

- Tainturier, Marie-Josèphe – Rapp, Brenda  
 2003 Is a Single Graphemic Buffer Used in Reading and Spelling?, *Aphasiology* 17, 6/7, 537-562.
- Treiman, Rebecca  
 1998 Beginning to Spell in English, in: C. Hulme/R.M. Joshi (Edd.), *Reading and Spelling: Development and Disorders*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey/London, 371-394.
- Van Galen, Gerard P.  
 1980 Handwriting and Drawing: A Two Stage Model of Complex Motor Behavior, in: G.E. Stelmach/J. Requin (Edd.), *Tutorials in Motor Behavior*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Amsterdam/New York/ Oxford [= *Advances in Psychology* 1], 567-578.
- Van Orden, G.C.V. – Jansen op de Haar, M.A. – Bosman, A.M.T.  
 1997 Complex Dynamic Systems also Predict Dissociations, but they do not Reduce to Autonomous Components, *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 14, 131-165.
- Vennemann, Theo  
 1972 On the Theory of Syllabic Phonology, *Linguistische Berichte* 18, 1-18.
- Wachter, Rudolf  
 1992 Der Informationsgehalt von Schreibfehlern in griechischen und lateinischen Inschriften, *WJA N.F.* 18, 17-31.
- Wing, Alan M. – Baddley, Alan D.  
 1980 Spelling Errors in Handwriting: A Corpus and a Distributional Analysis, in: U. Frith (Ed.), *Cognitive Processes in Spelling*, Academic Press, London/New York/Toronto/Sydney/San Francisco, 251-285.
- Zesiger, Pascal – de Partz, Marie Pierre  
 1997 The Cognitive Neuropsychology of Spelling, in Perfetti/Rieben/Fayol 1997, 39-57.

## The Treaty between Talmi-Teššub King of Karkemiš and Šuppilulijama Great King of Ḫatti\*

Lorenzo d'Alfonso (Konstanz)

In a recent contribution, I. Singer reconsidered the treaties between Ḫatti and Karkemiš and proposed the addition of four more fragments to the set of treaties between the last king of Ḫatti, Šuppiluliuma II (Šuppilulijama), and Talmi-Teššub. These four fragments are KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25 and KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225<sup>1</sup>. In accordance with this, the set pertaining to CTH 122, *Traité avec Talmi-Teššub de Kargamis*, consists of 4 manuscripts<sup>2</sup>:

CTH 122.1 = KBo 12.41

CTH 122.2 = KUB 40.37

CTH 122.3 = KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25 (previously CTH 126.4 and 126.2)

CTH 122.4 = KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225 (previously CTH 125)

Considering the formulation of CTH 122.3 and 122.4, Singer concluded as follows:

Šuppiluliuma is the speaker in KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25, the king of Karkemiš in KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225. What we may have here are reciprocal treaties between two contractors, distantly recalling the parallel treaties between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza of Mittanni (CTH 51-52).<sup>3</sup>

While studying the Hittite treaties for the Syrian Lands<sup>4</sup>, I myself reconsidered this set of manuscripts and found a join between KBo 12.41 and KUB 26.33. When I visited the Academy of Sciences and Literature at Mainz in May 2006, the join was

---

\* CTH 122.1 has been a central topic of discussion in a seminar held at the University of Konstanz by Prof. Dietrich Sörenhagen. I am grateful to him and to Jürgen Glocker, who discussed with me many passages of the text, if not all. I am also grateful to Dr. Mauro Giorgieri, who first allowed me to use his unpublished work on KUB 26.33, and then discussed with me this contribution. The version which I offer here is deeply indebted to the suggestions of these three scholars. Furthermore, Annick Payne kindly reviewed the English text, adding further comments. As usual, responsibility for the final version rests of course with myself.

1 S. Singer 2001. Both indirect joins were found by Singer himself.

2 The following list of manuscripts has been kept on the website of the Academy of Mainz: s. Košak 2002, <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>, CTH 122.

3 Singer 2001, 640.

4 S. d'Alfonso in 2006.

definitely confirmed by Dr. Košak and Dr. Miller<sup>5</sup>. It is therefore my great pleasure to present a new transcription and translation of this treaty in the volume in honour of Dr. Silvin Košak. The join brings about some changes to the list of manuscripts pertaining to the treaty between Šuppiluliuma II and Talmi-Teššub, king of Karkemiš. The new set reads as follows:

CTH 122.1<sup>6</sup>      A = KBo 12.41 (+) KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225  
                          B = KUB 40.37

CTH 122.2?      KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25

The present work will deal only with the edition of CTH 122.1. In fact, the proposal by Singer to recognize KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25 as the reciprocal treaty to CTH 122.1 is tempting; nevertheless, the mention of Karkemiš in line x+1 does not identify *per se* the treaty as a treaty with Karkemiš itself.<sup>7</sup> For the time being, the question of such an identification should better remain open.

### 1. Overview of the text's manuscripts

Two manuscripts of the treaty CTH 122.1 have been identified. Manuscript A is represented by KBo 12.41 (+) KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225. The fragments cover the upper part of the obverse and the lower part of the reverse of a two-column tablet. Each line of text consists of circa 16-17 signs. Manuscript B is represented only by KUB 40.37, a small fragment of the beginning of the Obv. of a single large column tablet. Here, one must reconstruct some 35-36 signs per line of text<sup>8</sup>.

5 Note that both fragments come from the „Haus am Hang“, area L 18, share the same ductus, and, moreover, on the column divider on the top of the Obv. of KUB 26.33 seven lines of text far from the upper edge traces of a paragraph divider from column I are to be seen both in copy and picture. This corresponds to what one finds in KBo 12.41, whose first paragraph in col. I closes after seven lines of text with a paragraph divider. A direct join on the Rev. seems possible, but is very difficult to prove since the two fragments are in two different museums.









6 A further very small fragment of a treaty, KUB 31.126, could pertain to CTH 122. It contains 6 lines of the Rev. Lines x+1 to 5' refer to the curses and after a paragraph divider, a list of gods begins (l. 6') with a preserved ]<sup>rd</sup> UTU<sup>URU</sup> A-ri-i[n-na. The ductus is also a very late imperial one (s. also S. Košak 2002, KUB 31.126) and the attestation in l. 2' of a KUR<sup>URU</sup> Kar-ga-m[iš, offers a strong point in favour of KUB 31.126 belonging to CTH 122. A comparison of this fragment with manuscripts A and B of CTH 122.1, suggests that KUB 31.126 could belong to manuscript B. The shape of signs such as KAR, MEŠ and A are close to those present in manuscript B.

7 Doubts concerning the identification of the text as a manuscript pertaining to CTH 122 are to be found already in Giorgieri 2002.





















8 Note that the same set of manuscripts is preserved for another late treaty, CTH 105: s. Kühne/Otten 1971, 1-5.

Since Manuscript B preserves only a small portion of text, one cannot be completely sure how exactly the two manuscripts relate to each other, but it is likely that B is not a copy of A (see the philological commentary on l. 5-7); both manuscripts seem to be copies of the original treaty, rather than preliminary drafts<sup>9</sup>.

While both A and B are contemporary manuscripts, they nevertheless show clear differences, which must be ascribed to the peculiarities of writing of two different scribes. The scribe of manuscript A tends to leave spaces between one line of text and the following, and between the last line of a paragraph and the divider, and he regularly draws the signs of the first line of a paragraph directly on the divider. On the other hand, the scribe of manuscript B tends to fill up all the space between the two paragraph dividers, leaving no space between the lines of texts and between the lines and the divider. The following table illustrates the peculiarities and differences in the writing of cuneiform signs, as noted after collation of the pictures of the two manuscripts:

	A (KBo 12.41 + KBo 13.225 + KUB 26.33)		B (KUB 40.37)	
EN		II 13; III 9', 22', 23', 24'		
IG		II 7; III 16'		
NI		I 29'; III 16', 19', 22'-24'; IV 11'		Obv. 3
MIŠ		I 5; IV 7'		
TA		II 4, 5, 7; III 11'; IV 4', 10'		Obv. 6
E		II 6, 7, 9, 15, 16; III 18'		

9 Only two corrections are found in manuscript A: KUB 26.33 II 8 and III 6'. For a preliminary draft, s. for instance, the treaty between Šaušga-muša and Tuthaliya IV: s. lastly Klengel 1995. For the possibility that also KUB 31.126 belongs to CTH 122 s. n. 6 above.

Ú	a <sup>10</sup>  b 	a) I 7; II 4; III 5', 20' b) II 4, 9; III 9', 14'		11
UN	a  b 	a) II 4, 11, 13, 19; III 11', 16' b) II 8, 12		
KU		III 6', 13', 23'; IV 12'		Obv. 6
DA		II 3, 20; III 9', 11', 15'; IV 11'		
KAR		I 5		Obv. 3
LI	a  b 	a) I 2; II 14, 18; III 18', 21', 22' b) III 20'		Obv. 5, 11
TU		I 2; II 14, 21; III 8		
ŠAR		I 6; IV 18'		Obv. 6
IN				Obv. 10
A	a  b 	a) I 29; III 11', 14'; IV 5'; b) III 7'-8'		Obv. 1 (IA)
HA		I 2; II 5, 12, 14, 24; III 12'; IV 9'		

10 Note that the sign Ú with four verticals is used just to write the words *uk* and *išhiul*.

11 Ú is attested in manuscript B in l. 7, but from the picture it is very difficult to see the shape of the sign clearly, and in particular whether it has 3 or 4 verticals; therefore, I shall leave the attestation out of this table.

## 2. Transcription and Translation

A. KBo 12.41 (+) KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225

B. KUB 40.37

Obv. I

A 1 [ <sup>d</sup>UT]U<sup>ŠI</sup>-za<sup>m</sup>Š[u-up-pí-lu-l(i-ja-<sup>ma</sup>LUGAL.GAL<sup>7</sup>)]

B 1 [oooooooooooo-l(i-ja-<sup>ma</sup>LUGAL.GAL<sup>7</sup>)]

A 2 [(LUG)AL KUR<sup>URU</sup>H]A-AT-TIUR.SAG DUMU<sup>m</sup>Tu-ut-*ha*-li-<sup>ja</sup>  
L[LUGAL.GAL]

B 1 [oooooooooooooooooooo]

A 3 [LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup>HA]-AT-TIUR.SAG DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA<sup>m</sup>  
<sup>m</sup>GIŠ<sup>GIDRU.DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup></sup>

B 1 [oooooooo]

B 2 [oooooooo<sup>m</sup>Ha-at-tu-ši-l]i

A 4 [(LUGAL.GAL UR.S)]AG ŠÀ.BAL.BAL ŠA<sup>m</sup>Mur-ši-DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>[LUGAL.  
GAL UR.SAG]

B 2 LUGAL.GAL UR.<sup>7</sup>SAG<sup>7</sup>Š[Àoooooooooooo]

A 5 [U<sup>m</sup>Tal]-mì<sup>d</sup>U-up-pa-aš LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup>Kar-ga-miš[(DUMU)]

B 2 [oooooooooooo]

B 3 [oooooooo]DUMU

A 6 [(<sup>m</sup>I-ni<sup>d</sup>U-ub LUGAL K)]JUR<sup>URU</sup>Kar-ga-miš DUMU.DUMU-ŠÚ ŠA <<sup>m</sup>Ša-  
hu-ru-nu-ya LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup>Kar-ga-miš DUMU.DUMU.DUMU-ŠU  
ŠA><sup>12</sup><sup>m</sup>Šar-ri-k[u-šu-uh]

B 3 <sup>m</sup>I-ni<sup>d</sup>U-ub LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup>Kar-g[a-mišoooooooooooooooooooo  
ooo]

A 7 [LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup>Kar-ga-mi]š iš-*hi*-ú-la-aš TUP-PU kiš-an i-<sup>7</sup>e<sup>7</sup>[-er]

B 4 [oooooooooooo]-aš TUP-PU kiš-ša-<sup>7</sup>an<sup>7</sup>[ooo]

B 5 [oooooooooooo]x DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup><sup>m</sup>Šu-up-pí-lu-li[-u-ma (e-šir)oooooooooooo  
ooo]

A 8 [oooooooooooo(DUMU<sup>M</sup>)]<sup>EŠ</sup>[(<sup>m</sup>Šu-up-pí-lu-li)-u-ma] e-šir

A 9 [oooooooooooooooooooo]

B 6 [ooo-d(u)oooooooo]-ta-at<sup>m</sup>Šar-ri-ku-u[š-šu-uhoooo (kar-ta)oooooooooooo  
ooo]

12 For this restoration, see the philological commentary.

14 A reading  $a[n$ - is possible.

## Rev. III

x+1 x<sup>15</sup>-x[...]

2' AŠ-RUx[...]

3' Ú-UL ARAD x[...]

4' ma-a-an-mu za-aḫ-ḫi-<sup>┐</sup>ja [oooooooo]5' ú-uk-ma-aš-ši Ú-<sup>┐</sup>UL [oooooooo]

6' \*ku-ya-ja-ta še-er[oooooooo]

7' KUR<sup>URU</sup> MI-IŠ-RI-I a-ra-an<sup>?</sup>[oooooooo]

8' nu tu-uk ša-ra-a A-NA x[oooooooo]

9' ú<sup>┐</sup> -da-aḫ-ḫi<sup>┐</sup> LÚ KUR-ma-za EN[oooooooo]10' LÚ<sup>MES URU</sup> HAT-TI mar-še-eš-šir [oooooooo]

11' an-da ta-a-ri-ja-nu-un na-x[oooooooo]

12' na-an-mu a-u-ya-an ar-ḫa ti-[ja-mi<sup>?</sup> ma-a-an]13' ku-iš-ki LÚ<sup>URU</sup> HAT-TI ŠA<sup>d</sup> UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> ḪUL-lu ša-an-aḫ-zi]

14' na-an Ú-UL mu-na-a-mi A-N[Aoooooooo]

15' da-aḫ-ḫi-ja-at Ú-UL<sup>┐</sup> ša<sup>┐</sup> -a-a[n-aḫ-mi<sup>?</sup> ooooo]

16' ma-a-an-mu UN-aš ZI-ni me-ek-[kioooooooo]

17' na-an-kán A-NA<sup>d</sup> UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> an-x[oooooooo]

18' le-e-ya-ra-an ḪUL-u-ya-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi]

19' ke-e-da-ni me-mi-ja-an-ni šal-la-a[n<sup>┐</sup> ni x x x x]20' DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> -mu-uš iš-ḫi-ú-li PAB-nu-ya-a[n-du oooo]21' tu-uk<sup>m</sup> Šu-up-pí-lu-li-ja-ma-an LUG[AL.GAL ooooo]22' DUMU<sup>m</sup> Tu-ut-ḫa-li-ja EN-an-ni PAB-aḫ-<aš> -ḫi tu-el kat-ta-ma]

23' NUMUN EN-an-ni PAB-aḫ-&lt;aš&gt; -ḫi DUMU-an-za ku-in [LUGAL-iz-na-ni]

24' ti-[it-t]a-nu-ši na-an EN-an-ni [PAB-aḫ-aš-ḫi]

## Rs. IV

x+1 [oooooooo DINGIR<sup>MES URU</sup> [HAT-TI]2' [dUTU<sup>URU</sup> PÚ-na<sup>d</sup> U<sup>URU</sup> HAT-TI<sup>d</sup> ZA-B[A<sub>4</sub>-BA<sub>4</sub> U<sup>URU</sup> HAT-TI]3' [dU<sup>URU</sup> Hal-pa] dU<sup>URU</sup> Zi-ip-pa-la[-an-da]

15 A reading of this sign as Ú is possible.

4' [dU<sup>URU</sup> Ne-r]i-ik<sup>┐</sup>-ka<sup>d</sup> Ta-r[u-up-pa-ša-ni]<sup>16</sup>5' [oooo] x<sup>17</sup> dLAMMA<sup>URU</sup> x<sup>18</sup> [oooo] dGAZ.BA.A.A6' [oooo] dḪé-pát<sup>d</sup> Ḫ[é<sup>?</sup>-oooo]7' [DINGIR<sup>MES URU</sup> Kar-g]a-miš<sup>d</sup> Ku-[ba-ba<sup>d</sup> K]ar-ḫu-u-ḫi-iš8' [oooo] dU<sup>URU</sup> x[oooo] x9' [dḪa-taḫ]ḫa<sup>d</sup> LIŠ x<sup>19</sup> [oooo] x10' [dMUNUS.LUGAL<sup>URU</sup> Ka-]a-ta-pa Š[A-MU-U ER]-ŠE-TUM

11' [ḫu-ma-an-te-e]š ti-ḫi[a-an-du na-a]t ke-e-da-ni

12' [li-in-ki-ja] ku-u[t-ru-e-eš a-š]a-an-du

## (Colophon)

13' [oooooooo] x

14' [oooooooo] x

15' [oooooooo] x DUMU

16' [oooooooo] x

17' [oooooooo] IŠ-ṬUR

18' [oooooooo] x<sup>20</sup> DUB.ŠAR19' [oooooooo] x<sup>21</sup> ŠA<sup>m</sup> Me-ra-A.A

20' [ooo] EN GIŠ.KIN.TI

Translation<sup>22</sup>

## Obv. I

[My] Majesty Š[uppilul(ijama, the Great King), the King of the Land of Ḫ]at-ti, the Hero, the son of Tuthali[ia, the Great King, the King of the Land of] Ḫatti, the Hero, the son of the son of Ḫattušil[(i, the Great King, the He)]ro, descendant of Muršili [the Great King, the Hero,<sup>(1-4)</sup> and Tal]mi-Teššub, the

16 The signs for dGAZ.BA.A.A were mistakenly copied by Götze at the end of this line. After collation they only appear in the following line. S. already Singer 2001, 638 note 6.

17 BAR or ŠI; traces of a vertical cut by a horizontal, the head of which is missing.

18 Traces of one horizontal.

19 The head of two small parallel horizontals can be seen: U[RU possible.

20 Two verticals remain.

21 Two parallel verticals remain.

22 Line numbers in the translation refer to manuscript A only.

King of the Land of Karkemiš, [(the son of Ini-Teššub, the King of the L)]and of Karkemiš, the son of the son of <Šaḥurunuṣa, the King of the Land of Karkemiš, the grandchild of> Šarri-K[ušuh, the King of the Land of Karkemiš], they have stipu[lated] one another the tablet of the treaty as follows:<sup>(5-7)</sup>

[...] were [(sons of Šuppiluliuma)... [(Šarrikušuh)] with (his) heart [...] (and just the ... of the treaty) ...]<sup>(8-12)</sup>

[... (and Mur)]šili [...] (them. Šuppiluliuma) ... (to<sup>2</sup> the Sungoddess of Arinna and to the Storm-god<sup>3</sup>)]<sup>(13-17)</sup>

[... (Muršili) ...] incited to revolt [...]<sup>(18-23; x+1)</sup>

...<sup>(2'-4')</sup>

[To<sup>2</sup> Talmi-Te]ššub, son son of Ini-[Teššub] ...<sup>(5'-6')</sup>

#### Obv. II

[...]<sup>(1'-2')</sup> [The people] of Ḫatti [...] against him, and myself I did not sin (too). If [he] had [any offspring], if [I] had not ex[cluded] this, I would have protected his offspring!<sup>(3-6)</sup> But he had no offspring. I asked about a pr[egnant] woman, and there was no preg[nant] woman.<sup>(7-9)</sup>

If Arnuṣanda [had an offspring], I would have sinned! I would have excluded the offspring of [my Lord]! I would have made Lord someone [else ...]!<sup>(10-13)</sup>

Furthermore, Tutḫaliya had [another son<sup>2</sup>] of young(er) age. [Since] he was [the only<sup>2</sup>] one, [I put<sup>2</sup>] Ḫattuša, (her) women [and her men] in [his hands<sup>2</sup>].<sup>(14-17)</sup>

Šuppiluliuma [...]. Him [...]; each one [...] Great King, son of Tut[ḫaliya ...] Šuppilul[iuma ...] be[came] king [of the Ḫatti Lands].<sup>(19-23)</sup>

The Land of Ḫattuša [...]<sup>(24-5)</sup>

#### Rev. III

The place [...] is<sup>2</sup> not the servant of [...]<sup>(2'-3')</sup>

If during the battle (to) me [...], myself I [will/did] not [...] to him. [...] because of the fear [...] the Land of Egypt *friendly* [...]. And I will bring for you [...] to [...], but the enemy the Lord[...]<sup>(4'-9')</sup>

The inhabitants of Ḫatti became unloyal [...] I involved myself on [...]. [I<sup>2</sup>] moved him far away from me [...] If] any inhabitant of Ḫatti [will seek the evil] against my Majesty, I will not hide him. To [...] I will seize them and I will not plan [to...] If [he ...] me very much for a human desire / If a man with intention [...] me very much, and to my Majesty....: "One should not make anything bad to him".<sup>(10-18)</sup>

In this case, concerning the rulers[hip ...] the gods [shall] make (him?) respect the treaties.<sup>(19-20)</sup> I will be loyal to you, Šuppilulijama, Great Ki[ng, Hero?], son of Tutḫaliya as overlord, and moreover I will maintain the overlordship of your offspring.<sup>(21-23)</sup> The son, that you will destine [to the kingship, I will maintain] him as overlord.<sup>(23-24)</sup>

#### Rev. IV

[... the] gods of [Ḫatti]: [The Sungoddess of Arinna], the Storm-god of Ḫatti, Zab[aba of Ḫatti, the Storm-god of Aleppo], the Storm-god of Zippala[nda, the Storm-god of Ne]rik, Tar[uppašani ...] the Tutelary-god of [...] Ḫuṣašanna [...] Ḫepat [...];<sup>(1'-6')</sup>

[the gods of Kark]emiš: Ku[baba K]arḫuḫi [...] the Storm-god of [...] Ḫataḫ]ḫa, Ištar of<sup>2</sup>[..., the Queen of Ka]tapa, the [Sky and the E]arth, [they shall all] be present and shall be the witn[esses] (of the execution) of this [sworn treaty]<sup>(7'-13')</sup>

#### Colophon

[...] son of [...] wrote [...] the scribe, [...] of Mera-muṣa [...], the Overseer of the implements.<sup>(13'-20')</sup>

#### Philological Commentary

**A I 1 A I** 1-7 were already transcribed and translated by Del Monte (1981, 207). Del Monte does not integrate any signs before <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>SI</sup>-za at the beginning of l. 1. According to my reconstruction, there would be space for at least two more signs at the beginning of the line; it is, however, possible that the rounded corner on the top of the edge did not allow the scribe to write any sign to the left of the syntagm <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>SI</sup>-za. Other restorations are also possible. A restoration: [IT-TI <sup>d</sup>U]TU<sup>SI</sup>-za, based on parallels with other parity or pseudo-parity treaties in Akkadian such as CTH 51, Obv. 1-2 and RS 17.230, 1-3 is not unlikely (d'Alfonso in 2006, §5.1), but thus far not attested in any Hittite text. For this restoration speaks the lack of

ending nom.s. /s/ (cun. -aš) at the end of the name Šuppilulijama in manuscript B, l. 1; if the restoration is accepted, then the first paragraph should be translated as follows:

[Together with] my Majesty Š[uppilul(ijama, the Great King)]... [Tal]mi-teššub, the King of the Land of Karkemiš ... stipulated the tablet of the treaty as follows

This requires a transcription *i-i[a-at]* at the end of l. A I 7, which is also possible on the basis of the residual traces. This translation would fully support the interpretation of the text given by Singer 2001 as a parallel to CTH 52.

The more usual *UM-MA* is difficult here, due to the presence of the particle of reciprocity *-za*; in fact, neither *UMMA* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>-*za* nor *UMMA tabarna-za* are attested as a beginning of normative texts (treaties, instructions, oaths or edicts). I can however postulate a restoration *UM-MA*, understanding the passage *UMMA* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>-*za* as a nominal sentence without copula.

**A I 4** Together with Del Monte, there is not enough space in the gap to integrate: LUGAL KUR <sup>URU</sup>HA-AT-TI. The lack of this title in the genealogy starting with Hattušili should not be related to the latter's controversial usurpation of the throne, as parallel instances of titlature diminution after the first generation can be observed in the genealogy of treaties by other Hittite kings: s. for example CTH 75, Obv. 1-2.

**A I 5-6** The name at the beginning of l. 5 has to be restored [<sup>m</sup>Tal]-*me*-<sup>d</sup>U-up-pa-aš, or even [<sup>m</sup>GAL]-<sup>d</sup>U-up-pa-aš, because of the residual traces on the edge of the gap. A reading which renders the name Ini-Teššub, on the other hand, is impossible<sup>23</sup>. The reading of the name Talmi-Teššub does not match with A I 6, where one reads: DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA <sup>m</sup>Šar-ri-[Kušuḫ]. The expression DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA PN in the genealogies is always to be translated literally: the son of the son. Now, the son of the son of King Šarri-Kušuḫ was *Ini-Teššub* and not *Talmi-Teššub*. Only a scribal mistake could explain this incongruity. The scribe would have omitted to copy the words: <<sup>m</sup>Ša-ḫu-ru-nu-ḫa LUGAL KUR <sup>URU</sup>Kar-ga-miš DUMU.DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA>, possibly getting confused by the repetition of the series DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA before both the name of Šaḫurunūḫa and Šarri-Kušuḫ (saut du même au même). The presence of this mistake on manuscript A precludes a derivation of B from A.

23 Opinion confirmed by Dr. J. Miller, e-mail, 17.02.2006. One could suggest an ideographic writing of the first part of the name, as <sup>m</sup>DINGIR<sup>LM</sup> for the hurrian *eni-/ini-*, parallel to the writing GAL for *talmi-*. Such a writing would fit the rest of the beginning of l. 5 very well, yet is thus far unattested, and for this reason rather unlikely.

**A I 7** For the restoration of the third person plural preterite, s. already Del Monte 1981, 207. Both the name of the King of Karkemiš in Nom. in l. 5 and the particle *-za* in l. 1 support this restoration. For an alternative restoration *i-i[a-at]* s. the commentary on A I 1 above.

**A I 8** With l. 8, the worst preserved part of the text begins. Manuscript A preserves only a few signs close to the right limit of the column. In two cases, they correspond to the series of signs preserved in B, and therefore I tried to integrate A in B. These restorations covering l. 8-19 are hypothetical, since one cannot be sure that all paragraphs of B correspond to those of A. Furthermore, a mistake in one of the two manuscripts could have altered the count of the number of signs underlying my reconstruction.

The first lines of this paragraph should refer to the installation of Telipinu and Šarri-Kušuḫ as kings at Aleppo and Karkemiš, and possibly even the installation of Arnuḫanda II at Hatti. For a parallel, cf. KUB 19.9 I 17'-18': *nu-za DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ŠU-NU LUGAL<sup>MEŠ</sup>-uš i-ja-at*. The traces on KBo 12.41 I 8 should be seen as the last part of the sign MEŠ. In fact, collation of the picture at the photographic archive in Mainz suggests that the last trace before the gap should be the last Winkelhaken of the sign MEŠ rather than a small Winkelhaken pertaining to a following sign, as the copy reads.

**A I 10** For an alternative translation of the end of the line as: "he discharged" s. Singer 2001, 637.

**B Obv. 7** *išḫiulaš=a=pat* is likely to refer to the first treaty between Hatti and Karkemiš dating to the time of Šuppiluliuma I and Šarri-Kušuḫ. One could reasonably recognize in this the fragmentary rests of CTH 50.

**B Obv. 11** The mention of a revolt caused by Muršili II does not refer to any known event. It seems possible that in this paragraph, manuscript A and B diverge.

**I x+5'** The restoration of the personal name as GAL-<sup>d</sup>I]M seems to be required by the following DUMU <sup>m</sup>I-ni-<sup>d</sup>[U-ub]. Although the other attestations of this name always make use of the writing <sup>d</sup>U, an alternation between that writing and <sup>d</sup>IM does not seem problematic. The lack of ending of the personal name argues for an indirect case depending by a sumerogram or akkadogram.

**I x+6** A restoration <sup>m</sup>Tu-ut-ḫa-l]i-ja-aš LU[GAL could be possible.

**II 3** Götze 1952, 68, then followed by Otten 1963, 3 and Carruba 1977, 151, translate the clause with the following restoration: "The Hittite people s[inned] against him". Meriggi 1962, 94, on the other hand, offers the translation: "die Leute] von Hatti aber [sündigten nicht] ihm gegenüber". Giorgieri 1995, 284 prefers not to offer a translation; however, in footnote 19 he notes that no further elements in this part of the text support the interpretation that the people of Hatti sinned against their master Arnuḫanda III. A restoration : <sup>r</sup>U [-UL ḫa-aš-te-er] would fit

the space at the end of the line and the traces of the first sign lost (two small horizontal heads). For the construction of this clause see CHD, *mēnahḫanda* 1b. 18'.

II 4 For the restoration s. Giorgieri 1995, 281, n. 4.

II 5 Restoration follows Giorgieri 1995, 282, on the basis of the parallel with II 12. Giorgieri (285) translates: "Se invece egli avesse avuto una discendenza, non l'avrei lasciata in disparte". S. in this sense also Götze 1952, 68. I understand the *man* at l. 5 as introducing a second protasis. S. also Meriggi 1962, 94.

II 7-9 For the translation see CHD *punušš-* 2a2', and for l. 8-9 also HW<sup>2</sup> I, 323-324.

II 10-13 Giorgieri 1995, 285, translates l. 10-11: "Ma se Arnuwand[a avesse avuto una discendenza], avrei forse commesso una colpa?". I prefer to follow Meriggi 1962, 94, and translate this and the following apodosis of the paragraph as affirmative unreal clauses. The sense of the first clause, in particular, seems ambiguous if translated as a question. S. also Singer 2001, 637, with a different restoration and translation of l. 10. The restoration by Singer 2001, 637, has been followed for l. 11. The restoration at the end of l. 12 follows Giorgieri 1995, 282.

II 14-15 The translation of this passage is difficult and controversial. Giorgieri (1995, 285) understands the syntagm TUR-aš SAG.DU-aš as a nominative, and translates: "Tutḫaliya [aveva un altro figlio...], era una persona (ancora)? giovane". Singer (2001, 637) transcribes the syntagm: DUMU-aš SAG.DU-aš and interprets DUMU-aš as gen.pl. depending on a nom. SAG.DU-aš. He then argues for a translation: "the head of sons", to be understood as "first son". In this case, however, one would expect the series DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup>-aš for a gen.pl. Van den Hout (2001, 216) transcribes the syntagm as Singer, but interprets DUMU-aš as nom. and SAG.DU-aš as a gen. depending on it. He translates the syntagm as "bevorzugter Sohn, Lieblingssohn" based on the parallel syntagm DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> ŠA SAG.DU-IA, my Tutelary-god, attested in KUB 21.38 Obv. 57': however, the first person enclitic pronoun plays a decisive role in the translation of the latter syntagm, while its absence in our syntagm seems to preclude a construction parallel to KUB 21.38 Obv. 57'. I prefer to follow the transcription of Giorgieri, but interpret the whole syntagm as a gen. depending on a *regens* to be restored at the end of l. 14. The position of the gen. after the *regens* would suggest an ideogram as *regens* (s. HE, §209b). I would like to suggest to restore the end of l. 14 as follows: [DUMU *ta-ma-iš*], and to translate: "Tutḫaliya had [another son] of young(er) age (lit. of young head)".

II 15 The translation is hypothetical, and rests on the potential restoration in the gap of: [*na-aš* I<sup>EN</sup> *ku-it*].

II 16-17 This passage seems to refer to the moment when the candidate was chosen for the enthronisation. After the previous paragraph, it seems very likely

that the passage should refer once again to the activity of the king of Karkemiš as King-maker in this situation. The restoration in the gap follows the closest parallel to someone acting as King-maker at the Hittite court, namely the passage of CTH 81 which refers to the enthronisation of Muršili III/Urḫi-Teššub by means of his uncle Ḫattušili: s. CTH 81, III 43'-44' (Otten 1981, 20-21). In the gap, l. 16, if the restoration ŠU-*i* is accepted, the syntagm should have been followed by an enclitic pronoun of the third person and a sentence particle. The restoration of the last sign before the gap in l. 17 as: MUNUS.NÍ[TA<sup>MEŠ</sup> is hypothetical, s. Giorgieri 1995, 282 n. 8. The syntagm normally employs NITA instead of NÍTA in the texts from Ḫattuša, but the writing with NÍTA is well attested in the corpus of Syro-Hittite documents drafted at Karkemiš and found at Ugarit and Emar: s. Tsukimoto 1992, 297 (for the ascription of Hir. 46 and Emar VI 212 to the Karkemiš scribal school s. Ikeda 1998, 24 and Seminara 1998, 125ff). For a different restoration of these lines s. van den Hout 2001, 216-217.

II 20 The restoration at the end of the line is based on the parallel Rev. III 20' and follows Giorgieri 1995, 282. He translates the line as follows: "ognuno [ha rispettato?] i pat[ti]/le deci[sioni] [(che stabilivano):]". Following his restoration, one could integrate the rest as follows:

20 *da-pi-an-za iš-ḫ[i-ú-li PAB-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ta-at' nu-ḫa']*  
 21 LUGAL.GAL DUMU<sup>m</sup> *Tu-u[t-ḫa-li-ja ki-ša-ru nu-x x x]*  
 22<sup>m</sup> *Šu-up-pi-lu-l[i-ja-ma-aš A-NA KUR.KUR<sup>MEŠ URU</sup> ḪAT-TI]*  
 23 LUGAL-*uš ki-[ša-at]*

Everyone [respected] the binding norms: "Great King [should become (only)] a son of Tut[ḫaliya], and then] Šuppilulijama became the King of the Lands of Hatti.

II 22 The restoration at the end of the line is based on the parallel with CTH 81 III 44'.

III 3' The reading of the third sign is unsure, but s. already Giorgieri 1995, 283, n. 11.

III 7' If the word before the gap is to be read as *a-ra-an*<sup>??</sup>, it should be understood as the accusative of *ara-*, "friend", and translated either as the object or as an adverbial form. For a parallel to the latter s. d'Alfonso 2004, 58 n. 6.

III 12'-13' The restoration is based on parallels with other normative texts: s. CTH 251 (KBo 16.24 +, I 67'-69') and also CTH 255.2 (KUB 26.1 +, III 54-56).

III 19' Otten 1963, 4 translates the line: „In dieser Frage [soll es keine] Großzügigkeit [geben].“ For the use of the term *šallatar* in the sense of „rulership, kingship“ s. CDH Š, 91. A possible restoration to the end of the line is: *šal-la-a[n-ni ŠA<sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>]*; with the following translation:



In this case, concerning the rulers[hip of my Majesty] the gods [shall] make (him?) respect the treaties.<sup>(19-20)</sup>

Beside this hypothetical restoration, one could raise the question, whether a reference to the claim to a higher office in the state, or even the highest, lays under the use of *šallatar* in this passage. The beginning of the previous paragraph remembers an episode, when the people of Hatti had been unloyal to their King (III 10'); then Talmi-Teššub declares, he moved someone away from himself (III 12'). *šallatar* at l. 19' could then refer to the ambitions of this given person, who was clearly an enemy of the Great King. In fact, *šallatar* in KBo 1.28 Obv. 7 could be translated as raising, elevation (Klengel 1965, 53: Erhöhung), if one considers that with that edict Piššili passed from the office of vassal of the Great King, like other kings of submitted Lands to a much higher office: the third office of the Empire, after the Great King and the Crown prince (s. Mora 1993).

III 20'-24' As to restoration and sense of these lines, I follow Giorgieri 1995, 283 and 286. In particular, he restores the last two lines on the basis of parallels with KBo 5.3 +, Vs. I 9-11 (CTH 42.A); KBo 1.5 Vs. I 57-59 (CTH 41.1A).

IV x+1 Restoration at the end of the line follows Singer's suggestion (2001, 639), where he points out that this paragraph should list the deities of Hatti.

IV 2'-3' The restorations at the beginning of these two lines are hypothetical but based on the very frequent occurrence of these deities in the lists of deities of treaties: s. Kestemont 1976, esp. 156. Note that the best parallels are to be found in group 3.

IV 4' Although only the beginning of the god-name is preserved, Singer's restoration Taruppašani (2001, 639) in the gap at the end of the line is certain. This god is not attested in any other treaty; however, his mention in our text is due to the importance which Taruppašani gained in the last decades of the Hittite Empire: s. Lebrun 2004.

IV 6' Traces before the gap at the end of the line allow a mention of a second Hēpat; s. also Trémouille 1997, 37 n. 111, who restores <sup>d</sup>L[UGAL].

IV 7' The restoration of this line follows Singer 2001, 638-9.

IV 9' The restoration of the divine name Hataḥḥa at the beginning of the line is hypothetical, but based on the parallel with many Hittite treaties (for the choice of this form of the divine name instead of the older Kataḥḥa s. already Kühne/Otten 1971, 49-50; compare also the different writing of the name by B.H.L. van Gessel 1998, 228-235, with the dating of each single text in Košak 2002).

IV 11' The restoration of the beginning of the line is based on the parallel with CTH 105, B Rs. 23' (s. Kühne/Otten 1971, 20-21). The use of the verb *tija-* in this context is unusual within the corpus of the treaties written in Hittite; a good parallel is offered by a formula which recurs to the verb *izzuzzu* in Hittite treaties

written in Akkadian (s. a.o. CTH 51 IV 58). The Akk. *izzuzzu* is normally translated in the treaties with the Hit. MP *ar-*, yet a correspondence between *izzuzzu* and *tija-* is certain (s. HEG T/D 3, 357).

The restoration at the end of this line and the next follows Singer 2001, 639.

IV 19' For a restoration [GÁB.ZU.Z]U at the beginning of the line s. Torri, in print, [4], with reference to further literature. The serious mistake at I 5-6 could fit well with the fact that manuscript A was written by a young scribe, student of Mera-muḫa.

A scribe named Mera-muḫa is not attested in any other Hittite cuneiform text; however, one seal impression among those found at Nişantepe bears this name written in Anatolian Hieroglyphs: s. Herbordt 2005, N. 240. The seal impression bears also two titles: the title SCRIBA-*la*, and, low on the right side, where part of the impression is not preserved, a title beginning with DOMINUS. If one suggests that the two attestations refer to one and the same person, the fragmentary title DOMINUS [...] could correspond to the EN GIŠ.KIN.TI attested at IV 20'.

### Bibliography

- Carruba, Onofrio  
1977 Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte: die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas, SMEA 18, 137-174.
- d'Alfonso, Lorenzo  
2004 Besprechung von Y. Cohen, Taboos and Prohibitions in the Hittite Society, THeth 24, Heidelberg 2002, OLZ 99, 56-62.  
2006 Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.-12. Jh. v.Chr.), in: M. Witte/K. Schmid/D. Prechel/J. Chr. Gertz (Hrsg.), Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus“-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten (= BZAW 365), Berlin/New York, 303-329.
- del Monte, Giuseppe F.  
1981 Note sui trattati fra Hattuša e Kizuwatna, OA 20, 203-221.
- van Gessel, Ben H.L.  
1998 Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon, Vol. I (= HbOr I/33.1), Leiden/New York/Köln.
- Giorgieri, Mauro  
1995 I testi ittiti di giuramento, PhD thesis, unpublished, University of Florence.  
2002 Birra, acqua e olio: paralleli siriani e neo-assiri ad un giuramento ittita, in: S. De Martino/F. Pecchioli Daddi (Edd.), Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati (= Eothen 11), Firenze 2002, 299-320.
- Götze, Albrecht  
1952 The Predecessors of Šuppiluliumaš of Hatti, JAOS 72, 67-72.

- Herbort, Suzanne  
2005 Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Großreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa (= BoHa 19), Berlin.
- van den Hout, Theo  
2001 Zur Geschichte des jüngeren hethitischen Reiches, in: G. Wilhelm (Ed.), Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, StBoT 45, Wiesbaden, 213-223.
- Ikeda, Jun  
1998 The Akkadian Language of Carchemish: Evidence from Emar and its Vicinities, ASJ 20, 23-62.
- Kestemont, Guy  
1976 Le panthéon des instruments hittites de droit public, Or NS 45, 147-177.
- Klengel, Horst  
1965 Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z., Teil 1 – Nordsyrien (= VIO 40), Berlin.  
1995 Historischer Kommentar zum Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag, in: Th.P. van den Hout/J. de Roos, (Edd.), *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (= PIHANS 74), Leiden, 159-172.
- Košak, Silvin  
2002 Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln (I-LXI), <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.
- Kühne, Cord – Otten, Heinrich  
1971 Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag, StBoT 16, Wiesbaden.
- Lebrun, René  
2004 Le dieu Taruppašani, in: D. Grodek/S. Röble, *Šarnikzel: Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an E.O. Forrer* (= DBH 10), Dresden, 409-414.
- Meriggi, Piero  
1962 Über einige hethitische Fragmente historischen Inhaltes, WZKM 58, 66-110.
- Mora, Clelia  
1993 Lo „status“ del re di Kargamiš, Or NS 62, 67-70.
- Otten, Heinrich  
1963 Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches, MDOG 94, 1-23.  
1981 Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung (= StBoT 24), Wiesbaden.
- Seminara, Stefano  
1998 L'accadico di Emar, Roma.
- Singer, Itamar  
2001 The Treaties between Karkamiš and Hatti, in: G. Wilhelm (Ed.), Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie (= StBoT 45), Wiesbaden, 635-641.
- Torri, Giulia  
in print The Scribes of the House on the Slope, in: A. Archi (Ed.), 6. IKH.
- Tsukimoto, Akio  
1992 Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (III), ASJ 14, 289-310.

## In margine al sistema di Caland: su alcuni aggettivi primari in \*-.nt- dell'anatolico

Paola Dardano (Siena)

1.1. Le formazioni primarie in \*-.nt- 1.2. Il sistema di Caland 2.1. I cosiddetti participi dell'ittito e le formazioni aggettivali 2.2. Gli aggettivi in \*-u- 2.3. Gli aggettivi in \*-i- 2.4. Gli aggettivi in \*-ro- 2.5. Il sistema di Caland in anatolico 3.1. La funzionalità di -ant- 3.2. L'alternanza -i-, -u- versus -ant- 3.3. I suffissi verbali del sistema di Caland 4. Conclusioni.

1.1. All'inizio del Novecento, a proposito di alcune formazioni in \*-.nt- di lingue indoeuropee antiche, Karl Brugmann osservava come forme dotate di un suffisso di participio, ma prive del significato di participi, potessero essere relitti di un'epoca, in cui queste formazioni non facevano parte di un paradigma verbale:

“Im allgemeinen muss die Adjektivkategorie entwickelt gewesen sein, ehe die Partizipialkategorie entstand, und möglicherweise sind gewisse Nomina mit Partizipialformantien, aber ohne partizipiale Bedeutung Reste aus einer Zeit, wo die betreffende Formation noch nicht ans Verbum angeschlossen war, z. B. ai. *śá-svant-* gr. *πᾶς* ‘ganz’, ai. *bṛhánt-* ‘erhaben, hoch’ ir. F. *Brigit* = ai. *bṛhatī*, ai. *dánt-* lat. *dēns* ‘Zahn’” (Brugmann 1906, 650).

Se ai tempi del *Grundriss* le lingue anatoliche non erano ancora accessibili agli studiosi, oggi, invece, dopo circa cento anni possiamo valutare tale osservazione in una prospettiva differente. I dati forniti dalle lingue anatoliche, e in particolare dall'ittito, sembrano confermare l'intuizione del Brugmann: in ittito il suffisso -(a)nt- è ben documentato e, soprattutto, il suo impiego non è limitato alla formazione dei cosiddetti “participi”, ma appare in una classe abbastanza produttiva di aggettivi, sia deverbali che denominali. Nel presente contributo intendo concentrare l'attenzione su alcuni aggettivi primari, antichi participi o più verosimilmente aggettivi verbali, i quali, anche se si possono ricondurre a una radice verbale, non sono inseriti, al livello sincronico, in un paradigma flessionale.

1.2. In primo luogo la lista proposta dal Brugmann può essere opportunamente ampliata. Basti pensare alle seguenti forme: ai. *járant-*, gr. *γέρων, -οντος*, oss. *zæronð* “vecchio”; av. *bərəzant-* “alto”; ai. *mahánt-*, av. *mazānt-* “grande, po-