

REVIEW ARTICLES

HITTITE CORRESPONDENCE*

RICHARD H. BEAL
THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

This article comments on an important compilation of Hittite texts—from and for the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary.

THE WORK UNDER REVIEW CONSISTS OF a two-volume set. The first volume is devoted to a general discussion of the letters. The first chapter discusses the circumstances of the discovery, findspots, publication, study and storage of the letters. The second describes what Hittite texts tell us about letters, scribes, messengers, and the post. The third concerns the physical appearance of letters, the use or non-use of clay envelopes, and the use or non-use of seals. Chapters follow on the different greeting formulae used in the letters and on various expressions typical of letters. A chapter is devoted to the themes found in Hittite letters and how these are the same or differ from other cuneiform letters written by those more or less contemporary with the Hittites. There is a chapter on certain aspects of the grammar of the letters discussing things that appear in letters; it is an odd collection since most are not peculiar to letters but are common to most types of Hittite texts, e.g., phraseological *pai-* and *uwa-*, connecting sentences with *-ya*, etc. The work ends with a brief overview of Hittite international correspondence.

In the second volume all tablets generally accepted to be letters are given a number. They are grouped into chapters: "The Correspondence of the Royal Family," "Letters of the King or Queen to Underlings," "Letters of Underlings to the King or Queen," "Letters of Subor-

dinates to Other Superiors," "Letters of People Referring to Each Other with Family Designations" ("my dear brother," etc.), "International Correspondence," "Correspondence between States in the Empire." The chapters are further divided into subchapters. All this is no mean feat considering the poor state of preservation of most of the letters and the fact that many letters lack the address. Hagenbuchner's (henceforth H.) studies in volume one often help to differentiate types. Those that were utterly hopeless are grouped in several catch-all chapters.

Each letter is transliterated and translated. A short commentary concerning content, dating, and philological problems follows. Many of the letters that are fully edited elsewhere (e.g., the long complicated so-called Tawagalawa letter, the Mašat texts, Ugarit texts, etc.) are given an entry number and bibliography but are not re-edited here. Similarly the Hittite-Egyptian correspondence of Ḫattušili III and Ramses II, which Edel is planning to edit, is not edited by H. Some badly broken letters are only transliterated, or—as in the worst cases or some of the Akkadian letters—only commented on. While working on the book, H. often corresponded with Alp and received much helpful information on the then-unpublished Mašat letters. Since H.'s was published, a complete publication of the Mašat texts has appeared. Copies: S. Alp, *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Mašat Höyük (=HKM)*, TTKY 6/34; transliterations, translations and extensive commentaries: S. Alp, *Hethitische Briefe aus Mašat Höyük (=HBM)*, TTKY 6/35. While working on this review, copies of the previous reviews by H. Freydank, ZA 80 (1990): 308–13 and G. Beckman, WO (forthcoming) crossed my desk.

* Review article of: *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, 1. Teil: *Die Briefe unter ihren kulturellen, sprachlichen und thematischen Gesichtspunkten*; 2. Teil: *Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. By ALBERTINE HAGENBUCHNER. Texte der Hethiter 15–16. Heidelberg: CARL WINTER-UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG, 1989. Pp. xxix + 175; xlv + 483.

I have checked the transliterations of *KBo* 18, *KUB* 19, 21 and 57 texts in Hagenbuchner against the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* cards and discrepancies between the two against the copies. I have also consulted collations by A. Walther, written into his personal copies of *KUB* 19 and 21 and old transliterations and partial copies by Güterbock of tablets later published in *KUB* 57. Although H.'s transliterations are generally quite reliable, the broken nature of the texts ensures that problems will always remain, particularly in reading traces. In this, H.'s tendency is to be daring, even if that means emending the copies. There are many places where suggested readings by H. are improvements and have now been entered on the dictionary cards. Places where H.'s readings seem problematic are listed below.

Vol. 1, p. 14: Marešre is the reading of ^mDUMU-UD.20. KAM, see H. Hoffner apud G. Beckman, *JCS* 35 (1983): 109 n. 54 and C. Kühne, apud S. Alp, *HBM*, 78f.

Pp. 32f.: The first find of a Hittite tablet with an envelope has occurred at Mašat Höyük. It is published by S. Alp, *HKM* 86a and 86b, ed. S. Alp, *HBM*, 284–87. Alp, *HBM*, 284 n. 427, notes that the same text appears both on the tablet and its envelope. No seal impression is to be found on what is left of the envelope.

P. 71 n. 27: *CHD* should not be quoted as Hoffner, *CHD*. *CHD* is a collaborative work edited by Güterbock and Hoffner. Like the *CAD*, it should simply be cited as *CHD*.

Pp. 85f.: The author of *KUB* 19.5 + *KBo* 19.79 is still referred to with the obsolete reading Manapa-Datta, although the most recent edition of the letter cited by H. under no. 258 (Houwink ten Cate, *JEOL* 28 [1984]: 39), correctly calls him Manapa-Tarhuntas.

Vol. 2, p. XLII: *KUB* LVII 12 is no. 379, not 380.

No. 5: add to the bibliography: Th. van den Hout, Diss. pp. 115f. (rev. 17–22), 232f. (obv. 12). The traces of *Kar-* at the end of obv. 7 correspond to the well preserved *Kar-* in 19, but the traces at the end of obv. 8 look different; read perhaps LUGAL KUR Aš-t[a-ta?]. Rev. 3–4: H.'s translation follows *HW*² 124b, however *-za* in a nominal sentence marks it as 1st or 2nd not 3rd person (Hoffner, *JNES* 28:225ff.) “If I were an enemy, I, My Majesty, would have *a-d* a legal-suit against him (and) I would [have been successful.” Rev. 6: the *ú*, and the *š[i]/m[i]* require an *!* or *?*. Rev. 7: Not *ku-uš!* (an unusual spelling anyway), but

ku-^le¹; Rev. 8: Read LÚ.KÚR-ni (d.-l.) with Beckman, *WO* review, citing Neu, *FsMeriggi*² 415f. n. 16. Also restore *ul-pát* ‘*ku-it-ki*’. Rev. 9: The emendations here are not to be followed blindly. ^(d)UTU-šr- would be more likely if the UTU were clear. As it is, the traces unemended appear to read GEŠTU-šr-. Also *ku-it!* is a clear *ku-iš*. Restore in the lacuna perhaps *l[a-a-k]i* or *l[a-ga-r]i*. Thus 7–10 should be translated: “Our affairs which the enemy wrote to him (saying): ‘The king (of Kargamiš) will not in any way cause a revolt for your enemy. He who [bends(?)] an ear to him/The ear which [bends(?)] to him (reports): The matter of the king of Kargamiš will not cause a revolt.’” Rev. 14: Since *naššu*, if present, precedes *našma* in a string of “or”-clauses, not the other way around (*CHD* L–N), H. should not emend *na-aš-šu!-kán* but read with the copy *na-aš-ták-kán*. Rev. 15: *[t]u?-[e]l* is clearly wrong—there is an *-an*, an acc. pron. in H.'s nominal sentence!—and the *-el* is clearly different from that in line 8. It looks more like a ‘*lu*’; perhaps it is a 1sg. imp. of a transitive verb. At the end of the line perhaps one should read a form of the Hittite verb *tapar-*. Line 19: van den Hout reads ¹EGIR-na¹ *q[A-TAM-MA . . .]*. Line 22: The copy shows *DÜ-an-du*.

No. 10: add to bibliography, Beckman, *JNES* 45 (1986) 20 w. n. 10 (for obv. 7–9) and van den Hout, Diss. p. 128 (obv. 5–9). In line 9 both Beckman and van den Hout read *[am-me-e]l!*, a small emendation, but H.'s *[ka-ru]-¹ú* requires no emendation. In line 11, why emend *-uš* to *-iš*?

No. 11, rev. 8: traces appear to read *ú-da-a[š]*. Rev. 10 read with *RGTC* 6:16 ^{URU}A-ni-¹e¹. L.E. 2 restore: EN KUR Pa-[*la-a*], a probable reference to Prince Hudupianza. Regarding the commentary, I do not see why the letter's author, Prince Aranḫapilizzi, the GAL UKU.UŠ of the Right, must be either a son or nephew of Šuppiluliuma. He could just as well be a cousin of some degree.

No. 12: read obv. 7 [. . .]x-zu-wi₅-ni GIM?-an.

No. 14, line 2: H.'s reading of the name of the author as Daki-Šarruma is confirmed by Güterbock (see Th. van den Hout, *BiOr* 47 [1990]: 432). Line 3: While H. emends SILIM-i to the expected SILIM-ul, the signs are so widely divergent it is hard to see how the scribe could make such a mistake. *CHD* L–N 102b reads SILIM-la!. Alternatively, one might see a divergent formula *ki!-i kuit* GIM-an. Line 4: An old copy by Güterbock clearly shows ^{URU}Ka-ni-ya rather than H.'s ^{URU}BAD-ni-ya. The

copy in *KUB* 57 is less clear. Read with Beckman, *WO* review, *k[iš-an ku-it ṭāš-p[ur]*; HGG in his old transliteration saw no need for the exclamation point that the copy forces Beckman to employ.

No. 15, line 16: perhaps *'wa-ar-aḫ'[-ḫu-iš]*.

No. 18: add to bibliog., van den Hout, Diss. p. 225 (rev. 5–9). Obv. 3: *'EN-YA'* not *[EN-Y]A*. Obv. 15: For *UGU-ti* read *UGU-ṭi*. In *ḫar-ga!-ni*: the *ga* is clear in the copy, but Walther questioned the first of the small verticals; the *ḫar*, however, certainly requires an *!* since it is only a *u*. The *-ni* is over an erasure and Walther added a *?* to the upper wedge, so *-aš* is a possibility. Thus Walther's collations suggest a reading *UL-aš*. Rev. 3: *še/pu-x*[: Walther saw a winkelhaken and the beginnings of two horizontals, thus *u*[*L* would be one possibility. Rev. 5 *a[š-me* is against the trace, a large winkelhaken. Van den Hout suggests reading *u*[*L ḫa-a-mi*] “vertraue ich nicht.” Rev. 6: *TUR^{RU}* read *TUR^{RU}*, *na-a-wi* read *na-a-wi*. After *kuwapik[ki* van den Hout restores *anda*. Rev. 16 beginning: *na-at-ma?* (coll. W.). Rev. 18: rather than *šu-mu-u-wa-aš*, H. Hoffner's collation found *GEŠPÚ-u-wa-aš*, supporting Walther's previous coll. L.E. 1: At the end Walther saw a bottom horizontal followed by the bottoms of two verticals (perhaps *URU* or the like) and then a clear *MEŠ*. L.E. 2: Before the verb the traces begin according to Walther with a winkelhaken followed by *ḫi.A*.

No. 19, obv. 1: The traces, [*UM-MA* *UTU-š*]*i-MA'*, unread by H., support her comment concerning the authorship.

No. 38: Whatever the sign is in the middle of obv. 10, it certainly doesn't resemble any *NIMGIR* known to HKL. Read perhaps *LÚ.MEŠ* *'Da-pár'-ra-an-da*, an otherwise unknown toponym. L.e. 1 probably concerns the *LÚSIGŠ* (approximately “corporals”) “running in front, leading” or “being put in front,” i.e., “appointed to squad-leadership.”

No. 40, obv. 7–13: Pecchioli Daddi's tr. is to be preferred; for obv. 14–17 see H.'s commentary. For the tr. of rev. 11–12, H. follows previous translators, but would the sentence not follow better if Duttu were the subject? “He has not caused the destruction of the walls.” This eliminates the need to suggest (H., p. 62) that the king had ordered that the besieged city's walls not be destroyed, militarily senseless if the much more costly ramp-building and tunneling (whose primary purpose anyway is undermining until the walls collapse) were to be undertaken. Rev. 21 and l.e. 1: The

answer to the question: *kuezza=wa=kan UL ḫapdari* “Why is it not succeeding?” is summed up in the sentence *nu=nnaš=kan apezza UL ḫapdari* “For that reason it is not succeeding for us.” Therefore in l.e. 1 for “Aber von dort aus . . .” read “Deswegen . . .” (observation courtesy of H. Hoffner). A dating of this text to Šuppiluliuma I is argued for by van den Hout, Diss., 192f.

No. 45, rev. 40: cf. *CHD* L–N 206b.

No. 51, obv. 10: *CHD* L–N 4a, 11a suggests restoring *la-aḫ-t[a (laḫ- B) or la-aḫ-l[a-aḫ- (laḫlaḫḫiya-)*.

No. 62: The author of the letter need not be *m.r^d*[. . .] but could be *m^hal-[pa-ziti*. The latter is one of the *GAL UKU.UŠS* under Tudḫaliya IV. Note the mention of *ERÍN.MEŠ. UKU.UŠ* in obv. 12. Line 7: Del Monte's suggestion, argued favorably by H., that *GÍR.TAB-PU* *UTU-š* is to be read *(LÚ)KAR_x-TAP-PU* *UTU-š* is ingenious. However, it is weakly based. She argues that *GÍR* could be read syllabically as *kar_x* since she claims that *GÍR* also has a *kar_x* reading in *URU-aš kar_x(GÍR)-di* “in the heart of the city” in *KUB* 53.50 obv. 3. However, *URU-aš GÍR-di* would make perfect sense as is “at the foot (*padi*) of the city.” In any case, *KUB* 53.50 obv. 3 probably does not have *GÍR-di*; the copy shows a sign much closer to *BAD* than *GÍR-di* and indeed it is a *BAD* that Güterbock saw when he transliterated the tablet some years ago. The sentence in *KUB* 53.50 reads: “or an eagle (sits) on the wall (*kutti*) of the fortifications of the city.” (Correct the edition of Hoffman, *AOF* 17 (1990): 186f. accordingly.) Secondly to make *GÍR.TAB-PU* into a professional title, one must emend our text by supplying a *LÚ* determinative. Better to take it as written and to assume that somebody is being described as a scorpion (*GÍR.TAB-PU* = Akk. *zuqaqipu*). One could translate either: “Because your majesty said to *UTU-ma-naddu*, the scorpion, concerning (*[šer memi]šta*) the men of Ampara, . . .” or “Because you said to *UTU-ma-naddu*, the scorpion of Your Majesty, concerning the men of Ampara, . . .”

No. 65, obv. 1: perhaps [*. . . wa-a*]*t-ku*[- . . .]. Obv. 5: *ŠU.ḫi.A-š[u. Obv. 12^h]* *a-mi-ni*.

No. 69, obv. 4: The copy shows space before the *ip-*. Obv. 8 perhaps: *me-eq]-qa-e-eš* “were numerous.”

No. 73, rev. 10: read *i-da-a-la-m[u-uš* for **i-da-a-la-n[u-*.

No. 75, obv. 2: The copy shows space before the first preserved sign. Obv. 10: *a-pé-n]**i-iš-ša-an-ma*.

No. 76, line 4: *a]n-ze-e-d[a-az*. Perhaps then also line 6: *an-z]e-el*.

No. 77, line 4: HGG read *ša* ⁴UTU-š]i? SAG.DU-aš. Line 5: The traces appear to be š]A rather than A-N]A. Line 7: for *ki?]-i-e-ez* HGG read *hé-e-uš*. Line 8: For *ú-ga-aš* HGG read KALAG.GA-aš.

No. 81, obv. 12: *íd?-aš*: The copy shows erasure here; the signs in question may have been intended to be erased. In any case, the winkelhaken would be difficult to explain as part of *íd*.

No. 83, line 4 *iš-ʿhi-x]*. Line 18: for *hu-u-da-ʿak*¹ read *hu-u-da-ʿa-ak*¹.

No. 86, line 2: The first sign cannot be *i*]t and may have word space after it. Rev. 9': For GUR-ša-d⁴KAL read *Gur-ša-d⁴KAL*, cf. *KBo* 2.6 iv 16 with *Kur-* (correct in H.'s commentary). A?šA.[HI.A] really doesn't fit the traces or spacing; read perhaps 2 KÙ.S[IG₁₇ or less likely 2 AZA[G.

No. 88, obv. 7': for [x TÚL.HI.A read [w]a-aš-túl^{HI.A}. Rev. 12 Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri*, 539, reads] 'GAL' LÚ.MEŠ₁[š KÙ.SIG₁₇, although such a title is otherwise unique and the 'GAL' is open to other interpretations. Rev. 16: read LÚ.M₁]^{ES}š KÙ.[SIG₁₇.

No. 89, obv. 5: for "beistehen" read "vorgehen," see Beal, *THeth* 20:513–18. The translations "beistehen, helfen" found in Friedrich, *HW*, 78 quoting L. Zuntz, *Ortsadverbien*, 100–102, are derivative and inexact. The gods may "help" the Hittite army, but the choice of the term *piran huwai-* indicates that they do so by "running in front." In this letter the men of Dalawa and Kuwalapaššiya are not simply volunteering to help, but to do so by being a vanguard.

No. 94, obv. 5: perhaps š]U-RI-PU-ya "and ice."

No. 100, obv. 12: for -t]a-at read -]ša-at.

No. 101, rev. 14: the author could just as well be ^mHal[-pa-.

No. 102: In this letter of one high official to another, the Chief of the Palace Servants refers to the GAL MEŠEDI as "my lord" and himself as "your servant," thus showing the former's inferior rank. However, he also refers to the GAL MEŠEDI as "my dear son." H. correctly points out that this may be due to a family relationship or teacher-student relationship. I wonder if a great difference in ages might also have yielded such a statement.

No. 104: Add to bibliography: S. Košak, *ZA* 78 (1988): 309, and Th. van den Hout, *BiOr* 47 (1990): 424. For this letter there exists an old transliteration by Güterbock. The traces copied by Güterbock [HGG]

and the traces copied by Archi of partially effaced signs often differ considerably. Clearly this is a very difficult tablet to make out. Line 3: HGG saw after -kán ^mAn-ʿtu¹-[o] 'x x' [o] 'x'. Line 4: HGG: 'x¹-iš-ti-ma?-mu. H.'s second *ti* is ruled out by both Archi (perhaps *g[a]/š[a]/t[a]*) and HGG, so a reading ^{URU}Ištitina seems unlikely here. Line 5: HGG: 'x x x é-ni' an-da? pa-a-ir. Line 6: HGG: *me-eq-qa?*[-eš]. Line 9 (commentary): Košak has also suggested the reading ^mTa-te¹-DINGIR-LIM-in. Line 10: HGG copied fewer traces than Archi, but is in essential agreement; he also saw a vertical at the beginning of the line, not good for H.'s *li*. Lines 13, 15: Pittipara is not a previously unknown GN but a well known Kaškean leader (*NH* no. 1030) as indeed Archi realized. Pittipara was defeated by Mursili II in the latter's 16th year (*KBo* 5.8 iii 19, 40, ed. *AM* 156–161). Line 16 perhaps [*am-mu-u*]k-ma-a[*t*] 'A¹-NA. Line 20 HGG: DUMU? ^mPí-. Line 23: The reading ^{URU}T]a-pí-i-ga, taken over from Archi's index, is considered unlikely by Košak. He suggests a PN, ^mPí-i-ga(-). Furthermore, it requires a great deal of imagination to get ^{URU}Pé-e-ta-aš-ša out of traces that look like EN *il-ta-aš-ša*. HGG read ^mPí-i-ga-aš-š[i?]-il?-ta-aš-ša. HGG saw traces at the end of the line, reading *ar-nu-um-ʿma*¹-[aš?]. Line 33: H.:]-kán šu!-up-ta-ri, copy:]-kán ú-up-ta-ri, HGG:] ta-ru-up-ta-ri. Line 34: H. & copy: x-ra-an, HGG: ku-it-ma-an. Line 40: H. & copy: 'x-x¹ nu 2-e-el KUR-e-x, HGG:]-ta? ke-e-el KUR-e-aš.

No. 117: see Th. van den Hout, *BiOr* 47 (1990): 425.

No. 131, line 11: the space on the tablet shows [n]a-at KÁN-ZU-TAM e-eš-ʿša¹-[i]. Line 35: . . . -aš (space) x[. . .

No. 138 edge 4': *pát/pít-t[a-*.

No. 143, rev. 16: probably *ku-ʿi-e*¹-[eš].

No. 145, rev. 4 commentary: The traces do indeed fit Ugarit, but Hurri is much less likely.

No. 153, rev. 1:]-aš-tén(?).

No. 158, rev. 4: for EGIR-a]n-mu perhaps read *ku-w]a-pí*. Rev. 10: for *ap-pa-tar* read ^{TUP-PA}^U[I.A.] (the traces drawn by the field transliterator, like the copy, show a winkelhaken to the right of and below the level of the PA).

No. 159, line 4: for ^fA-pád-da-aš read ^fA-pád-da-a-aš.

No. 160, rev. 31: for -a]m-ma-wa-ra-an perhaps *pí-i]*h-*hi-ma-wa-ra-an*. Rev. 33 [A-NA ŠE]š-ya. Rev. 37 *ti!*-.

No. 161, lines 3 & 4: read ^mAl-lu-ú-wa and ^mAl-lu-ú with *KBo* 18's index. Line 7 *kat*-[may just as well be

pa-]. Line 11: H.'s *ki* at the end of the line does not at all resemble the *-ki* in line 10; read *zi-ik* :x-].

No. 164, line 4: according to the copy *ḫa-li-i[š-ki-it* is impossible. Read perhaps *ḫa-li-i[ḫ-li-iš-ki-it*. (The field transliteration's traces agree with the copy's.)

No. 165, line 19: for GIM read 'URU' (so CHD card and field transliteration).

No. 166, obv. 2: probably *SISKUR-aš* [. Obv. 4, perhaps *me-ek-ki s[IG5-in]*.

No. 167, line 2: [*ki-n*]u-un. Line 8 is not a *zi* (only one vertical). The copy was confirmed by a photo. Read probably 'nam-x'].

No. 168, line 2: read [DING]IR-LUM-ma (erased *ni*) EGIR-pa . . .

No. 170, line 23: *šá* read syllabically is possible, but is very rare. One suspects that since the copy only shows three wedges anyway that the sign is an *a*.

No. 171, line 5: for *ḫu-x*] read 'zi'-].

No. 174, line 6: The traces in the copy support the restoration [^mT]i-li- and rule out [^m]A'-li-.

No. 178, line 2: perhaps LUGA]L-uš; line 4 LUGA]L-un; line 6:]x-uš (why emend?); line 13 perhaps]'x KUR URU x-x-x'].

No. 180, line 1: perhaps 'LÚ'.M[Eš. Line 7: The name in the copy (and in Archi's index) is ^mPa-aḫ-ri-pí-dan-na-a[š. Why emend the *-dan-* to *-el-*?

No. 181, line 2: -n[u!]. Line 6: not *a-im-pa!-nu!-z[i!]*, but according to the copy can be read *a-im-'pa!-z[i]*, perhaps from (*a*)*impai-*. Line 7: the copy has *a-du-ta* but read perhaps *a-uš!-ta*.

No. 188, i 1: the signs AN and DI used in writing the name Šulmānu-ašaredu are normally interpreted as ^dSILIM (cf. Grayson, *RIMA* 1, passim). i 14 *nu-kán ki-i ṬUP-PU*. ii 5 *pa-r[a-a*. iv 5: The Hittite king says of Šulmānu-ašaredu, "You approached the east and you made Mt. [. . .] the border. You approached the west and you took the cities which Šuppiluliuma had won with a weapon and which were tributary to the gods." The latter refers to the Assyrian's conquest of Mittanni. H.'s restoration of the mountain name as Mt. A[manus] is clearly incorrect, since the Amanus are not to the east of Assyria but beyond its western border.

No. 189, rev. 1 7: perhaps] *na-an-ta* [k]u-[i]t!

No. 207, obv. 6: *nu-wa-aš-ši* (space) 'kar?'-t[a?]

No. 208: add to bibliography: Wm. Murnane, *The Road to Kadesh*², *SAOC* 42 (1990): 25ff. Obv. 13 the reading *Ḫa-a*]t-ti? is against the traces. Obv. 16: read *ṭāš-PU*]R [(coll. Walther). Obv. 26 Walther read *me-mi-*

iš-ki-ši?. For rev. 17 cf. *CHD* L-N 209a. Rev. 21: for AN[x] read *ḫal-l[u-* (coll. Walther). Rev. 23 *n]u-kan* (coll. Walther). For rev. 22-25 cf. *CHD* L-N 336b. Rev. 25 *CHD* L-N 265a "Those who reject [him?] for lordship."

No. 221, rev. 3: read *-ki!-*. GIM? as copied most closely resembles an *-it* and so reading a GIM requires an ! or two. But why emend? Read perhaps *ku]it-an-kan*.

No. 225, obv. 1: HGG saw at the end of the line a clear]LIM, thus presumably the author is [^mḪattuša-DINGIR-]LIM (Ḫattušili III). Obv. 4: for *bi* read *bi*. Obv. 16: for *-gal-* read *-kal-*. Rev. 2: HGG read]x-an ta-ma i (*i* over erasure). Rev. 4: for A-NA HGG read *a-pád-[da-ya šU-PUR]*.

No. 227, line 5: -YA x]. Line 10 Walther's coll. *p]i-ih'-ḫi* confirms H.'s restoration.

No. 254: add to bibliography V. Haas in Wm. Moran, *Les Lettres d'el Amarna*, *LAPO* 13 (1987): 192-94 = idem, *The Amarna Letters* (1992): 101-3.

No. 255: add to bibliography idem, *Lettres* 195 = *Letters* 103.

No. 299, line 6: for *-piš-* read *-miš-*. Line 8: for *-kir-* read *-ki-ir*.

No. 301, line 3: the copy has]*ke-e ku-e* šU.GFD.ḪI.A AŠ-ŠUM 'šU.GFD-šU'[-(-). Since šU.GFD is not listed in *HKL* or in Borger's *ABZ* or Labat's *Manuel*, H.'s emendation to ṬUP-PU has good reason, but H. uncharacteristically does not try to read the traces after AŠŠUM. Does "these tablets which as his/th[eir] tablet . . ." make sense? Rather than emending the šU, one could just as well emend the PU by an equal amount and read GEŠPÚ "these forces which as his/th[ir] force," which might make sense in the military context of this letter. Lines 4-5 were mangled by H. (or her typist). They should read (4) [o o o o?]x-x KASKAL-aḫ-ḫe-er BÀD.ḪI.A-ta ku-e ku-e (5) [o o]x BÀD.ḪI.A ŠA A-BI ^dUTU-ši pí-ih'-ḫu!-?un!?!.

No. 304: To the literature add the edition of B 8-17 in van den Hout, *Diss.*, 132f. B 8: H.'s ^mTa-ku-u-w[a fits the traces most closely, but ^mTa-ku-ḫ[i?]-li] or van den Hout's ^mTa-ku-u-ḫ[i?]-li] (cf. B 18) or even ^mTa-ku-u[ḫ-li cannot be ruled out. B 12: H.'s *a-p[u-u-u]n* seems likely, but should read *a-p[u!-u-u]n*!

No. 305, i 4: ^{URU}Na-at-ki-n[a-an; iv 4:]x (word space) *za-at-ta-an* UGU *u*]L (although admittedly *u*-UL elsewhere in the letter); iv 7: concerning ^u[^uTE₄-MU *u*]GU, the traces and spacing (cf. ^u[^uTE₄-MU directly below in iv 8) cast doubt on this restoration.

No. 318, obv. 2: *ki-iš-du-m[a]-t[i]*: The copy has *ki-iš-du-wa-*. Do we emend *-wa-* to *-ma!-t[i]* with H. to

get the expected verbal form and so overlook what may be a previously unattested variant verbal ending? Obv. 5: Read *-ma!*- and *-na!*-.

No. 328, line 3: read *l-na* 'KUR' [. Line 10: read *me-mi-ir* (Walther's coll. confirms H.'s emendation).

No. 333, line 1: Concerning *pa-an-g)a-ri?-it?*, the *ri* and *it* are perfectly clear, but it is the *ga* that desperately needs !??. Line 9: why emend *A-BI A-BI-^rKA¹* to *A-BI A-BI-Y[A!]*? Line 11: for *it?* perhaps read *ir*.

No. 379, line 8 could, with H., be Aššur, but lands such as Alzi or Azzi cannot be ruled out. In line 11 H. reads "mother" (AMA), although AMA can also be DAGAL "wide." The copy, however, has GÁ×GIŠ which is closer to SILA₄ "lamb."

No. 409, line 2: read *A-B]U-KA* ("your father"), suggestion after coll. by Walther.

The silliness of reading all *Ce/i* signs with the *i* value (a problem not confined to this work) is clearly seen in no. 81 obv. 11 with *ki-e-iz*, to be read not *kiye²iz* but *kēz*. Why can't we transliterate *ke-e-ez*? There is no such thing as an unmarked sign! All such signs are equally *e* and *i*. We must make a decision every time we transliterate one of these signs, so why not make an intelligent decision?

In summary, this is a very useful book. We must thank Dr. Hagenbuchner for expending so much energy on what must often have seemed like a frustrating and thankless task.