-at-ta-da* für *natta-at-a* “auch sie (*-at* proleptisch für folgende “meine Worte”) nicht ...”. Wahrscheinlicher, obwohl zeichenmässig schwieriger, dürfte ein Mißverständnis von KAN sein, weil eine Partikel mit *sarra-* geboten ist.<sup>100</sup>

I, too, have tentatively opted for the emendation to *-kán*, since the *sarra-* in the sense of transgressing an oath or transgressing one’s words is otherwise almost always provided with an *-asta* or a *-kan*.<sup>101</sup> A significant problem for this solution, of course, is the fact that *sarra-* occurs here in the same text in the same context in ii 20”–21” without any local particle. Another possibility would be to see the *Á* – perhaps followed by an erasure – as the muddled initial part of *ud-da-a-ar-me-et*, i.e. *n]a-at-ta ud-da(Á)-{\*x\*}-a-ar-me-e[t*.

25”: Klinger translates as a passive, ‘wird mein [W]ort nicht gebrochen’,<sup>102</sup> but this is perhaps a mere blooper, as *sarrattuma* is surely 2nd pl., in accordance with the verb forms before and after it.

28”: One could, of course, as some have done,<sup>103</sup> just as well emend *ka-a* to *ka-a-aš* due to the obvious parallel at the beginning of 30” and translate accordingly, ‘This is he of Zalpa!’ But since *kā*, ‘here’, also makes perfect sense and is not obviously errant, I have refrained from emendation.

28”–30”: Translations of the second (*ka-a a-pa-aš* [<sup>URU</sup>*Za-al-pa-aš*) and fourth (*[ka]-a-aš a-pa-aš* [<sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš*) phrases as ‘Hier ist Zalpa!’ and ‘Hier ist Ḫaššu(wa)!’<sup>104</sup> or ‘da (ist) jenes Zalpa’ and ‘das (ist) jenes Hassuwa’<sup>105</sup> seem to, consciously or unconsciously, attempt to avoid the clear deictic references in *kā/kās* and *apas*, i.e. *kā*, ‘here’, *kās*, ‘this; this one’ and *apas*, ‘that one; the aforementioned’.<sup>106</sup> An unassailable translation and interpretation of these lines is of course impeded by the fact that both [<sup>URU</sup>*Za-al-pa-aš* and [<sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš* can be interpreted either as nominatives or as genitives, i.e. *Zalpa=s* (nom.) or *Zalpa=as* (gen.), on the one hand, and *Ḫassuwa=s* (a-stem nom.) or *Ḫassu=as* (u-stem gen.) or *Ḫassuwa=as* (a-stem gen.), on the other; and since both *Ḫassu* and *Ḫassuwa* are well-attested stems in Hittite texts,<sup>107</sup> the occurrences here are formally indeterminate.<sup>108</sup> If one takes [<sup>URU</sup>*Za-al-pa-aš* and [<sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš* as nominatives,

<sup>97</sup> Sommer – Falkenstein 1938, 168; Giorgieri 1995, 94 n. 26.

<sup>98</sup> Melchert 1985, 204.

<sup>99</sup> Email of 15 November 2022.

<sup>100</sup> Carruba 1992, 80; followed by Steiner 1996, 600 d.

<sup>101</sup> CHD Š, 237–238.

<sup>102</sup> Klinger 2020, 191.

<sup>103</sup> E.g. Gilan 2015, 102.

<sup>104</sup> Gilan 2015, 102.

<sup>105</sup> Carruba 1992, 79; similarly Haas 2006, 66.

<sup>106</sup> Not to mention such rather free translations as Klock-Fontanille’s ‘... voilà ce qui est arrivé à Zalpa! ... voilà ce qui est arrivé à Ḫaššuwa!’ and ‘Comment cette Zalpa est réduite! ... voilà comment cette Ḫaššu est réduite!’ (Klock-Fontanille 2001, 214 and 111 n. 20, respectively).

<sup>107</sup> RGTC 6/1–2, s.v.

<sup>108</sup> At first glance, one might think that *Ḫa-aš-šu-u-ma-aš* in 29” would speak for the stem here being *Ḫassu*, and thus, that *Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš* in 30” must unequivocally be seen as an *u*-stem in gen. – assuming, that

then one must translate ‘Here is that [Z]alpa!’ and ‘[Th]is is that Ḫassu!’<sup>109</sup> If one opts for this translation perhaps it can be understood as indicating that the speaker will have been pointing to some memento, booty or trophy from the conquests of Zalpa and Ḫassu that was kept at the Hittite royal court as a reminder of the fate of rebellious vassals.<sup>110</sup> If one takes [<sup>URU</sup>Z]a-al-pa-aš and <sup>URU</sup>Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš as genitives, however, one must translate ‘Here is he of [Z]alpa!’ and ‘[Th]is is he of Ḫassu!’. In both cases the *apas* would refer back to the LÚ and to the ethnicon in the preceding clause. And to my mind the most straightforward interpretation of these translations is that the speaker would have been pointing to the former kings of these two cities, who had been captured during the reign of Ḫattusili and presumably spent the rest of their lives, or at least some portion thereof, as prisoners at the Hittite court. In fact, we are in the case of Ḫassu even fortunate to have a reference from Ḫattusili’s Annals to its king being tied to a transport wagon headed for Ḫattusa (KBo 10.2 iii 41–42).<sup>111</sup> The word order, however, would seem to speak for the former solution, as the *rectum* generally precedes the *regens* in Hittite, so that for the latter translation one might expect *ka-a* <sup>URU</sup>Za-al-pa-aš *a-pa-aš* and *ka-a-aš* <sup>URU</sup>Ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš *a-pa-aš*. (Or so I thought, until I asked Petra Goedegebuure about the issue, who kindly responded in an email of 27 September 2024: ‘The word order of *apa-* Gen seems fine: in NPs focal *apa-* should precede unless the noun, and presumably the genitive, is discourse old. Since in the previous clause the topic was the person, not the city, the city should not be considered discourse old’, referring to a previous paper.<sup>112</sup> She also considers the possibility that (a) one might want to see *ka=as* rather than *kās* in 30” and that (b) a translation of the two phrases as rhetorical questions is to be considered, i.e. either ‘(Is) that [Z]alpa here? ... (Is) it [h]ere, that Ḫassu?’ or perhaps rather, ‘(Is) he of [Z]alpa here? ... (Is) he [h]ere, he of Ḫassu?’).

30”: The clear *na-aš-ma* is obviously difficult. Most commentators have essentially ignored the issue, translating literally, e.g. Carruba: ‘Der Mann aus Hassuwa verwarf des Vaters Wort: das (ist) jenes Hassuwa. Oder: auch der Mann aus Halpa verwarf des Vaters Wort: auch Halpa wird zugrunde gehen’.<sup>113</sup> Dardano rightly recognizes the difficulty, pointing to a case noted in the CHD<sup>114</sup> where *nasma* with no preceding *takku* or *mān* may perhaps mean ‘or (if)’. Assuming such a usage here, however, leads her to translate ‘... (Se) anche l’uomo de Ḫalpa dovesse rifiutare la parola, ...’.<sup>115</sup> I.e. she translates the same pret. verb form (*pessiyat*) twice as ‘ha rifiutato’ (in 28” and 29”) and the third time as ‘dovesse rifiutare’ (in 31”). Thus, unless one prefers to simply accept the aberrant usage of *nasma* here, one might consider emending *na-aš-ma* to *na-at*!. It requires assuming

is, that the scribe would have employed one and the same stem within a single paragraph, which is also not necessarily a given. However, stems in *-uwa* that receive the *-uman* suffix show elision of the glide, as in <sup>URU</sup>Anunum(*i*)nes, and similar (GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §2.44, §4.72), so that *Ḫa-aš-šu-u-ma-aš* could represent either the *a*-stem or the *uwa*-stem.

<sup>109</sup> Bossert 1946, 48–49, in fact, correctly interpreted these deictic particles, translating, ‘Hier (ist) jenes Zalpa! ... Hier (ist) jenes Ḫaššuwa!’. Cf. similarly Klinger 2020, 191: ‘dies ist (jetzt) jenes Zalpa ... dies ist (jetzt) jenes Ḫaššuwa’.

<sup>110</sup> One might recall the iron throne and sceptre of the king of Puruṣanda from §19 of the Anitta text (Klinger 2005, 141) or the booty, likewise from Puruṣanda, mentioned in the *šar tamḫāri* text from Ḫattusa (KBo 22.6++ iv 14’–19’; Güterbock 1969, 23; Miller 2012, 679–680).

<sup>111</sup> If one prefers not to assume that rebellious vassal kings would have spent long periods of imprisonment at Ḫattusa, then perhaps only their severed heads or impaled bodies were present (for a recent interpretation of Hittite *sakuwai-* as ‘to impale’, see Waal 2022), or perhaps they were only symbolically represented, e.g. by their bloodied clothes. One thinks in this context of Nunnu, stationed in Arzawa, whose blood-soaked clothes the king demanded to see in the Palace Anecdotes (§§3–4; Gilan 2015, 118); or Šanda, stationed in Ḫassu, who had been mutilated (§§5–6); or of Mariya, a king of Ḫayasa, who was killed for his misbehaviour at the Hittite court (§§32’–33’; Devecchi 2015, 107–108). And of course there is the slitting of the throat and hanging at one’s gate, as in §6” in our present text. For capital punishment among the Hittites in general, see most recently de Martino – Devecchi 2012.

<sup>112</sup> Goedegebuure 2013.

<sup>113</sup> Carruba 1992, 79; similarly Gilan 2015, 102.

<sup>114</sup> CHD L-N, b 4’ c’, p. 404b.

<sup>115</sup> Dardano 1997, 5 and n. 15.

merely that the copying scribe left out a single initial horizontal of the *-at*, which would then appear as *-aš-ma*. The *-at* would then be a cataphoric enclitic pronoun anticipating *uttar* in 31”; in fact, it would thus constitute another case of what Sideltsev sees as clitic doubling in topicalizing function,<sup>116</sup> directly paralleling the case in ii 19” (see commentary).

## Obv. II

### KBo 50.6

2’: Groddek’s<sup>117</sup> <sup>1</sup>LUGAL.G[AL] does seem possible, but in light of the damaged state of the signs, and since LUGAL.GAL is otherwise not found in what is preserved of this text, one would not want to exclude alternatives such as [UG]ULA LÚ X[, [DU]MU.LÚ.‘U<sub>19</sub>’, [LU, [L]UGAL DU[MU OR LÚ/[L]UGAL U<sup>RU</sup>.

5’: I can only assume that *ke-et-ti* is a unique – and seemingly inexplicable – writing of the dat.-loc. sg. dem. pron., otherwise attested, alongside ubiquitous *kēdani*, occasionally as *ke-e-ti*.<sup>118</sup> This may be a further case of our NH scribe, who would have known only *ke-e-da-ni*, having trouble with what might have been an original *ke-e-ti*.

6’: Cf. Groddek’s<sup>119</sup> [iš]-ki-iš-ši, which, though perhaps a possibility, seems less likely in light of *ták-k[i-iš-zi / ták-k[e-eš-zi* here in ii 11’ and *ták-ki-iš-ši* in 15”.

9’: James Burgin suggests [A-N]A DAM-KA i-da-lu l[e-e ku-iš-ki *ták-ke-eš-zi*]<sup>(?)</sup>.<sup>120</sup>

10’: Also possible is [h]a-*aš-ši*-i *ha-an-za-aš-ši*-i X[, but there does seem to be perhaps some slight space between the *-ši* and the *i*-d[a<sup>2</sup>-lu<sup>2</sup>]; cf. similarly in 6’.

11’: *ták-k[e-eš-zi* also possible.

12’: Without the benefit of further context one should probably not exclude the alternative [tá]k-ku, *šal-l[a-*.

### KBo 3.28+KBo 50.7

2’’: Pending collation – which, I suspect, is unlikely to yield significant results – it seems that the only signs that can be read with any degree of confidence are an AN in the first part of the line and an ‘IŠ’ toward the end. As Marazzi notes, Soysal’s suggested [ka-a-š]a<sup>(?)</sup> at the beginning of the line<sup>121</sup> is too long for the available space and must be rejected.<sup>122</sup> The rather clear *ma-a-an* in the copy thereafter should perhaps not be excluded, but based on the photos does not look likely, as there are only two verticals, not three, before the likely *-an*, reflected also in Soysal’s *mā<sup>1</sup>-a-an*. (What one might initially see as the first of three verticals is in fact a crack, which runs all the way down into line 5” and beyond.) Instead of *ma-a-* one might consider *-ia-an* or URU-*an*, but neither are these overly convincing. If *-ia-an*, one thinks of something like [nu i]R-*ia-an* or [n]e-*ia-an*, but there seems to be a space before the would-be *-ia-an*, so that these are at most possibilities to be kept in mind while collating. For the ensuing traces Marazzi refers to Soysal’s G<sup>15</sup><sub>AB</sub>-qz<sup>(?)</sup> as a possibility,<sup>123</sup> writing that if this were to be accepted, the ‘Blick aus dem Fenster’ motif examined by Christiansen<sup>124</sup> might contribute ‘zur literarischen Charakterisierung der anekdotischen

<sup>116</sup> Sideltsev 2011.

<sup>117</sup> Groddek 2008, 5.

<sup>118</sup> Goedegebuure 2014, 32–36; HW<sup>2</sup> K, 1; HED K, 5.

<sup>119</sup> Groddek 2008, 5.

<sup>120</sup> Email of 27 January 2023.

<sup>121</sup> Soysal 1989, 31.

<sup>122</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>123</sup> Followed also by Gilan 2015, 247.

<sup>124</sup> Christiansen 2007.

Erzählung’.<sup>125</sup> While not to be dismissed out of hand, the AB seems more likely to be an AN upon comparison with various other ANs and the ABs in ii 17” and 19”, and any contextual connection with what follows would remain tenuous and conjectural. At the end of the line *ut-tar-š[i-it/m[i-it ...]*, which would naturally fit well with the *[i]stamasta* of the following line, might be as or at least no less convincing than Soysal’s *‘û-u`k-k[a?]*. The UD also appears to be placed high enough in the line for it to be a proper sign in its own right rather than a subscripted part of UG.

3”–4”: Among the attempts to restore these lines, cf. [...-un] (4) *[š]a-kán-zi LUGAL-un URUḪattusan natta [kanesanzil]*, ‘[ihn] erkennen sie an, den König (und) die Stadt Hattusa [akzeptieren sie] nicht’.<sup>126</sup> As this text does not, as far as is preserved, employ the quotative particle or verbs of speaking (when introducing quoted speech), it is impossible to be certain, but I suspect that the clauses beginning either with *[i]stamasta* or with *kurur ē[pta? ...]* in 3” and ending with *essai* in 5” might be quoted speech from the prince of Puruṣḫanda, in which he explains his hostility against Ḫattusili.

4”–5”: (1) The copy (KBo 3.28) here shows unmistakably the signs EŠ TA DUMU at the beginning of line 5” before *URUPuruṣḫandumnan*, with a space between the EŠ TA and the DUMU. Most commentators have understood *eš-ta* as a ‘defective’ independent pronoun onto which the local particle is suffixed, i.e. *e=sta*.<sup>127</sup> The DUMU is thus understood as ‘prince’ in relation to ‘the Puruṣḫandean’.<sup>128</sup> Goedegebuure, in contrast, sees the verb *ēs-* here, i.e. 3rd sg. pret. *ēsta*, ‘s/he/it was’.<sup>129</sup> However, since this verb form is otherwise always spelled *plene*, she must restore *[e]-eš-ta*, for which there is certainly no room, neither in the copy nor in the photos. So, for her solution one would need to emend *⟨e⟩-eš-ta*, a suggestion against which the editors of CHD had already argued.<sup>130</sup> Pending collation, however, I would argue for reading *‘eš’-ša\*-i*, ‘s/he does/makes; s/he will do/make’. On the two photos available on the Mainzer Photoarchiv, the third sign is clearly an I, not a DUMU, though it is, it must be granted, separated by some space from the first two signs; this, perhaps along with the clear DUMU *URUPu-r[u-* in 6”, presumably led to the modern reading of the sign as DUMU. The second sign could understandably be read (or mistaken) for a TA, but its first inset vertical appears perhaps to be a wayward trace, as its head reaches up far above that of the clearly intentional inset vertical. The first sign is clearly EŠ, with only the front of its first wedge somewhat damaged, but clearly placed at the left border of the column. Of course, this interpretation as *‘eš’-ša\*-i* also makes sense in light of the following ethnicon in the acc. sg., not gen.: While an apposition *DUMU Puruṣḫandumnan*, ‘they took the prince, the Puruṣḫandean’, is conceivable (though one might prefer to see *DUMU-an Puruṣḫandumnan* for such), the scribe seems to have opted simply for ‘they took the Puruṣḫandean’. Against the interpretation *‘eš’-ša\*-i* one might point to *i-iš-ša-i* in ii 32”, but, though noteworthy, this bears only limited weight, as variant spellings are not uncommon within a single text, and especially a younger copy of an OH text. In the break at the end of 4” some positively connotated adverb is probably to be assumed, yielding ‘The king<sup>(acc.)</sup> (and?)<sup>131</sup> Ḫattusa<sup>(acc.)</sup> he does/will not treat [justly/well/correctly].’ Alternatively, one could see *‘LUGAL’-un* as postposed to the previous sentence, yielding something akin to, ‘They will [re]cognize [him], (as) king<sup>(acc.)</sup>! (But) Ḫattusa<sup>(acc.)</sup> he will not treat [well!]’ (2) Comparison with *ki-iš-ri-mi* just two lines below in 7” would suggest one should restore *ki-i[š-ri-* here as well, but on the copy there is a clear wedge at the break, which I believe I can see in one of the photos available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv (BoFN 6608), too, so that *ke-e[š-ri-* is perhaps the better option, pending collation.

<sup>125</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>126</sup> HEG S, 709.

<sup>127</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> A, 41a; HED A, 4; CHD P, 393b; HHw, 11; cf. Kloekhorst 2014, 165 and n. 641.

<sup>128</sup> An assumption upon which Weeden’s (2011, 212–213) considerations regarding the possible difference between *LÚ URUKUSSAR* and *DUMU URUKUSSAR* are based.

<sup>129</sup> Goedegebuure 2014, 109.

<sup>130</sup> CHD P, 393b.

<sup>131</sup> As the common double accusative constructions (GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§16.16–19) can probably be excluded for semantic reasons, an implicit ‘and’ seems to be the most likely solution.

6”: (1) *kēda=mmu* is generally taken as a unique instr. sg. form of demonstrative *ka-* with enclitic 1st sg. pron. *=(m)mu*, thus literally, ‘with the aforementioned (behaviour) that guy treats me’.<sup>132</sup> Hoffner and Melchert<sup>133</sup> and Goedegebuure<sup>134</sup> apparently reject this analysis of *kēda*. (2) In light of the reinterpretation of *DUMU* in 5” as *-i*, one might also want to call into question the common restoration here at the end of 6” in the same fashion, i.e. as <sup>URU</sup>*Pu-r[u-uš-ḫa-an-du-um-na-an]*.<sup>135</sup> Maybe more likely would be simply the non-declined ‘logographic’ stem form,<sup>136</sup> i.e. <sup>URU</sup>*PU.R[U.UŠ.ḪA.AN.DA]*, or a simple gen., <sup>URU</sup>*Pu-r[u-uš-ḫa-an-da-aš]*.<sup>137</sup> Perhaps suggesting a gen. of the ethnicon are the forms in i 28”–30”, i.e. <sup>URU</sup>*[L]ū URU Za-al-pu-u-ma-aš*, <sup>LÚ</sup> <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-aš-šu-‘u’-ma-aš* and <sup>LÚ</sup> <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫal-pu-u-ma-aš-ša*, and thus, <sup>URU</sup>*Pu-r[u-uš-ḫa-an-du-u-ma-aš]*.

7”: (1) Hoffner has *ne-ga-aš-t[aʔ]-aš-ša*, correctly noting that ‘the autograph copy indicates two vertical strokes in the beginning of the sign’.<sup>138</sup> The CHD, in contrast, reads *ne-ga-aš-š[a]-aš-ša*.<sup>139</sup> As a *-ta-* would be morphologically unintelligible, the reading *š[aʔ-* seems preferable, pending collation, as my examination of the photos is inconclusive. (2) Pringle rightly indicates the formal ambiguity with ‘her/his’.<sup>140</sup> Beal points out that the context suggests that it would likely be the sisters of the prince of Purušanda rather than the sisters of his wife who are intended.<sup>141</sup> And de Martino suggests that one might rather expect ‘sons’ here instead of ‘sisters’.<sup>142</sup> (3) The CHD restores [*te-et*] at the end of the line here,<sup>143</sup> which is certainly a possibility, as this scribe does continue onto the edge often enough in lines 10”–19”. If one restores anything, though, one could also consider *tenun* or *memahhun*, as these lines are otherwise framed in the first singular. It is not clear if this scribe used verbs of speaking to introduce quoted speech, though, as there are no directly comparable passages in the preserved text.

8”–9”: (1) Pending collation I have not included in the transliteration the (sign?) traces seen on the edge, separated from *LUGAL-wa-ša* by a considerable space, in the copy and indeed visible on the photos. (2) Dardano has repeatedly argued for this and similar expressions having been a calque on comparable Akkadian phrases.<sup>144</sup> While the suggestion must surely be seen as a possibility, Dardano makes no attempt to demonstrate why the phrases should be seen as a calque rather than a mere similarity that might be found in languages that are unrelated and unconnected,

<sup>132</sup> E.g. HED K, 5; EDHIL, 425; HW<sup>2</sup> K, 1; implicitly also CHD L-N, 311a; P, 393b; Š, 521b; similarly Dardano, ‘e in tale modo quello agisce nei miei confronti’ (2004, 240; cf. 2012, 628); slightly differently, it seems, HEG P, 667–668: ‘*kēda=mmu*, ... zu dem sich jener mir gegenüber verhält’.

<sup>133</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §7.3. Indeed, Craig Melchert informs me (email of 15 November 2022) that instr. sg. *kēda* would be hard to accept and that he would prefer to interpret this as *kēd=a=mmu*, i.e. instr. sg. with non-geminating topicalizing/contrastive *-a/-ma*, although *kēd* is otherwise known in OH texts only in the relative location usage ‘on this side’.

<sup>134</sup> Goedegebuure 2014, 32–36.

<sup>135</sup> E.g. Gilan 2015, 111.

<sup>136</sup> With Garrett 1990, 172.

<sup>137</sup> Note the declined PNs and GNs in i 6”, 13”, 22”?, 26”, 29”, 30”, 31”, ii 3”, 4”, 18”, 19”, 25”? vs. the solitary non-declined ‘logographic’ form in ii 21”.

<sup>138</sup> Hoffner 1966, 392.

<sup>139</sup> CHD L-N, 426a.

<sup>140</sup> Pringle 1993, 41–42.

<sup>141</sup> Beal 2003, 26.

<sup>142</sup> De Martino 1992, 27 n. 38. This would, of course, comport well with the narrative in CTH 13 (KBo 3.46 ii 9’–13’), in which the king addresses the man of Purušanda’s wife and son (Gilan 2015, 246), though with a different figure of speech. An anonymous reviewer points me to CHD L-N, 431a, which hypothesizes that *nega*, ‘sister’, from which *negna-* was built with a masculine marker, might have originally meant ‘sibling’. If so, one might speculate whether the meaning ‘siblings’ may have been intended still in the OH original of our text. Cf., however, eDiAna Nr. 3854 (Sasseville 2025), which disallows such a reconstruction.

<sup>143</sup> CHD L-N, 426a.

<sup>144</sup> Dardano 2010; 2016, 56–57; 2018, 362–365.

and thus ignores a basic principle of linguistic and/or cultural comparison.<sup>145</sup> Might this and similar expressions be found in countless languages around the world simply because they reflect the universal social experience of looking someone in the eye? The question is not posed and not examined in Dardano's discussions. As I have discussed the issue of inherited and borrowed vs. mere structural similarities elsewhere<sup>146</sup> I will not belabour the point here.

10": (1) For the right dislocation of *kuitki* in this and similar cases, cf. Neu<sup>147</sup> and GrHL<sup>2</sup>.<sup>148</sup> An anonymous reviewer plausibly wonders if the import here might be along the lines of 'in any way (whatsoever)'. (2) *a-pa-ša-an* A-[NA <sup>d</sup>ÍD?] was Laroche's suggestion.<sup>149</sup> The copy shows a clear ŠA in *a-pa-ša-an*. The wedges of the ŠA seem to be missing on the photos, however, yielding something like GUR or SI, so pending collation I will assume a scribal slip for the surely intended ŠA. (3) The traces at the break would seem to allow either 'A'-[NA <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub>(?)<sup>150</sup> or simply I<sub>7</sub>-ia], i.e. without the divine determinative before I<sub>7</sub> as in 12", 17" and 18"; whether the -ia found on I<sub>7</sub> in 12", 17" and 18" would have been added here would be a separate question. A further possibility might be *a-pa-ša*!(SI?) <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub>-ia] / [ha]l-za-a-i, i.e. with no acc. pronoun resuming the defendant and with the same divine determinative before and, presumably, the same phonetic complementation on I<sub>7</sub> as in 12", 17" and 18", and thus allowing either 'but he (the king) [de]clares a divine ri[ver] (ordeal)' or 'but he (the king) [ci]tes (him to) the divine ri[ver] (ordeal)'.

10"–11": Marazzi asserts that '*halzāi* ist hier wohl als Imperativ 2. Pers. Sing. aufgrund der in Z. 11'ff. in der 2. Pers. Sing. vorhandenen Verbalformen und Possessivpronomina aufzufassen,' and translates accordingly, 'Und jetzt, wenn sich ein Prinz der Person des Königs gegenüber in Bezug auf irgendetwas schuldig macht, dann sollst du jenen zu[m Flußgott rufen, und er soll (hin)gehen.'<sup>151</sup> Dardano, too, opts for the 2nd sg. imp., arguing against the 3rd sg. pres. in HW<sup>2</sup>, where one finds 'wenn ein (Königs-)Sohn ... sündigt, [r]uft jener (der König) ihn zu[r Flußgottheit]'.<sup>152</sup> She translates 'Ma ora se un principe pecca in un qualche modo nei confronti della persona (lett. testa) del re, convoca costui pres[so il dio Fiume] e quello vada!'<sup>153</sup> Marazzi's transcription (*apašan*) and translation and Dardano's translations, however, show or imply that they understand *apasan* as a 3rd sg. acc. dem. pron. This is an unfortunate error, though, as it clearly must be parsed as *apas=an*, i.e. the 3rd sg. nom. dem. pron. and the 3rd sg. acc. enclitic pronoun, i.e. 'the aforementioned ... him'. This, in turn, requires that one interpret [ha]lzāi as a 3rd sg. pres., not the 2nd sg. imp.<sup>154</sup>

11": Marazzi restores *ú-uš[-ki-it-tu]* at the end of the line, adding in n. 5, 'Ergänzung aufgrund der Parallelform *e-eš-tu* in Z. 12',<sup>155</sup> referring to Laroche<sup>156</sup> and contrasting with Soysal's *ú-uš[-ki-iz?-zi]*.<sup>157</sup> The new joins, however, provide better comparanda, i.e. further *ske-* forms in 3rd sg. imp., i.e. *ma-ni-ia-aḫ-ḫi-iš<sub>7</sub>-\*ke-et-{E}-tu\** in ii 25' and *ḫu-wa-iš-ket<sub>7</sub>-tu* in ii 28'. Since the signs here

<sup>145</sup> Surely incorrect is Dardano's (2018, 365) assertion that a similar expression in the Sunaššura treaty 'confirms that the Akkadian wording was widespread in Ḫattuša.' To the contrary, such an Akkadian expression would have been known at most to a handful of scribes competent in Akkadian and to diplomats and merchants in Ḫattusa.

<sup>146</sup> Miller 2004, 458–461.

<sup>147</sup> Neu 1974, 25.

<sup>148</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§17.54–17.55, §30.26.

<sup>149</sup> Laroche 1973, 186.

<sup>150</sup> So e.g. HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 197b.

<sup>151</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>152</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 197b.

<sup>153</sup> Dardano 2010, 49 n. 3; similarly Gilan 2015, 111–112.

<sup>154</sup> Thus already Laroche 1973, 186–187; Soysal 1989, 91; Dardano 2002, 388; CHD L-N, 151b.

<sup>155</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>156</sup> Laroche 1973, 186.

<sup>157</sup> Soysal 1989, 32.

run onto the edge, perhaps the considerably shorter *ú-uš-[ket<sub>9</sub>-tu]* is preferable. Cf. also *-ket<sub>9</sub>-* in ii 8” in two further *-ske-* forms.

12”: (1) The suggested alternatives to the essentially unproblematic *[t]ák-ku* <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub>-i[a-m]a *mi-im-ma-i* are not convincing. The clear space in the copy between I<sub>7</sub> and IA is refuted by examination of the photos (indeed the ‘tail’ of the head of the final vertical of the I<sub>7</sub> touches and cuts through the head of the upper left horizontal of the IA); and, pending collation, reading *-m]a* is similarly unproblematic, as what is drawn as the head of a vertical before the clear vertical both in the copy (KBo 3.28) and in Forrer’s rendering (BoTU 2.10y) is revealed in the photos to be dubious at best, and likely just part of the damage to the first part of the sign.<sup>158</sup> The reading <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub>-i[a-m]a also fits nicely with the expected syntax, as topicalizing *-ma* is regularly postponed to the second accented element in sentences beginning with *takku* (as well as *mān*, *kui-* and *nasma*).<sup>159</sup> The *-ia* here (as well as in 17” and 18”) I would like to see as phonetic complementation indicating the stem form,<sup>160</sup> not any particular case.<sup>161</sup> A literal translation would thus be, ‘If, however, he refuses the divine river,’ probably to be understood as ‘If, however, he refuses (to undergo/submit to) the divine river (ordeal),’ i.e. he foregoes any attempt to prove his innocence. Syntactically, ‘river’ presumably functions as an acc.<sup>162</sup> here in 12” and as a loc. (or even an instr.) in 17” and 18”. Cf. also HED: *takku* <sup>d</sup>ÍD-ya-ma *mimmai*, ‘but if he declines the river[-ordeal]’;<sup>163</sup> HW<sup>2</sup>, also with <sup>d</sup>ÍD=ia-m[a].<sup>164</sup> (2) The sequence *mi-im-ma-i* NA before the *é-ši-pát* has understandably been taken

<sup>158</sup> Even if one prefers to see here a further sign trace, it is surely errant and to be discounted, as is so often the case with wayward sign traces on this tablet. Cf. Marazzi (2011–2012, Partitura §2” n. 6), who writes that although the reading <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub>-i[a-m]a ‘eine bedeutungsvolle Sequenz wiedergibt, berücksichtigt sie weder den Raum, der zwischen <sup>d</sup>ÍD und dem darauffolgenden Zeichen “YA” vorhanden ist, noch die Zeichenspuren, die nach “YA” deutlich auf der Autographie sowie auf dem Foto noch zu lesen sind’; and further, ‘Sowohl die Autographie (und die in 2. BoTU 10y dargestellte Skizze der Zeichenreste) als auch das Foto scheinen die in Bin-Nun S.R. 1973a [i.e. Bin-Nun 1973, 7 and n. 18 – J. M.] vorgeschlagene Transliteration <sup>d</sup>ÍD ‘ya-ra’ ... zu bestätigen.’ To the contrary, the traces following *-ia-* look nothing like the other RA signs in this text. There are also no grounds whatsoever for the *-za* in <sup>d</sup>ÍD(-?)ia-ma-za(?) in CHD L-N, 151b; cf. the <sup>d</sup>ÍD-ya=ma’ in CHD L-N, 264a and the *takku* <sup>d</sup>ÍD-ya‘x’ *mimma*’ INA in CHD P, 221a.

<sup>159</sup> See CHD L-N, 97a; Sideltsev 2024, 184, with refs.

<sup>160</sup> Watkins 1973, 84–85 similarly assumed that the *-ia* disallowed an interpretation of the underlying form being the known Hittite word for river, i.e. *ḫapa-*. And he plausibly suggested that the otherwise attested divine name *Ḫapaliya* might lie behind the writing (1973, 85), which he saw as ‘an adjectival derivative of the thematic noun *ḫapaš* “river,” with the specific meaning of “the River God”’. He suggested, however, seeing here the directive case, but for the directive or allative one would surely want to see a motion verb or at least one that can indicate direction (GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§16.73–78), which is true neither of *mimma-* in 12” nor of *papreske-/papre-* in 17” and 18”. Zsolt Simon (email of 30 March 2025) agrees with Watkins that the *-ia* disallows interpreting the underlying word as *ḫapa-*, ‘river’, but suggests a derivation with the adjective-building morpheme *-iya-* (see GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §2.37), \**ḫapiya-*, thus literally ‘zum Fluß gehörig’, which one could indeed understand as a/the word for ‘river ordeal’.

<sup>161</sup> Pace Lebrun 2000, 115, who, referring to Laroche 1973, 182, translates ‘Mai[s], s’il (le coupable) refuse le dieu Fleuve, qu’il reste justement dans sa maison,’ adding, ‘Cette traduction tient compte du fait que le dieu Fleuve est l’objet direct du verbe *mimmai*. Cependant, comme l’avait bien observé E. Laroche, le Fleuve pourrait être le sujet de ce verbe, en ce sens que le Fleuve refuserait de juger. Dans ces deux interprétations possibles en soi, le dieu Fleuve ne peut se trouver ni au datif-locatif, ni au directif, ce que pourrait laisser entendre la finale en *-ya*.’ This may have influenced Dardano 2010, 49, who, revising her earlier translation (2002, 388), also reads *[t]ák-ku* <sup>d</sup>ÍD-ia-ma”, but translates ‘Ma se il dio Fiume dice di no, ...’ (similarly Soysal 1989, 32, 91). Her translation, though formally possible, would result in the only case in which ‘the river says no’ would be employed to express ‘he is proved guilty’ in a river ordeal, otherwise rendered with *papre-* or *papress-* in opposition to *parkue-* or *parkuess-*, which, though not impossible, seems unlikely, especially in light of the fact that *papreske-/papre-* are used for this purpose here in 17” and 18”.

<sup>162</sup> Also possible would be a dative function, as per CHD L-N, 264a, with an elided verb of motion.

<sup>163</sup> HED M, 158.

<sup>164</sup> Unfortunately, this is translated here (HW<sup>2</sup> H, 197b) as ‘Und ... ab[er],’ though *-a/-ia* and *-a/-ma* do not co-occur. For discussion of the highly unlikely alternative <sup>d</sup>I<sub>7</sub> ‘ia-ra’ *mimmai*, ‘wenn das jara des Flussgottes ablehnt/erbricht’, and similar, cf. Marazzi 2011–2012; 2010, 213–216; Bin-Nun 1973, 7 n. 18.

by some as a haplography for *mi-im-ma-i* <D>-NA É-ši-pát,<sup>165</sup> but since both a conjunction in the main clause and a subject pronoun are required, or at least solicited, by the grammar, most have opted for *na-aš*. (The ‘let him remain (lit. ‘sit’) in his house’ in the CHD<sup>166</sup> is presumably a hurried oversight, as *ēstu* is clearly 3rd sg. imp. from active *ēs*-, ‘to be’, not middle *ēs*-, ‘to sit’.) (3) The restoration at the end of the line goes back to Laroche,<sup>167</sup> and it is difficult to suggest a more sensible alternative.<sup>168</sup> Cf. Soysal, who has *ge-en-zu-ua-ī-[ši-ma?-an?]* ‘[Du wirst ihn jedoch] schonen.’<sup>169</sup>

12”, 14”: I follow those who assume that ‘to be (i.e. remain) in one’s house’ is to be understood as ‘under house arrest’ and/or ‘banned from the royal court and confined to a country estate’ in such contexts (cf. also ii 23”), and further, that it stands in opposition to ‘allowed to attend / be welcome at the royal court in Ḫattusa,’ expressed, *inter alia*, by the phrase ‘shall see the eyes of the king’ (i 18’, ii 8”–9”, 11”), and similar.<sup>170</sup>

13”: The precise connotation of *kappue*- here, with its basic meaning ‘to count’, and with the reflexive, ‘to consider’, is open to interpretation. Giorgieri assumes the meanings ‘considerare, contare tra (i propri servi)’, and, referring to Laroche,<sup>171</sup> translates, ‘(se) lo conterai (ancora tra la schiera dei tuoi servi), contalo! Ma se non vorrai (più) contarlo (tra i tuoi servi), egli se ne stia a casa sua; non metterlo in prigionie!’<sup>172</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> has ‘Wenn du (ihn) aber nicht kontrollier(en kann)st, soll er in seinem eigenen Haus bleiben.’<sup>173</sup> Perhaps something like the English usage, ‘to count on’, in the sense of ‘to trust’ would be apt? I.e. ‘[If you<sup>(sg.)</sup> are] lenient and you<sup>(sg.)</sup> can count on him, then count on him. If, however, you<sup>(sg.)</sup> cannot count on (him), then he shall remain in his own house.’ Cf. also HW<sup>2</sup>, ‘im Auge behalten’;<sup>174</sup> and HED, where the less illuminating ‘esteem’ is found for this passage, though ‘to keep tabs on’ is suggested for other passages.<sup>175</sup>

15”–16”: The interpretation depends, of course, on the restoration<sup>176</sup> at the end of 15” and whether one associates the *le-e* at the beginning of 16” with the verb at the end of 15” or with the ensuing phrase in 16”. (That the *lē* appears at the beginning of 16” must presumably be explained, if one nevertheless associates it with *ussaniyasi*, by the scribe running out of space on the edge following *uš-ša-n*[*i-ia-ši-an*].) Dardano, e.g., suggests ‘Mett[ilo in gioco!]’, restoring *uš-ša-n*[*i-ia-an*], i.e., the 2nd sg. imp. of *ussaniya*-, ‘vendere, mettere in vendita; mettere in gioco’, followed by the acc. enclitic pronoun. She then relates the *lē* at the beginning of 16” to the following sentence(s), translating, ‘Non procurare motivo di sofferenza agli dei in cielo, non procurare motivo di sofferenza agli esseri umani sulla terra.’<sup>177</sup> The main weakness in her interpretation is the unwarranted assumption of a negation in the second phrase. In other words, for her translation one would surely expect *ne-pi-ši* DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup> **le-e** *iš-tar-ni-ik-ši ták-na-a-ma mi-e-nu-uš le-e iš-tar-ni-i*[*k-ši*]. Topicalizing *-ma* on *taknā* surely suggests that the negative force of *lē* from the beginning of 16” does not

<sup>165</sup> E.g. Frymer-Kensky 1979, 236; CHD P, 221a.

<sup>166</sup> CHD L-N, 151b.

<sup>167</sup> Laroche 1973, 186.

<sup>168</sup> So also Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>169</sup> Soysal 1989, 32, 91.

<sup>170</sup> E.g. CHD P, 221a.

<sup>171</sup> Laroche 1973, 187–188.

<sup>172</sup> Giorgieri 1995, 128–129 with n. 17.

<sup>173</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> H, 564a; similarly Soysal 1989, 91. I doubt that the semantic range of *kappue*- extends as far as ‘to exercise control over (someone)’, though ‘to check on / keep tabs on (someone)’ (the German ‘kontrollieren’ is ambiguous) seems fitting enough, but I cannot reexamine all attestations in the present forum.

<sup>174</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> K, 124.

<sup>175</sup> HED K, 66.

<sup>176</sup> The restoration, in essence, goes back to Soysal 1989, 32, who, however, added topicalizing *-ma*- as well, *uš-ša-n*[*i-ia-ši-ma?-an?*], which is entirely possible, though one might opt for the shorter solution due to space considerations.

<sup>177</sup> Dardano 2010, 49 with n. 4; cf. differently Dardano 2002, 365.

remain in effect through the second phrase. Puhvel, essentially following Laroche,<sup>178</sup> also relates *lē* to the following phrases, but correctly realizes that the second phrase would then likely have to be in the imperative, restoring *istarni[k]* and translating, ‘in heaven do not afflict gods, but on earth afflict faces [= persons?].’<sup>179</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup>, also relating *lē* to the following phrases, but restoring *iš-tar-ni-ik-[-ši]* at the end of the line: ‘Mach nicht die Götter im Himmel krank/Verletze nicht die Götter im Himmel! Du wir[st] die freundlichen (Menschen?) auf der Erde krank machen/verletzen.’<sup>180</sup>

16”: (1) DINGIR<sup>DIDL</sup>, as noted by Corti, is found in the Hittite corpus only here, above in ii 6” and in the OH/OS exemplar of the Zalpa Text (KBo 22.2 obv. 4, 16, rev. 13’).<sup>181</sup> Van Gessel’s <sup>d</sup>HAL is an unfortunate lapse and should be struck from the record.<sup>182</sup> (2) Pending collation of the original, it seems from an examination of the photos that we have a perfectly normal, perhaps slightly damaged, -ši here in *iš-tar-ni-ik-ši*, as opposed to the PI in the copy. (3) For the oft discussed *mienu-*, cf. the dictionary entries<sup>183</sup> as well as Oettinger<sup>184</sup> and Puhvel.<sup>185</sup> (4) That allative *taknā* is errant or unexpected is implied by the CHD,<sup>186</sup> and is seen as possibly archaizing by Dardano,<sup>187</sup> which is the most likely solution. A further possibility might be to see *iš-tar-ni-i[a?]* or *iš-tar-ni-š[um?-mi?]*, or similar, as an adverb and to assume a verb of direction thereafter, i.e. ‘[You will send/bring] the *mienu-* to the middle of the earth/underworld’ or ‘[You will send/bring] the *mienu-* to the earth/underworld among [us]’, or similar. As the verb would bleed significantly onto the edge, and as I find no really comparable usage with *istarna*, *istarni=* or *istarniya-*,<sup>188</sup> the possibility should be viewed with caution, though it would solve the problem with the allative.

17”: For an alternative interpretation of HAR-ša-ni-i as Akkadian *hurš/sānu*, ‘river ordeal’, see Marazzi,<sup>189</sup> who follows Riemschneider<sup>190</sup> and Frymer-Kensky.<sup>191</sup> Despite the obvious difficulties the (copying) scribe had with some elements of the passage, the fact that Akk. *hurš/sānu* is otherwise never found in texts from Hittite Anatolia, as well as the fact that there is an oft-occurring and sensible Hittite reading,<sup>192</sup> not to mention the fact that the scribe himself understood the word this way as indicated by his SAG in 18”, surely speak for the interpretation as Hittite *ḫarsar/ḫarsn-*, ‘head; person’. Cf. HW<sup>2</sup>: ‘Dem Kopf meines Vaters und der Flußgottheit gegenüber

<sup>178</sup> Laroche 1973, 187.

<sup>179</sup> HED M, 115; similarly HED E & I, 476: ‘but on earth afflict countenances!’

<sup>180</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> I, 277b.

<sup>181</sup> Corti 2005, 116.

<sup>182</sup> Van Gessel 1998, 640.

<sup>183</sup> CHD L-N, 242–243; EDHIL, 579; HED M, 172–173; P, 219; HEG M, 198–199, with refs.

<sup>184</sup> Oettinger 2022.

<sup>185</sup> Puhvel 2023.

<sup>186</sup> CHD L-N, 243a.

<sup>187</sup> Dardano 2002, 384.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup> I, 272–277.

<sup>189</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012.

<sup>190</sup> Riemschneider 1977, 121–122 with n. 32. Inexplicably Riemschneider 1977, 122 still describes this passage as one in which a son had ‘committed a sin against the person of the king’, whereby ‘person’ can only be the translation of Hittite *ḫarsar/ḫarsn-*. Further, Riemschneider does not, in fact, actually argue for his interpretation, he simply asserts it as clear or obvious, and mentions some Mesopotamian comparanda of uncertain relevance, writing (1977, 121–122 n. 32), ‘*huršani* is clearly a borrowing from Akkadian, in which one word for ordeal is *huršānu*. Combined with “river”, it occurs in Nuzi as *ÍD hur-ša-an*. Obviously the same expression as in line 17 in the following line is written *A-NA SAG A-BI-YA* <sup>d</sup>ÍD-ya; this is clearly a misunderstanding by the scribe of this late copy, who took HAR-ša-ni-i for *ḫaršan-* “head”.’

<sup>191</sup> Frymer-Kensky 1979, 235–241.

<sup>192</sup> Frymer-Kensky 1979, 240 seems, on the one hand, to be unaware of this fact, writing, ‘the phrase “By my father’s head” does not seem to make any sense’; but on the other hand reasonably translates *A-NA SAG.DU LUGAL ú-wa-aš-ta-i* in 10” as ‘offend against the person of the king.’

zeigten sich viele unrein.<sup>193</sup> Marazzi translates, ‘molti sono usciti impuri dall’ordalia del dio fiume (stabilita per ordine di) mio padre, e il padre del re non li ha graziati.’<sup>194</sup> In Marazzi’s and in similar translations one also sees a rather forced attempt to accommodate the gen. ‘of my father’ (*attas=mas*), i.e. ‘dio fiume (stabilita per ordine di) mio padre’, as opposed to the unproblematic and amply attested ‘person of my father (*vel sim.*)’.<sup>195</sup>

18”: The emendation to *SAG.⟨DU⟩* is perhaps not strictly necessary, but since it is written *SAG.DU* in ii 10” and since the writing with *SAG* alone is in general so very rare in Hittite texts, it is perhaps preferable. Silvin Košak, who kindly checked the attestations for *SAG* alone in the card collection in Mainz for me, reports, ‘So weit ich sehen konnte, kommt es bei sicheren Belegen immer mit Komplement’, i.e. KBo 39.8 ii 36 (*SAG<sup>HI.A</sup>-aš-ma-aš*), KUB 50.96, 12’ (*SAG-i*), KUB 8.34 ii 14’ (*SAG-iš-ši*), KUB 43.8 obv. 5a (*SAG-aš*).<sup>196</sup>

18”–19”: (1) The CHD is surely correct, *pace* Kloekhorst,<sup>197</sup> in seeing in the *plene* writings in *ḫu-iš-nu-uš-ke-e-et* and *ḫu-iš<sup>7</sup>-nu-ú-ut* an indication that these sentences are intended as rhetorical questions.<sup>198</sup> This determination is also quite important contextually, as it makes clear that the point of the speaker’s narration is that the father had acted mercifully, not harshly, eschewing executions in favour of less severe punishments.<sup>199</sup> Understanding these as rhetorical questions places them in a long line of admonitions not to let bloodshed at the royal court get out of hand, such as in the Telipinu Edict, §§23, 26–34. (2) The potential identity of this Kizzuwa with *Ki-iz-zu-i*, Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, in the Palace Anecdotes (KBo 3.34 ii 32) and its implications were discussed by Beal and Forlanini;<sup>200</sup> the possibility that Kiswa in the Zalpa Text (KBo 3.38 i 30) might also be equated with this Kizzuwa was discussed by Corti.<sup>201</sup>

19”: (1) For the oft discussed *papritta*, see the CHD.<sup>202</sup> (2) Context and the parallel with *natta huisnuskēt* in 18” suggest that one should emend *na-at* to *na-at-⟨ta⟩* here, as most commentators have done. Cf. Hoffner:

the fact that this same writing *na-at* occurs three times, all in texts originally written in OH, makes one wonder if such a strange writing might be evidence for a rare variant of this word. ... It is understandable how *na-at* “not” might have been avoided in order to prevent confusion with *n=at* “and it”. The writing *na-at-ta* could only be confused with *n=at=ta* “and they/it (to) you”, a combination which never occurs, being replaced by *ne-et-ta* (*n=e=ta*) KBo 4.10 rev. 12.<sup>203</sup>

<sup>193</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 197b–198a. Cf. also HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 198a for 18”–19”: ‘Gerade Kizzuwa wurde dem Kopf meines Vaters und der Flußgottheit gegenüber unrein.’

<sup>194</sup> Marazzi 2013, 75.

<sup>195</sup> For this common usage, and similar, see HW<sup>2</sup> Ḫ, 352–353. On these lines cf. further CHD L-N, 245b, 411a; P, 106a.

<sup>196</sup> Email of 9 September 2020.

<sup>197</sup> Kloekhorst 2014, 66, 496.

<sup>198</sup> CHD Š, 526; cf. GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §27.2.

<sup>199</sup> Cf. e.g. Strobel (2011, 262, referring to KBo 3.27 and 3.28), who writes, ‘Labarna I. selbst erscheint in der juristischen Überlieferung als gnadenloser Herrscher.’ Or Korošec 1950, 203, commenting on BoTU 2.10γ (i.e. KBo 3.28): ‘Dabei wird ein Vergleich mit den Rechtsvorschriften, wie sie unter dem früheren Herrscher, dem Vater (*attas-miš*, Z. 16; 18) des Verfassers des Textes gegolten haben, angestellt, mit dem offensichtlichen Bestreben, den jetzigen Rechtszustand als den milderen und günstigeren darzutun.’ Similarly, Freu 2007, 71: ‘Dans son édit le « roi », c’est-à-dire Muršili, opposait sa mansuétude envers le prince rebelle de Puruṣḫanda et surtout envers sa femme et ses enfants, qu’il avait bannis, à la dure sévérité de son père.’

<sup>200</sup> Beal 2003, 27–28; Forlanini 2010, 118 n. 20.

<sup>201</sup> Corti 2005, 116.

<sup>202</sup> CHD P, 106a, with refs.

<sup>203</sup> Hoffner 1986, 84.

Cf., however, GrHL<sup>2</sup>, where this is seen as ‘almost certainly a case of an accidental omission’.<sup>204</sup> (3) Kloekhorst reads *hu-iš-nu-ú-ut*<sup>205</sup> where previously most had read *hu-e-nu-ú-ut*,<sup>206</sup> which is worth considering.<sup>207</sup> The photos do not allow a firm decision one way or another, but do, to my eyes, suggest an inset vertical between the horizontals rather than a wedge, so rather an E than an IŠ. Collation might well help in this case, as the sign is right on the edge and only partly visible on the photos. Watkins suggests *hu-uš<sup>17</sup>-nu-ú-ut*, pointing to several parallels,<sup>208</sup> so that this is also a good possibility. Cf. HED, where it is booked under *huinu-*, ‘to run’, but also sub *huesnu-*, where one finds *hu-e-⟨es⟩-nu-ú-ut*.<sup>209</sup> (4) The syntax of this passage and the topicalization via clitic doubling in 19” were discussed by Sideltsev.<sup>210</sup> Cf. Melchert, who rejects Sideltsev’s interpretation,<sup>211</sup> and Watkins, who sees in *-an* ‘the archaic aspectual particle’,<sup>212</sup> concerning which see now GrHL<sup>2</sup>.<sup>213</sup>

20”: The enclitic *-a-* in *ud-da-a-ar-ra-me-et* (i.e. *uddārr=a=met*) I tentatively understand as the conjunctive particle<sup>214</sup> in the sense of ‘too’, though one would naturally expect *uddār=mett=a*.<sup>215</sup> The speaker has just narrated a number of anecdotes in which the word of his father had been ignored; he continues that he himself had also during his own reign (*kinun=a*) seen similar evil, so that he must exhort his listeners/readers not to transgress his words, too, like they had transgressed those of his father. Similarly the CHD: ‘Do not transgress the words of me, the king, either.’<sup>216</sup> Cf., however, GrHL<sup>2</sup>: ‘The form *uddārra=met* ‘my words’ KBo 3.28 ii 20 (OH/NS) appears to show double marking of the plural (for the ending *-a* compare *kallāra* in §4.82) and the gemination seen with neuter nom.-acc. plurals in *-i* (see §3.24 and Rieken 2012). The reality of this isolated form in a late copy is very doubtful.’<sup>217</sup> But differently GrHL<sup>1</sup>, with *uddārr=a=met* and the translation, ‘But now I, the king, have seen much evil, so you (plural) must not transgress even (*-a/-ya*) the words of me, the king.’<sup>218</sup> Here the particle is interpreted, correctly in my view, as the conjunctive morpheme, but the translation ‘even’ in this case makes little sense to my mind. Craig Melchert informs me that he now doubts GrHL<sup>2</sup>’s first interpretation,<sup>219</sup> i.e. the double marking of the plural. He was also unable to point to any other examples of the conjunctive morpheme *-a/-ia* appearing between a noun and a possessive pronoun, and notes that such ‘would be pretty much inexplicable linguistically.’

21”–22”: These lines have received a great deal of attention in the secondary literature.<sup>220</sup> The reading of the signs themselves in the phrase in question has never really been at issue: *a-ši* MUNUS. LUGAL <sup>URU</sup>*ĜU.RU.MA É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A / e-eš-ta*. (At most one might add that the horizontals of the É seem to be written over a small erasure or wayward sign traces, not rendered in the copy, perhaps intimating,

<sup>204</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 49 n. 132.

<sup>205</sup> In EDHIL, 354, he opted for *hu-e-⟨eš⟩-nu-ú-ut*.

<sup>206</sup> Cf. already Archi 1968, 59, *hu-iš<sup>1</sup>-nu-ú-ut*.

<sup>207</sup> Kloekhorst 2014, 496 with n. 1931.

<sup>208</sup> Watkins 1973, 85 and n. 14.

<sup>209</sup> HED H, 421 and 334, respectively.

<sup>210</sup> Sideltsev 2011, 87–88.

<sup>211</sup> Melchert 2015, 139–140.

<sup>212</sup> Watkins 1973, 85 n. 13.

<sup>213</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 479–480.

<sup>214</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§29.25–29.

<sup>215</sup> Emended accordingly by Steiner 1996, 601 e, i.e. *ud-da-a-ar-{ra-}me-it-⟨-ta⟩*. Presumably, we have here another case of our NH copyist struggling with OH possessive enclitics.

<sup>216</sup> CHD Š, 238a; cf. CHD L-N, 219a, where the morpheme is ignored.

<sup>217</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 178 n. 403.

<sup>218</sup> GrHL<sup>1</sup>, §29.17.

<sup>219</sup> Email of 4 September 2020, considerations which did not find their way into GrHL<sup>2</sup> (2024).

<sup>220</sup> Cf. various translations and discussions by Beal 2003, 26–27 and n. 80; Boley 1992, 43; 1984, 34; Cohen 2002, 154 and n. 662; de Martino 1989, 15–16 with n. 65; Marazzi 2011–2012; Martínez 2016, 184–185; Otten 1975, 502.

as does the omission of expected, though not absolutely necessary, MUNUS before É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A,<sup>221</sup> that the copying scribe might have had his difficulties with this series of signs.) Interpretations, however, vary, generally based on whether one opts for ‘that queen of Huruma was a bride’ or ‘that queen was a bride (in/of/from) Huruma’. The syntactically obvious translation, ‘that queen of Huruma was a bride’ makes little sense in the context, as Beal has emphasized.<sup>222</sup> The contextually only marginally more illuminating rendering, ‘That queen was a bride (in/of/from) Huruma’ is syntactically quite unlikely and requires special pleading.<sup>223</sup> I therefore suspect that we have a scribal error here, i.e. \*É\*.GI<sub>4</sub>.A for É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup>, or similar, as the signs ZU HI together could easily be interpreted as a GI<sub>4</sub> by an inattentive scribe.<sup>224</sup> Naturally, one would also like to see an I-NA before an emended É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup>, if this is what was intended. In any case, seeing \*É\*.GI<sub>4</sub>.A as a scribal mistake for (I-NA) É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup> or the more palatable É<sup>HLA</sup>.ŠU/ZU would yield the translation, ‘That queen of/from Huruma remained (in) her houses/estate’, i.e. was placed under house arrest there. This could then be compared to the similar expressions in ii 12” and 14” (É-ši-pát e-eš-tu / É-iš-ši-pát e-eš-tu), which decree that a potential offender should ‘remain in his/her house/estate’, and to that in ii 23” (É-ti ku-wa-ta-an pé-ta-at-te-ni), where the issue seems to be to what house a certain princess is to be brought, presumably in exile or house arrest. Alternatively, if the emendation is rejected, perhaps one can understand the phrase ‘that queen of Huruma was a bride’ as indicating, in keeping with the historical interpretation advanced below, that ‘that queen of Huruma (who was a daughter of Labarna and Tawannanna) was a bride (of the King/Prince of Huruma)’. Others, of course, have seen the Tawannanna herself as this queen of Huruma.<sup>225</sup>

22”: (1) Cohen has collected more or less similar attestations of sentences with *āra*, i.e. those without the negation and containing *iya-* or *es-*.<sup>226</sup> He notes that *āra* appears in transitive sentences with *iya-*, where *āra* functions either adverbially or predicatively in reference to the direct object, suggesting the translations ‘something done legally, correctly, or lawfully’ or ‘to make something permissible, lawful, correct, legal’.<sup>227</sup> In Cohen’s translation, ‘This queen was a bride from the city of Hurma. In this (matter) my father had made (it) permissible for her’,<sup>228</sup> the unexpressed direct object would presumably refer to the queen’s marriage. If, however, one accepts the emendation of \*É\*.GI<sub>4</sub>.A to \*É\*-ZU<sup>HLA</sup>, then the unexpressed direct object would refer to the

<sup>221</sup> I find four cases of É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A without MUNUS in my files (KUB 21.33 iv’ 12’; KUB 13.8 obv. 13, 14; KUB 13.23, 4’) vs. some 19 cases with MUNUS.

<sup>222</sup> Beal 2003, 26–27 and n. 80.

<sup>223</sup> That *asi* MUNUS.LUGAL GN should be considered one syntactic unit is emphasized, e.g., by Goedegebuure 2002–2003, 27 n. 54; 2014, 161 n. 178, who translates, ‘*That (aš) queen of Hurma* was an eligible bride.’

<sup>224</sup> Of course, É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup> would be quite unexpected, even for a Hittite scribe, from whom one would expect rather É<sup>HLA</sup>.ŠU/ZU (cf. Hoffner 2010; here Hoffner does not actually address the question of whether the Sumerian plural markers appear following Akkadographic pronominal suffixes, but as far as I see from my searches, they never do). Thus, one might well doubt that the É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A here will have resulted from a misreading of a hypothetical É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup> in an OH original; and it is difficult to imagine why a scribe would perceive a more plausible É<sup>HLA</sup>.ZU as É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A. Still, the signs as found on the extant tablet look so much like É-ZU<sup>HLA</sup> that I cannot but suspect that this may have something to do with a solution. The muddled writing might have resulted from an attempt to convert *pár-ni-iš-ši*, É-iš-ši or É<sup>HLA</sup>.ŠU/ZU in the OH original (cf. the slightly diverging renderings É-ši-pát in ii 12” and É-iš-ši-pát in 14”) into (I-NA) É-TI-ŠU, or similar. Perhaps a (damaged?) -iš-ši in the original was misread as -ZU<sup>HLA</sup>; which the copying scribe rejected in favour of É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A?

<sup>225</sup> E.g. Martínez 2016, 184–187. Of course, some authors derive their ideas about the relationship of the early OH kings to Huruma from the Zalpa Text (e.g. Beal 2003, 29, who writes that the mention of Huruma in KBo 3.28 ‘reminds us that Labarna’s father was Lord of Hurma’; Martínez 2016, 183), but any such attempt is very tenuous, both because the identities of the various kings in the Zalpa Text are yet to be clearly established and because the lines mentioning Hurma and the ‘father of the old king’ are fragmentary and remain, despite much optimism, largely opaque.

<sup>226</sup> Cohen 2002, 16–19.

<sup>227</sup> Cohen 2002, 17.

<sup>228</sup> Cohen 2002, 154 n. 662.

queen's exile, i.e. 'That queen of/from Huruma remained (in) her estate. In this (matter), though, my father had made (the exile) permissible with regard to her' or, similarly, 'My father, though, had handled (the matter) justly in this (affair) regarding her.' Alternatively, one could opt for an intransitive usage of *iya-*,<sup>229</sup> which is well enough attested, though far less common than the transitive,<sup>230</sup> yielding something akin to 'My father, though, had acted justly in this (affair) toward her.' The intent of the two translations would be essentially the same. In any case, it is likely the perceived need to account for the apparent bride in 21" that has led some authors to interpret *addas=mis=a=sse kēdani ara iyan harta* in unorthodox or idiosyncratic ways, i.e. as some type of expression for arranging or sanctioning a marriage, e.g. 'Und mein Vater hat mich dieser (Königin von Hurma) rechtmäßig (zum Gatten) gemacht';<sup>231</sup> 'my father had me duly betrothed [lit. made] to her';<sup>232</sup> 'my father ... had her betrothed to me';<sup>233</sup> 'e con lei mio padre aveva fatto un accordo in questo modo'.<sup>234</sup> There is, however, no other comparable usage of *āra*. Arranging or performing marriages is expressed in other terms.<sup>235</sup> As mentioned, the unexpressed object in Cohen's translation, 'In this (matter) my father had made (it) permissible for her',<sup>236</sup> would presumably be the fact that the queen had become a bride or had married, but this would again beg the question of the meaning of the term *āra iya-*. What would be intended by the father having made socially, morally or legally acceptable, justifiable, allowable, that a princess marries? Forlanini's 'mais mon père m'avait considéré comme légitime pour elle'<sup>237</sup> faces similar semantic, contextual difficulties.<sup>238</sup> What in the world would be the intent of such a locution? Contextually, then, the most parsimonious understanding seems to be, as suggested, 'My father, though, had acted justly in this (affair) toward her.' Of course, with any traditional interpretation of the phrase in 21" along the lines of 'that queen of Huruma was a bride', also this understanding of this sentence in 22" makes little sense and appears at first glance to hang in mid air (but see below, sub 2). Only when one assumes, as suggested above, that line 21" mentions the house arrest of the queen of Huruma does the meaning of line 22" immediately become obvious, i.e. that the father's exiling of the queen was justified in Mursili's view. In other words, to paraphrase, 'she was allowed to remain in her home (instead of being killed), and in this (affair) my father had acted justly toward her.' (2) As Marazzi points out, opinions differ as to the referent of *kēdani* here as well as regarding the relation of this final phrase in §18" to the content of the following paragraph.<sup>239</sup> Soysal relates *kēdani* to the queen mentioned in 21", translating 'und mein Vater hatte an dieser (Frau) gerecht gehandelt'.<sup>240</sup> Some commentators have related *kēdani* to an unexpressed 'matter/affair', and further, have seen the following lines as an explication of just what this 'matter/affair' had been in

<sup>229</sup> As does, e.g., Soysal 1989, 91, 125.

<sup>230</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> I, s.v. §V.

<sup>231</sup> HW<sup>2</sup> H, 291b.

<sup>232</sup> HED H, 152.

<sup>233</sup> Boley 1992, 43; similarly 1984, 34.

<sup>234</sup> De Martino 1989, 16.

<sup>235</sup> Pringle 1993, 181–208.

<sup>236</sup> Cohen 2002, 154 n. 662.

<sup>237</sup> Forlanini 2017b, 133–134.

<sup>238</sup> Forlanini 2017b, 133 reads *ad-da-aš-mi-iš-ša-mu* rather than *ad-da-aš-mi-ša-aš-še*, and while his added *-iš-* is presumably merely an unintended slip, his *-mu* would in principle be worth considering (so also, e.g., HW<sup>2</sup> H, 291b; HED H, 152). Comparison with the MU signs in i 13", 18" and ii 6" (twice), however, with their two leading wedges drawn far to the left, shows that *mu* here is at least graphically quite unlikely (as Forlanini 2020, 153 n. 37 admits), but of course, a NH scribe could have misinterpreted an OH *-mu* as *-aš-še*, or vice versa. Forlanini intended to comment on his reading in his note 58, but a redactional error replaced the text of his note 58 with the contents of his note 56. He subsequently provided this commentary in a footnote in a later paper (Forlanini 2020, 153 n. 37), but it does little to advance his argument. The passage in the funerary ritual KUB 30.24 ii 1, e.g., hardly provides 'un parallélisme parfait', as the phrase *āra iyan hark-* occurs there in a completely different context.

<sup>239</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012, Translatio n. 6.

<sup>240</sup> Soysal 1989, 91, 125.

which the father had treated the queen justly. Beal, e.g., even suggests seeing the following lines as quoted speech: ‘The aforementioned queen was a bride/daughter in-law in Hurma. My father had done right to her, (saying?). § “Wherever you carry away the daughter of the house of the queen, do [not har]m(?) [her].”<sup>241</sup> While I see no way to demonstrate conclusively that §19” constitutes an explicatory excursus on the father’s just action with regard to the queen of Huruma of §18”, as neither verbs of speaking nor the quoted speech particle is employed in this text, contextually this does seem the most likely interpretation.

23”: (1) *[na-aš-t]a*<sup>242</sup> is probably the better restoration, as *[ka]-a(?)*-š<sub>a</sub>, ‘[Se]ht’, as suggested by Soysal,<sup>243</sup> does not fit well with ‘to whatever house you bring’ (or with Soysal’s ‘wohin könnt ihr ... hinschaffen?’<sup>244</sup>), as *kāsa* is now to be understood as a first person and/or near deictic particle.<sup>245</sup> The verb *peda-* does occur often enough with *-asta*,<sup>246</sup> and relates here perhaps to the notion of arrival or goal.<sup>247</sup> The available space seems just a bit tight for either *[na<sup>2</sup>-aš<sup>2</sup>]-ta<sup>2</sup>*, or *[ka]-a<sup>2</sup>-ša<sup>2</sup>*, but is perhaps acceptable. Pending collation I tentatively assume that the trace above and before the *ta<sup>2</sup>*, visible both on the copy and on the photos (but not rendered by Forrer in BoTU 2.10y), is just damage or perhaps a wayward trace.<sup>248</sup> (2) *MUNUS.LUGAL-aš DUMU.MUNUS É-Ti* has often been translated ‘the queen’s “daughter-of-the-house”’,<sup>249</sup> or similarly,<sup>250</sup> but it has nearly as often been noted that this makes little sense. Surely ‘to whatever house you<sup>(pl.)</sup> bring the daughter of the queen’ is more sensible and syntactically no less likely,<sup>251</sup> though for this translation one would admittedly expect *A-NA É-Ti* (cf. the similar omission in ii 12”). In any case, the phrase ‘to bring to a house/estate’ seems to parallel ‘to be/remain in one’s house/estate’ in ii 12”, 14” and perhaps 21”, and thus serve as a euphemism for house arrest. Forlanini understands the sentence as a question (‘la reine, la fille du palais, pourquoi l’amenez-vous?’),<sup>252</sup> as did Soysal before him (‘wohin könnt ihr im Hause die Tochter der Königin hinschaffen?’),<sup>253</sup> which is worth considering, but of course the queen cannot be the object, as in Forlanini’s translation, which would require *MUNUS.LUGAL-an*. One might consider ‘To what house are you bringing the daughter of the queen?’ I fail to see, however, how this would fit sensibly in the context.

23”–24”: Beal, even without the benefit of the join, anticipated with his reading and restoration *n[=an(?) lē / HUL-a]’ht’eni* that we are likely dealing with an injunction regarding the princess in exile,<sup>254</sup> in which he is probably correct. One possibility would be to read and restore *[ú-w]a-at-te-ni* at the beginning of 24”,<sup>255</sup> resulting in an injunction against the addressees going to where she had been brought, presumably to prevent any further conspiring with her and/or, since Mursili sees his father’s actions as having been just (ii 22”), perhaps to prevent her from being murdered as well.<sup>256</sup> Of course, one might have expected *lē paatteni*, ‘you shall not go’, rather than *lē uwatteni*, ‘you shall not come’. Perhaps Ḫattusili is envisioned here as speaking these words not in Ḫattusa,

<sup>241</sup> Beal 2003, 26–27; similarly de Martino 1989, 16.

<sup>242</sup> Beal 2003, 26; CHD P, 349b.

<sup>243</sup> Soysal 1989, 33.

<sup>244</sup> Soysal 1989, 91.

<sup>245</sup> For *kāsa* and related deictic particles see Rieken 2009, followed by Steitler 2019; GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §17.50.

<sup>246</sup> CHD P, s.v.

<sup>247</sup> GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §28.67.

<sup>248</sup> I do not believe it can be seen as part of the *na-*, as apparently intended by Gilan’s (2015, 113) *na’-[aš-]’ta*.

<sup>249</sup> E.g. CHD P, 349b.

<sup>250</sup> Beal 2003, 30.

<sup>251</sup> Cf. Soysal 1989, 91.

<sup>252</sup> Forlanini 2017b, 134.

<sup>253</sup> Soysal 1989, 91.

<sup>254</sup> Beal 2003, 27 n. 81.

<sup>255</sup> Obviously not *[x-n]a-at-te-ni*, as Marazzi (2019–2020, xix) reads, even with the benefit of the new joins and new photos.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. Ḫattusili’s Testament, §§17–18 (Klinger 2005, 145).

but in whatever town or region to which the daughter of the queen was brought, e.g. in Kussara? Perhaps the *uwa-* is imagined from the vantage point of those who are to have brought the princess to the house (*petatteni*), thus ‘come’ from the point of view of their location once there.<sup>257</sup> Craig Melchert wonders about the possibility of restoring *n[u-uš-ši le-e kat-ta-an]* at the end of 23”,<sup>258</sup> which would come closer to the meaning ‘you must [not v]isit [her]’. One might also consider a deictic element such as *apadda(n)* or *apiya*, ‘there, thither’. Another possibility would be to restore *[šu-w]a-at-te-ni*, though which verb and which meaning this would imply would remain an open question, as would the issue of whether an injunction with *le-e* restored at the end of 23” would be preferable to the mere present implying a command, i.e. without *le-e*. Little would seem to speak for *su(wa)-*, ‘to fill’.<sup>259</sup> Conceivable might be *suwe-/suwai-/suwiye-*, ‘to push’,<sup>260</sup> probably with *parā* or *arḥa*, in the meaning ‘to expel’,<sup>261</sup> i.e. something akin to *n[a-an le-e pa-ra-a/ar-ḥa]* / *[šu-w]a-at-te-ni* ‘(To whatever house you<sup>(pl.)</sup> bring the daughter of the queen), you<sup>(pl.)</sup> [shall not ex]pel [her] (from it).’ But would such a caveat really be necessary? Finally, there’s *suwaye-/suwaya-/suwai-*, ‘to look at/for; to regard’,<sup>262</sup> though which of this verb’s meanings might make sense in this line is difficult to say. Presumably not, ‘(To whatever house you<sup>(pl.)</sup> bring the daughter of the queen), you<sup>(pl.)</sup> [shall lo]ok to (it for compensation)’, as this seems to be a specific legal idiom restricted to the Hittite Laws. The meaning ‘to spy’ favoured in EDHIL, though not accepted in the CHD, would yield a plausible sense here, but this does not seem to be what is implied in such cases of banishment and house arrest. Perhaps *n[a-at]* / *[šu-w]a-at-te-ni*, ‘(To whatever house you<sup>(pl.)</sup> bring the daughter of the queen), you will/shall observe/monitor [it]’?

24”–25”: Even before the discovery of the joins Beal offered two possible restorations that anticipate what is suggested here, i.e. *MUNUS.LUGAL[=ma=za] / [apūn(?) memmi]škit(?)*, ‘[But] the queen has continually [rejected(?) the one whom I place on my throne’, and, alternatively, *MUNUS.LUGAL-[š=an LUGAL-iznani] / [anda kann]iškit<e>tu*, ‘Let the queen always [recognize for kingship] ...’.<sup>263</sup> In light of the new joins, perhaps *MUNUS.LUGAL-[aš-ša-an ga-né-eš-tu]* (i.e. *MUNUS.LUGAL-[ss=a=an]*),<sup>264</sup> or perhaps more likely, *MUNUS.LUGAL-[aš-ša-an-za ša-ak-du]*,<sup>265</sup> or similar, would be a possibility, i.e. ‘the queen [shall recognize him], and he shall govern.’

25”: While the joins clarify the hitherto enigmatic *ma-ni-ia-aḥ-ḥi-iš-ke-et-{E}-tu\**, how the mysterious *<sup>m</sup>Ga-ri-ia-an~\*še?~\*x[* is to be understood remains an open question. How would a PN Gari(ya) in the accusative relate to the subject matter in 23”–24” or to what seems perhaps to be a blessing formula in 26”–27”? Might this be an entirely muddled rendering of intended *ga-ri-ia-an le-e ḥar-zi*, ‘she shall not/must not hold (it/anything) concealed’, or the like? Cf. the attempts by Soysal and Marazzi.<sup>266</sup> Despite the queen likely being the subject of the clause at the end of 24”, the subject of *maniyahḥiskettu* is presumably he whom the speaker will have placed on the throne; otherwise the speaker would be commanding that the queen, whom he is trying to marginalize, is to govern the land, which is precisely what he is trying to prevent.

26”–27”: I am not sure what one could read other than *‘ar’-ma-na-an-te-eš*, i.e. *armanantes*, ‘ill<sup>(pl.)</sup>’, but what might possibly be intended with ‘mules shall/must be ill’? Is someone (the queen?)

<sup>257</sup> For similar usage of *uwa-* with reference to a distant vantage point, cf. KUB 14.3 ii 71–72 and discussions in GrHL<sup>2</sup>, 198; Heinhold-Krahmer – Rieken 2020, 30–31, 216.

<sup>258</sup> Email of 15 November 2022. This would, of course, bleed a fair bit on to the edge, but not all that much farther than some of the signs on the edge in lines 16”–19”, so might be acceptable.

<sup>259</sup> CHD Š, 530–539; EDHIL, 797.

<sup>260</sup> CHD Š, 559–563; EDHIL, 797–798.

<sup>261</sup> CHD Š, 561b–562a.

<sup>262</sup> CHD Š, 539–542; EDHIL, 795–796.

<sup>263</sup> Beal 2003, 27 n. 81.

<sup>264</sup> Cf. comparable usage in HW<sup>2</sup> K, 64.

<sup>265</sup> Cf. usage in CHD Š, 29–30.

<sup>266</sup> Soysal 1989, 33, 91; Marazzi 2011–2012.

uttering here a curse formula? Or might we be dealing with an error for *armawantes*, and thus, ‘mules shall be pregnant’, i.e. (part of) a blessing formula invoking fecundity and prosperity that should result if the queen recognizes the appointed heir and he is allowed to govern?<sup>267</sup> The interpretation as a blessing formula would comport well with the following, in which something is to be right or just, and, to finish off the paragraph, ‘the scepter bearers a[nd] those not in the line of succession’ presumably either ‘shall be or behave in a positive manner’ or receive here a further final injunction along the lines of ‘must not transgress my word’, or similar.

28”: I find not a single other occurrence of *huwai-*, ‘to run, flee’, with the reflexive, so that one can only guess what ‘his/her cities shall *huwai-*’, or, if one understands it transitively,<sup>268</sup> ‘s/he shall *huwai-* his/her cities’, might mean. As the verb is in the singular one might assume, if intransitive, that the populations of these cities in the collective is intended.

29”: With Groddek,<sup>269</sup> *pace* Cohen’s UDU.SÍG+MUNUS<sup>HLA</sup>-ša? A-NA ša-?-?, which was based on a copy provided to him by H. Otten.<sup>270</sup> For considerations on the problematic ŠA \*KÛ.BABBAR ŠA KÛ\*.G[?], see Marazzi’s recent paper.<sup>271</sup>

31”: Either *hu-u[r-ta-li-iz-zi]*, ‘per[vert]/dis[tort]’ (cf. i 16”, 18”, 20”), or *hu-u[r-d/ta-i]*, ‘cu[rse]’ would seem to offer reasonable possibilities.

32”: Also conceivable are *nu-uš t[u-* (cf. Cohen’s *nu-uš tu-*<sup>272</sup>) or, as suggested by Groddek, *nu-uš l[e-e;*<sup>273</sup> but one might expect to see some traces of the horizontals of *t[u-* or *l[e-* in the little area preserved following the four wedges if to be read as such.

33”: Cohen reads *a-ap-pa-li ka-pu-it pa-*,<sup>274</sup> and this is perhaps a possibility, but his *ka-*, upon comparison with the KA in 34” and the IŠ in 32”, is surely more likely to be an IŠ, and there is no space between the LI and the IŠ. This suggests the possibility of emending the clear BU to a -še<sup>l</sup>- and reading *a-ap-pa-li-iš-še<sup>l</sup>(BU)-et ku-w[a-*, with Groddek.<sup>275</sup> Cf. also Soysal: ‘The usage *appali kapuwai-* ‘to take a trap into account > be aware of a trap’ in ii 10’ pleads for a neuter *i*-stem noun *appali-* instead of a commune *a*-stem *appala-*.’<sup>276</sup> Assuming that our NH copying scribe rendered the possessive pronoun -sset properly, we should indeed assume that *appali* is a neuter *i*-stem, here in the nom.-acc.

34”: *kuedanikka* is now attested only in this text (above in ii 7’ and here in ii 34”) and in KBo 3.41+ obv. 4, 5 (2×); KBo 12.22 i 6, 7, 8 (both CTH 16).

<sup>267</sup> An anonymous reviewer suggests an interpretation that is certainly worth considering, even if somewhat daring: ‘[If I set] Gariya o[n] (it) (i.e. the throne), then let mules be pregnant/sick (i.e. “let pigs fly!”). [Instead, let the queen] behave uprightly/properly, and [let] the sceptre-men and those not in the line of succession also [behave uprightly/properly].’ And s/he adds, ‘In this case, Gariya would have been the successor backed by the queen’s party.’ One is reminded of the curious episode in §2 of the Zalpa Text (Gilan 2015, 181–183). Zsombor Földi (pers. comm.) notes that the pregnant(?) mules remind him of Herodotus’ (III: 151–153) description of the siege of Babylon and wonders if a literary topos might be traced here.

<sup>268</sup> For the transitivity ‘toggle’ function of -z(a), see GrHL<sup>2</sup>, §§28.30–36.

<sup>269</sup> Groddek 2008, 7 with n. 28.

<sup>270</sup> Cohen 2002, 175 with n. 11.

<sup>271</sup> Marazzi 2019–2020, xxii.

<sup>272</sup> Cohen 2002, 175.

<sup>273</sup> Groddek 2008, 6.

<sup>274</sup> Cohen 2002, 175.

<sup>275</sup> Groddek 2008, 7 with n. 31.

<sup>276</sup> Soysal 2006b, 133.

35”: Neu saw in *nakkita* an instr. sg.<sup>277</sup> The CHD<sup>278</sup> shows only *na-ak-ki-it* (KBo 50.7 had not yet been published by that time). As the spaces between words in this fragment are sometimes minimal, a reading *na-ak-ki ta-* would also be a possibility.

36”: (1) The sign traces also allow *[n]a-aš-ma*, as Cohen reads based on a drawing provided to him by H. Otten,<sup>279</sup> in addition to Groddek’s *[n]a-aš-šu*.<sup>280</sup> Both *[n]a-[a]š-šu* and *[n]a-aš-ma* require one to assume that the word was indented *vis-à-vis* the *na-aš-šu-ma* in 35” or that a single short sign preceded it, thus suggesting a *nu*. (2) The traces at the end of the line are of course amenable to a *Ú*, and could thus constitute the beginning of some form of *au(s)/u(wa)-*, ‘to see, to look’, but any number of alternative possibilities must also be taken into account, too, so I have not restored this here.

### Rev. III

1’: The *]-ši/-Li* occurs ca. 16 lines from the top of the column, judging by the lines of the obv.

## Discussion

### Dating and Authorship

Naturally, a key matter that must be addressed again in light of the new joins is the question of the dating and the authorship of the composition. The issue is particularly germane in view of the fact that KBo 3.27 has generally been seen as stemming from Ḫattusili I, while KBo 3.28 has mostly, though not universally, been deemed as originating with Mursili I.<sup>281</sup> The new joins suggest that the text as a whole should be considered a composition of Mursili I (perhaps together with some counsellor; see presently), with which he presents primarily the political counsel of his (adoptive) father, Ḫattusili I, but also his own words of wisdom, which he often bases on or extrapolates from his father’s counsel. The overarching purpose of the text is to bolster the authority and legitimacy of the author, Mursili I, as the heir of Ḫattusili. The summary and focal point of the repeatedly referenced ‘word of the father’ was, after all, both in the Testament and here in the Political Counsel, the designation of Mursili as Ḫattusili’s chosen successor. This accords, in fact, with Pecchioli Daddi’s insightful conclusion regarding this and other similar texts,<sup>282</sup> i.e. ‘che la redazione dei documenti, nei quali emerge la figura del padre come fonte di legittimità e di autorità, sia stata ispirata da Muršili.’<sup>283</sup>

<sup>277</sup> Neu 1974, 64 n. 94.

<sup>278</sup> CHD L-N, 364b, 368a.

<sup>279</sup> Cohen 2002, 175.

<sup>280</sup> Groddek 2008, 6.

<sup>281</sup> To note only a small number of more influential and/or more recent views: Gilan (2015, 102–103, 110, 247) and de Martino (1991, 54–55; 2005a, 145) ascribe KBo 3.27 to Ḫattusili I and KBo 3.28 to Mursili I (Barjamovic’s [2011, 115 n. 345] claim that de Martino ascribes KBo 3.27 to Mursili is an oversight); Forlanini (2017a, 242 n. 45) and Klinger (1996, 217) ascribe both KBo 3.27 (typo KBo 3.29 in Forlanini 2017a) and KBo 3.28 to Ḫattusili I; Pecchioli Daddi (1994, 82, 90–91) ascribes both to Mursili I.

<sup>282</sup> As Pecchioli Daddi (1994, 90 with n. 104) indicates, in this she was expanding on considerations offered by Liverani, who wrote, e.g., that ‘il vero “autore” del testamento di Ḫattušili deve essere considerato Muršili’ (Liverani 1977, 115 and n. 35; cf. his even more far-reaching formulation in Liverani 2014, 260). In light of Liverani’s thesis, Gilan’s (2015, 95–98) more recent considerations, and now the demonstration that the erstwhile ‘Edict of Ḫattusili’ in fact constitutes just one part of the ‘Political Counsel of Mursili I’, the nature and authorship of the ‘Testament’ should perhaps be reassessed. Still, I tend to doubt that one will be able to convincingly prove that the Testament was composed by Mursili I. Liverani’s argument is essentially that it will have been authored by Mursili I because it serves his legitimation, as it certainly does, but this fact in no way precludes Ḫattusili having authored a text intended to serve Mursili I’s legitimation.

<sup>283</sup> Pecchioli Daddi 1994, 91.

As part of this discussion it might be useful to attempt to establish the narrative situation, i.e. speaker, audience and temporal setting, of each paragraph. Of §§1'–3' too little remains to even allow speculation. One might initially suspect that §4' would see Mursili speaking, as the 'father/father's [...]' is mentioned, but the occurrence of 'my daughter' and the command to eat and drink (i.e. to remain alive)<sup>284</sup> but not to see the eyes of the king (i.e. to be banished from the court), echoing §15", probably presented as a speech of Ḫattusili, surely outweigh this. §5' almost certainly continues this narrative, as the 'taking of a son' is mentioned, which presumably refers to Ḫattusili's well-attested search for an heir. And if 'That one, however, ...' in 20' can be understood as an indication that at some point this son failed to live up to the expectations of the (adoptive) father, then it would probably clinch the suggestion. These paragraphs thus likely relate to Ḫattusili's struggles to find a loyal heir so well known from other texts, first and foremost his Testament.<sup>285</sup> Thus, the daughter of 13' and 14' is likely the daughter of the Testament, §13 and §§17–18; the son in 19' could theoretically be any of Ḫattusili's (adoptive) sons or sons-in-law – or some other prince entirely for that matter – but if one can connect 'h[is] tears' in 21' with the description of that son from the Testament, §§1–6, who could not cry or show empathy (§1), then this would be the son that Ḫattusili had designated and subsequently rejected for the throne, i.e. Labarna, the son of his sister. In any case, the subsequent §§6" and 8" are very probably, and §7" is indisputedly, presented as the words of Ḫattusili.

§9", in contrast, has always presented a bit of a conundrum for a text assumed to be from Ḫattusili I, since it refers to the rulers of Zalpa, Ḫassu and Ḫalab having spurned the 'word of the father'. Klengel, for example, asserts that the usage in this case is only intended metaphorically,<sup>286</sup> though he does not clarify what the meaning or intent of this supposed metaphorical usage is to have been. With the new joins and the determination of the text as a whole as a composition of Mursili, it now becomes clear that Mursili is the speaker in §9". Thus, the rulers of Zalpa, Ḫassu and Ḫalab all 'spurned the word of the father', i.e. rebelled, during the reign of Ḫattusili; and while the rulers of Zalpa and Ḫassu had already paid the price, revenge against Ḫalab remains, at this point in Mursili's reign, a task for the future.

In §§10" and 14" no relevant clues remain, but §§11"–13" seem again to be dealing with the era of Mursili. The 'now though' (*kinun=a*) in ii 2' can be compared with the same at the beginning of §§16" and 18", which clearly introduce Mursili's era in contrast to that of his (adoptive) father. And in §§12" and 13" the audience is addressed in the 2nd sg., just as in §16", perhaps even suggesting that some counsellor might be addressing Mursili here. If so, this counsellor might be seen as instructing Mursili on how to deal with the complicated familial and dynastic situation left to him by his (adoptive) father. Without further context, however, this remains quite uncertain.

§15", related in the first person (*kēda=mmu; su=mu ... kisri=mī*), is presumably presented as the words of Ḫattusili,<sup>287</sup> if for no other reason than the fact that the following §16" is presented in chronological contrast to it (*kinun=a*) at the beginning of the paragraph. One wonders, however, if §16", though likely presented from the temporal vantage point of the reign of Mursili, is actually

<sup>284</sup> Cf. Dardano 2012, 627–633, suggesting that the injunction to eat and drink expresses banishment. It seems to me, however, that the phrase can rather be understood as an expression by which the king waives the death penalty, allowing the accused to remain alive, which is then generally followed by a phrase (to not see the eyes of the king and/or to remain in one's house) indicating banishment and/or house arrest instead. See in this sense §2" of the second tablet of Mursili II's Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Ousting of the Tawannanna (Miller 2014, 534–535).

<sup>285</sup> Gilan 2015, 65–103.

<sup>286</sup> Klengel 1999, 39 n. 30; cf. de Martino 1991, 63–66.

<sup>287</sup> I suspect, however, that at least 'The king<sup>(acc.)</sup> (and?) Ḫattusa<sup>(acc.)</sup> he will not make/treat [...]' in 4"–5" and perhaps also '[...] they [re]cognize/will [re]cognize' in 3"–4" should be understood as words of the prince of Puruṣhanda as quoted by Ḫattusili, but the fragmentary state of the lines precludes certainty.

styled as the speech of Mursili. The king is referred to at the beginning of the paragraph in the third person, after which a person is addressed repeatedly in the 2nd sg. Since the person being addressed has the power of life and death regarding offending princes, he must be the king, or at least the heir apparent, and thus presumably Mursili himself. So who is speaking to Mursili, the young king, in such a manner? One possibility would be that the author of the composition envisioned Ḫattusili speaking directly to Mursili here, giving him advice,<sup>288</sup> and this suggestion must remain an option. Still, the ‘now, though’ (*kinun=a*) at the beginning of the paragraph seems to suggest that someone during the era of Mursili is addressing the king here, and we just happen to have a familiar candidate from this time period for such a role: Pimpira. He is known, of course, as a counsellor and perhaps vice-regent for the king in his youth, and even composed words of advice for the young king in a separate document or documents.<sup>289</sup> This, of course, must remain a mere hypothesis, as there is no explicit indication in the preserved portions of the text of who the speaker here might be, but the possibility is tempting.<sup>290</sup> Both possibilities, Ḫattusili and Pimpira, should in my view be considered. In any case, I suspect that the link between the content of §15” and the counsel given in §16” is the question implied in §15”, i.e. ‘What to do with a rebellious prince?’ The answer was, as suggested by Mursili’s counsellor, a river ordeal in order to establish guilt or innocence, whereupon the king must decide how strict or lenient he wishes to be with the offender.

In §17” we clearly have Mursili speaking about events from the era of his father. It obviously takes up contextually the theme of the river ordeal suggested in §16”, recalling Ḫattusili’s mercy in its application. It has often been remarked that Kizzuwa here might be equated with Kizzuwa, Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, in the Palace Chronicles,<sup>291</sup> which would thus also be told from the vantage point of Mursili’s reign, referring often to events of Ḫattusili’s era. §18” is again set in temporal contrast to the father’s age, and is styled first as Mursili speaking in an attempt to establish the authority of his own reign, and then, depending on one’s understanding of these lines, in a brief defense of his father’s actions. In §19” we seem to revert to Ḫattusili speaking; indeed these lines seem to constitute Mursili’s attempt to allow Ḫattusili to present in his own words his reasoning and justification for sending the queen of Ḫuruma mentioned in §18” into exile, if the emendation suggested there is accepted. This timeframe is supported by the mention of ‘He whom I, the king, place on my throne, ...’, which surely presents Ḫattusili expressing his oft-repeated deliberations concerning who his heir should be. One might also compare the ‘scepter bearers a[nd] those not in the line of succession’ here with warnings concerning the ‘the royal bodyguard, those not in the line of succession or<sup>l</sup> the *m*.-men’ in §7”, clearly presented as spoken by Ḫattusili. Finally, I can only assume that what remains of §20” essentially continues the considerations expressed in §19” and is thus also presented as speech of Ḫattusili, though exactly where the quoted speech ends is now impossible to ascertain.

<sup>288</sup> So, e.g., Gilan 2015, 114.

<sup>289</sup> Cammarosano 2006; de Martino 2005b; Gilan 2024. On the question of whether Pimpira served merely as an adviser or as a regent of some sort, I am rather neutral, and it is not directly relevant for present purposes. Gilan 2024 argues against him ever having been king or regent, but while Gilan 2024, 58 mentions the offering list in which Pimpira appears as LUGAL alongside a Ḫattusili, a Labarna and a Ḫuzziya, all labelled LUGAL, he never explains how this is to be understood if Pimpira did not serve as regent or king, which should have been a central concern of his paper. Neither does Gilan (2024, 59) reveal by what legerdemain he manages to see in §4 of the Telipinu Edict sons of Ḫattusili I ruling in the seven cities listed rather than sons of his predecessor Labarna.

<sup>290</sup> Forrer’s (BoTU 2, p. 4\*) assumption that BoTU 2.10 might be attributed to Pimpira was based primarily on his reading and interpretation of NU.BÀNDA-aš rather than NU DUMU-aš in i 14”. For the refutation of this argument, see already Sommer – Falkenstein 1938, 211–212.

<sup>291</sup> Cf. Beal 2003, 27–28; Forlanini 2010, 118 n. 20.

## Genre and Function

Even before the discovery of the joins presented here, Gilan had argued that both KBo 3.27 and KBo 3.28 should be viewed as didactic literature, as texts of political wisdom or political counsel.<sup>292</sup> In my view Gilan is clearly correct in seeing these compositions as essentially didactic and, I would emphasize, legitimizing, in nature, not as juridical or legislative documents, and the new joins only bolster Gilan's argumentation.

This contrasts markedly, e.g., with Marazzi's assessment of KBo 3.28 as a juridical document, as an edict:<sup>293</sup>

Der Text, obwohl sehr lückenhaft und nur partiell erhalten, erweist sich mit Sicherheit als Königserlass. Anekdotische (auf eine nähere Vergangenheit, in der der König als juristische Autorität vorkommt, oder auf eine fernere, in der ein „Vater des Königs“ handelt, chronologisch bezogen) kurze Erzählungen alternieren mit Textpartien mit dispositivem Charakter (*kinun*=a ... Z. 10' und 20'). Anlass und Hauptgegenstand des Erlasses scheint die Festlegung der Strafprozeduren im Falle untreuen Verhaltens der Person des Königs gegenüber ... von Angehörigen der königlichen Familie oder des königlichen Hofes zu sein. Die vorgesehenen Strafprozeduren sind (je nach betroffener Kategorie) mit verschiedenen (?) Ordalformen verbunden.

I do not wish to belabour the point here, as both Gilan and Marazzi have laid out their cases extensively, to which I can add but little. In fact, however, at no point in the entire reconstructed text does the author, Mursili, utter any dispositive statement; he only refers back to decisions and statements made by his (adoptive) father and patron. The only seemingly dispositive statements in §16" are actually spoken by a third party (either Ḫattusili himself or, perhaps, some other counsellor) to Mursili; however, in my view, these statements seem more like the political counsel of an adviser to his liege, as they suggest alternative options in the face of a courtier suspected of having transgressed against the king, which is surely rather didactic than legislative. And the rules regarding the river ordeal are obviously not being instituted by the speaker, he is merely referring to existing practice, as is made obvious by the ensuing paragraph (17"), where reference is made to Ḫattusili having employed precisely these methods. Surely §16" is not a case of law giving or legislation. Neither does the recollection of the *damnatio memoriae* or *abolitio nominis* of Tawannanna, uttered at some point (or repeated any number of times) during the reign of Ḫattusili and recalled here by Mursili, reflect the issuing of an edict, and it is only one aspect or episode of the text's overarching narrative.<sup>294</sup>

The primary unifying theme of the composition is, as Gilan and others have argued, the Hittite court's desired behaviour with regard to the word of the king or the word of the father.<sup>295</sup> And since the focus of that father's word – as seen, *inter alia*, in his Testament and in our current text – is that Mursili has been chosen as that father's legitimate successor, this repeated emphasis on the word of the father is at its core legitimizing for Mursili. This, of course, was seen long ago by

<sup>292</sup> Gilan 2015, 98–103, 110–115.

<sup>293</sup> Marazzi 2011–2012, Introductio. That Marazzi's assessment is strongly derivative of von Schuler's (1959, 441–442, 444, 459, 467, etc.) is clear; cf. also Marazzi 2007. Marazzi 2019–2020, even in the light of the new joins, continues to refer to the text as an edict, neglecting to even mention the reassessment of the question of its genre in Gilan's (2015) seminal work. Cf. also Klinger's (2020, 190) recent comments regarding KBo 3.27 alone, which he asserts 'läßt sich keinem spezifischen Textgenre zuweisen, etwas, was durchaus typisch für die hethitische Überlieferung bereits der frühesten Epoche ist.'

<sup>294</sup> For convincing argumentation for seeing the *damnatio* as directed against this particular individual and her offspring rather than as directed against the office of the *tawannanna* in general and in perpetuity, as argued by Bin-Nun 1975, 52–53 and followed more recently by Yiğit 2005, 788, see e.g. Bryce 1981, 15; Beal 1983, 124–126; 2003, 14–15; Freu 2007, 67. On further fundamental weaknesses of Bin-Nun's work, see already Archi's (1977), Beckman's (1978) and Haas's (1977) reviews.

<sup>295</sup> Gilan 2015, 98–100 and n. 375.

Liverani and emphasized by Pecchioli Daddi (see above, under Dating and Authorship, with ns. 282–283).

As to the function and original setting of the text, one can naturally do little more than speculate. For the most part the text reads like a speech of Mursili held or to be held at the Hittite court before the assembled nobility. As argued above, however, §16” seems rather to consist of words of advice spoken by a prominent adviser to the young king, and thus would hardly have been spoken as such by Mursili to his court. Perhaps, then, the document arose as Mursili and his closest advisers were considering what Mursili should say to the nobility at some point, and into the text flowed not only Mursili’s thoughts about the importance of his father’s word being heeded, but also some key adviser’s thoughts about how the young king should deal with disloyal subordinates. The ‘quoted’ speech of Ḫattusili is presumably pieced together from the memories of Mursili’s advisers, perhaps from his own memories of the later years of Ḫattusili’s reign, and likely also from written documents from Ḫattusili and his scribes, such as the Testament, which consisted of a tablet that was to be read to Mursili every month (§22).

The traditional title of KBo 3.27 = CTH 5, Edict of Ḫattusili I, is thus seen to be obsolete, both with regard to its genre as well as to its authorship. Neither should KBo 3.28 be seen as an edict, be it of Ḫattusili or of Mursili. ‘The Political Counsel of Mursili I’ is suggested here as a suitable alternative for the expanded text.

### ***Selected Historical Considerations***

Of course, a number of passages from the fragments now constituting the Political Counsel of Mursili I referring to various persons or events have played a central role in discussions about early Hittite history. In light of the narrative situation detailed above, it is a perpetual challenge to determine whether any given passage in this text is presenting (a) events and utterances from the reign of Ḫattusili as if from his own vantage point; (b) events and utterances from the reign of Ḫattusili from the vantage point of Mursili (whereby it is difficult or impossible to say when during the reign of Ḫattusili any given event occurred, let alone how long its repercussions may have remained relevant); or (c) events and utterances from Mursili’s own reign. The events and persons in question can now be reassessed in light of the new joins and the determination that the entire text constitutes a didactic and legitimizing composition of Mursili I.

### **The Identity of Tawannanna and Ḫattusili’s *coup d’état***

Since the new joins demonstrate that there is no ‘Edict of Ḫattusili’ that must be dated to the end of Ḫattusili’s reign, there is no reason to assume that Tawannanna was alive toward the end of his reign; and there is thus no reason to assume that such a late Tawannanna can only have been the wife, sister or daughter of Ḫattusili. In other words, there is no reason to assume more than a single Tawannanna, i.e. the aunt of Ḫattusili and queen of Labarna, in the early Old Hittite period. One is thus forced to reassess the nature of Ḫattusili’s ascension to the throne as well as Tawannanna’s (and Labarna’s) stance toward his claim to kingship. It will be seen that there is little to suggest that Ḫattusili was the designated and favoured successor, but rather the instigator of a *coup d’état* that deposed his predecessor’s lineage.<sup>296</sup>

<sup>296</sup> I will use the term *coup d’état* here, but in fact the nature of Ḫattusili’s takeover of Ḫattusa, whether a *coup d’état* or a conquest, should probably be left open for discussion. He was after all from Kussara, reigned at least in part in Kussara, probably died in Kussara (see most recently Gilan 2020, 208–210), and came to power in Ḫattusa by dislodging the reigning dynasty in Ḫattusa. Since he belonged, however, to this dynasty in Ḫattusa to a certain degree (his grandfather, Ḫuzziya, presumably having been king in Ḫattusa; his aunt, Tawannanna, a subsequent queen), one could perhaps say it was part *coup d’état* and part conquest.

Tawannanna is mentioned by name here in the newly reconstructed text in i 10' and i 6", in both cases with the determinative for feminine personal names and titles.<sup>297</sup> It remains the case, as argued most recently by Beal, that the only person in this period who is ever unambiguously called Tawannanna is Ḫattusili's aunt, whom he identifies as such in the opening lines of his Annals,<sup>298</sup> and who will have been the wife and queen of Labarna.<sup>299</sup> All attempts to identify an Old Hittite figure bearing the name Tawannanna or the title *tawannanna* in other persons, be she Ḫattusili's sister, his daughter or his wife,<sup>300</sup> are based on more or less convoluted considerations concerning a very small number of text passages. Moreover, no person from any period other than the ruling queen or queen mother is ever unambiguously attested with the title *tawannanna*; and neither Ḫattusili's sister nor his daughter, whose personal names still elude us, ever reigned, as far as we know, as queen. Thus, pending further more decisive evidence becoming available, the most parsimonious solution is to see Ḫattusili's aunt, the wife and queen of Labarna, as the Tawannanna mentioned here in i 10' and i 6".<sup>301</sup>

Naturally I cannot address in the present paper all the arguments for contrary opinions – and much less the status of the *tawannanna*, the nature of Hittite kinship relations and the rules of the succession to the throne in general<sup>302</sup> – so I will mention and briefly discuss only a few.

The primary assumption made in arguing for a further Tawannanna in the Old Hittite period in addition to Ḫattusili's aunt has been that this queen of Labarna can no longer have been alive or would have been too old to have been a person of interest in a text such as the 'Edict of Ḫattusili' (CTH 5, i.e. KBo 3.27), which has generally been assumed to have been promulgated toward the end of the reign of Ḫattusili, since it mentions Mursili as designated successor.<sup>303</sup>

<sup>297</sup> There has been, and remains, some disagreement on whether any given attestation is to be considered a personal name or the royal title (cf. Beckman 2012; Forlanini 2017b, 134 and n. 61; Soysal 2004, 772–774; Sürenhagen 1998, 84, all with refs.). Obviously it can be difficult to impossible to ascertain which is intended in any given case, as Hittite scribes used the same determinative for both feminine personal names and feminine titles, while employing two distinct signs for male personal names vs. male titles.

<sup>298</sup> KBo 10.2 i 3: ŠA <sup>1</sup>Ta-wa-an-na-an-na DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU; KBo 10.1 obv. 1: ŠA <sup>1</sup>Ta-w[a-na-an-na DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU].

<sup>299</sup> Beal 2003, 29. Others who have asserted that the Tawannanna in question is probably to be equated with Ḫattusili's aunt include Soysal (2006a, 16) and Forlanini (2010, 117 and n. 16, 124 and n. 49; 2017b, 134 and n. 61).

<sup>300</sup> Cf. Gilan 2015, 89 and n. 340; 2020; Beckman 2012, 488–489; Bryce 2005, 93–94; Beal 2003, 29–30; de Martino – Imparati 1998, 392–395; de Martino 1991, 59–60, all with refs.

<sup>301</sup> Of course, the question is tied to the oft-discussed issue of matrilinearity (even matriarchy for some scholars) in the Old Hittite period, which I will not address here, except to state that I see no convincing evidence for it whatsoever. Also rejecting Old Hittite matriarchy are, e.g., Beckman 1986a; 1993, 37 with n. 69–70; 1995, 533–535; Gilan 2016, 569; Klinger 2005, 144 n. 10; 2007, 42–43; 2017, 62–63 with n. 33; Wilhelm 1990; cf. Goedegebuure 2004 and Sürenhagen 1998, who argue for an avunculate.

<sup>302</sup> Particularly the rules of the succession to the throne cannot, unfortunately, be properly discussed here. For the purposes of the present paper I will merely mention that I assume that a patrilinear system of male primogeniture existed for the entirety of Hittite history (similarly, e.g., Beckman 1986a; Klinger 2017, 64; 2020, 190–191 n. 14). In other words, a son (generally the eldest) of the king (and queen) was the assumed successor (whereby the king could exercise a degree of choice); if there was no son or if he could not fulfil the role or was rejected for it, then the king (and queen) pragmatically sought an alternative close male relative, who was often adopted as a son. I know of no instance where this is not the case, excluding, obviously, cases of violent or forceful usurpation. In his Edict Telipinu is simply codifying and/or refining this basic principle, not introducing anything substantially new (except, perhaps, a loophole allowing for his own usurpation; see Klinger 2017, 64). It is thus apparent that I regard reconstructions such as Sürenhagen 1998 and Forlanini 2010 – though both are full of astute observations and attractive suggestions – as almost entirely fantastical. I also cannot agree with Gilan's (2016, 569b) more recent statement, i.e. that 'OHitt. historical literature, most notably the historical introduction of the Telipinu edict ..., shows that any male relative of the reigning king could aspire to the throne.' All those in the Telipinu Edict (and elsewhere) who 'aspired to the throne', but were not a son of the king, did so through violent means, not through rules of succession.

<sup>303</sup> So e.g. Freu 2007, 63–64; Carruba 1992, 80–81; de Martino 1991, 59; Bin-Nun 1975, 72–73. This argument, though suggestive, ultimately failed on at least two grounds, even before the new joins.

First, we have only a vague idea of how old Tawannanna would have been toward the end of Ḫattusili's

It is now seen, however, that the expanded document to which the ‘Edict’ belongs, the Political Counsel of Mursili I, was not composed toward the end of the reign of Ḫattusili, but during that of Mursili, rendering moot any assumption that this Tawannanna would have to have been alive toward the end of Ḫattusili’s reign.

A secondary argument in support of there having been a further Tawannanna in addition to Ḫattusili’s aunt was expressed by de Martino and Imparati:<sup>304</sup>

In the preamble of the *Gesta*, in fact, Ḫattušili calls on his kinship with her, undoubtedly to demonstrate the legitimacy of his position as king of Ḫatti. From this we may assume that at this time Ḫattušili’s aunt did not have children who were old enough to take the throne. Moreover, she cannot have had children who could claim rights of succession to the throne even at the time of the Testament, since there is no mention of them in this document, which instead refers to various members of the royal family who could aspire to the succession. It would appear, therefore, that an identification of this *Tawannanna* with Ḫattušili’s aunt, who we have said had no children, can be excluded, given that in KBo III 27 Ro 6’–8’ — subsequent to, as we said, though not that long after the Testament — reference is made to the sons of the/of *Tawannanna* who were banished with her.

De Martino and Imparati thus assume that Ḫattusili only became king because Tawannanna was childless, or heirless, and that she remained so up until the end of Ḫattusili’s reign.<sup>305</sup> This argument, however, ignores the clear evidence that Labarna and Tawannanna did indeed have children, including adult sons, and that Ḫattusili thus usurped the rights of these sons by taking the throne,<sup>306</sup> which would have led to her attempts to reassert her and their rights, to which Ḫattusili responded by formally banning the utterance of her and her offspring’s names.<sup>307</sup>

reign. We have no idea how old she was when she married Labarna; no clue when during Labarna’s lifetime he took his bride. And while she, as Ḫattusili’s aunt, will have belonged to the generation preceding him in kinship terms, she need not have been a full generation (i.e. ca. 20–25 years) older than him; indeed she need not have been older than Ḫattusili at all. Nor do we know whether Ḫattusili reigned 15, 25 or 35 years or more, or if he died at age 55 or 85. Thus, while Freu 2007, 63 claims that she must have been in her 80s or 90s toward the end of Ḫattusili’s reign, she could just as well have been in her 60s or 70s. (Freu is the only one who argues with a specific age or age range. All others [e.g. Carruba 1992, 80–81; Klingner 1996, 217–218], as far as I see, argue only more generally or implicitly assume that the *damnatio* in KBo 3.27 would be too late, so that only Ḫattusili’s wife, sister or daughter would even come into question.) And who’s to say that an 80 or even a 90 year old woman and queen mother cannot be a formidable force? History provides the occasional example of precisely such persons. This argument is thus seen as a case of the well-known error of applying averages to specific cases.

Second, even assuming that the ‘Edict’ would have been issued at the end of Ḫattusili’s reign, it would not be necessary to assume that Tawannanna would still have been alive at this late date, nor need she have been, for the *damnatio* to refer to her. The issue of Tawannanna was for Ḫattusili not one of Tawannanna alone, but also, perhaps primarily, of her royal lineage, which would have constituted a threat to Ḫattusili’s authority, to his selection of an heir and to Mursili’s authority, whether Tawannanna was still alive or not. The *damnatio* is, after all, an injunction against speaking her name as well as those of her progeny, regardless of her status. The *damnatio* would thus have aimed first and foremost at stifling the fading hopes of those who still yearned for a son of Labarna and Tawannanna for king.

<sup>304</sup> De Martino – Imparati 1998, 393.

<sup>305</sup> Also Barjamovic 2011, 186, 367 n. 1523 assumes that Tawannanna, the wife of Labarna, had no sons. Bin-Nun 1975, 69 also suggested that Tawannanna, the aunt of Ḫattusili, will have had no sons, but of course, Bin-Nun believed that this Tawannanna was not the queen of Labarna, but rather his sister, a view which, weak even when proposed, was rendered obsolete by the cruciform seal (Dinçol *et al.* 1993).

<sup>306</sup> As argued, e.g. by Soysal 1989, 124.

<sup>307</sup> Incidentally, this is the only measure taken against Tawannanna in KBo 3.27. Nowhere is she said to have been banished, as asserted, e.g. by de Martino – Imparati 1998, 392–393. This assertion is obviously based on the assumption that this Tawannanna would have been the daughter of Ḫattusili, who was indeed banished from Ḫattusa (Testament, §§16–17), and/or one of the persons (queen of Ḫuruma; daughter of the queen; the queen) banished in §§18–19 in our text, which, though one possibility, remains quite uncertain.

The first bit of evidence is found in the Telipinu Edict, §§3–4, in which it is said that each of Labarna's sons went to one of seven specifically named towns to govern them.<sup>308</sup> Of course, Telipinu's depictions of the reigns of Labarna, Ḫattusili and Mursili are known to be somewhat schematic and to seek to depict, to some degree,<sup>309</sup> a kind of golden age in contrast to that of their successors, so that one could perhaps argue that this mention of Labarna's sons need not be taken seriously. On the other hand, while the Telipinu Edict, §6, mentions how Ḫattusili's sons administered towns with almost identical words (though without naming concrete towns) – which is indeed attested for his son Ḫuzziya, while his adopted son Labarna was made a priest (Testament, §§12 and 3) – no such thing is noted for Mursili, so that the phrase was not simply mechanically copied for each ruler, a conclusion bolstered by other differences in details as well.<sup>310</sup> Thus, Tawannanna seems indeed to have had sons, unless one wishes to maintain that none of Labarna's seven sons were born of Tawannanna, which, as far as I can see, no one has argued explicitly in recent decades; nor am I aware of any evidence that Labarna had any other queen who would have born him these seven sons. It is surely much more parsimonious to assume that Tawannanna was indeed the mother of (at least some of) these seven sons, and that it is precisely these persons who would have represented a real and present danger to Ḫattusili and his designs and whom Ḫattusili's *damnatio* is designed to exclude from contention for the throne.<sup>311</sup>

Second, there is no indication that Labarna and his queen, Tawannanna, assented to or advocated Ḫattusili's becoming king in Ḫattusa.<sup>312</sup> To the contrary, one might understand the fact that it is nowhere mentioned<sup>313</sup> that Ḫattusili married a daughter of Labarna and/or was adopted as

<sup>308</sup> Thus I will assume here that Labarna (and Tawannanna) will have had seven sons, which seems to be the most straightforward reading of the passage. Of course, one cannot exclude the possibility that this royal couple had a smaller number of sons, and that they ruled these seven cities either in some consecutive configuration or grouped in some fashion. Also possible is that some of these seven sons would have been adopted sons and/or sons-in-laws who married daughters of Labarna and Tawannanna, i.e. were *antiyant*-sons.

<sup>309</sup> 'To some degree' because §7 of the Telipinu Edict in fact shows clearly that Telipinu was fully aware of the conspiratorial and bloody nature of the age of Ḫattusili, though he does not seem inclined to elaborate or to name names. Despite all the obvious indications to the contrary, Telipinu desperately wanted to present this period of the first three kings as an age of dynastic unity and of the growth and success of the state. He was apparently unable, however, to differentiate between dynastic unity on the one hand, which at no point was a reality, and military success and an expanding empire on the other, which is indeed clearly witnessed. In Telipinu's worldview the success of the state could only stem from dynastic unity, so that he was forced to see dynastic unity where there was none.

<sup>310</sup> See, e.g. Kloekhorst – Waal 2019, 197b. Indeed, one might even see the prince and son of Labarna stationed in Purushanda (Telipinu Edict, §4) as precisely that prince whom Ḫattusili managed to capture and whose family he banished in §15" here in our text, for which, see below.

<sup>311</sup> As for the question of why the *damnatio* was directed against Tawannanna and her progeny rather than against Labarna and his, I can only assume that it relates to Tawannanna being the daughter of the previous king, likely Ḫuzziya, while Labarna was presumably merely an *antiyant*-son in Ḫattusili's eyes. She may also have been actively attempting to (re)establish (one of) her sons on the throne. The issue for Ḫattusili was thus one of allegiance to Tawannanna's line vs. allegiance to his own, Labarna not even warranting mention. Of course, it may also be the case that Labarna was no longer alive when the *damnatio* was uttered, so that Ḫattusili felt even less inclined to bother with him.

<sup>312</sup> Pace Martínez 2016, 187, e.g., who writes, 'It is clear that Hattušili I had a positive relationship with Tawannanna early in his reign, as evidenced by his reference to her in his epithets.' Similarly, Bin-Nun 1975, 69: 'It was obviously with her [i.e. the Tawannanna's] official agreement that Hattušili as her nearest kin became king.' To the contrary, Ḫattusili's reference to his aunt, Tawannanna, in the opening clause of his Annals yields no information about their relationship other than his kinship claim. It surely says nothing about Tawannanna's stance toward or involvement in Ḫattusili having become king or about her opinion of his exploiting his kinship with her for his political legitimation. Klinger (2017, 62–63) is more likely to be correct when he writes, 'Es ist vermutlich nicht falsch, in der wie auch immer im Detail zu erklärenden Wendung weniger einen Hinweis auf vermeintlich matriarchale Traditionen zu sehen, sondern eher den Versuch, die eigene Herrschaft zwar durch Bezug auf das Königshaus zu legitimieren, wobei gerade im Umgehen bzw. dem Fehlen einer traditionellen patriarchalen Filiation ein Hinweis auf eine mögliche Thronusurpation zu sehen sein dürfte.'

<sup>313</sup> Pace Forlanini 2010, 117 n. 16, 124 and n. 49; Barjamovic 2011, 289 n. 1147, 367 n. 1523.

son and successor<sup>314</sup> to Labarna as suggesting that Labarna and Tawannanna would much rather have seen one of their own sons on the throne. And the fact that Ḫattusili felt the need to so decisively rule against these sons of Tawannanna agrees with the assumption that their claims would indeed have been legitimate, i.e. that they were Labarna's and Tawannanna's rightful and intended heirs. Those who assume that (Labarna and) Tawannanna chose Ḫattusili for the throne and that the transfer of power played out peacefully assume in effect that Tawannanna and/or this pair wilfully initiated the disenfranchisement of their own grown and politically active sons and that these sons were entirely content with this state of affairs. This is, in my view, quite unlikely.

Further, that Tawannanna (and Labarna) would have had no children is surely not the only possible explanation for the fact that Ḫattusili's Testament does not concern itself with her or her heirs. One might assume, e.g., that at the time of writing of the Testament late in Ḫattusili's reign (but cf. n. 312) he no longer considered Tawannanna and her sons a threat to his hold on the throne and his ability to pass it on to Mursili; perhaps their power had been curtailed by his political machinations, or maybe he had succeeded in eliminating them all.<sup>315</sup> (For the 'Purushanda Episode' as one chapter in this contest, see below.) Alternatively, and probably more likely, it may be the case that the Testament does not mention Tawannanna and her sons because they are simply not its subject matter: the primary topic of the Testament is (a) those persons from Ḫattusili's own family whom he had considered as candidates for his throne, (b) why he had rejected them, and of course, (c) the elevation of his final choice, Mursili. Tawannanna and her sons certainly did not belong to those whom Ḫattusili considered for the throne and thus warranted no mention. The Testament does not address all the dynastic issues mentioned, e.g., in the Telipinu Edict, the Zalpa Text and the Political Counsel of Mursili I. Labarna's sons – regardless of the question of who their mother would have been – are not afforded even a passing allusion in the Testament, and there is no reason why the modern reader should expect that it should do so. Of course, it bears repeating that nowhere in the extensive narrative essentially fully preserved in the Testament of Ḫattusili is any *damnatio* of any person mentioned, only the rebellion and subsequent death (or dismissal)<sup>316</sup> of his own son, Ḫuzziya (§§12–13), the adoption and subsequent disowning, dismissal and banishment of Ḫattusili's sister's son, Labarna (§§3–6), and the disowning and banishment of his own unnamed daughter, whose male progeny had been eyed for the throne by unnamed persons (§§13–18).

Finally, there is little reason to assume, with de Martino and Imparati, that Ḫattusili would only have referenced his relationship to Tawannanna in the opening lines of his Annals (see n. 298) as part of his legitimation if she had had no sons old enough for the throne. This presumes, again, that Labarna and Tawannanna approved of, perhaps even initiated, Ḫattusili's ascent to the throne due to their lack of heirs. In fact, this calls into doubt our traditional understanding of Ḫattusili's reference to his aunt, Tawannanna, in his Annals as pointing to his kinship with her in order to bolster or even grant him his own legitimacy. After all, it is not only Tawannanna who is mentioned in this line, but Tawannanna and her brother, i.e. Ḫattusili's father, together. Probably it has generally been assumed that it is the reference to Tawannanna that is the one that

<sup>314</sup> As is occasionally seen (or suspected) when a Hittite ruler has no (preferred) son of his own, i.e. in the cases of Mursili I, Arnuwanda I and Suppiluliuma I.

<sup>315</sup> The question arises, of course, why would Mursili bring up the matter of the *damnatio* again at such a late juncture, i.e. in his own reign? Naturally, if Ḫattusili had not yet succeeded in eliminating them, which seems likely enough, the *damnatio* of Tawannanna's issue might still have been directly relevant for Mursili and his authority and legitimacy. If, however, Ḫattusili had succeeded in eliminating the threat of Tawannanna's and Labarna's lineage, then one can only speculate that perhaps Mursili's renewed reference to it simply fit within his broader self-legitimizing narrative of reverence for the word of the father.

<sup>316</sup> Depending, of course, on how one restores and understands the fragmentary passage (§§12–13). Cf. most recently Gilan 2020, 204; 2015, 74–75; Klinger 2005, 144, with refs.

matters because she is named, while the reference to Ḫattusili's father is somewhat oblique. Still, one wonders if Ḫattusili is not rather (or also) pointing to his relationship to this person, son of the previous king, as supporting his claim to legitimacy.<sup>317</sup> Of course, the weakness of any such theory is this: Why did Ḫattusili not just openly say, 'I am the rightful heir of my father, PN, who is the rightful heir of my grandfather, PN!?' Naturally, one can only speculate. First and foremost, Ḫattusili's father was, as far as we know, never king. Further, perhaps Ḫattusili's father died young, before he could have ascended the throne; perhaps he was involved in some rebellious activities and was banned by his father, as suggested, e.g. by Beal.<sup>318</sup> Presumably, Ḫattusili references both Tawannanna and his own father, knowing that he might enjoy some degree of legitimacy from each, but also knowing that he cannot claim full legitimacy from either. And why reference Tawannanna at all? Perhaps as the still living child of Ḫattusili's grandfather (presumably Ḫuzziya), and maybe the only remaining member of that dynasty in Ḫattusa?

A further argument why Tawannanna in our text should not be identified with Ḫattusili's aunt is put forth by Freu, who writes, 'Si la vieille tante du roi avait été visée, comme la veut Beal, il est invraisemblable que Ḫattušili n'ait pas fait disparaître la mention de cette Tawananna (I) dans le prologue de ses « annals ».'<sup>319</sup> This suggestion, too, should not be dismissed *a priori*, but counterarguments are also conceivable. It may be the case, for example, that the *damnatio* was to be understood as a ban on uttering the name of Tawannanna and those of her sons in the context of advocating for their rights to the throne, while Ḫattusili in his Annals refers to her in a different context entirely, i.e. of his relationship to her, her brother (his father), and his own legitimacy. A member of the court saying something like 'We support you, Ḫattusili, as opposed to Tawannanna's sons for the throne,' for example, would presumably not have been at all unwelcome. After all, Mursili and his scribe are now witnessed as uttering the name of Tawannanna in the context of recalling Ḫattusili's *damnatio*, and they apparently did not feel any qualms about speaking (or writing) her name in such a way. Alternatively, as Beal suggests, the *damnatio* might have been uttered after the Annals had already been composed, and one cannot necessarily expect that the *damnatio* would have entailed the act of seeking out all the texts in which the name Tawannanna occurred and physically scratching it out of the dried clay.<sup>320</sup> Finally, it may simply be the case that Ḫattusili did not see himself bound by the same rules that he imposed on others, which hardly requires any stretch of the imagination considering the well-attested behaviour of monarchs, dictators and autocrats throughout history.

Thus, while one cannot on present evidence exclude the possibility that some Tawannanna other than the queen of Labarna is at issue here in i 10' and i 6", there is no clear indication that such an additional Tawannanna must be posited, be she Ḫattusili's wife, his sister or his daughter.<sup>321</sup> It

<sup>317</sup> I wonder, in fact, whether the thinking behind Ḫattusili's cryptic reference to Tawannanna and her brother might even have been to contrast what he felt would have been his own greater legitimacy with the lesser legitimacy of Tawannanna's sons. In other words, to paraphrase, 'I, Ḫattusili, am the son of a SON of the previous king, my grandfather, while the sons of Tawannanna and Labarna – who is, need I remind you, merely an *antiyant*-son – are only the sons of a DAUGHTER of the previous king, my grandfather.' Obviously, the truncated formulation in the Annals fails to fully express the entirety of this presumed thinking.

<sup>318</sup> Beal 2003, 15.

<sup>319</sup> Freu 2007, 68.

<sup>320</sup> Beal 2003, 14 n. 3.

<sup>321</sup> Conceivably, Kaddusi, Ḫattusili's wife as attested in the cruciform seal and the offering lists, could have taken the office of *tawannanna* at whatever point the queen of Labarna died or was formally stripped of the office, but nowhere in our documentation is Kaddusi or any wife of Ḫattusili connected with the office, and nowhere does Ḫattusili express animosity toward his wife (cf. also Beal 2003, 29). In fact, it remains an open question just how far back into Hittite history the office of *tawannanna* goes. Several ritual texts that clearly reach back into the OH period (Carruba 1992, 85–89; Beckman 2012, 489) show that it can be traced at least this far back; but what historical dating these linguistically and, in part, palaeographically, OH rituals suggest is another question. In other words, as the OH palaeography stretches down to the immediate predecessors of Tudḫaliya I (or to Telipinu according to the more conventional

therefore seems likely that Tawannanna here was simply that Tawannanna known as the queen of Labarna and aunt of Ḫattusili.

### The Other Royal Women

Related to this question as to the identity of Tawannanna is the matter of the identities of the bevy of other female royals mentioned in our text, i.e. ‘the/my daughter’ in i 13’ and 14’, perhaps ‘a/the snake’ in i 26”, the ‘daughters of the king’ in ii 4’, ‘your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife’ in ii 9’, ‘the *quee[n]*’ in ii 12’, ‘his wife’ and ‘his(/her) sisters’ in ii 7”, ‘that queen of Ḫuruma’ in ii 21”, the ‘daughter of the queen’ in ii 23” and ‘the queen’ in ii 24”.

In i 13’ and 14’ – just a few lines after the mention of Tawannanna in 10’ in the same paragraph – is mentioned ‘the’ or ‘my daughter’. Obviously, as only some 3-5 signs at the beginning of each line are preserved at this point, no conclusions should be based on this passage, *pace* e.g. Gilan<sup>322</sup> or Marazzi, who wrote:

Sia detto per inciso che l’ipotesi che la Tawannanna qui oggetto del provvedimento regio sia da riferire alla figlia e non alla sorella di Ḫattusili, sembrerebbe ottenere ora maggiore credito in virtù del nuovo join KBo 3.24+KBo 53.275 illustrato in Soysal 2006.<sup>323</sup>

This very fragmentary passage offers, in my view, not the slightest hint of an identity between Tawannanna mentioned in 10’ and the daughter mentioned in 13’ and 14’; nor, to be clear, the least bit of evidence against it.<sup>324</sup> With some three-quarters of the right portion of the paragraph missing, one can just as easily imagine that these lines refer to a single person first with the name Tawannanna and then again with the word daughter as one can imagine that they refer first to a person named Tawannanna and then to another person referred to as the daughter;<sup>325</sup> it depends entirely on what once stood in the break. Neither, incidentally, does the new join (i.e. KBo 3.24+53.275) make the identity between Tawannanna and the daughter in these lines any more or any less likely than before the join. That said, it seems to me the most parsimonious assumption that Ḫattusili refers here first to his aunt, Tawannanna, and then, following the topic marker, to his daughter, who would be his rebellious daughter known from his Testament (§§13–18). But this remains, of course, mere conjecture.

Little more can reasonably be said about the reference to ‘a/the snake’ in i 27”, who is imagined will strangle Ḫattusa if the king’s words are not respected. Naturally, this can conceivably be equated with Ḫattusili’s calling his sister<sup>326</sup> a snake in his Testament, §2, so that she might be the referent here,<sup>327</sup> even if nothing necessitates this interpretation. It is hardly unlikely that Ḫattusili may have used the same metaphor for other persons as well, such as the Tawannanna mentioned in §6”. Nor can one exclude the possibility that the image here represents evil in

view; cf. Miller 2004, 463–464 n. 773; Klinger 2022, 307–308 n. 142), the OH language down to roughly the same period (Melchert 2008), the OH rituals attesting the office of *tawannanna* merely show that this office arose at some time before Tudḫaliya I (or Telipinu); when in this period remains unclear.

<sup>322</sup> Gilan 2015, 89.

<sup>323</sup> Marazzi 2011 [2015], 64 n. 8.

<sup>324</sup> So already Beal 1983, 125. At the most one might point to the topic change at the beginning of 13’ (*ug=a*) – i.e. not the conjunction *-ia/-a*, as understood, e.g. by Dardano 2012, 630 –, but though a topic change from Tawannanna to the daughter is one possibility, perhaps even the most likely one, it is obviously not the only possibility. It might well, e.g., be topicalizing ‘I, however ...’ as opposed to the previous actors in the paragraph.

<sup>325</sup> So e.g. Soysal 2006a, 16.

<sup>326</sup> Not his daughter, as mistakenly asserted by Klinger 2020, 191 n. 16.

<sup>327</sup> E.g. Freu 2007, 67; Carruba 1992, 80.

general that will plague the land if the king's counsel is ignored.<sup>328</sup> Arguing staunchly for one or the other option is, in my view, rather forced.

The identities of the 'daughters of the king' in ii 4', 'your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife' in ii 9' and 'the *quee[n]*' in ii 12', in consideration of the fragmentary state of these lines and without the benefit of any further context, must also be left open. If one takes *kinun=a* in ii 2' to suggest that §§11"–14" should be situated in the reign of Mursili, and if one assumes that the 2nd sg. forms in ii 6' and 9' suggest that some adviser is speaking to Mursili (cf. above, on §16"),<sup>329</sup> then perhaps the 'daughters of the king' would refer to the daughters of Ḫattusili,<sup>330</sup> 'your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife' to Mursili's wife, Kali, and 'the *quee[n]*' either to Ḫattusili's queen, as queen mother, or to Mursili's queen; in this case the switch from 'your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife' to 'the *quee[n]*' in reference to one and the same person would remain unexplained, though not necessarily fatal to the hypothesis. Otherwise, if *kinun=a* in ii 2' relates only to lines 2'–3', so that it is again Ḫattusili speaking in 4'–13', then perhaps the 'daughters of the king' and the 'sons [*of the king*']' relate to the progeny of Labarna and Tawannanna; and maybe the 'the *quee[n]*' is again a reference to Tawannanna, or maybe to Ḫattusili's own wife and queen. Who 'your<sup>(sg.)</sup> wife' would be in such a scenario is anybody's guess: perhaps the wife of one of the sons of Labarna and Tawannanna, who is thus being addressed? After having been stripped of his office as regional administrator, as the prince of Puruṣhanda had been?

It seems clear enough that 'his wife' and 'his(/her) sisters' in ii 7" refer to the wife and the sisters of the prince of Puruṣhanda.

Finally, we have 'that queen of Ḫuruma' in ii 21" as well as the 'daughter of the queen' and 'the queen' in ii 23" and 24" in the enigmatic paragraphs §§18"–19". I am inclined to see 'that queen of Ḫuruma' and the 'daughter of the queen' as one and the same person, and to see in her a daughter of Tawannanna; and I therefore tend to see Tawannanna in 'the queen' in 24". This queen of Ḫuruma would thus have been a further vestige of the dynasty of Labarna and Tawannanna that was herewith marginalized by Ḫattusili.<sup>331</sup> It must be emphasized, however, that this scenario is largely speculative, that present evidence is insufficient to prove or disprove it, and that other possibilities must yet be entertained.<sup>332</sup>

The dem. pron. *asi* in 21" should, of course, refer back in the text to where this queen of Ḫuruma was mentioned already, so that one might be inclined to equate her with the wife of the prince of Puruṣhanda mentioned in §15", the more so as she, too, was banished. Indeed, this possibility should not be excluded.<sup>333</sup> It would surely be odd, however, for the speaker or the scribe to refer

<sup>328</sup> Collins 1989, 216–217, e.g., doubts Sommer's suggestion of equating the snake here with Tawannanna, and sees a mythological creature instead, though providing no further reasoning.

<sup>329</sup> This interpretation may well be doubted, however, since '[if] you<sup>(sg.)</sup> [*con*]*coct* [evil]', or similar, at the end of 5' and in 6' suggests rather that a royal person is addressing a subordinate, who is not to concoct evil against the king and/or the royal family. I suspect, therefore, that Mursili (or an adviser) is speaking to a subordinate (or subordinates).

<sup>330</sup> But then who would the 'sons [*of the king*']' in 4' be referring to? The sons of Labarna and Tawannanna? So would both 'daughters of the king' and 'sons [*of the king*']' be referring to daughters and sons of Labarna and Tawannanna?

<sup>331</sup> One question that arises with such a scenario is: Why then is Ḫuruma not in the list of seven cities in the Telipinu Edict (§§3–4) that were ruled by sons of Labarna (and, presumably, of Tawannanna)? Clearly one can only speculate. Perhaps because these seven were ruled by sons of Labarna and Tawannanna, while Ḫuruma (and other cities?) were ruled by (mere) *antiyant*-sons who had married daughters of Labarna and Tawannanna? Perhaps one or more of the seven sons were transferred at some point from one city to another?

<sup>332</sup> Cf. e.g. Beal 2003, 26–27 with n. 80; Martínez 2016, 184–189; Forlanini 2017b, 133–134.

<sup>333</sup> In fact, if one regards §16", with its 2nd sg. forms, as an insert into the flow of the text, then §17" would follow or would have followed narratively or structurally upon §15". This would considerably reduce the distance between *asi* and whatever its antecedent might have been. Similarly, one might take §§16"–17" as the insert, §17" being Mursili's contextual commentary or response to §16". In this case, §18" would follow or would have followed upon §15".

to the wife of the just mentioned prince of Puruṣḥanda as ‘that queen of/from Huruma’. Why not refer to her as ‘that queen of/from Puruṣḥanda’? Alternatively, *asi* may refer to some royal woman mentioned in the now (largely) missing paragraphs at the beginning of obv. ii. Still, as this composition in general seems to be pieced together from a number of sources, be they speech situations, memories thereof, or various texts, *asi* could presumably have referred anaphorically to a queen mentioned in that initial narrative or textual situation, whereupon it was subsequently imported into the present composition, where its referent is no longer present. One should therefore probably not expect more insight from this pronoun than is warranted. Thus, *asi* might be referring back to the princess of Puruṣḥanda, or it might be referring again to Tawannanna<sup>334</sup> or, as suggested above, to a daughter of hers.

A further possibility, though very much in the realm of speculation, might be to see ‘that queen of Huruma’ as the wife of Kizzuwa, who would thus have been a prince or king of Huruma. The beginning of §16” does introduce the matter of the river ordeals as one in which ‘a prince/son transgresses against the person of the king’, so that subsequently presenting the example of Kizzuwa in §17” as just such a prince would fit the narrative. If so, for the scribe and his audience it would have been obvious that this ‘queen of Huruma’ was Kizzuwa’s wife, so that his use of anaphoric *asi* would have been clear to all, even if it seems obscure to us, since nowhere in the preserved text is it explicitly stated that this ‘queen of Huruma’ was Kizzuwa’s wife or that Kizzuwa was prince or king of Huruma. This interpretation would also echo to some degree the pattern seen in §15”, where the matter of the prince of Puruṣḥanda and his offences is mentioned, whereupon the banishment of his wife and family is noted.<sup>335</sup>

In fact, such a scenario might provide a narrative and associative thread in §§15”–19” that otherwise seems rather difficult to detect: In §15” the prince of Puruṣḥanda is at issue, but while we see that his family is banished, we do not seem to learn what happens to him; it is thus perhaps the question of what happens to him that leads to the topic of §16”, i.e. the river ordeal, so that we can perhaps assume that the prince of Puruṣḥanda would have been subjected to the same ordeal, though the scribe neglects to name him explicitly. This reference to the use of the river ordeal in §16” may then have reminded the speaker/scribe of the related case of Kizzuwa, who likewise was found guilty by means of the river ordeal, but was spared nevertheless. And upon relating Kizzuwa’s ordeal, the speaker/scribe continued with the fate of Kizzuwa’s family, i.e. with the fate of ‘that queen of Huruma’.

That said, an alternative scenario might provide a no less plausible narrative and associative thread for §§15”–19”. The prince of Puruṣḥanda might be Kizzuwa. In this case, §16” would again function as an interlude of sorts, addressing the question ‘What to do with a rebellious prince?’, after which the case of Kizzuwa, Prince of Puruṣḥanda, is taken up again in §17”. If so, one might speculate further that Kizzuwa’s wife might be the ‘daughter of the queen’, whose banishment would thus be mentioned at the end of §15” and again in §19”. In this case, assuming that she would thus be a daughter of Tawannanna, Kizzuwa would presumably be an *antiyant*-son of Labarna and Tawannanna. If, moreover, this ‘daughter of the queen’ and ‘that queen of Huruma’ of §§18”–19” were one and the same person – i.e. if Kizzuwa married into the royal family of Hurma, his bride thus becoming a queen (of Puruṣḥanda) from Hurma –, then it would presumably support

<sup>334</sup> E.g. Martínez 2016, 184–187.

<sup>335</sup> Such a scenario might imply either that this Kizzuwa was not the same person as the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard of the same name in the Palace Anecdotes, or, if they were indeed the same person, that at some point he gained his position as prince or king in Huruma by marrying into the royal family, i.e. by marrying a daughter of Labarna and Tawannanna. In any case, Kizzuwa, the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, must have been a member of the innermost circle of the royal family, as this office is generally filled by such a person, often by a brother of the king (Bilgin 2018, 97–116).

the suggestion of Martínez that Labarna's family was based in Ḫuruma.<sup>336</sup> Again, these two scenarios are rather speculative, and any number of alternatives can and should be entertained.

To recapitulate, I am inclined to see 'that queen of Ḫuruma' and the 'daughter of the queen' as one and the same person, and to see in her a daughter of Queen Tawannanna;<sup>337</sup> and I tend to see Tawannanna in 'the queen' in 24". This presumes a situation in which this daughter of Labarna and Tawannanna ruled as queen in Ḫuruma at some point, presumably as the wife of a husband who would have married into the royal family and ruled as king or prince in Ḫuruma, just as Labarna's and Tawannanna's seven sons ruled as princes in the seven cities mentioned in the Telipinu Edict, §§3–4. It must be emphasized, however, that this scenario is largely speculative, that present evidence is insufficient to prove or disprove it, and that other possibilities must remain in the discussion.

### The Rulers of Zalpa, Ḫassu and Ḫalab

A further important historical issue that gains some clarity with the new text reconstruction is that concerning the rulers of Zalpa, Ḫassu and Ḫalab. In particular, as it is now clear that Mursili can be seen as the narrator of §9" rather than Ḫattusili, it becomes quite likely that the rulers of these three cities had 'spurned the word of the father', i.e. that of Ḫattusili, that the rulers of Zalpa and Ḫassu had already been punished for this, and that the fate of the ruler of Ḫalab was at this point during the reign of Mursili yet to be decided. There is no longer any need to see the reference to the father as metaphorical,<sup>338</sup> self-referential<sup>339</sup> or as pertaining to Ḫattusili's predecessor, Labarna.<sup>340</sup>

How one interprets these laconic statements of Mursili historically is of course another matter, which cannot be treated exhaustively here. I remain of the opinion<sup>341</sup> that the most obvious interpretation is that Ḫattusili succeeded during his reign in subjugating all three cities, concluding vassal treaties with them.<sup>342</sup> All three subsequently rebelled, 'spurning the word of the father', i.e. still during the reign of Ḫattusili, and only Zalpa and Ḫassu had since been reconquered,<sup>343</sup> presumably during the latter part of Ḫattusili's reign.<sup>344</sup> The reconquest of Ḫalab was thus left to Mursili. The rulers of such cities would only be said to have 'spurned the word of' a Hittite king if

<sup>336</sup> Martínez 2016. In such a scenario, this Kizzuwa, Prince of Puruṣanda, could only be equated with Kizzuwa, Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, in the Palace Anecdotes if one assumes either that (a) the events in the Anecdotes occurred during the reign of Labarna or that (b) Kizzuwa, despite his opposition to Ḫattusili while Prince of Puruṣanda, not only survived (as per §17") but was subsequently installed by Ḫattusili in a position as sensitive as Chief of the Royal Bodyguard. The first assumption seems unlikely, as it is quite clear that the Anecdotes relate to Ḫattusili's court in Kussara, at a time when he already ruled over essentially all of Anatolia and much of Syria. The second assumption also seems rather unlikely, though it must be noted that the land grants do attest a number of high officials' surviving (violent) regime change; however, one might assume that these survivors would have been active supporters of the up-and-comers (Rüster – Wilhelm 2012, 49–57).

<sup>337</sup> It is difficult to imagine to what other queen she might have been a daughter. Ḫattusili never refers to his own troublesome daughter as 'daughter of the queen', by which he would be intending his own wife and queen, but simply as 'my daughter'.

<sup>338</sup> Klengel 1999, 39 n. 30.

<sup>339</sup> Archi 1979, 44.

<sup>340</sup> Forlanini 2007, 277; 2009, 51.

<sup>341</sup> Miller 1999, 12–13.

<sup>342</sup> As noted explicitly in the case of Nuḥasse and Astata in §10 of the historical introduction to Muwattalli II's Copy of Mursili II's Treaty with Talmi-Šarrumma of Aleppo (CTH 75), assuming of course, that Ḫattusili here is Ḫattusili I, not the disputed Ḫattusili II. This is often overlooked by those treating this period, e.g. by Beckman (2013, 3082), who writes that 'There is no evidence that Hattusili imposed Hittite governance on Syria.'

<sup>343</sup> Dardano 2014, 43 also speaks of these two cities, which had 'ribellatesi al potere ittito', having been 'riconquistate', with Ḫalab, in contrast, 'destinata alla rovina'.

<sup>344</sup> Miller 2001, 72–74, with refs.

they had been obliged to their sovereign by an oath of vassalage; rulers who are not vassals of the Hittite king are not obliged or expected to obey his word.<sup>345</sup> Of course, which of the three or four cities named Zalpa/Zalpuwa is at issue here remains an open question. In my view it is more likely to have been one of the northern Syrian Zalpās.<sup>346</sup> Corti,<sup>347</sup> Freu<sup>348</sup> and Forlanini<sup>349</sup> have argued recently for the northern Anatolian Zalp(uw)a, whereby Forlanini's assumption is predicated on his placement of the events pertaining to these three cities back in the reign of Labarna.

### The Puruṣhanda Episode

Another important historical issue is raised by the occurrence of the Puruṣhanda and the prince of Pur[uṣhanda] in ii 5" and 6", apparently in the context of a (re)conquest<sup>350</sup> of this city or at least of the dismissal of its ruling prince along with the banishment of his wife and his(/her) sisters. As argued above, these events seem to be presented by Mursili as having been narrated by and thus having taken place during the reign of Ḫattusili. Moreover, as the Telipinu Edict (§§3–4) lists Parsuḫanta as one of the cities governed by the sons of Labarna, it seems likely that what we see here in §15" is one episode in Ḫattusili's disenfranchisement of Labarna's and Tawannanna's heirs; perhaps the missing portions of the text would have informed us of further stages in these efforts. Possibly the phrases in 3"–6" of this paragraph are to be understood as indicating that this prince of Puruṣhanda, rather than accepting Ḫattusili's *coup d'état* and recognizing Ḫattusili as king, responded by beginning hostilities against Ḫattusa, which Ḫattusili perceived as unjustified behaviour toward him, so that the gods surrendered this prince to him.<sup>351</sup> While the fate of the prince of Puruṣhanda is not obviously related,<sup>352</sup> his family is banished.

A closely related question is whether this would be the same episode as that concerning Puruṣhanda mentioned in KBo 3.46+ ii 4'–13' of CTH 13 and, if so, when these events should be dated.<sup>353</sup> It has generally been assumed that the events in these two texts should be equated. Further, most have assumed that KBo 3.46+ and the events narrated in it should be ascribed to Mursili I, and this conclusion has generally been based, at least in part, on the assumption that KBo 3.28 is to be attributed to Mursili I.<sup>354</sup> Kempinski and Košak, in contrast, argued that KBo 3.46+ should rather be seen as the Extended Annals of Ḫattusili I,<sup>355</sup> while Forlanini attributes it either to Mursili I or to Ḫantili I, with a preference for the latter.<sup>356</sup>

In light of the new joins and renewed analysis it can be seen that the Puruṣhanda episode here in §15" is indeed presented as if narrated by Ḫattusili, but retrospectively, from the vantage point

<sup>345</sup> I emphasize this point here because Klengel 1992, 82, e.g., asserts that this passage 'demonstrates that Halab itself was not yet conquered during the late years of Hattushili's reign.' Cf. also e.g. Soysal 1989, 123.

<sup>346</sup> Miller – Corti 2017, 195–196, with refs. So also e.g. Klinger 2014, 72, updating his previous view (1996, 124).

<sup>347</sup> Corti 2005, 119–120 with n. 46.

<sup>348</sup> Freu 2007, 80.

<sup>349</sup> Forlanini 2007, 277; 2009, 51.

<sup>350</sup> I.e. presumably not the initial Hittite conquest of this area, which had already been under the control of Labarna, who installed a son in Parsuḫanta (Telipinu Edict, §4).

<sup>351</sup> Perhaps the most probable juncture for Ḫattusili launching his *coup d'état* will have been Labarna's death, at which point Ḫattusili will have seen himself as rightful heir. While seemingly likely enough, there is in fact no evidence that might specifically support or militate against such an assumption.

<sup>352</sup> Dardano's (2018, 363) assertion that he was sentenced to death is not correct.

<sup>353</sup> For recent treatments and discussions of CTH 13 and/or the 'Puruṣhanda episode', see Beal 2003, 26–31; de Martino 2003, 127–153; 2004, 40–41; Dardano 2004; Barjamovic 2011, 367–368; Gilan 2015, 243–248; Forlanini 2017b, 131–137.

<sup>354</sup> E.g. de Martino 2005a, 145–147; Soysal 1989, 136–137.

<sup>355</sup> Kempinski – Košak 1982.

<sup>356</sup> Forlanini 2017a, 242–243 and n. 46.

of Mursili, thus placing the events back in the reign of Ḫattusili. Assuming that this episode concerning Purušanda and that in KBo 3.46+ ii 4'–13' can be connected or equated, as indeed seems likely, one should probably conclude that the events of KBo 3.46+ should be dated to the reign of Ḫattusili I as well. This, of course, leaves open the precise characterization and narrative situation of KBo 3.46+, which Gilan<sup>357</sup> has recently suggested might also narrate events dating to the reign of Ḫattusili from the perspective of Mursili, as presciently intimated already by Pecchioli Daddi.<sup>358</sup> Whether these two text passages, with their significant similarities and despite their significant differences, can indeed be reconciled, should be the topic of further analysis.

## Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to Craig Melchert, Petra Goedegebuure, James Burgin, Amir Gilan, Gary Beckman, Michele Cammarosano and Oğuz Soysal for reading and commenting on a pre-print of this paper and/or discussing various issues with me. Thanks also to Zsolt Simon and an anonymous reviewer for numerous helpful comments. The more concrete or substantive of their suggestions I have noted specifically where appropriate.

## Bibliography

- ALPARSLAN, M. 2016: *Yayımlanmamış Boğazköy Tabletleri (Bo 8486-8694) / Unpublizierte Boğazköy Tafeln (Bo 8486-8694)*. Istanbul.
- ARCHI, A. 1968: Sulla formazione del testo delle leggi ittite. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 6, 54–89.
- ARCHI, A. 1977: Review of Bin-Nun 1975. *Orientalia* NS 46, 480–487.
- ARCHI, A. 1979: L'humanité des Hittites. In: N. N. (ed.): *Florilegium anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*. Paris, 37–48.
- BARJAMOVIC, G. 2011: *A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period*. (Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 38) Copenhagen.
- BEAL, R. H. 1983: Studies in Hittite History. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35, 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3515945>
- BEAL, R. H. 2003: The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I. In: BECKMAN, G. – BEAL, R. – McMAHON, G. (eds.): *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake, 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781575065434-005>
- BEAL, R. H. – COLLINS, B. J. 1996: Hittite *pankur*, a new suggestion. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 23, 308–315. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aof.1996.23.2.308>
- BECKMAN, G. M. 1978: Review of Bin-Nun 1975. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98, 513–514. <https://doi.org/10.2307/599780>
- BECKMAN, G. M. 1986a: Inheritance and Royal Succession among the Hittites. In: HOFFNER, H. A. – BECKMAN, G. M. (eds.): *Kaniššuwat. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*. (Assyriological Studies 23) Chicago, 13–31.
- BECKMAN, G. M. 1986b: Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Hittite. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45, 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1086/373154>
- BECKMAN, G. M. 1993: From Cradle to Grave: Women's Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic. *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8, 25–39.
- BECKMAN, G. M. 1995: Royal Ideology and State Administration in Hittite Anatolia. In: SASSON, J. M. (ed.): *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. New York, 529–543.

<sup>357</sup> Gilan 2015, 247.

<sup>358</sup> Pecchioli Daddi 1994, 84.

- BECKMAN, G. M. 2012: Tawan(n)anna. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 13, 488–490.
- BECKMAN, G. M. 2013: Hattusili I and his Dynasty. In: BAGNALL, R. S. – BRODERSEN, K. – CHAMPION, C. B. – ERSKINE, A. – HUEBNER, S. R. (eds.): *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History* 6. Malden – Oxford – Chichester, 3082–3083.
- BILGIN, T. 2018: *Officials and Administration in the Hittite World*. (Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 21) Berlin – Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501509773>
- BIN-NUN, SH. R. 1972: The Anatolian Background of the Tawananna's Position in the Hittite Kingdom. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 30, 54–80. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rhita.1972.1060>
- BIN-NUN, SH. R. 1973: The Offices of GAL.MEŠEDI and TUḪKANTI in the Hittite Kingdom. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 31, 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rhita.1973.1067>
- BIN-NUN, SH. R. 1975: *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom*. (Texte der Hethiter 5) Heidelberg.
- BOLEY, J. 1984: *The Hittite hark-Construction*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 44) Innsbruck.
- BOLEY, J. 1992: The Hittite Periphrastic Constructions. In: CARRUBA, O. (ed.): *Per una grammatica ittita / Towards a Hittite Grammar*. (Studia Mediterranea 7) Pavia, 33–59.
- BOSSERT, H. TH. 1946: *Asia*. Istanbul. <https://doi.org/10.26650/AB/AA07.2022.025>
- BRYCE, T. R. 1981: Ḫattušili I and the Problems of the Royal Succession in the Hittite Kingdom. *Anatolian Studies* 31, 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3642754>
- BRYCE, T. R. 2005: *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. New Edition. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199281329.001.0001>
- CAMMAROSANO, M. 2006: *Il decreto antico-ittita di Pimpira*. (Eothen 14) Firenze.
- CARRUBA, O. 1992: Die Tawannannas des Alten Reiches. In: OTTEN, H. – AKURGAL, E. – ERTEM, H. – SÜEL, A. (eds.): *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp. Sedat Alp'a Armağan. Festschrift für Sedat Alp*. (Anadolu Medeniyetlerini Araştırma ve Tanıtma Vakfı Yayınları 1) Ankara, 73–89.
- CHRISTIANSEN, B. 2007: Der Blick aus dem Fenster. Bemerkungen zu einem literarischen Motiv in einigen Texten des hethitischen Schrifttums und des Alten Testaments. In: GRODDEK, D. – ZORMAN, M. (eds.): *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25) Wiesbaden, 143–152.
- COHEN, Y. 2002: *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society. A Study of the Hittite Expression natta āra ('not permitted')*. (Texte der Hethiter 24) Heidelberg.
- COLLINS, B. J. 1989: *The Representation of Wild Animals in Hittite Texts*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University). New Haven.
- CORTI, C. 2005: Il racconto delle origini: alcune riflessioni sul testo di Zalpa. In: PECCHIOLI DADDI, F. – GUIDOTTI, M. C. (eds.): *Narrare gli eventi. Atti del Convegno degli Egittologi e degli Orientalisti italiani in margine alla mostra "La battaglia di Qadesh"*. (Studia Asiana 3) Roma, 113–121.
- DARDANO, P. 1997: *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: la cosiddetta "Cronaca di Palazzo"*. (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 43) Roma.
- DARDANO, P. 2002: 'La main est coupable', 'le sang devient abondant': sur quelques expressions avec des noms de parties et d'éléments du corps humain dans la littérature juridico-politique de l'Ancien et du Moyen Royaume hittite. *Orientalia* NS 71, 333–392.
- DARDANO, P. 2004: Il re, il grasso e l'argilla: per una proposta di interpretazione di KBo 3.46 +, Ro II 13'. In: GRODDEK, D. – RÖßLE, S. (eds.): *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19.02.1894-10.01.1986)*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 10) Dresden, 239–251.

- DARDANO, P. 2010: “Guardare gli occhi del re”: per l’analisi di una formula antico-ittita. In: KLINGER, J. – RIEKEN, E. – RÜSTER, CH. (eds.): *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 52) Wiesbaden, 47–60.
- DARDANO, P. 2012: Die Worte des Königs als Repräsentation von Macht: Zur althethitischen Phraseologie. In: WILHELM, G. (ed.): *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20–25 July 2008*. Winona Lake, 619–636. <https://doi.org/10.5325/j.ctv1bxgx80.51>
- DARDANO, P. 2014: Šanda e i Hurriti: nota su KBo 3.34 I 24–25. In: BROSCHE, C. – PAYNE, A. (eds.): *Nawa/i-VIR.ZI/A MAGNUS.SCRIBA. Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 45) Wiesbaden, 41–49.
- DARDANO, P. 2016: Su alcune espressioni ittite per ‘vedere, osservare’. In: MARQUARDT, H. – REICHMUTH, S. – GARCÍA TRABAZO, J. V. (eds.): *Anatolica et indogermanica. Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 155) Innsbruck, 43–61.
- DARDANO, P. 2018: Semitic influences in Anatolian languages. In: NIESIOŁOWSKI-SPANÒ, Ł. – WĘCOWSKI, M. (eds.): *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-Eastern Mediterranean at the turn of the Bronze Age and in the early Iron Age*. (Philippika 118) Wiesbaden, 345–375. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvckq4zg.22>
- DE MARTINO, S. 1989: Hattušili I e Haštayar: un problema aperto. *Oriens Antiquus* 28, 1–24.
- DE MARTINO, S. 1991: Alcune osservazioni su KBo III 27. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18, 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aof.1991.18.1.54>
- DE MARTINO, S. 1992: I rapporti tra Ittiti e Hurriti durante il regno di Muršili I. *Hethitica* 11, 19–37.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2003: *Annali e Res Gestae antico ittiti*. (Studia Mediterranea 12 = Series hethaea 2) Pavia.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2004: König, Gott und Feind in den althethitischen historiographischen Texten. *Kaskal* 1, 31–44.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2005a: Le Res Gestae dei sovrani ittiti dell’Antico Regno. In: PECCHIOLI DADDI, F. – GUIDOTTI, M. C. (eds.): *Narrare gli eventi. Atti del Convegno degli Egittologi e degli Orientalisti italiani in margine alla mostra “La battaglia di Qadesh”*. (Studia Asiana 3) Roma, 143–147.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2005b: Pimpira, Pimpirit. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 10, 565–566.
- DE MARTINO, S. – IMPARATI, F. 1998: Sifting Through the Edicts and Proclamations of the Hittite Kings. In: ALP, S. – SÜEL, A. (eds.): *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 16-22 Eylül 1996 / Acts of the III<sup>rd</sup> International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16-22, 1996*. Ankara, 391–400.
- DE MARTINO, S. – DEVECCHI, E. 2012: Death Penalty in the Hittite Documentation. In: ROLLINGER, R. – LANG, M. – BARTA, H. (eds.): *Strafe und Strafrecht in den antiken Welten: Unter Berücksichtigung von Todesstrafe, Hinrichtung und peinlicher Befragung*. (Philippika 51) Wiesbaden, 191–201.
- DEVECCHI, E. 2015: *Trattati internazionali ittiti*. (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4: Letterature dell’Asia Minore 4) Brescia.
- DINÇOL, A. M. – DINÇOL, B. – HAWKINS, J. D. – WILHELM, G. 1993: The ‘Cruciform Seal’ from Boğazköy-Hattusa. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 87–106.
- FORLANINI, M. 2007: The Offering List of KBo 4.13 (I 17’-48’) to the local gods of the kingdom, known as “Sacrifice List”, and the history of the formation of the early Hittite state and its initial growing beyond central Anatolia. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49, 259–280.
- FORLANINI, M. 2009: Upper Mesopotamia in the Middle of the 17th Century B.C. according to the Hittite Texts. *Kaskal* 6, 49–75.

- FORLANINI, M. 2010: An Attempt at Reconstructing the Branches of the Hittite Royal Family of the Early Kingdom Period. In: COHEN, Y. – GILAN, A. – MILLER, J. L. (eds.): *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 51) Wiesbaden, 115–135.
- FORLANINI, M. 2017a: South Central: The Lower Land and Tarḫuntašša. In: WEEDEN, M. – ULLMAN, L. Z. (eds.): *Hittite Landscape and Geography*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/121) Leiden – Boston, 239–252. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004349391\\_022](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004349391_022)
- FORLANINI, M. 2017b: Le rôle de Puruṣḫanda dans l'histoire hittite. In: MOUTON, A. (ed.): *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday / L'hittitologie aujourd'hui : Études sur l'Anatolie hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche*. 5<sup>èmes</sup> Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFÉA, Istanbul, 21-22 novembre, 2014. Istanbul, 125–150. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifeagd.3508>
- FORLANINI, M. 2020: Il contesto storico delle istruzioni “umanitarie” hittite e l’“invasione” dei caschei (Kaška). In: CAMMAROSANO, M. – DEVECCHI, E. – VIANO, M. (eds.): talugaeš witteš. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. (Kasion 2) Münster, 141–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.18654733.16>
- FREU, J. 2007: Télipinu et l'Ancien royaume de Ḫatti. In: ID. – MAZOYER, M.: *Des origines à la fin de l'Ancien royaume hittite. Les Hittites et leur histoire*. (Kubaba 7) Paris, 27–186.
- FRYMER-KENSKY, T. S. 1979: *The Judicial Ordeal in the Ancient Near East*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University). New Haven.
- GARRETT, A. J. 1990: *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Harvard University). Cambridge, MA.
- GARRETT, A. 1998: Remarks on the Old Hittite Split Genitive. In: JASANOFF, J. – MELCHERT, H. C. – OLIVER, L. (eds.): *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 92) Innsbruck, 155–163.
- VAN GESSEL, B. H. L. 1998: *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon 1-2*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/33) Leiden – New York – Köln. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004294028>
- GILAN, A. 2015: *Formen und Inhalte althethitischer historischer Literatur*. (Texte der Hethiter 29) Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.33675/978-3-8253-7434-1>
- GILAN, A. 2016: Verwandtschaft (kinship). B. Bei den Hethitern. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 14, 566–570.
- GILAN, A. 2017: The Shadows of a Distant Past. The Historical Introduction of the Aleppo Treaty (CTH 75). *Altorientalische Forschungen* 44, 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1515/afo-2017-0005>
- GILAN, A. 2020: “She did not call me father, so I will not call her my daughter!” The Episode of the “Daughter” in CTH 6 and Its Historical Significance. In: CAMMAROSANO, M. – DEVECCHI, E. – VIANO, M. (eds.): talugaeš witteš. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. (Kasion 2) Münster, 203–214. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.18654733.19>
- GILAN, A. 2024: Was Pimpira Regent for the Underage King Muršili I? A New Look at an Old Hittite Prince. *Anatolica* 50, 53–65.
- GIORGIERI, M. 1995: *I testi ittiti di giuramento*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Università di Firenze). Firenze.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2002–2003: The Hittite 3<sup>rd</sup> person/distal demonstrative *aši* (*uni*, *eni* etc.). *Die Sprache* 43, 1–32.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2004: Troonsopvolging in het Oud-Hettitische Rijk: patrilineair, matrilineair of avunkulair? *Phoenix* 50, 5–21.

- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2012: Hittite Iconoclasm: Disconnecting the Icon, Disempowering the Referent. In: MAY, N. N. (ed.): *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*. (Oriental Institute Seminars 8) Chicago, 407–452.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2013: Hittite Noun Phrases in Focus. In: JAMISON, S. W. – MELCHERT, H. C. – VINE, B. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 24th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, October 26th and 27th, 2012*. Bremen, 27–45.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2014: *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 55) Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc16s5m>
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2019: The Old Hittite Genitive Plural Ending *-an*. In: CATT, A. A. – KIM, R. I. – VINE, B. (eds.): *QAZZU warrai. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Kazuhiko Yoshida*. Ann Arbor – New York, 59–72.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. in press: Old Hittite *kuid=a* ‘but as for’, introducing contrastive topics in left-dislocation. In: ID. *et al.* (eds.): *Acts of the 10<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Hittitology 2017*. (Oriental Institute Publications) Chicago.
- GRODDEK, D. 2008: *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KBo 50*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 28) Wiesbaden.
- GÜTERBOCK, H. G. 1938: Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil: Hethiter. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 44, 45–149. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zava.1938.44.1-2.45>
- GÜTERBOCK, H. G. 1969: Ein neues Bruchstück der Sargon-Erzählung «König der Schlacht». *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 101, 14–26.
- HAAS, V. 1977: Review of Bin-Nun 1975. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morganlandes* 69, 150–156.
- HAAS, V. 2006: *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin – New York. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110193794>
- HEINHOLD-KRAHMER, S. – RIEKEN, E. 2020: *Der ›Tawagalawa-Brief‹. Beschwerden über Piyamaradu. Eine Neuedition*. (Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie 13) Berlin – Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110581164>
- HOFFNER, H. A. 1966: Composite Nouns, Verbs and Adjectives in Hittite. *Orientalia* NS 35, 377–402.
- HOFFNER, H. A. 1986: Studies in Hittite Grammar. In: HOFFNER, H. A. – BECKMAN, G. M. (eds.): *Kaniššuwār. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*. (Assyriological Studies 23) Chicago, 83–94.
- HOFFNER, H. A. 2010: Logographic Plural Markers in Hittite Cuneiform Texts. In: KIM, R. – OETTINGER, N. – RIEKEN, E. – WEISS, M. (eds.): *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor – New York, 137–158.
- KAMMENHUBER, A. 1969: Die Sprachstufen des Hethitischen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83, 256–289.
- KEMPINSKI, A. – KOŠAK, S. 1982: CTH 13: The Extensive Annals of Hattušili I(?). *Tel Aviv* 9, 87–116. <https://doi.org/10.1179/tav.1982.9.2.87>
- KLENGEL, H. 1992: *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C. A Handbook of Political History*. Berlin.
- KLENGEL, H. 1999: *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/34) Leiden – Boston – Köln. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004294066\\_015](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004294066_015)
- KLINGER, J. 1996: *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37) Wiesbaden.
- KLINGER, J. 2005: Das Testament Hattušilis I. In: JANOWSKI, B. – WILHELM, G. (eds.): *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*. (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments NF 2) Gütersloh, 142–146.

- KLINGER, J. 2007: *Die Hethiter*. (C.H.Beck Wissen) München. <https://doi.org/10.17104/9783406646461>
- KLINGER, J. 2014: The Imperial Space – The Early Hittite Kingdom. In: CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM, E. – BRISCH, N. – EIDEM, J. (eds.): *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space. The Emergence of the Mittani State*. (Topoi 17) Berlin – Boston, 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110266412.75>
- KLINGER, J. 2017: Die Entwicklung von Herrschergenealogien bei den hethitischen Großkönigen. In: RENGIER, A.-B. – WITTE, M. (eds.): *Sukzession in Religionen: Autorisierung, Legitimierung, Wissenstransfer*. Berlin – Boston, 55–84. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431667-005>
- KLINGER, J. 2020: Ein »Edikt« Hattušilis I. (CTH 5). In: JANOWSKI, B. – SCHWEMER, D. (eds.): *Texte zur Wissenskultur*. (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments NF 9) Gütersloh, 189–191.
- KLINGER, J. 2022: Zu den Anfängen der hethitischen Überlieferung überhaupt und zur Methode der paläographischen Textdatierung. In: CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM, E. – SCHRACKAMP, I. (eds.): *Transfer, Adaption und Neukonfiguration von Schrift- und Sprachwissen im Alten Orient*. (Episteme in Bewegung 25) Wiesbaden, 255–340. <https://doi.org/10.13173/9783447117210.255>
- KLOCK-FONTANILLE, I. 2001: *Les premiers rois hittites et la représentation de la royauté dans les textes de l'Ancien Royaume*. Paris.
- KLOEKHORST, A. 2014: *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 56) Wiesbaden. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc2rm8t>
- KLOEKHORST, A. 2017: The Hittite genitive ending -*ān*. In: HANSEN, B. S. S. – HYLLESTED, A. – JØRGENSEN, A. R. – KROONEN, G. – LARSSON, J. H. – NIELSEN WHITEHEAD, B. – OLANDER, TH. – SØBORG, T. M. (eds.): *Usque ad radices: Indo-European studies in honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*. (Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 8) Copenhagen, 385–400.
- KLOEKHORST, A. – WAAL, W. 2019: A Hittite Scribal Tradition Predating the Tablet Collections of Hattuša? The origin of the 'cushion-shaped' tablets KBo 3.22, KBo 17.21+, KBo 22.1, and KBo 22.2 *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 109, 189–203. <https://doi.org/10.1515/za-2019-0014>
- KOROŠEC, V. 1950: Die Kollektivhaftung im hethitischen Recht. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entwicklungsgeschichte. *Archiv Orientální* 18/3, 187–209.
- LAROCHE, E. 1965: Études de linguistique anatolienne. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 23/76, 33–54. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rhita.1965.1198>
- LAROCHE, E. 1973: Fleuve et ordalie en Asie Mineure hittite. In: NEU, E. – RÜSTER, CH. (eds.): *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*. 27. Dezember 1973. Wiesbaden, 179–189.
- LEBRUN, R. 2000: Reflexions concernant Ḫapaliya et la cité de Sura. *Archivum Anatolicum* 4, 113–120. [https://doi.org/10.1501/Archv\\_00000000077](https://doi.org/10.1501/Archv_00000000077)
- LIVERANI, M. 1977: Storiografia politica hittita – II. Telepinu, ovvero: della solidarietà. *Oriens Antiquus* 16, 105–131.
- LIVERANI, M. 2014: *The Ancient Near East: History, society and economy*. London – New York. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315879895>
- MARAZZI, M. 2007: Gli editti reali hittiti: definizione del genere e delimitazione del corpus. In: GRODDEK, D. – ZORMAN, M. (eds.): *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25) Wiesbaden, 487–502.
- MARAZZI, M. 2010: Pratiche ordaliche nell'Anatolia hittita. In: BIGA, M. G. – LIVERANI, M. (eds.): *ana turri gimilli. Studi dedicati al Padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J. da amici e allievi*. (Vicino Oriente, Quaderno 5) Roma, 197–230.
- MARAZZI, M. 2011–2012: Königserlass (Mursili I?) (CTH 9.6). [hethiter.net/CTH 9.6](http://hethiter.net/CTH_9.6)
- MARAZZI, M. 2011 [2015]: Dimensione temporale e collocazione spaziale: qualche breve riflessione. *Isimu* 13, 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.15366/isimu2011.13.004>

- MARAZZI, M. 2013: Emanazione e fondamento della norma nella società ittita. In: LUCREZI, F. – MARAZZI, M. – VISCONTI, A. (eds.): *Oralità e scrittura*. (Fondamenti del diritto antico 1) Napoli, 41–110.
- MARAZZI, M. 2014: „Jenseits von Gut“ ... aber nicht „von Böse“. Gedanken über hethitisch *tameu-man*. In: BROSCHE, C. – PAYNE, A. (eds.): Na-wa/i-VIR.ZI/A MAGNUS.SCRIBA. *Festschrift für Helmut Nowicki zum 70. Geburtstag*. (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 45) Wiesbaden, 125–131.
- MARAZZI, M. 2019–2020: Work on the “Textzeugnisse/Erlässe” of the Mainzer Portal: Short notes on the new text KBo 3.27+. *News from the Lands of the Hittites* 3–4, xvii–xxiv.
- MARAZZI, M. 2024: CTH 5: Vorarbeiten zu einer neuen Edition für das Mainzer Portal. *News from the Lands of the Hittites* 8, 93–120.
- MARTÍNEZ, J. 2016: The Evidence for Hurma as Early Hittite Capital in the Old Kingdom. In: MARQUARDT, H. – REICHMUTH, S. – GARCÍA TRABAZO, J. V. (eds.): *Anatolica et indogermanica. Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 155) Innsbruck, 173–190.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 1983: A ‘New’ PIE \*men Suffix. *Die Sprache* 29, 1–26.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 1985: Hittite *imma* and Latin *immō*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 98, 184–205.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 2008: Middle Hittite revisited. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 50, 525–531.
- MELCHERT, H. C. 2015: Alleged “Right Dislocation” in Hittite. In: MÜLLER-KARPE, A. – RIEKEN, E. – SOMMERFELD, W. (eds.): *Saeculum. Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 58) Wiesbaden, 137–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc2rmpm.14>
- MILLER, J. L. 1999: *The Expeditions of Ḫattušili I to the Eastern Frontiers. A Study in the Historical Geography and Internal Chronology of the Great King’s Campaigns*. Unpublished MA Thesis (Tel Aviv University). Tel Aviv.
- MILLER, J. L. 2001: Anum-Ḫirbi and His Kingdom. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 28, 65–101. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aof.2001.28.1.65>
- MILLER, J. L. 2004: *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 46) Wiesbaden.
- MILLER, J. L. 2006: *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* 50. *Texte historischen Inhalts*. Berlin.
- MILLER, J. L. 2012: The (City-)Gate and the Projection of Royal Power in Ḫatti. In: WILHELM, G. (ed.): *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20–25 July 2008*. Winona Lake, 675–685. <https://doi.org/10.5325/j.ctv1bxgx80.55>
- MILLER, J. L. 2013: *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 31) Atlanta. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjgsb>
- MILLER, J. L. 2014: Mursili II’s Prayer Concerning the Misdeeds and the Ousting of Tawannanna. In: TARACHA, P. (ed.): *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*. Warsaw, 516–557.
- MILLER, J. L. – CORTI, C. 2017: Zalpa (Zalba / Zalpaḥ / Zalpa/u(wa) / Zal/rwar). *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 15, 193–202.
- NEU, E. 1974: *Der Anitta-Text*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18) Wiesbaden.
- OETTINGER, N. 2022: Hethitisch *menu-* ‚Mensch, männlich‘. *Historische Sprachforschung* 135, 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2022.135.1.255>
- OTTEN, H. 1975: Ḫur(a)ma. B. Nach heth. Quellen. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 4, 502–503.

- PECCHIOLO DADDI, F. 1994: Il re, il padre del re, il nonno del re. *Orientalis Antiqui Miscellanea* 1, 75–91.
- PRINGLE, J. M. 1993: *Hittite Kinship and Marriage. A Study Based on the Cuneiform Texts from 2nd Millennium Boğazköy*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (University of London). London.
- PRINGLE, J. 2010: Further Comments on a Hittite Kinship Term. In: SINGER, I. (ed.): *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. (Tel Aviv University / Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology, Monograph Series 28) Tel Aviv, 193–198.
- PUHVEL, J. 1986: *Huidar* and *vitnir*: Creatures and Critters in Anatolia and Iceland. *Die Sprache* 32, 54–57.
- PUHVEL, J. 2009: Hittite *pankur*: Return to Common Sense. *Aramazd* 4/1, 56–62.
- PUHVEL, J. 2023: Hittite *mi-e-nu-us*: Humans as ‘meek’ or ‘lesser’. *Aramazd* 17/1, 20–21. <https://doi.org/10.32028/ajnes-vol-17-pp.20-21>
- RAMAN, C. F. J. 1973: *The Old Hittite Relative Construction*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Texas). Austin.
- RIEKEN, E. 2009: Hethitisch *kāša*, *kāšma*, *kāšat(t)a*: drei verkannte deiktische Partikeln. In: RIEKEN, E. – WIDMER, P. (eds.): *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden, 265–273.
- RIEKEN, E. 2012: Der Nom.-Akk. Pl. n. auf *-i* im Hethitischen: Zu den Mechanismen der Ausbreitung von Kongruenzsystemen. *Historische Sprachforschung* 125, 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.13109/hisp.2012.125.1.285>
- RIEMSCHEIDER, K. K. 1977: Prison and Punishment in Early Anatolia. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 20, 114–126. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004618152\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004618152_007)
- RÜSTER, CH. – WILHELM, G. 2012: *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 4) Wiesbaden.
- SASSEVILLE, D. 2025: Proto-Anatolian *\*ne-ḡnh<sub>2</sub>-o-* ‘brother’. In: HACKSTEIN, O. – MILLER, J. L. – RIEKEN, E. (eds.): *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München – Marburg. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=3854>
- VON SCHULER, E. 1959: Hethitische Königserlasse als Quellen der Rechtsfindung und ihr Verhältnis zum kodifizierten Recht. In: VON KIENLE, R. – MOORTGAT, A. – OTTEN, H. – VON SCHULER, E. – ZAUMSEIL, W. (eds.): *Festschrift Johannes Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag am 27. August 1958 gewidmet*. Heidelberg, 435–472.
- SIDELTSEV, A. V. 2011: Clitic Doubling: A New Syntactic Category in Hittite. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38, 81–91. <https://doi.org/10.1524/aofo.2011.0005>
- SIDELTSEV, A. V. 2024: Clitic Third in Hittite: Variation and Development. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 77, 183–216. <https://doi.org/10.1556/062.2024.00399>
- SOMMER, F. – FALKENSTEIN, A. 1938: *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Ḫattušili I. (Labarna II.)*. (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung NF 16) München.
- SOYSAL, O. 1989: *Mursili I. Eine historische Studie*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg). Würzburg.
- SOYSAL, O. 2004: *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/74) Leiden – Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047412465>
- SOYSAL, O. 2005: Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 95, 121–144. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zava.2005.95.1-2.121>

- SOYSAL, O. 2006a: Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (IV): Ein Textanschluß an KBo 3.24 (CTH 39.1). *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2006, 15–16 (No. 18).
- SOYSAL, O. 2006b: Review of Cohen 2002. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 65, 129–134. <https://doi.org/10.1086/504994>
- SOYSAL, O. 2021: Kleine Beiträge zu den unpublizierten Bo-Texten (I): Die Klageschrift eines althethitischen Königs (Bo 6109). *Kaskal* 18, 55–63.
- STARKE, F. 1996: Zur „Regierung“ des hethitischen Staates. *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 2, 140–182.
- STEINER, G. 1996: Muršili I: Sohn oder Enkel Labarna-Hattušilis I? *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28, 561–618.
- STEITLER, CH. W. 2019: The Personal Deictic Function of Hittite *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(t)a*: Further Evidence from the Texts. In: KIM, R. I. – MYNÁŘOVÁ, J. – PAVÚK, P. (eds.): *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 107) Leiden – Boston, 365–381. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413122\\_020](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413122_020)
- STROBEL, K. 2011: Die Geschichtsschreibung der Hethiter und frühe griechische Historiographie. Wertungsfragen im Lichte der Anatolisch-Ägäischen Koinē. In: HUTTER, M. – HUTTER-BRAUNSAAR, S. (eds.): *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn*. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 391) Münster, 245–274.
- SÜRENHAGEN, D. 1998: Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen und Erbrecht im althethitischen Königshaus vor Telipinu – ein erneuter Erklärungsversuch. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 25, 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.1524/afo.1998.25.1.75>
- WAAL, W. 2022: Crime and Punishment in Hittite Anatolia: A New Interpretation of the Verb *šaku(ua)*-/šaku<sub>u</sub>ai- (with an etymological contribution by Alwin Kloekhorst). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 74, 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.1086/719865>
- WATKINS, C. 1973: ‘River’ in Celtic and Indo-European. *Ériu* 24, 80–89.
- WEEDEN, M. 2011: *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 54) Wiesbaden.
- WILHELM, G. 1990: Matrilinearität. B. Bei den Hethitern. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7, 588–590.
- YİĞİT, T. 2005: Sequence of Internal Events During the Foundation Period of the Hittite Kingdom. In: SÜEL, A. (ed.): *V. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 02-08 Eylül 2002 / Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 02-08, 2002*. Ankara, 779–788.