

On Recent Cuneiform Editions of Hittite Fragments (I)

OĞUZ SOYSAL

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*¹ (henceforth *KBo*) is one of the primary and oldest publication series for the Hittite cuneiform documents from Boğazköy, and its first six volumes were edited by pioneer scholars H. H. Figulla, E. F. Weidner, O. Weber, E. Forrer, and F. Hrozný between the years 1916–21. They contain the copies of the most important and well preserved tablets stemming from the first excavation seasons at Boğazköy under the direction of H. Winckler and Th. Makridi. The Second World War and its aftermath resulted in an extended hiatus of the publication of *KBo*. In 1954 H. Otten released volume 7 of the series, which offered the finds from the more systematically conducted excavations of K. Bittel. Since then, and for more than a half century, Otten alone and with his long-time colleague Chr. Rüster (Werner) continuously and prodigiously published a great deal of this series. With some exceptions (H. G. Güterbock, C. W. Carter, H. M. Kümmel, G. Wilhelm, E. Neu), Otten was the person primarily responsible for work on the *KBo* editions.

Volume 45 (2003) represented a turning point for the series when scholars from the younger generation (G. Torri, J. L. Miller, D. Groddek) joined in the job of copying Hittite fragments. The appearance of volume 58 in September 2008 established the welcome fact that the reinforcements of new copyists have remarkably sped up the process of editing and disseminating previously unpublished written material from Boğazköy, making them accessible to the scholarly community. Among these freshmen, J. L. Miller alone in the short time period between 2005 and 2008 has delivered four volumes of *KBo* (50, 53, 57, 58). The volume under review, from the year 2005, is his first publication in this category. It contains copies of 310 fragments made by him and twenty-six hand-copies by others (E. Neu, H. Otten, and Chr. Rüster).

We are extremely thankful to Miller for his useful but time-consuming pursuit, and hope that he will be able to continue his work copying Hittite fragments in the future as well. After the publication of *KBo* 53 Miller published several articles dealing with further joins and duplicates to the fragments from *KBo* 53 which will be mentioned in the present review under the relevant text numbers. He has also treated some religious texts belonging to the Maštigga ritual from *KBo* 53 (nos. 22–23, 25–27, and 29) in the course of his revised doctoral dissertation, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, *StBoT* 46 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004).

KBo 53 has previously been reviewed by V. Haas, *OLZ* 100 (2005): 454–56.

GENERAL AND TECHNICAL REMARKS

According to the *Vorwort* of *KBo* 53 (p. III), Miller has developed a new copying technique which has enabled him to produce copies quickly. Despite the fact that *KBo* 53 is his

This is a review article of: *Texte aus dem Bezirk des Grossen Tempels V*. By JARED L. MILLER. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, vol. 53. Berlin: GEHR. MANN VERLAG, 2005. Pp. xx + 46. €27 (paper).

1. Abbreviations employed here are those of *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. Add: *Caucasica: The Journal of Caucasian Studies*. Tbilisi.

very first “cuneiform” production, Miller has managed to deliver neat and accurate copies. The volume itself, as usual, exhibits a nicely and carefully done standard of production. Only a few technical errors are to be noticed:

Inhaltsübersicht, p. V (nos. 15 and 16): Why has the copy of the relevant and important duplicate 1209/u not been included, given that according to its inventory number it would fit perfectly in the range covered by the present volume?

p. VIII (no. 152): Read *ḥapalze/ir*.

p. VIII (nos. 207 and 213): Are these pieces duplicate or parallel texts?

no. 107 i 7: Correct the transliteration *a-aš-ša-an-zi* to *a-ša-an-zi*.

no. 173 line 7' should be 8', since in the edition the previous line is left unnumbered.

no. 211 is superfluous; it had already been published as *KBo* 37.151.

no. 213 i 10 should be i 11, since in the edition the previous line is left unnumbered.

no. 223 is also superfluous; it is already available as *KBo* 37.71.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO INDICES

no. 4, l. edge 3': Read *Û.MEŠ-uš* (not *Gul^{MEŠ}-uš*, *Indices*, p. XVIII).

no. 37 iv (colophon) 3': To be restored as *URU A-an-[ku-ua]?*

no. 62 line 3': Restore *[LÚ.MEŠ URU Iš-t]a-nu-ua?*

no. 84 line 3': The precise designation of the goddess is *^dHebat ḥalziy[auwaš]*.

no. 91 obv.[?] 7': Read rather *URU Ū-li-pa<-aš> TÚL-az* “from the spring of the town Ulipa.”

no. 101 l. col. 11': Read *URU[†] Tu-u-šar¹-[pa-at-ta]*.

no. 107 ii 6': read *^dU.[†]GUR¹*.

no. 110 i 4': A personal name *^fAnninijami* does not exist (*pace Indices*, p. XIX); read *MUNUS anniniyami*- “female cousin.”

no. 113 rev.[?] 1': Perhaps *ḪUR.[†]SAG¹ Ḫa-ḥ[ar[?]-ua[?]]*.

no. 155 line 1': Probably *[^dT]a-az-z[†]u-u¹-u[*a-ši(-)* . . .] or [^dT]a-az-z[†]u-ua¹-š[i(-) . . .]*.

no. 160 iv (colophon) 13': Read *ḪUR.SAG Ga-ši-[. . .]*.

no. 164 l. col. 7''–8'': Restore *[^dMe-ez-zu-u]l-la-an-na* or *[^dḪu-u]l-la-an-na / [. . . akuw]anzi*.

no. 189 obv. l. col. 1: Read *[^dH]a-ša-la-a*.

no. 197 line 5': To be read *^{†d}GAŠAN-ni-in?*

no. 212 iv 7: A restoration *^{†LÚ}SANGA¹ ^d[U AN-E]* is also possible (cf. iv 3).

no. 213 i 3: Read probably *[URU Ḫa-an-z]u-u-uš-ra*.

no. 214 line 23': *^dŠi-ú-ni* (for *DINGIR-ni* in line 18''); line 24': read *^dZi-i[š[?]- . . .]*.

no. 216 i 13': Read *^dU URU Kargarama ^dLAMMA* (not *AN-E*, *Indices*, p. XVIII); i 30': *ḪUR.SAG A-d[a[?]]-[†]x-x¹*.

no. 224 rev.[?] (iv) 16': Alternatively read *^dTub-bi-[†]x¹-[. . .]* (instead of *^dUm-bi-x[. . .]*); rev.[?] (iv) 17': read *[^dH]i-[†]iš-kal¹-li* (not *Iškalli*, *Indices*, p. XVIII).

no. 241 line 9': [*DINGIR.M*]AḪ-aš; 12': [*^d?*]r-ḫa-an-da-ua-aš[?](-) [. . .]; 14': *^dIŠTAR-iš*.

no. 247 line 1': Read and restore *[^dIš-ḫa-ra mi-ḥ]u¹²-mi-n[a-a(-) . . .]* based upon the dupl. *IBoT* 2.81:5'; V. Haas, *OLZ* 100: 456, interprets differently.

no. 249 line 5': Read [*^m . . .*]-[†]x¹-zi-ti-iš *ŠEŠ-ni*; thus contrary to the *Indices*, p. XIX, the first word is not a geographical name.

no. 265: The following readings and restorations are to be suggested: line 1': [*^dU URU*]Li-iḥ-[zi-na]; 3': [*^dU URU*]Zi-ip-la-a[n-da]; 4': [*^dU URU*][†]Ḫa-la¹-ap; 5': [*^dU Š*]A KA[R]AŠ; 6': [*^dLAMMA UR*]^UGaraḥn[a].

no. 267 line 8': [*^m . . .*] *^dLAMMA-an*; 9': perhaps *^{†d}Š[e-e-ḫa]*.

no. 269 l. col. 2': Read [^{URU}H]a-at-te-na.

no. 271 line 7': Read probably ^mNi-en-na-aš (add to E. Laroche, NH [1966], no. 881); on this personal name see O. Soysal, *BiOr* 60 (2003): 44–45; cf. also M. Poetto, *Le Muséon* 117 (2004): 5.

no. 278 line 2': Restore possibly [^dUT]U ^{URU}TÚL-na.

REMARKS TO INDIVIDUAL TEXTS

I would like to dedicate this section to discussions of the individual fragments. It will mainly focus on the duplicates and joins, suggested readings and restorations, rare or new lexical entries to the recent Hittite dictionaries (*CHD*, *HED*, *HEG*, *HW*²) or sign lists (*HZL*), and the supplemental bibliographic references. I do not intend, however, to get into the *CTH*-generated and rapidly expanding text ensembles or into dating of texts, for which the reader is to be referred to the electronic resource prepared by S. Košak, *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* on the *Hethitologie Portal* Mainz: <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

no. 1 has now been joined to *KUB* 33.21 iii 8'ff. by Miller, *ZA* 96 (2006): 236.

no. 3 rev. 11: The recent work of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project definitely confirms that (^{GIŠ})šišiyamma- is not a tree, but an agricultural implement like ḫaḫhara-, muila-, intaluzzi-, and the galamma-tool of copper which accompany it (*KUB* 12.51 i² 11'–12' // *KUB* 42.99 i² 3'–4'). An additional occurrence of (^{GIŠ})šišiyamma- is [. . . an]daš (end of a participle) šī-ši-ya-a^m-ma⁷¹-aš (pl. dat.; this reading is against V. Haas, *AoF* 34 [2007]: 29, 31, 34: daššišiyamnaš) in the MH Allaituraḫi Ritual *KBo* 31.143 obv.² 12', where the word appears beside the (^{GIŠ})tiddutri-tool, another agricultural implement.

no. 5 joins *KUB* 8.63; see now Miller, *N.A.B.U.* 2005 (no. 1): 10.

no. 9: Cf. also Soysal, *ZA* 95 (2005): 139 n. 18.

no. 10: The long-awaited MH prayer fragment of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal presented here expands the content of this highly interesting composition:

ii 17: The profession ^{LÚ}ENSI “seer” is very rare and should be added to Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, *HZL* (1989), no. 40; elsewhere one finds always ^{MUNUS}ENSI “female seer.”

ii 22'–25' (with unpublished duplicate 577/u ii 4'–9', from which I draw the restorations here) list members of the family circle of Arnuwanda I and his queen Ašmunikal, certainly of historical importance: [^mArnuwanda LUGAL.GAL] / Û ¹Ašmunikal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL [^m71][Tuthaliya DUMU.LUGAL (tuḫukanti)] / [¹Š]atandu¹hepa ^mPar[iyawatra (DUMU.NITA SANGA)] / [. . . ? ¹Mušuḫep][a² katt¹[a ḫāšša (ḫanzā)šša . . . (QĀT)AMMA²]. Šatanduḫepa was the (first) wife of Tuthaliya II/III (who is the son of Arnuwanda I and bears here his early title tuḫukanti). Pariyawatra is known from several religious sources as well (e.g., *KUB* 45.47 i 40–41, ii 5–6, 10, iii 25, *KBo* 20.62 i 10'–11') with the same title DUMU.NITA SANGA as in this document. He was probably another son of Arnuwanda I beside Kantuzzili (O. Soysal, *BiOr* 60: 50 with bibl.). Finally, I would suggest the restoration [¹Mušuḫep]a for ii 25' based on the co-occurrence of Mušuḫep[a] and Pariyaw[atra] in *KUB* 34.58 ii rt. col. 1'–4'; she would then have been attached to Pariyawatra as his sister or wife.

iii 8'–10': The three foreign words after the personal names Šunāili, Temitti, and Pazizi are hardly proper names (thus, *Inhaltsübersicht*, p. IV “Vatersnamen(?)”), since they do not apply the personal determinative ^m. I would consider piggappilu(-), pikuduštenaḫ, and pi-tūntūna(-) more likely as epithets, nicknames, or designations of family or origin, whatever they might mean in their native language. All of them sound like good Hattian words (cf. gappilu, kuduštenaḫ, tuntuna), having a common plural-collective prefix pi=, which is not

a simple initial part of *Vatersnamen*. A similar conclusion was drawn by E. von Schuler, *Kašk.* (1965), 94 (under *Beinamen*), assuming, however, that *pi*= here is the Hattian locative prefix. These linguistic considerations would also be supported by the Hattian ethnicity of the city Kammama (iii 7'), where the persons in question were apparently resident.

no. 13: The verbs in ii 4'–5' are preserved only in this version and allow some corrections to the "conjunctural restorations" posed by O. R. Gurney, *AAA* 27 (1940): 26. The verbal forms iter. pret. pl. 3 ¹*m*¹*a-al-le-eš-ki-ir* (ii 4') and defective pres. sg. 3 *ma-al-<la / li>-z¹i¹* (5') are to be added to the occurrences of *malla/i-*, *mallya/i-* "to mill, grind" listed in *CHD* 3/2 (1983), 125.

no. 15 rt. col. 5'–9' and 16 obv. 1'–5' are duplicate or parallel to unpubl. 1209/u: 5'–9'. Remarkable is the lexical interchange between [a]mmel *iš-ḥar*-. . .] (*KBo* 53.16 obv. 3') and *ammel* ^{UZU}*KA*×*ÀŠ-na²-ša-¹x¹*(eras.) (1209/u: 7'). This unique logogram from Boğazköy, which is unknown in the Mesopotamian cuneiform system, is already listed in Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, *HZL* as no. 150 "*Körperteilbezeichnung?*" It may designate a human facial feature located around the mouth.

no. 17: The spelling [š]*a²-ku-ṽa-aš-šar-aš-at-mu* "it (is) [e]ntire . . . to me" (obv. 4) and the verbal form iter. pret. sg. 3 *aš-¹ša¹-nu-uš-ki-it* "he arranged" (rev. 8') appear here for the first time.

no. 19 line 4': Note the unique spelling [š]*u-meš^š-ša* "and you (gods)."

no. 20 lines 4'–5' are to be reconstructed in the light of similar phrases in the prayers *KUB* 60.156 obv. 15–16 and *KBo* 22.81 rev.² 3'–4', 9' as follows: [*takku ninkanza*] *ṽa-aš-ta-aḥ-ḥu-un ták-k[u-ma . . . waštahḥun nu waštauš=muš ḥar-ni-i]k* "(O mercy, (you) Storm-god!) [If] I committed a sin [by being drunk], (or) i[f I committed a sin by being . . . , then please destroy] [my sins]."

no. 21: A transliteration is now found in B. Christiansen, *StBoT* 48 (2006), 69–70.

no. 24 line 4': This version omits the next sentence after [(*an-né-eš*)]-*ki-mi*, available in the dupl. *KUB* 12.58 + *KUB* 7.53 ii 57.

no. 26 iv 6': The unexpected occurrence of *ti-eš*(eras.)-*ša-d[u(-) . . .]* here instead of proper *ti-ṽa-ri-ia* in four duplicates should be understood as the result of scribal error, as the erasure also may indicate. Neither semantically nor materially does it have any connection with *tiwariya-* (pace Miller, *StBoT* 46, 123), which is a designation or classification of the "plant of the Sun(-god)." On the contrary, *tiššadu-* refers to an unfavorable entity which must be removed from the body of the ritual client and destroyed. *tiššadu-* is constructed of a combination of wools and tallow and manipulated in the ritual as a replica (e.g., *KBo* 39.8 i 44–49, *KUB* 12.34 i 5–10).

no. 29 line 6': Despite Miller's reservations in *StBoT* 46, 141 and 191, I do not hesitate to emend the participle *ti-ta-an-za* to *ti-<it>-ta-an-za* and to attribute it to *tittiya-* / *tittai-* "to set, assign," since lines 4'–6' exhibit other scribal errors, and the duplicate *KBo* 43.319 i 12' uses the semi-synonym *ḥantanza* "arranged, determined" in the place of *tit<t>anza*.

no. 31 line 2': To be emended to ANŠE.GİR.NUN.<NA>.ḪI.A¹.

no. 33 has now been joined to *KBo* 6.34 + *KUB* 48.76 iii 22–26 by Miller, *ZA* 96: 237–38.

no. 34 line 1': [š*u-u*]ḥ-ḥa-ma¹+kán¹ (written as one sign) is intended for *šu-uh-ḥa-ma-kán*, as it appears in the par. *KBo* 10.45 iv 38; line 3' reads [*a-a*]r-ši-iz-zi, which stands for *a-ar-zi*(!) in *KBo* 10.45 iv 39 and for *a-ar-aš-zi* "flows" in *KUB* 41.8 iv 37.

no. 35: Cf. Miller, *ZA* 96: 238.

no. 36 lines 3'–4': The copy shows a clear ¹*a¹pel la-at-t[i]* and *apel la-at-ti p[iran tianzi]* "they place in front of his *latti*-" (restoration taken from par. *Bo* 4171 + *KUB* 46.46 i² 4', which uses ŠU-TUM instead of *latti*; see H. Otten and Chr. Rüster, *ZA* 68 [1978]:

271). Thus, against *CHD* 3/1 (1980), 47 and 48, the word *latti* is found here in its complete form and in the sg. d.-l. case. I am not sure if the context of the present ritual text (*CTH* 448) would support the established meaning “tribal troops, tribe” for *latti*-, or if it may refer here to a (tribal) symbol, emblem, or even a locality. Nevertheless, we find in the same composition the related expression *lattien gulš*- “to write down the *latti*-” (*KUB* 17.18 iii 14–15; see *CHD* 3/1, 48).

no. 37 i 7'–10' with a scene of blood sacrifice: [1 GU₄.MAḪ]=kan ANA ^dParāy[a šipandanzi] / [n=an=ka]n ḫattešni katt[anda ḫaddanzi] / [ŠA GU₄].MAḪ ēšḫar udanz[i . . .] / [n=at a]nda laḫūwanzi “[They sacrifice a bull] to the deity Parāy[a. They slit it (i.e., the bull in its throat)] down[wards into] the hole in the ground. They brin[g] the blood [of the b]ull, [. . . and] they pour it [i]n [. . .]; cf. *KUB* 29.4 iv 35–36.

no. 42 iii 3': Due to insufficient context it is unclear if *ma-ri-i-iš* here is to be booked under (^{GIŠ})*mari*- “spear” or (^{NINDA})*mari*- “bread stick, baguette?”. In any case, this form would be one of the rare occurrences of sg. nom. com. for either lemma; cf. Soysal, *BiOr* 63 (2006): 566.

no. 44 lines 1'–5' are similar to *KUB* 47.35 iv 7'–12' (*CTH* 500). Note the alternation between ^{LÚ}ḪAL “seer, diviner” (here line 1') and the synonym ^{LÚ}AZU (*KUB* 47.35 iv 7').

no. 46 l. col. 8': DINGIR.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ “daughter(!) deities” immediately after [DINGIR.MEŠ] 'LÚ.MEŠ' “male deities” (complete form is present in line 6') is so far peculiar and should be interpreted as a scribal error: DINGIR.MEŠ «DUMU»MUNUS.MEŠ “female deities.”

no. 47 obv.² 1'–3': The multiplicative 8-*anki* 8 “eight times eight” referring to the food rations and pots is mentioned by H. A. Hoffner and H. C. Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Eisenbrauns, 2008), 163, 169. Note also *ḫašši=tti* “in / to your brazier” in obv.² 6'. Narration in pret. sg. 3 in obv.² 2', 5'(*daiš*, *pēda*[š]) would fit a mythological composition as well.

no. 48: According to its introductory lines (esp. obv. 1: É-TIM GIBIL “new house”), this is more likely a foundation ritual.

no. 49 l. col. 4'ff. contain a ritual performed in the presence of the king² (4': 'LUGAL-uš² ?) and the army (5': ÉRIN.MEŠ.ḪI.A sic!); l. col. 10' reads [ud-d]a-na-aš-ša-mu EN-a[š²].

no. 50 is a religious fragment in MH ductus with some unique lemmata and forms: *alwanzešnanza* (lines [3'], 5', on which see H. Otten, *ZA* 66 [1976]: 101 and Soysal, in *CRRAI* 53 [Moscow, forthcoming]); nominal *ḫalliššar* of unknown meaning (10'); ^{GIŠ}UD.MUNUS.ḪÚB “a kind of large jug” (14'), as already listed by Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, *HZL*, no. 316.

no. 52 line 7': Note the rare spelling *ke-eš-ša-an* for *kiššan* “thus,” also found in *KBo* 2.4 iii 17' and *KUB* 7.3:17'.

no. 53 should more likely be assigned to the MH composition *CTH* 691–692; line 5': perhaps [mān EN.SISKUR L]^ÚMÁŠDA=ma “But [if the sacrificer is a] poor [m]an”; cf. *KUB* 17.24 ii 16 (*CTH* 691.2).

no. 64 rev. 1 and 9: Read and restore *ú-é-te-na-az* “with water”; rev. 4: [UD.x.KA]M *tuhḫušta* “[the . . . t]h [day] is finished”; rev. 8: read ^{GIŠ}[ER]IN “[ce]dar.” It is not certain if this fragment should be affiliated with a ritual (*CTH* 470) or a festival (*CTH* 670). Interesting is the mention of the cult functionaries [^{LÚ}.MEŠ²ḫi-l] *am-mi-ia-aš-š(a)* (suggested reading; pl. nom. or rather dat.) in rev. 2, who also appear elsewhere in connection with water (*KBo* 17.93:6') and with the cult action of “taking a bath” (*KBo* 20.51 i 16'); cf. here rev. 6: *warpanzi*.

no. 69 line 6': pres. pl. 3 *ša-a-ki-ia-an-zi* should be added to the occurrences of *šakiya/e-* "to give a sign" listed in *CHD Š/1* (2002), 41.

no. 70 obv.² includes many unique nominal spellings: [^{GADA}*gaz²-za-a*]*r-nu-ul-la* (obv.² 1); [^{NINDA}]*ú-i-iš-ta-ni-eš-ša* (3'); [^{LÚ}]*a²¹-ku-ut-tar-aš-ø* (5').

no. 76 line 3': Note the sg. nom. form of the bread designation ^{NINDA}*hu-u-re-e-e[š]*, which is found elsewhere as ^{NINDA}*hu-u-ri-iš*, e.g., in *KUB* 43.55 iv 3'.

no. 81: Note the partially preserved A-az *park[unu-]* "to clean(se) with water" in obv. 7', otherwise only in *KBo* 24.41 i 9': *witenaz arḥa par[kunu-]* "to clean up with water," which is likewise incomplete.

no. 82: There is no solid clue to identify this fragment as *CTH* 470 "ritual fragment." In respect to its contents in which the narration is phrased in various persons (sg. 1 and 2, pl. 1 and 3), it could be any text genre, e.g., a letter.

no. 85: Because of the phrases *āpi ḥēš[anzi]* "[they] open up an offering pit" and *karūiliaš* [*DINGIR.MEŠ*] "ancient [gods]" in the lines 4'–5', this fragment should be assigned to *CTH* 492 and not to *CTH* 500 (*Indices*, p. VI) or to *CTH* 485 (Košak, *Konkordanz*); cf. *KUB* 45.28 + *KUB* 47.59 + *KUB* 39.97+ obv. 12.

no. 86 lines 5'–6': To be reconstructed as [*EGIR-a*]*nda=ma kuiēš namma* 'DINGIR. M¹[EŠ] / [*ANA* . . . *āš*]*šaweš n-uš ekuzi* "[Ne]xt, whichever deitie[s are] additionally [ple]asant [to the . . .], he drinks them."

no. 92 rt. col. 5': On the Hurrian offering term in dative *putiḫi=ya* (same spelling also in dupl. *KBo* 35.220:4'), see V. Haas, *ChS* I/9 (1998), 239 with n. 221.

no. 93: Mention of the Hurrian cult profession ^{LÚ}*ki-ri-iš-te-na-aš* (sg. nom.) in line 9'; add this occurrence to J. Tischler, *HEG* I (1983), 584.

line 11': To be read [*MUNUS*]-*TU₄ KIR₁₄ ḥaddanza* "[woman] (whose) nose is slit," known from other Hurrian religious texts, e.g., *KBo* 33.167 iii 10', *KUB* 10.63 ii (21'), *KUB* 29.7 obv. (38), 48, and *KUB* 47.65 iii (3'). Most recently Th. van den Hout, *JAOS* 127 (2007): 347, has discussed this female class, taking it to mean "women with pierced nose." I believe, however, that the verb *ḥattai-* "cut open, slit" in Hittite may reflect a cutting action with more severe results on the human body than a cosmetic action such as piercing. I do not want to exclude the possibilities that these women were either punished after committing a serious crime or ritually marked during initiation into certain (Kizzuwatnan?) cultic duties by the physical mutilation of nose-slitting, whereby they were then considered clean (*parkui-* as emphasized in *KUB* 29.7 obv. 38, 48). My colleagues R. H. Beal and D. Campbell have drawn my attention to the practice of ritual mutilation among various cultures, in particular, the practice of cutting or piercing the nose of a male crosswise through the septum by a cassowary-bone dagger; see F. Poole's contribution to *Rituals of Manhood: Male Initiation in Papua New Guinea*, ed. G. Herdt (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1982), 127; on the practice of ritual mutilation in general, see A. van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1960), 71–74.

no. 95 obv.². 2: Read ^{GIŠ}*šu¹-ru-uḫ-ḫa-aš* "a tree? and its wood."

no. 97 obv. 2: [. . .](-)*ḥa¹-zu-un-zu* (or ^{KU₆}*zu-un-zu*) is unknown and does not appear to be Hittite. The sign traces in the edition seem not particularly in favor of an alternative reading ¹[^{NINDA}¹]*zu-un-zu*, for which compare the (incomplete) bread designation ^{NINDA}*zu-un-z[u(-) . . .]* in *KBo* 10.52 obv.² 11'; cf. H. A. Hoffner, *AlHeth* (1974), 192, and P. Taracha, *Ersetzen* (2000), 124.

no. 101 l. col. 15': Here the scribe intended to write *PĀNI* ^{GIŠ}*ŠUKUR* (not *DINGIR-LIM* as claimed in *Inhaltsübersicht*, p. VI), since the identical sentence is present in line 11' as well.

no. 102 line 10": Perhaps a verbal form [l]e-e-la-ri-in-ti as Luwian pres. pl. 3. Its relation to *lēlaš* "conciliation" in the next line and to the iterative *lilarešk-* "to conciliate" elsewhere (CHD 3/1, 59) is highly possible.

no. 103 has been joined to KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 iv 27–37 and left edge 1–2 by Miller, ZA 96: 239–40.

no. 106 line 4': [šu]-ra-aš-šu-u-re-e-eš-š[a] is a rare pl. nom. occurrence for this oracle bird.

no. 107 i 11, (13) and ii 11' mention *lu-lu-u-ti du-uš-ka₄-ra-te/ti* "(in)to the *lulu(t)-* (a desirable condition) and to the delight" as two favorable locations in the snake oracle; ii 5', 9' read MUŠ.IR-kán (not MUŠ-ir-kán as wrongly proposed in *Inhaltsübersicht*, p. VII), perhaps in the sense of "the snake of the (oracle) request," which is to be added to Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, HZL, no. 342. This text with its join-piece KUB 50.72 has recently been studied by D. Lefevre-Novaro and A. Mouton, *Anatolica* 34 (2008): 33–36, for which I suggest the following corrections and readings; i 9: *hur-da*-[iš?], i 11 and ii 4': HÁD.DU.A-za (not *ud-da-a-za*), i 13: SAG.¹DU-kán *lu-lu-u¹*-[ti], i 14: IR²-za-ma-¹kán¹ *la-aḫ-l[a-ḫi-ma]*, i 16: [g]a-re-eš-ki-iz-zi, i 18: *ḫar-kán-ni ÚŠ-ni pa-¹i¹t*, ii 1': [N]U.S[II]G₅-¹d¹u, ii 6': ⁴U.¹GUR¹ AŠ (= INA), ii 7' G¹ŠDÌM (not G¹Š ŠEŠ-tar), ii 11' (end of line): H[ÁD.DU.A-za], ii 12' [S]AG² *píd-du-li-ja¹-aš*, ii 13': *še-eš-k¹d¹n-zi* NU.ŠE-d[u], iii 7': [G]UNNI (not x IZI), iv 3': [A-N]A 1 GAL DUB.SAR.GIŠ, iv 4': [A-N]A ^mšag-ga-pí (cf. Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, HZL, no. 192).

no. 110 ii 6': On the use of Akkadian ANZILLU "taboo" in Boğazköy, see Soysal, JNES 65 (2006): 130.

no. 115 line 4': Read *a-pa-a-a*[š?] ¹e¹-eš-ša-ú "let him do / finish!"

no. 120 has been joined to KUB 53.32 obv. 4'–8' by Miller, ZA 96: 240–41. With the restorations taken from the duplicate KBo 10.25 vi 19'–21' the present text KBo 53.120 obv. 8' can be further reconstructed as ¹EGIR-ŠU AM.SI *ú*[-(iz-zi) pí-r]a-an UGULA LÚ.ME[(ŠUR.GI₇) ḫu-(i-ja-an-za)] "Thereafter comes (the image) of an elephant; the chief of the dog-men (or: hunters) is [ru]nning [bef]ore (it)." Against Miller's handcopy the traces of an *ú*-sign are still to be seen in KUB 53.32 obv. 8'. One may recognize a broken ¹AM.SI¹ also in the duplicate KBo 10.25 vi 19'. If the reading AM.SI for both texts is correct, this would be the first occurrence of the logogram AM.SI for "elephant" to be found as an independent logogram in the Hittite corpora; it otherwise always appears in the compound designation ZU₉.AM.SI "tooth of elephant = ivory." This reading would furthermore support the idea of J. Puhvel, StBoT 45 (2001), 561–62 (inspired by an early suggestion of V. V. Ivanov), that the Hittite lexicon possessed two lemmata: *pēri-* (c.) "elephant" (simply borrowed from Akkadian *pīru*) and *laḫm/pa-* (c.) "ivory," since the description in KBo 10.25 vi 19'–24' // KBo 53.120 obv. 8'–10' with mention of AM.SI, LÚ.MEŠALAM.ZU₉, and ZU₉.AM.SI is similar to that in KBo 17.43 iv 5'–6': *pēriš uizzi* [LÚ.MEŠ . . .] *pēran* SİR-RU *laḫmaš / paizzi* UGULA LÚ.MEŠAL[AM.ZU₉ . . .]. The Hittites may have never met the elephant physically, but they knew this animal by its name from the Mesopotamian written tradition, and also as the source of ivory.

no. 121: I see no reason why this MH fragment should be classified as CTH 635. In lines 5'–8' it better resembles KBo 38.28 rev. 11'–13' (CTH 646.15), which is likewise written in the MH ductus. In regard to the context relating cult music with G¹ŠTIBULA here (line 6'), cf. also KBo 22.206: 8'–10'.

no. 125 lines 6'–18' duplicate VBoT 89 i 6'–22' (CTH 628); line 13': after comparison with VBoT 89 i 14' read and restore [. . . (-x-zu-ḫ)]a-aš I ku-gul-la-aš ¹GA¹.KIN.AG.TUR " . . . , one lump? / ball? of small cheese"; the entry "cheese," however, has dropped out in VBoT 89.

line 14': The writing *ta-ma-al-ki* here now confirms the emendation of *ša-ma-al/an-ki* in VBoT 89 i 9', 16' to *ta-ma-^o*, as proposed in CHD Š/1, 112 based on a collation. This word seems to be a Hurrian offering term, and its forms *tamalki* / *tamanki* were perhaps simply phonetic variants.

no. 127 lines 2'–6' (with mention of ŠALMUTIM "whole, entire" in line 2') may have some textual connection with KBo 21.55 rt. col. 7'–12' (CTH 670).

no. 128 rev. 3: ^d*Ka-taḫ-zi-ūu-u-ri* and no. 129 l. col. 6': faulty writing ^d*Ka-taḫ-z[i]-ūa¹-u-ri* are renderings of the Hattian name of the Hittite / Luwian goddess Kam(ma)rušepa, on which see Soysal, in CRRAI 53 (Moscow, forthcoming).

no. 133: Cf. also D. Groddek, KBo 54, p. IX with n. 21.

no. 134 obv. rt. col. 2: MUNUS.MEŠ^{ha}-az-ka-ra-ri¹ exhibits a defective spelling for the female cult profession MUNUS^{ha}zkarai-, which has recently inspired many studies: H. A. Hoffner, JCS 50 (1998): 37–40; S. Röbke, in: GsForrer (2004), 557–69; E. Rieken, in GsForrer, 535; G. Torri, SEL 23 (2006): 99–106. The origin of the word will be discussed elsewhere by the reviewer in FsSinger (forthcoming).

no. 136 obv.[?] (ii) 9': On the female cult functionaries MUNUS.MEŠ^{zintuḫiyaš}, see L. Jian, JAC 9 (1994): 82–94; G. Giorgadze, Caucasica 3 (1999): 21–27; Y. Arıkan, AnAr 5 (2002): 11–51.

no. 140 line 6': Note the spelling [i]m-mi-en-zi "they mix" and add to J. Puhvel, HED 1–2 (1984), 362f.

no. 141 line 2': Read and restore [G¹ŠBAN]ŠUR-i ši-im-m[a-al²-lu²], a further occurrence for šim(m)al(l)u- "a foodstuff made of milk"?

no. 152 l. col. 1'–8' are duplicate to KUB 2.6 v 5–14 (CTH 598.1.A). Note the interchange between ^{TU}ḫapalzir (a rare form attested only in this text) and ^{TU}ḫapalzil.

no. 153 iv 1–4 are to be reconstructed as [nu² L]UGAL-uš ^Éḫale[ntuwa] / [p]aizzi dun-nakk[išna] / [pa]izzi NINDAšsaramma / [ḫal]ziya "[and² the k]ing [g]oes to the pala[ce-complex]; he [go]es [into] the inner chamber, (and) [ca]lls šsaramma"; cf. similar KBo 21.70 i 5'–7', KBo 17.74 ii 26.

no. 154: If line 1' is to be read [šu-up-pi-ia]-aḫ-^rḫa¹-a[n-zi] "[they consecra]te," the closest offering descriptions to lines 1'–5' here are found in KUB 2.6 iv 26–33 (CTH 598.1.A), KUB 10.23 iii 2–8 (CTH 612.b.C), and KUB 41.40 iv 24'–28' (CTH 669.32), among many others.

no. 155 lines 3'–5' are parallel to KBo 20.10 i 12–15 and ii 9–12 (CTH 669).

no. 159 i 7': Against the clear copy *ma-ú-e-ra-an* one would prefer to read *ku¹-ú-e-ra-an* (sg. acc.) as a unique spelling for (A.ŠÀ) *kuera*- "field."

no. 160 iv 11' possibly reads [a-pé]-^re¹-en-za-an G¹ŠZA.LAM.GAR.ḪI.A-aš "[th]eir (i.e., of the gods in the previous line) tents"; cf. the sg. usage *apēl* G¹ŠZA.LAM.GAR-aš in KUB 45.77 obv. i[?] 16'.

no. 161 rt. col. 7'–9' have a description similar to KBo 53.164 rt. col. 6'–9', where the chief cook presents to the king a sample of liver. After reciprocal restorations with KBo 53.164 the passage here reads as follows: GAL LÚ.MEŠMUḪALDIM ŠA QĀTI U¹[ZU¹NÍG.GIG LUGAL-i] / parā ēpzi LUGAL-u[š tūaz QĀTAM] / dāi "The chief of the cooks presents [to the king] t[he liver] of the hand. The kin[g] holds [(his) hand at a distance (to it)]." For ŠA QĀTI U¹ZU¹NÍG.GIG "liver of the hand, i.e., just for holding, touching," see KBo 30.54 i 14'f., KBo 41.94 i 6'f., KUB 10.79:8'ff., all the same rite including the participation of the king and the chief cook.

no. 165 rt. col. 4'–6': A description of NINDA^{taparwa^ašu} by the chief royal body guard as part of a festival; see most recently Soysal, JANER 4 (2004): 86 n. 12, and Anatolica 31

(2005): 196 n. 26. The closest parallel to this phrase appears in *KUB* 11.13 v 9'–11' (*CTH* 613.1.A).

no. 166 line 8': Read ¹šar-la¹-a-at-t[a(-) . . .] “praise offering” also in connection with the bread designation ^{NINDA}mulati- (line 6'); see *CHD* Š/2 (2005), 276.

no. 168: In addition to the possible identification as a festival (*CTH* 670), one should not exclude a cult inventory (*CTH* 530) for the genre of this fragment.

no. 169 i 1–4 describe the hand-washing rite of the king in the vicinity of the *ḫalentuwa*-building: [LUGAL-uš] ^Ḫhalintūwaš / [p/šar]¹ ā¹ paizzi / [DUMU].¹MEŠ¹.É.GAL wātar pē-danzi / [LUGAL-uš QA-TI]-¹ŠU a-ar-ri¹ “[The king] goes [forth /u]p to the palace-complex. The palace [attendant]s carry water. [The king] washes his [hands].” The closest description to this is found in *Bo* 6106 ii 12'–14'; cf. S. Alp, *Tempel* (1983), 304–5.

no. 174 l. col. 3'–4': To be reconstructed as UGULA ^{LÚ}.MEŠ¹zili[puriyatallaš ḫattili] / maldi “the chief of the zili[puriyatalla]-men recites [in Hattian]”; cf. *KUB* 1.14 ii 13'–14'.

no. 177 rt. col. 3'–6': The poorly preserved scene here with a priest may be compared to the *Ḫišuwan* festival *KBo* 15.37 v 4–6 (*CTH* 628.II.1), where a priest strikes first the “back(side)” (*iškiša*) of the divine statue with staffs three times, and then the king kisses (*kuwašzi*) those staffs, while here the “feet” (*GİR.ḪI.A*) of the statue are treated instead of “back(side).”

no. 183 lines 2' and 5': Restore the cult profession ^{LÚ}ta-az-zi-il-li-iš, on which see now Y. Arkan, *FsKošak* (2007), 33–58.

no. 184: ^dUTU ^{URU}Ḫimuwa is attested only here and is to be added to B. H. L. van Gessel, *Onomasticon* II (1998), 887.

no. 193 features descriptions of “honoring the deities by cult drinking” and “offerings with *takarmu*-bread.” ^{NINDA}takar(a)mu, on whose designation see recently Soysal, *BiOr* 63 (2006): 568, is widely utilized in festivals from various cults, but the members of the pantheon listed here (*Mezzu[lla]*, *Hull[a]*, *Inar* in lines 5', 8', 11') clearly point to a Hattian background of the present festival, like *CTH* 630, 638, and 648 (all with *takarmu*-breads).

no. 198 rt. col. 2'–3': Read and restore [EGI]R-š^rU¹-ma-aš-š^ri¹ 10 ^L[^Ú.MEŠ¹ḫa-a-pé-e-eš] / ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti-i-ḫ¹a¹-a[n-ta-ri] “[Afte]r him/her ten [ḫapiya-]m[en] from Ḫatti [are] march[ing].” The restoration of the profession follows lines 4'–5', and its ethnic designation by ^{URU}Ḫatti here is known also from *KUB* 59.16 obv. iii 9–10: 15 ^{LÚ}.MEŠ¹ḫāpēš ^{URU}Ḫatti / ¹EGI¹R-pa-ššit išgara¹nt¹eš “Fifteen ḫapiya-men from Ḫatti are lined up in position after him/her”). I suspect that both fragments go back to the same composition, *CTH* 649.

no. 200 rt. col. 11': 4 ^{NINDA}MIŠLU ^{NINDA}šaramnaš “four half loaves of bread allotments?”; for *MIŠRU* “half,” see *CHD* Š/2, 242.

no. 204 line 4': Read [ANA . . . A.D]A.GUR GUŠKIN ¹anda¹ tarnan[za] “a golden [drink-ing] tube is inserted in [. . .].”

nos. 207 and 213 are discussed in detail by V. Haas, *OLZ* 100 (2005): 455.

no. 209 lines 4', 8': ^{GIŠ}ḫalmuti- is a graphic variant of the cult object ^{GIŠ}ḫalputi- of Hattian origin; see my study, *JANER* 8/1 (2008): 58–65.

line 8': The Akkadian word ŠAPŪ “thick” is found in Boğazköy only as part of the designation ^{KUŠ}NÍG.BÀR ŠA-(A-)PU-Ú “sturdy leather drape”; cf. J. Klinger, *StBoT* 37 (1996), 684. The spelling ŠA-A-PU-U appears only in this fragment.

no. 211 is a duplicate or parallel to *KUB* 48.8 obv. 3ff. and 92/v (now edited as *KBo* 54.227) 2'ff.; cf. already Soysal, *HWHT* (2004), 49.

no. 216 iv 30': ^{MUNUS}zi-iḫ-ḫi-i[n- . . .] (in this form more likely incomplete) is a hapax denoting a hitherto unknown female profession in cult.

no. 218: In this tiny fragment there is nothing indicating Hattian language except incomplete [. . . (-) *h*]u-u-uz-z[i(-) . . .] in line 6'.

no. 219 line 5': *a-an-aš-ta* is obscure. One may strongly doubt the unsatisfactory explanation of this word as a possible error for *aštaratar* "something unfavorable" as proposed in *Inhaltsübersicht*, p. IX.

no. 223 lines 10'–11' are in Hattian; cf. *KUB* 28.112:7', 10' (*CTH* 743.4). Line 8': [. . .]-^rx¹-š*i-ū*¹ is copied here more accurately than in the old copy, *KBo* 37.71.

no. 224 obv.[?] (i) 11': Read and restore [1 ANŠE.GİR.NU]N.NA.MAḪ 1 ANŠE.^rMAḪ¹ [. . .]; both logograms for "stud / brood mule and donkey" occur here for the first time and are to be added to Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, *HZL*, no. 302; rev.[?] (iv) 3': reads [^{UZUT}]I.ḪI.A ku-u-ra-aš-ki-iz-z[i] "he chop[s] the [r]ibs."

no. 225 obv. 1: The rare logogram SISKUR.GE₆ is attested in *KBo* 31.20:5' as well, for which P. Dardano, *StBoT* 47 (2006), 266, proposes the meaning "night ritual"; add to Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, *HZL* no. 156. Alternatively, SISKUR.GE₆ "dark ritual" could be the antonym of SISKUR *parkui*- (= ²BABBAR, ZALAG) "clear ritual," e.g., in *KUB* 13.29:9', *KUB* 15.32 i 51–52, and *KUB* 15.34 ii 3, referring to a ritual in which possibly (black) magic with evil forces is practiced.

no. 228 lines 6'–8' are written in Luwian: the *i*-stem EME-*iš* (sg. n. c.) refers to the Luwian word *lali*- "tongue; slander," and in the following lines it reads: *ū-la-an-tal*¹-l[i- . . .] "mortal" and *pa-ri*-^ri(-)*iš*¹[-. . .]. On the other hand, EN.SISKUR/SISKUR "sacrificer" (lines 2', 3') and [a]nda puššai[zzi] "he chop[s] up /crushe[s]" (4') recall *CTH* 480; cf. *KUB* 29.7 + *KBo* 21.41 rev. 24–25, 30–33.

no. 239 line 4': The archaic genealogical term *ABI ABI LUGAL* "grandfather of the king" otherwise occurs only in the Zappa-Text, *KBo* 3.38 obv. 8', (12'), (19').

line 6': ^mWa_apwa_aili exhibits a typical Hattian name (^{*}wa_a=p=wa_ail; for this formation, cf. wa_a=wa_ail in *KBo* 37.89 rev. 9').

line 7': [. . . (-)a]r-ḫa-aš KUR-e, if not acephalic, would mean "border land."

no. 241: If my reading [^dI]rḫandawaš(-)[. . .] for line 12' is correct, this could be the dative or genitive form of the name of the divine group (^d)*Irḫant*-, which is always plural (^d)*Irḫanteš* / *Irḫanduš* or a Luwian variation of it; add to the occurrences in B. H. L. van Gessel, *Onomasticon* I (1998), 193.

no. 242 may be an instruction or a protocol; l. col. 3': read [*te-ek-ku*]-uš-ša-nu-ud-du "let him [rev]eal."

no. 244 line 3': Read and restore [*i-da-a*²-l]u ták-ki-iš-^rki¹[-. . .] "to commit [evi]l."

no. 247 lines 1'–4' are dupl. to *IBoT* 2.81:5'–8' (*CTH* 500), as well as similar to *KBo* 23.15 iii 30'ff. (*CTH* 701).

no. 249 is to be assigned to the cult inventory fragments (*CTH* 530), rather than to *CTH* 832.

no. 251: To the lines 2'–3' with bread designations, cf. *KBo* 10.52+ obv.[?] ii 11'–12' (*CTH* 448.4.3.b).

no. 253 (*CTH* 458): Line 3' has one of the very rare usages of the logogram "wool" in Hittite with the phonetic complement SÍG-an (sg. acc.; Hitt. *ḫuliyān* or ^{*}*ḫulanan*), which is otherwise known only from *KBo* 48.94:3'. The two texts are, in fact, duplicate or parallel (*KBo* 53.253: 3'–5' = *KBo* 48.94: 3'–5'). After some restoration on the basis of *KBo* 48.94, our fragment reads as follows: (1') [LU]GAL-uš x[-. . .] (2') [ḫa]r-ša-na-az ši[-. . .] (3') [^{NINDA}ḫar-ši-i]n SÍG-an (// SÍG-an-na) ša-ak[-. . .] (//^rḫ¹[-. . .]) (4') [ḫa-ap-pi]-na (// ḫa-ap-pé-e-ni) pe-eš-ši-ja-z[i] (5') [. . .] x (// an identical sign is erased here) ma-ma-^ral¹-[za-ki-it-ta] (// ma-am-mā-al-za-ki-i[t-ta]) "[The k]ing [. . .] / from the [h]ead [. . .] / [He / she smears[?] a thick-brea]d and wool [with[?] fa[t . . .], / throw[s them] into [the flame] /

[. . . He / she] recit[es].” The middle form *mam(m)alzakitta* for pres. sg. 3 to *mammalt-* “to recite” is to be added to the occurrences in *CHD* 3/2, 138 and J. Puhvel, *HED* 6 (2004), 36.

no. 257 line 3’ should possibly be restored: [*maḥḥa*]n GE₆-za k[išari] “[whe]n it b[ecomes] evening”; line 5’: [*i*]š-pí-ia-nu-zi (pres. sg. 3) is so far the only occurrence for a finite verb *išpiyanu-* “to satiate, saturate”; line 9’: see also Soysal, *BiOr* 63 (2006): 568.

no. 262: [*š*]u²-ya-a-iz-z[i] (line 2’) and KÜ.BABBAR (3’) would at first seem to suggest a fragment of the Hittite Laws, but ‘DINGIR.MEŠ’ (1’) does not fit the content of that legal composition.

no. 265 lists the divine witnesses of a treaty (*CTH* 212). For the restored and suggested proper names, see under “Additions and Corrections to Indices.”

no. 267 appears to concern a political issue about Arzawa. Line 8’: [m . . .].^dLAMMA-an, 9’: ^{ld}š[ēḥa?]. Furthermore, lines 11’–12’: [*n*?]=an *pedi=šši(-)*[. . .] “[and] him in his place” / [EGIR?-and]a=ma=kan *kui[š]* “but [afterward]s wh[o]” would seem to refer to installation on a throne and a loyalty clause. Thus, this text may be strongly considered to be a treaty (*CTH* 212).

no. 269 l. col. 1’–2’ is suggestive of *KUB* 6.45 ii 50–51 (*CTH* 381).

no. 271: Outside of this text (lines 5’, 8’), the proper name ^m*Innarauwa* appears only in *KUB* 48.105+ obv. (5’), 11’ (A. Archi and H. Klengel, *AoF* 7 [1980]: 143, 157). However, it belongs to one of the oldest attested traditions of name-giving in ancient Anatolia, as amply documented in the Cappadocian cuneiform sources as *I-na-ra-wa* (*CCT* 3.40b:7, *CCT* 5.14b:10, etc.).

no. 273: If the sentences in obv.² 6”, 9”, and 11” end with ‘*aki*’ “dies,” this fragment is an omen (*CTH* 560.II).

no. 275 joins directly to *KBo* 3.24 (*CTH* 39.1); treated by O. Soysal, *N.A.B.U.* 2006/1: 15–16, with some comments on Old Hittite history.

no. 276 lines 5’–7’ mention ^{LÜ}*tarpalli-* “substitute,” on which see recently A. Mouton, *N.A.B.U.* 2004/2: 54–55; Soysal, *JANER* 4 (2004): 103–4 nn. 11 and 12.

no. 280 appears to be a mythological text of Hurrian origin (*CTH* 370). The lexemes *daššauwaza* (line 2’), *nepiši* (3’), ^{URU}*Nenuwa* (4’) and [*a*]lpuš *GADA-it* “[in the heaven? someone wipes? the c]louds with a cloth” (5’) may suggest the Hedammu Myth (*CTH* 348); cf. J. Siegelová, *StBoT* 14 (1971), 58, text no. 16, lines 3–5.

no. 285: If ^{LÜ}*u-ra-an(-)*[. . .] (rev. 3) is to be related to *ura-* “great,” this is its first occurrence with the determinative ^{LÜ}.

no. 288 obv. 1: ^{DUG}*puššale[š]* occurs here for the first time, and is to be added to the Hittite dictionaries. The word in question is a close cognate of *puššali-* (a garment for leg or foot), and it may therefore denote a shoe or boot-shaped vessel. A variety of these kinds of vessels have been discovered in many excavations in Anatolia including those at Boğazköy; see F. Fischer, *Die hethitische Keramik von Boğazköy* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1963), 79–80, pl. 131 (nos. 1241–43).

no. 289 lists damaged (cult) objects: (line 3’) [*a*]^r*ḥa*¹ *arrira[n(-) . . .]* “scrape[d o]ff,” (4’) [. . .] *ŠA*² *ME-ŠE-TI*₄ *GUŠKIN GAR.[RA]* “[. . . o]f the lance inla[id] with gold,” (5’) [*a*]^r*ḥa*=*ya*=*at d*[uwarnan(-) . . .] “it (is) b[roken o]ff.”

no. 291 (*CTH* 39): The phrases [UR]U.DIDLI.ḪI.A “the [cit]ies” (line 2’), [*natt*]^a *paḥšuanan(-)*[. . .] “[no]t protected” (3’), and especially [*k*]*a-a-pát-ya* “right / only [h]ere” (5’), remind one strongly of the OH historical composition *KUB* 31.64+ (*CTH* 12); cf. O. Soysal, *AoF* 25 (1998): 17, 23, 32; *idem*, *ZA* 95 (2005): 134.

no. 296 line 3’ reads ^{GIŠ}*ú-ra-la*, and not ^{GIŠ}*ú-ra-at-* (pace V. Haas, *OLZ* 100 [2005]: 456). Except for this text, ^{GIŠ}*urala-* is attested only in *KBo* 35.246 obv. 5’ // *KBo* 21.30 i 7’–8’ in an object description: [1-(*NUTIM*)] ^{GIŠ}*ú-ra-a-la ŠA TI*₈ ^{MUŠEN}*nu=ššan laḥmaš GUŠKIN=ya*

anda [. . .] “[One] *urala*-set of an eagle on which ivory and gold (are) [inlaid[?]].” I. Wegner, *ChS* II/3–3 (2004), 139: “*bestimmte Wertgegenstände (Kollektiv)*.”

no. 301 is Palaic and seems to belong to CTH 751 “*la parole des pains*”; line 2’: The royal title [t]*abarnaš* always appears in Palaic with initial *t*; cf. Soysal, *Anatolica* 31 (2005): 192–93; line 4’: ‘a’¹-*an-ta šu-ya-a-[an-da]* “and the fu[ll . . .]”; line 5’ is to be analyzed as *kuwaiš=a=ti*; cf. O. Carruba, *StBoT* 10 (1970), 61; line 7’: perhaps [š]u²-*ya-an-ti-i[š ašandu]* “[let them be f]illed.”

no. 302 l. col. 5’: Read perhaps [T]^úGNÍG.LÁM.MEŠ ŠA N[Í.T]E “sumptuous garments of the b[od]y.”

no. 303 belongs to CTH 378.I, and obv.[?] (now rather rev.¹) lines 3’–7’ duplicate *KUB* 14.14+ rev. 47’–51’. This allows some small restorations and corrections to the transliteration of the First Plague Prayer of Muṣili II edited by R. Lebrun, *Hymnes* (1980), 198. Rev. 47’: ŠA ^m*Du*-[*u(t-ḥa-li-ja)*], 48’: *u-e-i-ja-[(at-tén na¹-a)]t*, 49’: *da-at-tén [(nu-kán KUR)]-^re¹ an-da*, 50’: *u-ya-aḥ-ḥ[(a-ru)]*; 51’: *u-e-ja-[a(t-te-en)]*.

no. 304 CTH 39: If [l/*tab*]*arna* (line 3’) and ^m*Huzz[iya]* (4’) do not refer to a great king Ḫuzziya (I or II), one may suggest that this fragment reflects the conflict of Ḫattušili I with his son Ḫuzziya known from CTH 6.

no. 308: Read and restore: [. . .]-^r*eš-kir¹* (line 1’), [*k*]*ar-aš-ša-an* (2’), [*ḥal-k*]*u-i-eš-šar-ra* (3’).

Copyright of Journal of the American Oriental Society is the property of American Oriental Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.