Muršili II's Prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377)*

Alexei Kassian (Moscow) – Ilya Yakubovich (Chicago)

1.1. General Remarks.

Telipinu, a Hittite deity of Hattic origin, is much better known from a narration portraying him as a disappearing god, than from personal prayers addressed to him. The myth of Telipinu (CTH 324) is attested in three main versions and more than ten copies, while the prayer of Telipinu made on behalf of Muršili II (CTH 377) is known only from three copies. The only other potential prayer to Telipinu known to us is the fragment KUB 36.45 // KUB 58.48 (CTH 627, KI.LAM) containing the entreaties to Telipinu embedded in a ritual.

The preserved part of CTH 377 can be divided into three main sections. The beginning of the prayer contains a formulaic evocation (*mugayar*; I 1-17) and hymn (*yallijatar*; I 18 – II 22) addressed to Telipinu, which stress his intimate connection with Ḫatti-land. After a lacuna of some ten lines, a no less formulaic set of entreaties to the deity aiming at securing his positive involvement in the affairs of the land of Ḫatti, concludes the prayer (*arkuyar*; III x+1 – IV 18). As usual, the entreaties are dealing with three main issues, the physical and spiritual health of the king and his subjects, the subjugation of enemies, and the prosperity of the land. One does not necessarily need to interpret this triad in Dumézilian terms because it transcends the Indo-European cultural area, and perhaps represents a pan-cultural concept. When King David organized a census in Israel and Judea, the Hebrew God offered him a choice of seven years of famine, three months of military defeats, or three days of pestilence as a punishment for this act of hybris (2 Samuel: 24). The individual formulae used in our text can, of course, reflect either the Indo-European cultural heritage or Near Eastern influence[1].

---

1 For the recent comparison of CTH 377 with the poetic texts belonging to the Greek and the Near Eastern traditions, see M. Bachvarova, Diss. [2002]: 129-172.

We can only guess about the content of the missing part of the text, but complaints about scourges that befell the land of Ḫatti and attempts at self-justification are among the possible topics that can be suggested on the basis of the other prayers. The main part of the preserved text, however, does not bear any traces of personal involvement on the part of the king. It is only from the preamble to the prayer that we get information about the royal commission to recite it daily in front of the deity, and learn that Telipinu was one of the personal deities of Muršili II and his family.

The text that has the greatest number of similarities with ours is the prayer of Muršili II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376[2]), which also begins with a hymn and ends with formulaic entreaties. The initial parts of the hymns are almost identical in both cases, and the final invocations also exhibit striking parallelism. The hymn to the Sun-goddess is, however, much longer. Even if we assume that the hymn to Telipinu continued throughout the lacuna, it will not match its more famous counterpart. Such assumption is, in any event, unlikely, since according to the just observation of Güterbock (JAOS 78 [1958]: 247) the middle part of the hymn to the Sun-goddess of Arinna repeats almost verbatim the Hittite Hymn to the Sun-god of Mesopotamian inspiration (belonging to CTH 372). The transfer of epithets from the Babylonian Sun-god to the Sun-goddess of Hattic origin, who, in addition, had the same name *Ištanu-* in Hittite, is quite natural, but one would hardly expect a similar transfer in the case of Telipinu. In all probability, the *ṷalliṷatar* of CTH 376 was compiled of two heterogeneous sources: "hymn to a disappearing deity", and "hymn to a solar deity". Only the first source is reflected in CTH 377.

The formulaic character of our prayer somewhat complicates its dating. There is no direct indication in the text that the "commissioner" of CTH 377 was Muršili II, rather than his grandson, Muršili III. The 13th century ductus of KUB 24.1 and 24.2 (cf. below) is also compatible with both options. Several facts, however, speak in favor of the first hypothesis. First of all is the above-mentioned similarity with CTH 376, a prayer that dwells on the topic of the plague and, therefore, can be certainly attributed to Muršili II. Second, the prayer to Telipinu makes a recurrent reference to the queen and the princes. Since Muršili III was dethroned at a young age by his uncle Ḫattušili III, we may doubt that he had an official principal wife during his short reign. It is his stepmother Tanuḫepa, whose name appears next to his name on royal seals (Bryce, KgHitt[2] [2005]: 244 with endnote 63).

Should our conclusions be correct, two deities, Telipinu and the Sun-goddess of Arinna, enjoyed the status of personal gods (DINGIR *ŠA* SAG.DU) of Muršili II and his immediate family. Of the two deities, the Sun-goddess appears to have enjoyed more attention on the part of the king, since Muršili II's devotion to her is foregrounded in his Annals. The situation is further complicated by the fact that Muršili is designated as "beloved of the Powerful Storm-God" in two independent sources (Singer, Muw.Pr.: 153 with fn. 338). Apparently, Muršili II was rather promiscuous in his relationships with divine patrons, and did not shy away from changing his declared allegiance as the occasion required.

The mention of the queen and princes in our text led O. Carruba (StMed 4: 12) to think that its date is somewhat later than that of CTH 376, where the formulaic blessings are confined to the king and the land of Ḫatti. This argument, however, is relevant only for the final edition of both prayers, since it is possible to show that both CTH 376 and CTH 377 are based on compositions of the Middle Hittite Period. The Middle Script parallel version KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12, erroneously assigned as 376.C in CTH, represents in fact a direct prototype of Muršili II's prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna. In addition, both CTH 376 and CTH 377 display a number of linguistic archaisms that cannot be accounted for from within Neo-Hittite (see our comments on CTH 377 below and O. Carruba, ZDMG Suppl. 1 [1969]: 240 for CTH 376).

1.2. Primary and secondary sources.

According to Košak, Konkordanz, CTH 337 includes:

A. KUB 24.1 + 1122/v + 217/w
B. KUB 24.2 (= A Vs. I 1 – II 2, Rs. III 16' – IV 18)
C. Bo 8072 (= A Rs. III 2'–13').

The three copies of the prayer to Telipinu were found in the excavations of H. Winckler and Th. Makridi Bey (1905/6-1912) and assigned museum numbers Bo 2415, Bo 2082, and Bo 8072. In 1930 the first two pieces were published in autography by A. Walther as KUB 24.1 and KUB 24.2 respectively, while the last one, representing a duplicate of KUB 24.1 III 2'-13', remains unpublished in autography up to now[3].

Two small fragments joining Bo 2415 (upper left corner, Vs. I 1-7) were found in 1963 and 1964 in the excavations of K. Bittel and assigned numbers 1122/v and

---

2 For the arrangement of CTH 376 fragments see now Košak, Konkordanz. The main Ex. A is KUB 24.3 + KUB 31.144 + 544/u + 401/u + 1947/u + 107/w (the last three unpublished fragments remain unavailable to us). MS KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12, traditionally assigned as Ex. C, represents a MH prototype of Muršili II's prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna.

217/w. Both fragments remain heretofore unpublished in autography, but H. Otten and Ch. Rüster presented the transliteration of the relevant part of the join in ZA 62 [1972]: 232 (Nr. 15). The excavation records indicate that fragments 1122/v and 217/w were found in a garbage pile made by the original excavators of Temple I in Ḫattuša. Thus, in all probability, Bo 2415 had also been found in Temple I. Unfortunately, we cannot say anything about the original location of Bo 2082 and Bo 8072 since the finds of pre-World War I excavations in Boghazköy usually lack provenance records.

The paleographic analysis of KUB 24.1 and KUB 24.2 was undertaken by Ch. Rüster in StBoT 21. The ductus of both texts indicates that they were written no earlier than the 13th century. At the same time, it is easy to observe that the sign shapes of KUB 24.1 are more consistently "cursive", whereas KUB 24.2 contains more archaic sign variants (cf. especially SAG, IK, AL, LI, ḪA). The form of the QA sign attested in KUB 24.1 usually occurs in the texts written during the reign of Ḫattušili III or later, even though there is one exception (see Neu, StBoT 32: 3). Paleographic considerations alone do not allow us to make a conclusion, as to whether KUB 24.2 needs to be assigned to an earlier date, or was simply written by a more archaizing scribe, so one needs to turn to linguistic data.

The orthographic and linguistic discrepancies between KUB 24.1 and KUB 24.2 were analyzed by Carruba, GS Pintore 13, as well as in StBoT 21. The material that is potentially relevant for comparative dating can be summarized in the table below. Forms that cannot be used as positive arguments have been shaded.

	Ex. A (KUB 24.1)		Ex. B (KUB 24.2)	
1	I 3	DINGIR^{LIM}-iš	Vs. 3	DINGIR-uš
2	I 13	^{É}ka-ri-im-ni	Vs. 11	^{É}ka-ri-im-ni-it-ti
3	I 20	da-aš-ša-nu-ua-an	Vs. 16	ta-aš-nu-ua-an
4	I 20	nam-ma-ma-ta	Vs. 16	nam-ma-ma-at-ta
5	I 23	dam-me-e-d[a-ni]	Vs. 19	⌈ta⌉[-me-]⌈e⌉-da-ni
6	II 1	KÙ.BABBAR.GI₄	Vs. 21	KÙ.GI
7	III 12'	mi-i-ia-ta	Rs. 16' (not parallel-ed)	mi-ia-a-tar
8	III 21'	ku-e-da-aš-ma-az	Rs. 5'	ku-i-e-eš-ma-a[z]
9	IV 7	ta-pa-ša-an	Rs. 10'	ta-pa-aš-š[a-an]
10	IV 13	ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš	Rs. 15'	ANŠE-aš
11	IV 15	mi-e-eš-du	Rs. 16'	mi-e-eš-ša-d[u]
12	IV 16	še-e-eš-ša-u-ua-a[š]	Rs. 17'	ši-]iš-ša-ua-aš

One can see that Ex. B contains a number of older variants than its counterpart. Archaic morphological forms, like šiuš 'god' in (1), ^{É}karimni=ti 'in your temple' in (2) are especially clear examples. For tašnuuan (3), see Hoffner, JNES 32/1 [1971]: 31b. On the orthographic level, compare the usage of a CVC sign in dam-me-e-d[a-ni] (5). The syntactically correct form kuiēš in (8) was misinterpreted as kuedaš in Ex. A, perhaps through ungrammatical case attraction to the preceding A-NA DINGIR^{MEŠ}. Both copies show the secondary stem ši/ešš- 'thrive' instead of the original šišt-, but B preserves the more archaic i-spelling (12). For the verbal form mi-e-eš-ša-du vs. mi-e-eš-du (11) see comm. on Ex. A IV 15[4].

Ex. A mīiata with the archaic loss of final -r vs. Ex. B miiātar (7) represents the only instance where the form of KUB 24.2 is demonstrably less archaic, but the loci are non-parallel and we don't know what we might find in the corresponding broken part of Ex. B.

In conclusion, KUB 24.1 appears to have been written at least several decades later than KUB 24.2, even though one cannot positively claim that the latter is the protograph of the former.

As for the general outlook of the tablets, one can see that the scribe of Ex. B was not very proficient at his art: the lines on both the obverse and the reverse of his tablet are not horizontal and their beginnings slide down little by little. As for the colophon, the scribe did not manage to fit it on the tablet at all. Ex. A, in its turn, has a great number of erasures.

The first attempt to edit CTH 376 and 377 in transliteration belongs to O.R. Gurney (AAA 27 [1940]), who deemed the prayers to Telipinu and the Sungoddess of Arinna to be almost identical and thus not worthy of being treated separately. After H. Güterbock succeeded in showing the opposite (see above), the need for a separate edition of CTH 377 became apparent. In 1971, Muršili II's prayer to Telipinu was re-edited in Lebrun, Prières: 180-191. Unfortunately, this publication can be regarded only as a preliminary one, in view of several errors and omissions both in transliteration and translation. The issues discussed in the commentary to the present edition were, almost without exception, ignored by Lebrun, and their sheer number provides an ample justification for the present work.

In addition to full editions, one must mention the English translation of the prayer published in Singer, Prayers (WAW 11): 54-56. Far from being a compilation of earlier editions, Singer's translation tacitly incorporates several original

---

4 Pace Carruba (GS Pintore: 13) the variant ANŠE-aš 'donkeys' in (10) is not necessarily more archaic than its counterpart ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš 'horses'. Horses are mentioned as domestic animals already in the Old Hittite rituals (see Neu, StBoT 26: 225 for their attestations). The variant ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš is independently attested in CTH 376, KUB 24.3 III 17, and therefore the variant ANŠE-aš may be due to a simple scribal omission. The unusual Sumerogram KÙ.BABBAR.GI₄ in (6) likewise cannot be used as a decisive argument for the dating.

restorations and reinterpretations. Another positive side of this piece is that, unlike Gurney's edition, it is written in contemporary English. We have chosen it as a basis for our translation, and have attempted to comment on those cases where our understanding of the text substantially deviates from that of Itamar Singer.

2. Texts[5]

2.1. Ex. A: KUB 24.1 + 1122/v + 217/w.

Vs. I

1 [*ki-i-*]*ma-kán*[6] *Ṭ*[(*UP-PÍ* DUB.SAR *A-NA* DINGIR*LI*)]*M an-*⌜*da*⌝ [ ]
2 [(UD-*at* U)]D-*at me-mi-iš-ki-i*[*z-zi nu* DING(IR*LAM*)] ⌜*ya*⌝-*al-li-iš-*⌜*ki*⌝-*i*[(*z-zi*)]

3 [(*ᵈTe-li-p*)]*í-nu-uš šar-ku-uš n*[(*a-ak-ki-iš*)]DINGIR*LIM-iš*[7] *zi-ik*
4 ⌜*u-i*⌝-*ja-at-mu* ᵐ*Mur-ši-*DINGIR*LIM*[8] *L*[(UGAL-*uš tu-*)] ⌜*e*⌝-*el* ARAD-*KA*
5 MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš-ša tu-e-el* GÉME-*KA* [(*u-i-*)]⌜*e*⌝-[*i*]*r i-it-ya*
6 ᵈ*Te-li-pí-nu-un an-zi-el* EN-*NI* DINGIR⌜*LAM*⌝
7 *ŠA* SAG.DU-*NI mu-ga-a-i*

8 *nu-za-kán ma-*⌜*a-an*⌝ [(*na-ak-ki-iš*)] ᵈ*Te-li-pí-nu-uš* ⌜*še-ir ne-pí-ši*⌝
9 DINGIR*MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na* ⌜*ma-a-an a*⌝-*r*[(*u-n*)]*i na-aš-ma A-NA* HUR.SAG*MEŠ!*[9]
10 *ya-ḫa-an-na* [(*p*)]*a-a-an-za*[10] *na-aš-*⌜*ma*⌝-*za I-NA* KUR *LÚ*KÚR *za*⌞*-aḫ-ḫi-ja*[11] *pa-a-an-za*

11 *ki-nu-na-at-*⌜*ta*⌝ *ša-ne-iz-zi-*⌜*iš*⌝ *ya-ar-šu-la-aš*
12 *GIŠ*ERIN-*an-za* ⌜*Ì*⌝-*an-za kal-*⌜*li-iš*⌝-*du na-aš-ta* EGIR-*pa*
13 Ė*ka-ri-im-ni*✶[12] *an-*⌜*da e*⌝ [-*ḫ*]*u*✶ *nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša*

---

5 We abstain from the interpretative transliteration that assigns the values *Ce* and *eC* to the signs *Ci* and *iC* respectively and believe that the choice between /i/ ~ /e/ in such cases should be left to linguists rather than epigraphists. Double strike-through (✶) marks signs erased by the scribe. Signs written over erasure are marked with ⦂ ... ⦂.
6 B: [*ki-i-k*]*án*.
7 B: DINGIR-*uš*.
8 B: ᵐ*Mur-ši-i-li*.
9 Both A & B read EŠ sign here.
10 B incorrect: TÀŠ-*a-an-za*.
11 Text: ḪA-*aḫ-ḫi* ... (B: corrects).
12 Erased IT? Cf. B: Ė*ka-ri-im-ni-it-ti*.

---

14 *mu-ki-iš-ki-mi* NINDA*ḫar-ši-i*[(*t* DUG*iš-pa-a*)]*n-du-zi-it*
15 *nu-uš-ša-an pa-ra-a ka-*⌜*la-a-an*⌝ [(-*ká*)]*n-za e-eš nu-ut-ta ku-i*[(*t*)]
16 *me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu* DINGIR*LUM iš-*⌜*ta*⌝-*ma-na-an*
17 *la-ga-a-an ḫar-ak na-at iš-t*[*a-ma*]-*aš-ki*

---

18 *zi-ik-za* ᵈ*Te-li-pí-nu-uš na*[(*-ak-ki-i*)]*š* DINGIR*LIM-*⌜*iš*⌝
19 *nu-ut-ta* DINGIR*LIM-JA Ù* É*ME*[(*Š*.DINGIR*MEŠ*)] ⌜*Ì*⌝-*NA* KUR URU*ḪA*[*T-*(*TI-pát*)][13]
20 *da-aš-ša-nu-ya-an*[14] *nam-ma-ma-ta*[*dam-me-*]⌜*e*⌝-*da-ni*[15] *ut-n*[*i-(e)*][16]
21 *Ú-UL ku-ya-pí-ik-ki e-e*[(*š-zi*) *n*]*u-ut-ta* EZE[(N₄*HI.A*)]
22 SÍSKUR[17] *I-NA* KUR URU*ḪAT-TI*[18] *p*[(*ár-k*)]*u-i šu-up-pí*
23 *pí-iš-kán-zi nam-*⌜*ma*⌝-*ma-ta*[19] *dam-me-e-d*[(*a-ni*)][20]
24 *ut-ni-e Ú-UL ku-y*[*a-*]⌜*pí-ik-ki pí*⌝-*i*[(*š-kán-zi*)]

---

25 É*MEŠ*.DINGIR*MEŠ-ta pár-ku IŠ-T*[*U* KÙ.B(ABBAR KÙ.GI *ú-nu-ya-an-ta*)]
26 *I-NA* KUR URU*ḪA-AT-*⌜*TI*⌝-*p*[*át e-eš-zi nam-ma-ma-ta*]
27 *ta-me-e-da-ni* K[UR-*e Ú-U*(*L ku-ya-pí-ik-k*)*i e-eš-zi*]

(the edge)

Vs. II

1 [GAL]*HI.A-ta BI-IB-RI*HI.A KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.BABBAR.GI₄[21] NA₄[*HI.A*]
2 [ ] ⌜*Ì*⌝-*NA* KUR URU*ḪA-AT-TI-pát e-eš-zi*

3 EZEN₄*HI.A-it-ta* EZEN₄.ITU EZEN₄*HI.A* MU-*aš me-e-a-na-aš*
4 *gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš ḫa-mi-iš-ḫa-an-da-aš*
5 *zé-na-an-da-aš a-ú-li-uš mu-ki-iš-na-aš-ša*
6 EZEN₄*MEŠ I-NA* KUR URU*ḪA-AT-TI-pát*⦂*e-eš-zi*⦂ ✶
7 *nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni* KUR URU *Ú-*⌜*UL*⌝
8 *ku-ya-pí-ik-ki*⦂*e-eš-ša-an-zi*⦂

---

13 B: URU*ḪA-AT-TI-pát*.
14 B: *ta-aš-nu-ya-an.*⌝
15 Cf. I 23. B reads: ⌜*ta*⌝ [-*me-*] ⌜*e*⌝-*da-ni*.
16 B: KUR-*e*.
17 B: SÍSKUR*HI.A*.
18 B: URU*ḪA-AT-TI-pát*.
19 B: ⌜*nam*⌝-*ma-ma-at-ta*.
20 B: *ta-me-e-da-ni*.
21 Sic! The same in IV 2. Cf. comm.

9   n[u] ⌜tu-el ŠA⌝ ^{d}Te-li-ịpí-nuː DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar ⌜I⌝ [-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI-pát]

10   n[a-a]k-k[i-ịa-aḫ-ḫ]a-an nu-ut-ták-kán ^{m}Mur-š[i-DINGIR^{LIM} LUGAL-uš ARAD-KA]

11   [MUNUS.LUGAL-aš GÉME-KA] ⌜Ù DUMU^{MEŠ}.LUGAL⌝ A[RAD^{MEŠ}-KA]

12   [I-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI-pát na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-eš nu tu-e-el]

13   [ŠA ^{d}Te-li-p]í-nu ḫ[i-im-mu-uš EZEN$_4$$^{ḪI.A}$ SÍS]K[UR]

14   [i-ịa-u-ụa-an-z]i ša-ra-⌜a⌝ [ti-it-ta-nu-uš-ká]n-z[i]

15   [nu-ut-ta ḫ]u-u-ma-an šu-up-p[í pár-ku-i p]i-⌜iš⌝-kán-zi

16   [nam-ma-aš-ša-]an ːÉː.DINGIR^{LIM}-K[A BI-IB-R]I$^{ḪI.A}$-KA

17   [GAL$^{ḪI.A}$-KA] Ú-NU-TE^{MEŠ}-KA na-⌜aḫ-ša-ra-za⌝ ti-ịa-an-za

18   [na-at-za E]GIR-pa kap-pu-ụa-an A-NA ⌜Ú-NU⌝-UT

19   [DINGIR^{LIM} (?) ma-ni-i]n-ku-ụa-an Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ⌜ti⌝-ịa-az-zi

___

20   [zi-ik-za ^{d}Te-l]i-pí-nu-uš na-⌜ak⌝-ki-iš DINGIR^{LIM}-iš

21   [nu-ut-ták-kán ŠUM-a]n ŠUM$^{ḪI.A}$-aš iš-tar-na-aš^{22} na-⌜ak-ki⌝-i

22   [DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar-ma-ták-kán] ⌜DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš iš-tar-na na-ak⌝-k[i-i]

(approximately five lines missing)

Rs. III

(approximately five lines missing)

x+1   [… ca. 8 signs   ]DUMU^M[^{EŠ}.LUGAL ARAD^{MEŠ}-KA ?]

2'   [(Ù) ? A-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-T]I an-da aš-⌜šu-li⌝ n[e-iš-ḫu-ut]

3'   [zi-ik-za (^{d}Te-l)]i-pí-nu-uš šar-ku-uš DINGIR[^{LIM}-iš]

4'   [LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL Ù DUMU^{ME}]Š.LUGAL TI-an ḫar-ak nu-⌜uš-ma-aš⌝

5'   [mi-ịa-a-tar?? EGI]R.U$_4$-MI^{23} ḫa-ad-du-la-tar MU$^{KAM.ḪI.A}$ GÍD.DA

6'   [in-na-ra-u-ụa-tar] pí-eš-ki nu-uš-ma-aš-kán A-NA ZI-ŠU-NU an-da

7'   [mi-ú-mar (la-lu-u)]k-ki-ma-an du-uš-ga-ra-da-an-na

8'   [zi-ik-ki]

___

9'   [(nu-uš-ma-)]aš [DUM]U.NITA$^{ME.EŠ}$ DUMU.MUNUS^{MEŠ} ḫa-aš-šu-uš ḫa-an-za-šu-uš pí-eš-ki

10'   [nu-u]š-⌜ma⌝-aš nu-ú-un ːtuː-um-ma-an-ti-ịa-an pí-eš-ki

11'   ⌜nu-uš⌝-ma-aš ḫal-⌜ki⌝-ịa-aš^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-aš ŠA GU$_4$ UDU

12'   DUMU.LÚ.U$_{19}$.LU-ịa✳ mi-i-ịa-ta pí-eš-ki

13'   nu-uš-ma-aš LÚ-aš tar-ḫu-u-i-li-in pa-ra-a ⌜ne-ịa⌝[-an-ta-]a[n]

14' $^{d.GIŠ}$TUKUL-in pí-eš-ki nu-uš-ma-aš KUR.KUR ^{LÚ}KÚR

15'   ŠA-PAL ✳-✳ GÌR^{MEŠ}-ŠU-NU zi-ik-⌜ki⌝ na-at in[-na-ra ḫar-ga-nu?]

___

16'   IŠ-TU KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI-ma-kán i-da-lu-un ta[-pa-ša-an]

17'   ḫi-in-kán ka-aš-ta-an ːmaː-a-ša-an-na a[r-ḫa da-a?]

___

18'   nu KUR.KUR$^{ḪI.A}$ ^{LÚ}KÚR ːkuː-e šu-ul-la-an-ta

19'   ḫur-šal-la-an-ta ku-e-eš-kán tu-uk A-NA ^{d}Te-li-⌜pí⌝-nu

20'   Ù A-NA DINGIR^{MEŠ} ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI UL na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-eš

21'   ku-e-da-aš-ma-az^{24} šu-me-en-za-an É$^{ḪI.A}$ DINGIR^{MEŠ}-KU-NU

22'   ar-ḫa ụa-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zi i-la-li-iš-kán-zi

___

(the edge)

Rs. IV

1   ku-e-eš-ma BI-I[(B-RI$^{ḪI.A}$ GAL$^{ḪI.A}$) Ú-NU-TE^{MEŠ} (KÙ.BABBAR)]

2   KÙ.BABBAR.GI$_4$^{25} da-a[(n-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi ku-e-eš)-ma-aš-za]

3   ːA.ŠÀA.GÀR-KU-NUː ^{GIŠ}⌜KIRI$_6$⌝.[(GEŠTIN ^{GIŠ}MÚ.SAR ^{GIŠ}TIR)]

4   ːdan-na-at-ta-aḫ-ḫu-ụa-an-⌜zi⌝ː [ša-an-ḫi-iš-ká(n-zi)]

___

5   ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$APIN.LÁ ⌜LÚ⌝$^{.M}$[(^{EŠ}NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI$_6$.GEŠTIN)]

6   ~~LÚ~~ LÚ.MEŠNU.^{GIŠ}MÚ.SAR ✳ MUNUS^{MEŠ} ^{N}[(^{A_4}ARA$_5$ da-an-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi)]

7   nu i-da-lu-un ta-pa-ša-an^{26} [ḫi-in-k(án ka-a-aš-ta-an-na)]

8   BURU$_5$$^{ḪI.A}$-ịa✳ ːa-pí-e-da-aš A-NA [(KUR.KUR) ^{L}(^{Ú}KÚR pa-a-i)]

___

9   ⌜A⌝-NA LUGAL-ma MUNUS.LUGAL. DUMU^{MEŠ} LU[(GAL Ù A-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI)]

10   TI-tar ḫa-ad-du-la-tar^{27} in-⌜na⌝ [(-ra-ụa-tar MU^{KAM} GÍD.DA)]

11   EGIR.U$_4$-MI du-uš-ga-ra-at-ta-a[(n-na p)í-eš-k(i) nu ḫa(l-ki-ịa-aš)]

12   ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-aš ^{GIŠ}še-e-ša-an-na-aš^{28} GU$_4$[($^{ḪI.A}$-aš UDU$^{ḪI.A}$-aš UZ$_6$$^{ḪI.A}$)-aš]

___

22 Perseverative scribal error for iš-tar-na.

23 C: EGIR.U$_4$[-. Probably this adverb takes another position in the sentence in Ex.C.

24 B correctly: ku-i-e-eš-ma-a[z.

25 Sic! The same in II 1. B reads: KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI. Cf. comm.

26 B: ta-pa-aš-š[a-an.

27 B: ḫa-at-tu-la-tar.

28 Text: ^{GIŠ}KUR-e-ša-…; B: ^{GIŠ}še-e-ša-na-aš.

13 ŠAH-aš ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA^HI.A-aš ⸢ANŠE⸣.KUR.RA-aš^29 g[(i-im-ra-aš
    ḫu-u-it-ni-it)]
14 DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš-ša ŠA EGIR. U₄-M[(I mi-ja-a-tar pí-eš^30-ki)]
15 nu mi-e-eš-du^31 ḫé-⸢ e-mu-uš-ša ⸣ ⸢ú^?⸣ [-ua-an-du ?]
16 nu še-e-eš-ša-u-ua-a[šI]M^HI.A-⸢uš^32 i-i[(a-an-ta-r)u]
17 nu I-NA KUR ^URU HA T- ⸢ TI ⸣ ^33 {erasure} ma-a-ú še-e[š]- ⸢ du ⸣ ^34 [vacant]
18 nu pa-a-an-ku- ⸢ uš ⸣ ^35 a-pa-a-at^36 e-eš-du ḫal-za-a- ⸢ i ⸣ [ ]

_____

19 DUB.I ⸢PU⸣   QA-TI ⸢LÚ⸣DUB.SAR-za GIM-an
20 A-NA ⸢LUGAL⸣ še-er PA-NI ^d Te-li-pí-nu
21 UD^KAM-ti-li ar-ku-ua-ar e-eš-ša-i

(further uninscribed)

2.1.1. Translation.

§ 1 (I 1-2). [This] tablet the scribe reads out daily to the god and praises the
god (saying):

§ 2 (I 3-7). "You, Telipinu, are a powerful, honored god. Muršili the king,
your servant, sent me, as well as your maidservant the queen. They sent
(me saying): go, invoke Telipinu, our lord, our personal god, (saying):

§ 3 (I 8-10). 'Whether (you), honorable Telipinu, are above in heaven among
the gods, or in the sea, or gone/going to roam in the mountains, or you are
gone/going to an enemy land for battle [or: Whether (you), honorable Te-
lipinu, are gone/going to roam above in heaven among the gods, or in the
sea, or in the mountains, or you are gone/going to an enemy land for
battle].

§ 4 (I 11-17). Let now the sweet odor, the cedar (and) the oil summon you.
Come back into your shrine! I am hereby invoking you by (means of of-
fering) bread and libation^37. Be pacified and keep your ear inclined to
what I am saying to you, (my) god, and keep listening to it!

_____

29 Text: ⸢GÌR⸣.KUR.RA-aš, B: ANŠE-aš.
30 B Rs. 16': -iš-.
31 B: mi-e-eš-ša-d[u].
32 B: ši-]iš-ša-ua-aš ḫu-u-ua-du-uš.
33 B: ^URU]^U ⸢KÙ⸣.BABBAR^TI.
34 B: ši-iš-du.
35 B: pa-an-ku[-uš]
36 B omits apāt due to the lack of space.
37 Literally: "I am invoking you by bread and libation-vessel(s)".

§ 5 (I 18-24). You, Telipinu are an honored god. Furthermore, my god, your
temples are considered important only in the land of Ḫatti, but nowhere
in any other land do they exist for you. They provide festivals (and) rituals
for you in a pure and holy manner only^38 in the land of Ḫatti, but nowhere
in any other land do they provide (them) for you.

§ 6 (I 25-27). Only in the land of Ḫatti are there lofty temples for you, a-
dorned with silver [and gold, but] nowhere in any other land do they exist
for you.

§ 7 (II 1-2). Only in the land of Ḫatti are there [cup]s (and) rhyta of silver,
gold (and) precious stone[s] for you.

§ 8 (II 3-8). Only in the land of Ḫatti are there^39 festivals (such as) the
monthly festival, the annual festivals of winter, spring, fall, the auli-sac-
rifices and the festivals of invocation for you^40, but in no nowhere in any
other land (or) city do they perform (them) for you.

§ 9 (II 9-19). [Only in the land of Ḫatti] is your, Telipinu's, divinity honored.
[It is in the land of Ḫatti] that Murš[ili the king, your servant, the queen,
your maid-servant and] the princes, your s[ervants are respectful] to you.
They set up your, Telipinu's, [replicas in order to perform festivals] and
rituals. They present everything [to you] in a holy (and) [pure] manner.
[Furthermore], respect is established for your [cups, your rhyta], (and)
your utensils (belonging to) your temples. [They are] (all) taken care of.
None approaches the utensils [of the god(?)].

§ 10 (II 20-22). [You], Telipinu, are an honored god. [Your name] is hon-
ored among names and [your divinity] is honored among gods.

(approximately 10-12 lines missing)

§ 1' (III x+1'-8'). T[urn] with benevolence toward [the king, your servant,
the queen your maid-servant (?)], the prin[ces your servants(?) and the
land of Ḫatti(?)! ... You,] Telipinu, are a mighty god, keep alive the [king,
the queen and the prin]ces, and give them [growth(?)] forever, health,
longevity [(and) vigor]! [Put] in their soul [gentleness(?)], radiance, and
joy!

§ 2' (III 9'-15'). Give them sons and daughters, grandchildren (and) great-
grandchildren! Give them (power of) hearing(?) and understand-

_____

38 A omits "only".
39 Scribal error for the earlier "they perform"; see comm.
40 Perhaps a scribal error of an emendation for the earlier "monthly festivals, the annual festivals
    of winter, spring, fall, of auli-sacrifices, and of invocation(s)" (or: "monthly festivals, festivals of
    the 'course of the year', of winter, spring, ..."); see comm.

ing(?)![41] Give them the growth of grain, vines, cattle, sheep and man-kind! Give them a man's(?) valiant, battle-ready divine(?) weapon! Put beneath their feet the enemy lands, and [destroy(?)] them ri[ght away]!

§ 3' (III 16'-17'). But from the land of Ḫatti [take awa]y evil f[ever], plague, famine and locusts!

§ 4' (III 18' – IV 4). (As for) the enemy lands, which are arrogant (and) re-bellious(?), and whichever (of the peoples of those lands) are not re-spectful to you, Telipinu, and to the gods of Ḫatti, whichever wish to burn down your(pl.) temples, whichever seek to take (your) rhyta, cups [and utensils] of silver (and) gold; whichever [see]k to lay waste to them, (namely) your(pl.) fallow lands, vineyards, gardens (and) groves,

§ 5' (IV 5-8). Whichever seek to capture them, (namely) (your) ploughmen, vinedressers, gardeners (and) grinding women, to those lands give the evil fever, [plagu]e, famine and locusts!

§ 6' (IV 9-18). But to the king, the queen, the princes and the land of Ḫatti [give] life, health, vigor, longevity forever, and joy! Give forever the growth of grain, vines, fruit trees(?), cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, horses (B : donkeys), together with the beasts of the wilderness, and mankind! May (they/everything) grow! And may the rains [come(?)]! May the winds of prosperity pass over! May (everything) in the land of Ḫatti thrive and prosper!'" And the congregation cries out: "(So) be it!"

§ 7' (IV 19-21). One tablet, complete. When the scribe presents daily a plea on behalf of the king before Telipinu.

2.1.2. Commentary.

I 1-2 Since *anda* does not make sense as a postposition in the given context, it must be taken as a preverb[42]. According to the CHD, L-N: 261b-262a, *anda mema-* means 'to speak concurrently with an action'. Our passage, however, does not in-dicate any specific action performed by the scribe. Perhaps this is an oblique reference to the daily rituals for Telipinu that have to accompany the scribal plea, such as offering bread and libation mentioned in I 14.

I 3 *šarku-* 'powerful' is used here as an epithet of Telipinu, but can also modify other deities such as Sun-god, Storm-god, Kumarbi, and "Ištar" (cf. Weitenberg,

U-Stämme: 134-135; CHD, Š: 268-269). In Hieroglyphic Luwian, (DEUS)*sa₅+ra/i-ku-* is a personal name of a certain deity, whom Hawkins (Hawkins, CHLI: 107) identifies with Ea. It is interesting that the title *šarku-* seems to be deliberately omitted in the parallel invocation to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (Lebrun, Prières: 158 was probably right in not restoring this word in KUB 36.80 Vs. 1 for reasons of space and since *šarku-* does not otherwise occur in CTH 376).

On the archaic absence of *-za* in this sentence contrasted with its presence in I 18 *zik=za* ᵈ*Telipinuš nakkiš* DINGIR*^{LIM}*-*iš* see the commentary to I 8-10.

I 4-7 *uįįat=mu* ... LUGAL-*uš* ... MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš=<š>a* ... *uįēr*. This example illustrates the tendency for the predicates preceding their subjects to a-gree in number with the first of the coordinated subjects, rather than with the whole group. Other examples illustrating the same tendency (KBo 39.8 II 13 and KUB 17.10 IV 8) can be found in Sidel'tsev, Anatolian Languages [2002]: 162.

īt=ųa ᵈ*Telipinun* ... *mugāi* represents a marginal example of the so-called "phraseological" (serialized) construction. Although the two serialized predicates seem to belong to one clause in our case, their translation by separate verbal forms is warranted by the general sense of the passage. For difficulties involved in draw-ing a sharp boundary between verbal serialization and coordination in Hittite see van den Hout, FS Hoffner: 180-184 (cf. especially example 12).

I 8-10 The paragraph *nu=za=kan* **mān** ... *šer nepiši* ... **mān** *aruni* **našma** ANA ḪUR.SAG*^{MEŠ}* *uahanna pānza* **našma**=*za* INA KUR *^{LÚ}*KÚR *zahhiįa pānza* is amenable to two different syntactical interpretations. It is important that the parallel passage in the prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (KUB 36.80 I 4ff.) contains =*za* next to each conditional particle, i.e. *nu=za=ka*[*n* **mān**] ... *nepiši* **mān**=*za aruni* **mān**=*za* AN[A ḪUR.SAG*^{MEŠ}* ...] *uahhanna pānza*.

According to "Hoffner's Rule" (JNES 28/4 [1969]: 225ff.), if the nominal clause contains a first or second person subject, it will contain =*z*(*a*) in the texts postdating "Old Hittite"[43]. But the term "Old Hittite" had another meaning in 1969 than in our time; cf. ibid.: 229, where Hoffner notes that this rule applies to the texts composed after Šuppiluliuma I, i.e. to the Neo-Hittite corpus. In fact, this rule is optional in Middle Hittite. Cf. the absence of =*za*, e.g., in the original Middle Hittite rituals CTH 443 and CTH 395.3 (as edited in Kassian, Zipl.): KBo 15.10 +, I 32, KBo 20.34 Rs. 7'-8'; the number of similar MH examples can be easily increased.

---

41 Translation uncertain, see the commentary *ad locum*.

42 The Old Hittite opposition between the postposition *andan* and the preverb/adverb *anda* remains essentially intact in Neo-Hittite, as shown in D.M. Salisbury, Diss. [2005]: 18-32. Therefore, the claim that *anda* represents a postposition in our case is *a priori* unlikely.

---

43 Hoffner (loc. cit.) uses the term "nominal sentence", rather than "nominal clause" in the def-inition of his rule, but it is clear from his following exposition that the relevant compound sentences consisting of several nominal clauses are expected to feature the particle =*za* in each of them.

If one assumes that Muršili II's prayers to Telipinu and to the Sun-goddess of Arinna reflect the Neo-Hittite grammatical norm on this point, one should propose different analyses for the two loci quoted above: "whether **you are** in heaven among the gods, or **you are** in the sea, or **you are** going to the mountains to roam …" for the prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna and "whether **you are** going to roam above in heaven, or in the sea, or in the mountains, or **you are** going to an enemy land for battle" for our text. The general meaning of both passages would remain, of course, the same.

On the other hand, it is clear that both CTH 376 and CTH 377 preserve a number of MH grammatical archaisms. With respect to the discussed feature, cf. the occasional absence of the expected =za in the nominal clauses in our text: ^{d}*Telipinuš šarkuš nakkiš* DINGIR^{LIM}-*iš zik* "O Telipinu, a mighty (and) honored god are you!" (I 3) and *nu=ššan parā kalānkanza ēš* "Be pacified!" (I 15) vs. *zik=za* ^{d}*Telipinuš nakkiš* DINGIR^{LIM}-*iš* "You, Telipinu are an honored god" (I 18). Thus one can suppose that the discussed passages from the prayers to Telipinu and to the Sun-goddess of Arinna have the same clause division. The four-clause analysis of our passage from the prayer to Telipinu, accepted also by Singer and CHD (L-N): 159a, implies that the parallel locus in the prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna underwent redactional changes at the time when Hoffner's Law was fully generalized in Hittite.

I 9 *ANA* ḪUR.SAG.EŠ 'mountains' (dat.-loc. pl.) should be read ḪUR. SAG$^{MEŠ!}$ even though the haplographic variant without the vertical in the final sign occurs in both duplicates. It is likely that the omission of the vertical was purely accidental in the protograph, but the fact that both scribes eventually accepted it suggests that at least one of them did not have a full command of the dialect in which the prayer to Telipinu had been originally written. Compare further the commentary to IV 16.

I 10 For the translation of *u̯eḫ-* as 'to stride, to travel, to undertake a tour of inspection, to walk around' see Ünal, Ḫantitaššu: 53.

I 11-12 *šanezziš u̯aršulaš* ^{GIŠ}ERIN-*anza* Ì-*anza* 'the sweet odor, the cedar and the oil'. The fact that the coordinated, originally neuter nouns use different strategies of "ergativization" is remarkable. As a matter of fact, almost no Hittite noun in -*ul* (n.) has an "ergative" form in -*ulanza*[44]. It is possible to account for this distribution if we assume that the animate by-form of *u̯aršul* (n.) 'odor' was formed by analogy with free-standing genitives, such as *takšulaš* (c.) 'ally' vs. *takšul* (n.) 'treaty', *u̯aštulaš* (c.) 'sinner' vs. *u̯aštul* (n.) 'sin' etc. This explanation, however, is possible only under the assumption that the Hittite "ergative" in -*anza* was a deri-

---

44 Except *a-aš-šu-la-an-za* KBo 38.263 + KBo 38.134 Rs.$^{?}$ 17' Groddek, AoF 26 [1999]: 40/41.

vational suffix of limited productivity, and so different nominal classes could use alternative strategies of "ergativization" (pace Garrett, Diss.: 49-51).

We follow Singer in translating *šanezziš u̯aršulaš* ^{GIŠ}ERIN-*anza* Ì-*anza* literally, as "the sweet odor, the cedar (and) the oil". It is likely that we are ultimately dealing here with some sort of hendiadys, cf. the translations of CHD, Š: 176b: "let the fragrant odor, (namely) the cedar and oil …" and HED, 4: 22 "let the sweet aroma [of] cedar oil …" Our translation, however, stresses the fact that the hendiadys in this case represents a figure of speech, and not a grammatical phenomenon. It is to be distinguished from case attraction in a possessive construction, a contact-driven feature of Hittite grammar that is never triggered by the nominative head noun (Luraghi, AGI 68/2 [1993]: 163-166).

I 12 This is the only attestation of the particle group *n=ašta* in this text. It is noteworthy, however, that the sequence *nu=kan* is not attested in the Prayer to Telipinu even once, whereas =*kan* occurs at least five times with other constituents (I 1, 8, II 10, III 16', 19'). This is compatible with the hypothesis that our text belongs to the same linguistic group as the First Military Oath (pre-NH/NS), Indictment of Madduu̯atta (MH/MS), Telipinu Myth (preNH) and other compositions with the so called "rhythmic" distribution of the particles =*ašta* and =*kan* ("stage II" according to Oettinger, StBoT 22: 67-70, which is characteristic of Middle Hittite compositions)[45]. The same distribution can be argued for with more persuasion in the case of Muršili II's prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, where seven cases of *n=ašta* contrast with nine cases of =*kan* after other elements just in KUB 24.3 + (cf. MS KUB 24.4: thrice *n=ašta* and once -*u*)]*š=kan*). The same is, however, not true in the case of Muršili II's second plague prayer, where the sequence *nu=kan* is common (e.g. KUB 14.11 II 28', 33', 34'; dated as "sjh" in Košak, Konkordanz). In the annals of Muršili II, as edited by Goetze (MVAAeG 38), the clitic =*ašta* occurs only once, while the sequence *nu=kan* is likewise quite common. One cannot argue that the distribution of =*ašta* and =*kan* in the texts composed at the time of Muršili II was skewed by later copyists, since the sequence *nu=kan* occurs in the texts VS NF 12.7 and KUB 31.121 + that can be dated to the time of Muršili II on paleographic grounds and were apparently not copied in a later period, while =*ašta* does not occur in these texts at all. This distribution provides yet another piece of evidence of the fact, that the formulaic prayers to the Sun-goddess of Arinna and to Telipinu were not composed at the time of Muršili II.

---

45 It should be noted in passing that Oettinger's word "rhythmic" ("rhythmisch") for this secondary distribution between =*ašta* and =*kan* is misleading. There would be no rhythmic difference between sequences, e.g., *namma=(a)šta* and *namma=kan* (where the enclitic joins to a form ending in a vowel), but in "stage II" we find *namma=kan*, not *namma=(a)šta*. Thus it is merely **lexical** distribution: =*ašta* with *nu=*, =*kan* with other words.

I 13-14 For ^{É}*karimmi/-mni* 'shrine' (a more general concept than É.DINGIR 'temple') cf. Hoffner, JAOS 120/1 [2000]: 72. HED, 4: 83 holds the contrary opinion. Ex. B reads ^{É}*karimni=tti* with the archaic possessive clitic.

The latest discussion of Hitt. *kāša* can be found in Hoffner and Melchert, GS Imparati: 388. The authors remark that the meaning of this lexeme can often be captured by the English adverbs 'hereby' and 'herewith', "indicating that the action or state expressed by the predicate coincides with the moment of speech or writing." In this case it serves exclusively stylistic purposes, since the usage of the English present continuous tense appears to be sufficient to convey the same meaning.

The inverted word order of the type *nu=tta kāša mukiškimi* ^{NINDA}*ḫaršit* ^{DUG}*išpanduzit* (OVO$_{indirect}$) is characteristic of formulaic evocations and direct speech in Hittite texts[46]. For similar examples in MS data see in general Sidel'tsev, Anatolian Languages [2002]: 137ff., and especially pp. 143-144 (§1.2.1.1.2).

I 15-17 Cf. Hoffner and Melchert, GS Imparati: 381, on the usage of the aspectual marker -*šk-* in this sentence.

I 19 The Akkadogram *Ú* presumably stands here for the connective enclitic =*ia*, translated as 'furthermore'. The clitic =*ia* normally occurs in Wackernagel position, but it is incompatible with the particle *nu=* and cannot occur after the vocative, and so in our case it is shifted to the position after the third stressed word.

Theo van den Hout (pers. comm.) suggests as an alternative that the sequence *nu=tta* DINGIR^{LIM}-*IA* can be taken as a short nominal clause: "You are my god", followed by the next clause with the connective =*ia* in the Wackernagel position. Unfortunately, we are not aware of any other examples where =*ta* 'to you' would replace the reflexive particle" =*za*, as a linker in a nominal clause or elsewhere. Boley, The Hittite Particle -*z/-za*: 198, claims that =*ta* can be substituted for =*za* once in a while, particularly in imperatives, but fails to provide any examples in support of her opinion.

I 20 *namma=* lit. 'furthermore, in addition' duplicates the meaning of *tamai-* 'other' here and in I 23, [26], II 7 (cf. CHD, L-N: 390 sub 6d; also 95f. sub b8'). It is left without translation in our edition.

I 25 The neuter singular form *parku* in É^{MEŠ}.DINGIR^{MEŠ}=*ta* **parku** *IŠT[U* KÙ.B(ABBAR KÙ.GI *unuu̯anta)]* ... *ēšzi* can be contrasted with the neuter plural form *pargauu̯a* in the corresponding passage from CTH 376.F, KUB 36.81 I 12'-13' ... **pargauu̯a** *IŠTU* KÙ.BABBAR [(KÙ.GI) *unuu̯anta]* ... *ēšzi*. The second passage obviously contains a nominal phrase 'lofty and adorned temples'. The first passage permits two interpretations.

1. *parku* can be regarded as an uncharacterized nom.-acc. pl. n. For these archaic forms, derived from adjectival *i-* and *u*-stems, see Prins, Neut.Sg.: 42ff. and Watkins, GS Kronasser: 250ff.[47]. The scribe of KUB 23.81 replaced *parku* with the productive form *pargauu̯a*. This hypothesis helps to account for the discussed passage without assuming any scribal errors. Note, however, that the *a*-less forms of nom.-acc. pl. n. are rare, and the appearance of such a form in the very late manuscript KUB 24.1 is rather unexpected.

2. Ex. A preserves only *parku*, while Ex. B preserves only *unuu̯anta*. Thus one can suppose that Ex. B had form *pargauu̯a* (concurring with CTH 376), while the scribe of the later Ex. A misunderstood the adjectives as predicates and changed the grammatical number to the singular, i.e. *parku* and [*unuu̯an*]. For neutral singular nominal predicates accompanying neuter plural subjects see van den Hout, Anatolisch und Indogermanisch [2001]: 167ff.[48].

II 1 KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.BABBAR.GI$_4$ 'silver (and) gold' – cf. the same [(KÙ.BABBAR)] KÙ.BABBAR.GI$_4$ in IV 1-2. In both cases in Ex. A, where gold is meant, we find an unusual heterogram KÙ.BABBAR.GI$_4$. Ex. B has the regular KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI 'silver (and) gold' in Vs. 21 (= lacuna in Ex. A) and Rs. 7' (= A IV 1-2).

It should be noted, that the scribe of Ex. A uses the GI sign 〈sign〉 (similar to HZL, No. 30/A) with a phonetic value: *gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš* (II 4; according to A. Walther's KUB edition), but GI 〈sign〉 for both occurrences of KÙ.BABBAR. GI$_4$ (according to Walther's edition; GI$_4$ in IV 2 also checked against the photograph of Bo 2415 Rs. available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv[49]). The scribe of Ex. B uses the standard sign 〈sign〉 (HZL, No. 30/B) in all cases: Rs. 15' *gi-im-ra-aš* and in both KÙ.GI-s (checked against the photograph of Bo 2082 available in the Mainzer Photoarchiv). Consequently, we would like to suggest the following changes to HZL:

---

46 It should be stressed that there is no evidence to attribute this syntactic pattern to foreign influence. In all probability, we are dealing with a cross-linguistically common, but sporadic dislocation of metrically heavy constituents to the right periphery of the clause.

47 Prins, Neut.Sg.: 42ff. and Watkins, GS Kronasser: 250f cite additional examples of uncharacterized neuter plurals. Unfortunately, both authors occasionally confuse the genuine *a*-less forms of nom.-acc. pl. n with nom. sg. n. predicates used with plural subjects. The majority of the remaining examples are nominal rather than adjectival forms, which are not directly relevant to our discussion.

48 Pace CHD, P: 161a, the predicative interpretation of the forms 'lofty' and 'adorned' is formally very difficult. The translation "Only in the land of Ḫatti are your temples high/lofty, adorned with silver and gold" implies that *ēšzi* is a copula, which makes one wonder why it was not omitted. Our translation implies that *ēšzi* represents an existential predicate, which is not expected to be omitted. Yet the possibility that the scribe of KUB 24.1 made the same mistake as the authors of the CHD cannot be excluded.

49 The photographs of the other parts of Ex. A are not published there yet.

1. The logogram KÙ.BABBAR.GI₄ for 'gold' should be added to HZL, No. 69 (KÙ sign) and No. 234 (GI₄ sign).
2. The shape HZL, No. 30/7 (GI sign) should be moved into No. 234 (GI₄). The same is applicable to StBoT 40: 171 – GI₄, not GI. Unfortunately we do not know where else this shape is attested in Hittite texts.

To our knowledge this NH(?) spelling KÙ.BABBAR.GI₄ for 'gold' is unparalleled in Hittite. It is not quoted in Akkadian syllabaries either; cf. the recent Borger's Zeichenlexikon (AOAT 305), where only KÙ.GI and KÙ.KI are listed (the latter in OAss. Kültepe). As for Sumerian, alongside the standard KÙ.GI, there is also a variant *"ku'udki"* (i.e. KÙ.BABBAR.KI) 'gold' in ePSD, but it is not provided with any references (we failed to find KÙ.BABBAR.KI in any Sumerian texts available to us). In any event, it is possible that this KÙ.BABBAR.KI is a designation of 'white gold' corresponding to the post-Sumerian BABBAR KÙ.GI, for which see Reiter, Metalle (AOAT 249): 53ff.

II 3-6 The direct interpretation of the discussed passage EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$-*i=tta* EZEN₄.ITU EZEN₄.$^{HI.A}$ MU-*aš mēanaš gimmantaš ḫamišḫandaš zenandaš auliuš mukišnaš=<š>a* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} implies that we are dealing here with four coordinated nominative noun phrases, EZEN₄.ITU 'monthly festival', EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$ MU-*aš mēanaš gimmantaš ḫamišḫandaš zenandaš* 'annual festivals of winter, spring, and autumn', *auliuš* 'a.-sacrifices', and *mukišnaš* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} 'festivals of invocation', preceded by the hyperonym EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$-*i(=tta)* 'festivals'. On the idiom MU-*aš mēanaš* (with var.), lit. 'of/in the course of the year' see Rieken, HS 114/1 [2001]: 73-75. Our translation assumes that it also functions as a hyperonym to *gimmantaš ḫamišḫandaš zenandaš* (the seasonal festivals are celebrated precisely once per year), but this is not certain. Compare the MH/NS instruction for temple personnel (CTH 264), where the yearly festival (EZEN₄ MU^{TI}) is mentioned separately from the seasonal festivals (Süel, Directif Metni: 26). For the three basic meanings of *auli-* 'throat; sacrificial animal; animal sacrifice', each of which represents an extension of the preceding one, see Kühne, ZA 96 [1986]: 85-117.

This interpretation, however, does not explain why "invocations" are rendered as *mukišnaš* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} instead of the common *mukiššar* matching the preceding nominative *auli-*. In addition, the co-occurrence of the Sumerographic word order EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$ ... *zenandaš* and the Hittite word order *mukišnaš=<š>a* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} within the same sentence is mildly uncomforting. One can argue that the last noun phrase deviates from the expected Sumerographic pattern in order to accommodate the particle =(*i̯*)*a* in the proper syntactic position, but this claim is weakened by the examples of stranded clitics in partly Sumerographic expressions (Melchert, FS Watkins: 488-489).

One can try to account for these difficulties by making an emendation. The parallel CTH 376.A KUB 24.3 +, I 16'-18' reads EZEN₄.IT]U$^{HI.A50}$ MU-*ti mīi̯anaš* [(*zenandaš*)^{51} *gimmant*]*aš ḫamešḫandaš* ⌜*auliuš*⌝ m[*ukišnaš=<š>a* EZ]EN₄^{MEŠ}. One could suppose that CTH 376 has MU-*ti mīi̯anaš* [EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$] corresponding to EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$ MU-*aš mēanaš* in CTH 377, but the lack of space in both CTH 376.A & F speaks against the additional EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$. One can assume that CTH 376 preserves an older reading in this case and emend EZEN₄.ITU EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$ to EZEN₄.ITU.<<EZEN₄>>$^{HI.A}$ 'monthly festivals' in our text. Given the number of scribal errors occurring in KUB 24.1 (as opposed to KUB 24.3 +), one more would not be surprising (for another error in the discussed sentence (*ēši* for *ēššanzi*) see below). The reconstructed earlier version of this locus would then read as follows: *EZEN₄$^{HI.A}$-i=tta* **EZEN₄.ITU$^{HI.A}$** MU-*ti mēanaš gimmantaš ḫamišḫandaš zenandaš auliuš mukišnaš=<š>a* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} *ēššanzi* "(Only in the land of Ḫatti) do they celebrate for you the festivals (such as) monthly festivals, the annual festivals/feasts of winter, spring, fall, of *auli*-sacrifices, and of invocation(s)." Alternatively, one can suggest a translation "... festivals/feasts of the 'course of the year', of winter, spring ...", if MU-*aš mēanaš* EZEN₄ is a designation of a separate ritual, not identical to seasonal festivals of winter, spring etc.^{52}

The main advantage of the proposed reconstruction is the possibility of interpreting the sequence MU-*ti mēanaš ... mukišnaš=<š>a* as a chain of dependent nouns governed by the final EZEN₄^{MEŠ}. Under this interpretation, we wind up with normal Hittite word order throughout the sentence. The main difficulty of this reconstruction is the necessity of dealing with the unusual case attraction *auliuš ...* EZEN₄^{MEŠ} 'festivals of sacrifices' repeated in both CTH 376 & 377 instead of the expected *auliaš ...* EZEN₄^{MEŠ}, which interrupts the chain of genitive dependent nouns. The only close parallel to such a phenomenon of which we are aware is *ANA* KUR ^{URU}ḪATTI=*kan anda ḫalkiuš* ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-*aš* GU₄-*aš* UDU-*aš* DUMU.NAM.<LÚ>.U₁₉.LU-*aš mii̯atar šalḫittin mannittin annaren=<n>a uda* (MH/LNS KBo 2.9 I 22'-24') "Bring into the land of Ḫatti growth **of crops**, vines, cattle, sheep, (and) humans, *š., m.*, and *a.*" (CHD, L-N: 237b). On the whole, the suggested emendation of our passage remains a distinct possibility, but not a proven theory.

Another point to be noted is the verbal form *e-eš-zi*, which probably originated as a perseverative scribal error for the expected *e-eš-ša-an-zi* 'they perform' (cf.

---

50 Not EZE]N₄$^{HI.A}$, checked against photo of Bo 2034, available in Mainzer Photoarchiv.

51 Restored after Ex. F KUB 36.81 I 17'.

52 Cf. already Gurney's translation: "(there are for you) the festivals of the sacrificial animals [*auliuš*] and of the supplication' (AAA 27 [1940]: 19).

ēšzi in the previous paragraph I 25-27). The latter form appears in the next sentence II 8 and in the parallel passage CTH 376 KUB 24.3 +, I 19'.

Puhvel's translation of the discussed sentence: "for you they perform (*ēš<šan>zi*) feasts in the land of Ḫatti – feast of the month, feasts of Newyear, sacrificials (*auliuš*) of winter, spring, fall, and feasts of ritual (*mukišnaš* EZEN₄^MEŠ)" (HED, 1-2: 230) requires corroboration through independent evidence for the seasonal character of the *auli*-offerings. The agnostic translation of *auliuš mukišnaš* as "festivals of invoking the *auli-*" (CHD, L-N: 231b) stumbles against the fact that Hitt. *mukeššar* 'invocation' can govern the genitive or the dative, but never the accusative.

II 7 KUR URU probably originated as a perseverative scribal error for KUR-*e* 'land (dat.-loc. sg.), which is attested in the parallel invocation KUB 24.3 +, I 19' in CTH 376.

II 9-22 These lines are restored after the parallel passage in CTH 376, KUB 24.3 +, I 21'-31'.

II 9 DINGIR^MEŠ-*tar* here and [DINGIR^MEŠ-*tar*] in II 22 correspond to DINGIR^LIM-*ia-tar* without MEŠ in KUB 24.3 + (CTH 376) I 21', 30'. These forms (phonologically **šiuniiatar*) are usually translated as 'divinity, godhood' ("your divinity is honored among gods"). There is also the second, material, meaning of **šiuniiatar* – 'spirit-holder, divine image'[53], which is probably more frequent in Hittite texts. This second meaning also fits the discussed passage ("your spirit-holders are honored among (the spirit-holders of) gods"), while **šiuniiatar* in the meaning 'godhood' is consistently provided with the complement *LIM* rather than MEŠ in all the other Hittite contexts known to us.

On the other hand, the forms DINGIR^LIM-*tar* and DINGIR^MEŠ-*tar* alternate in the second meaning 'spirit-holder' without indicating grammatical number. Compare two passages from the same text KUB 5.1 III 19 DINGIR^LIM-*tar* KASKAL-*anzi* DINGIR^MEŠ ^URU*Šapinuuaiia udanzi* "They will dispatch spirit-holders and bring all the gods to Šapinuua" vs. ibid. 5.1 III 44 DINGIR^MEŠ-*tar=ma pe-an tiiat nu apezza* NU.SIG₅ "The spirit holder(s) took its/their place in front. Is it for this (reason that it was) unfavorable?" We choose the translation 'divinity, godhood', since it seems to be more consistent with the general context of the two prayers, but the translation 'spirit-holder, divine image' is also possible. The choice of the complement MEŠ rather than *LIM* in our context was perhaps influenced by the attraction to the following DINGIR^MEŠ[54].

53 See Güterbock, FS Bittel [1983]: 209ff.

54 In addition see further examples of the ungrammatical usage of ḪI.A and MEŠ in Prins, Neut.Sg.: 12-13.

II 13-14 This passage is reconstructed on the basis of the parallel invocation to the Sun goddess of Arinna, KUB 24.3 +, I 23'-25' (CTH 376).

CHD, Š: 227b translates KUB 24.3 +, I 23'-25' (CTH 376) *nu tuel ... himmuš* SÍSKUR^ḪI.A EZEN₄^ḪI.A *iiauuanzi šarā tittanuškanzi* as "They finish worshipping your images, performing/celebrating your festivals and rituals." This translation is unlikely for two independent reasons. First, the act of worshipping the images is not mentioned earlier in CTH 376, and so the stress on finishing these acts does not appear to be felicitous. Second, our passage cannot be separated from KUB 39.6 Rs. 16-17 *nu=šši himmuš ḫūmanteš šarā tittanuuanzi* "they set up all the figurines for him/her" (Kassian et al., Funerary Ritual (AOAT 288): 617)[55]. It is likely that *šarā tittanu-* represents the immediate syntactic head of the direct object *himmuš* in both contexts.

Singer, Prayers: 51, following the interpretation of HED, 3: 315, translates the discussed passage in CTH 376 as "They perform fully substitute rites, rituals, and festivals for you". We cannot accept this translation because of the lack of compelling evidence for *himma-* meaning 'substitute ritual'. Besides the two contexts cited in the previous paragraph, HED backs this meaning only by *himmuš hazziui* SÌR^ḪI.A-*ia* occurring in an unclear syntactic context of an Ištanuuian ritual (CTH 771, KUB 35.131 + KUB 25.37 ++, IV 3). Puhvel translates this passage as "substitute rites, ceremonies, and songs", but there are no difficulties with translating it merely as "figurines, ceremonies, and songs".

In addition to this, H. Gonnet (Atti II ICH (StMed 9): 149ff.) attempted to show that *himma-* means 'substitute rite' in CTH 757 (^m*Zarpiia* ^LÚAZU ^URU*Kizzuuatna*; Starke, StBoT 30: 46ff.). In our opinion, she fell short of proving her point. The well preserved tablet HT 1 contains the following passage: *n=at <<ANA>> EN É^TIM ANA DINGIR^LIM parā ēpzi namma=kan uāki himman iianzi ANA* ^GIA.DA.GUR *=ia=ššan pūrin dāi nu pāši nu kiššan memāi* §, which can be translated as follows: "The master of the house holds it (i.e. various meat) forth to the deity. Then he 'bites'. **They make a replica** and he puts his lip(s) to the drinking straw and swallows. He speaks as follows: ..." (Vs. I 39'-42'). Although the purpose of the replica in the Zarpiia ritual admittedly remains obscure because *himma-* is not mentioned any more in the subsequent text, the hypothesis that *himman iianzi* introduces some separate sub-ritual (i.e. *himma-*ritual) within the main performance is not likely either. In this case we should expect *himman iianzi* to be placed at the beginning or at the end of the paragraph and not to be casually followed by another clause containing the *=(i)a* particle (^GIA.DA.GUR *=ia=ššan*). By contrast, the making (*iia-*) of *himma-*object(s) is a usual action in various Hittite rituals. Compare, for example, the clear passage from the Royal Funerary Ritual:

55 Translation 'they finish...' does not make any sense in the context of this funerary ritual.

n=ašta É-*ri and*[*a*] *laḫḫanzanaš*[MUŠEN] *ḫimuš iịanzi* (KUB 39.7 II 7-8) "They make figurines of *l.*-ducks inside the house." The passage from the Telipinu myth, quoted by Gonnet, is likewise not compelling, since KUB 17.10 III 33 reads *ḫi*[?][- and nothing else[56].

Summing up, there are some contexts, where one can propose the abstract meaning 'substitute rite' for *ḫimma-* with different degrees of plausibility, but all of these passages permit also the concrete interpretation 'replica, figurine'. By contrast, *ḫimma-* meaning 'replica, (substitute) figurine' (~ Lat. *imāgō*)' is reliably attested in more than ten different contexts. In addition, we are not aware of substitute rites for Telipinu or the Sun-goddess of Arinna, nor would the purpose of such rituals be immediately clear. Thus we have to reject the translation 'substitute rite' for *ḫimma-* by Occam's Razor until new unambiguous data will emerge.

Our translation of the discussed passage implies that the supine form *iịauịanzi* 'in order to perform' functioned as an adjunct, rather than a complement, of the main verb *šarā tittanu-*. Such a syntactic function of the Hittite supine is admittedly rare, but not without parallels, for which see Ose, Sup.: 44-45.

The discussion above does not entail any position with regard to the metaphorical translation 'to finish, complete' for *šarā tittanu-*, proposed in the recent fascicle of the CHD. Each of the translations collected in CHD, Š: 227bf. sub 4j must be judged on its own merit. We believe, however, that in our passage *šarā tittanu-* is used in its literal meaning 'to erect, to put up on/in', for which see CHD, Š: 220 sub 1a53'.

II 15 *parkui* 'pure' in *šuppi parkui* is restored after I 22 (*parkui šuppi*) and CTH 376. *Šuppi parkui* can theoretically be adjectives here ("Everything they present to you is holy (and) pure"), but we prefer the adverbial interpretation based on the parallelism with I 22.

II 16-17 *BIBRI* and *GAL*[HI.A] are restored after II 1 and IV 1. The parallel passage KUB 24.3 +, I 26'-27' (CTH 376) reads *nam-ma-ša-an* É.DINGIR[LIM]-*KA A-NA* KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI *na-aḫ-ša-ra-az ti-ịa-an-za*. We presume the omission of *ANA* in our text (i.e. É.DINGIR[LIM]-*K*[*A* <*A-NA*> *BI-IB-R*]*I*[HI.A]-*KA*) due to the lack of space in the lacuna.

II 19 The restoration of *Ú-NU-UT* [DINGIR[LIM]] 'the utensils of the god' is conjectural. Cf. ⌜*Ú*⌝-*NU-UT* DINGIR[MEŠ] 'the utensils of the gods' in the late inventory list VS NF 12.116 Vs. 10'.

II 22 For the translation of DINGIR[MEŠ]-*tar* ('divinity, godhood' or 'spirit-holder, deity's imagine') see comm. to II 9.

---

56 Cf. Hoffner's (Myths[2]: 17) translation: "I have treated the gods under (the hawthorn) for long years [...]" instead of Mazoyer's (Télipinu: 78; following Gonnet) "et auprès des dieux, les *ḫ*[*imma*(?)] de l'Avenir je les ai cé[l]ébrés."

III x+1-2 We guardedly restore these lines after II 10-12 (which are in turn restored after CTH 376) and after CTH 376 KUB 24.3 +, III 15'ff. // 1229/u, 5'ff. As an alternative to *n*[*ešhut*] (as in CTH 376), one can perhaps venture *n*[*eịanza ēš*] or (2') *n*[*eịanza*] (3') [*e-eš zi-ik-za*].

III 3' Restored after I 18.

III 5'-6' Tentatively restored after IV 10-11, where almost the same nouns are used in a different order: TI-*tar*, *ḫaddulatar*, *innarauatar*, MU[KAM] GÍD.DA EGIR *UMI*, *dusgaratt-*, followed by ŠA EGIR *UMI mijātar* in the next sentence (IV 14). The self-suggested restoration [*ḫuišuatar* EGI]R *UMI* (cf. Singer's "life forever") may be less plausible since:

a) The idea of life (*ḫuišụa-*) is already expressed in the preceding sentence (III 4'): LUGAL … TI-*an ḫar*[*a*]*k*;

b) The syllabic writing of this stem is not very probable in view of logographic TI-*an* (one line above) and TI-*tar* (IV 10), while the restoration [TI-*tar* EGI]R *UMI* is unlikely for reasons of space.

Note, however, that the noun *mijatar* is repeated several sentences below (III 12') paralleling ŠA EGIR *UMI mijātar* in a similar locus IV 11-14.

III 6'-8' The restoration *ANA* ZI-ŠUNU [*miumar* (*lalu*)]*kkiman dusgaradan=*<*n*>*a* was proposed in CHD, L-N: 29a and accepted by Singer, since the juxtaposition *miumar* 'gentleness' + ZI-*aš lalukima-* 'brightness of spirit' is attested in several other Hittite texts (see CHD, L-N: 29a, 309), sometimes together with *dusgaratt-* 'joy'. Cf. the parallel CTH 376 KUB 24.3 + KUB 31.144 +, III 20'-22' where one can restore *nu-*] ⌜*uš*⌝ -*ši-kán* [*A-NA* ZI-Š]*U a*[*n-da mi-ú-mar la-lu-u*]*k-ki-ma-an* [*du-uš-ga-ra-ad-da-an-na*] *zi-ik-ki*.

III 10' The stable collocation *nū*(*t*)- *tummantiịa-*, frequently appearing in formulaic lists of desirable states, alternates with *nū*(*t*)- *ištamaššuụar* in several contexts. In all likelihood (⊰)*tummantiịa-* represents the Luwian equivalent of Hitt. *ištamaššuụar* (see HEG, III: 431ff. w.lit.).

Hitt. *ištamaššuụar* has the literal meaning 'hearing', as well as more general meanings 'attention' and perhaps 'perception'[57], but the additional meaning 'obedience' is apparent in MH/MS KUB 15.34 II 24-25 ANŠE.KUR.RA[H][ʾ][I].A-*aš* ÉRIN[MEŠ]-*aš alšuụar ištamaššuụar* 'allegiance and obedience of the cavalry and infantry' (HED, 1-2, 41; Haas/Wilhelm, AOATS 3: 193). Since this phrase occurs in one and the same text with the formula *nūn ištamaššuụar* (KUB 15.34 II 10), *ištamaššuụar* was taken to mean 'obedience' also in the latter context (Haas/Wil-

---

57 The last meaning is apparent in IGI[HI.A]-*aš* … *ištam*[(*ašuụar*)] 'perception of the eyes' (KUB 41.21 I 10' restored after VBoT 132 II 11), but the sign IGI 'eye' (HZL No. 288) in this context may represent a scribal error for GEŠTU 'ear' (HZL No. 317), since both signs differ only by one Winkelhaken.

helm, AOATS 3: 191), and the same hypothetical meaning was eventually carried over to the Luwoid *tummantiĭa-* (e.g., CHD, L-N: 476a-b; Melchert, The Luwians: 20, w. fn. 22).

It seems, however, rather odd for a king to pray to gods to grant him obedience. Even if one speculates that obedience to the gods is what is meant here, it remains unclear why the king cannot achieve this state on his own free will. Neither can one assume that *tummantiĭa-* refers to obedience to the king, since the king is explicitly attested as the logical subject of *tummantiĭa-* in KBo 2.9 I 20-21 (CHD, L-N: 476a). Therefore, one would fare better separating *tummantiĭa-* and *ištamaššuŭar* occurring in the collocation with *nū-* from *ištamaššuŭar* 'obedience' (KUB 15.34 II 24-25 is a single reliable attestation of this meaning). It is necessary to look for a different extension of the basic meaning 'hearing' that better fits our context and related passages. Power of hearing and perception represent qualities that are certainly desirable for everyone, including the king and the members of the royal family, and we take them to represent the approximate denotation of the irreversible binomial *nū(t)- tummantiĭa-*.

This hypothesis finds a degree of support in the etymological analysis of *nū(t)-*. One can try to reanimate the old hypothesis of Haas and Wilhelm (AOATS 3: 93), connecting Hitt. *nū(t)-* with Hurr. *nui-*, the meaning of which has been defined rather precisely in recent years[58]. In Hurrian texts *nu(i)-* occurs in the phrase *ḫa-az-zi-zi šal-ḫu-li-e-eš nu-u-ĭa-al ḫa-a-ša-ši-li-e-eš* (KUB 29.8 ++, III 30-31 = ChS I/1, Nr. 9), similarly *ḫa-zi-iz-[z]i-pal šal-ḫu-u-li-eš nu-i-ŭaₐ-al-la ḫa-a-[ša-ši-li-e-i]š* (KUB 27.42 Rs. 12' = ChS I/1, Nr. 11), i.e. something like *ḫazzizi=v=a=lla šalh=ol=e=š nui=v=a=lla ḫašaš=il=e=š* (Wegner, Einführung: 96) 'May your perception/ear hear/understand them (i.e. the words), may your *nui* hear/understand them'. Both *šalh-* and *ḫaš(aš)-* correspond to Hitt. *ištamašš-* 'to hear' in the Hurr.-Hitt. Bilingual (see e.g. Catsanicos, Amurru 1 [1996]: 267f.). *ḫazzizzi* 'ear, perception' is a well known Akk. loanword[59], and so Hurr. *nui-* should mean '(anatomic) ear' or 'inner ear, *i.e.* hearing' here (cf. Wegner, ZA 85: 121-122). A similar juxtaposition *nui* + *ḫazzadiḫi* occurs in a broken Hitt. passage [I] MUŠEN *ŭuᵤ-u-ri-ĭa* I MUŠEN *nu-ú-i-ĭa ḫa-az[-za-ti-ḫi-ĭa]* ... *ŭarnuan[zi]* "they burn 1 bird of/for "eye" (and) 1 bird of/for *nui* and *ḫazzadiḫi*" (KUB 45.79 + KUB 47.89 = ChS I/9, Nr. 4 Rs. 31'-35', restored after ibid. Rs. 12'); it is likely that the term *ḫazzadiḫi* is reflected to *ḫazzizzi*, even though the details of its derivation remain unclear.

We would like to suggest tentatively that the Hittites borrowed the Hurrian word *nui* in its metaphoric sense 'understanding, perception'[60]. This would represent the precise parallel to the borrowing of Akk. *ḫasīsu* 'ear; perception' > Hurr. *ḫazzizzi* 'perception'. Thus one can hypothesize that the two members of the collocation, *nū(t)-* and *ištamaššuŭar/(ˣ)tummantiĭa-* are roughly synonymous, although originally they came from different languages. Compare, furthermore, the similar Hurrian collocation *mādi*[61] *ḫazzizzi* 'wisdom and perception', which frequently occurs as a part of lists of desirable qualities in the incantations of the AZU-priest[62].

The interjection (ˣ)*nū*, discussed in CHD, L-N: 466-467 together with the noun *nū(t)-*, may have the same Hurrian origin, but its synchronic meaning is likely to be different. Since it alternates with Hitt. *apāt ēšdu* 'let it be so' in the Hantitaššu ritual, one is fully justified in taking it as an expression of compliance or satisfaction. This semantic development would resemble that of *ištamaššuŭar* in its metaphorical meaning 'obedience', mentioned above. More to the point, compare Classical Arabic *sam'u-*, literally 'hearing' as a part of the formulaic expression *sam'an wa-ṭā'atan* 'obedience and compliance' uttered in reply to a superior's orders ("Yes Sir").

III 12' *mi-i-ĭa-ta* 'growth', with the loss of *-r*, is likely to represent a form inherited from the Middle Hittite text underlying the present prayer, as per Neu, FS G. Neumann [1982]: 214-215[63].

III 14' The passage *nu=šmaš* LÚ-*aš tarḫūilin parā neĭantan* [d.GIŠ]TUKUL-*in peški* presents difficulties. The collocation *parā neĭant-* [GIŠ]TUKUL 'battle-ready weapon' is well known and common in such kinds of Hittite texts, while the juxtaposition *tarḫuili-* + *parā neĭant-* [GIŠ]ŠUKUR 'battle-ready, valiant spear' is attested in KUB 57.63 II 4-5 (see Archi, FS Otten[2]: 18ff.; Starke, StBoT 23: 102; CHD, P: 354b-355a)[64]. But the modifiers LÚ-*aš* and DINGIR appear to be mutually contradictory.

We would prefer the rendering [d.GIŠ]TUKUL, not DINGIR [GIŠ]TUKUL in the modern system of transliteration (pace Lebrun's edition) for syntactic reasons.

---

58 Melchert ("The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite" in Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel [2005]: 445-459) suggests that Hitt. *nū-* was borrowed from Luvian on the grounds that KUB 8.69, 11' dat.-loc. sg. *nūdi* shows "uniquely Luvian inflection". This argument is not convincing since e.g. Hitt. *abi-* 'sacrificial pit', an assured Hurrian loanword, has the similar dat.-loc. sg. *ābidi* (HED 1, 100).

59 Akk. *ḫasīsu* (OB+) '(1) ear; (2) (faculty of) hearing; (3) understanding' (CAD, Ḫ: 126-127).

60 Note that the phonetic details of this borrowing remain not entirely clear. One could expect Hitt. **nui(t)-*, since Hittite possesses a number of native *-ui* stems (*kui-*, *dankui-* etc.) and some loans, like [(GIŠ/GI)]*e/irḫui-* 'a type of basket'. On the other hand the main part of *-ui* stems (as listed by Jin Jie, RetrGlos: 35) ends in *-Vui* (i.e. /-Vŭi/) or in *-kui/-ḫui*, which can phonologically be regarded as /-kᵘi/, /-gᵘi/ and /ḫᵘi/). The rest of the stems, which can be theoretically interpreted as /-Cuĭ/ or /-Cui/, are all very rare and marginal.

61 = Hitt. *ḫattadar* in Hurr.-Hitt. Bilingual.

62 See ChS I/1 6 III 34', 9 III 15, 10 II 30', 10 II 41', 11 Rev. 4', 49 II 23.

63 Melchert's (GS Schwartz [1988]: 215ff.) supposition that all *r*-less forms are nom.-acc. pl. is plausible but requires additional evidence.

64 Cf. also twice the phonetic writing *tarḫuili* [GIŠ]*turi* in *āššu ḫuišŭatar (miĭatar) tarḫuili(n)* [GIŠ]*tūri piškiddu* KUB 43.23 Rs. 15'-19' (MS) // KBo 38.58 (NS).

Since the dependent noun would normally be placed after the head noun in a Sumerographic expression (^{GIŠ}TUKUL DINGIR^{LIM} vel. sim.). Even if the assumption that **DINGIR ^{GIŠ}TUKUL reflects the underlying Hittite word order, the position of the dependent noun before the head noun, but after the adjectives modifying the head noun, remains ungrammatical. $^{d.GIŠ}$TUKUL-*in* 'deified weapon(?)' is the only occurrence of the determinative marking divine names in front of the Sumerogram ^{GIŠ}TUKUL according to van Gessel, Onomasticon: 748.

A separate question is the nature of the solicited weapon. The most trivial thing would be to assume that it represents a metaphor for a strong army, but the dependent noun LÚ-*aš* 'of a man' appears to be redundant under such an interpretation. As an alternative, one can consider the imaginative hypothesis of Riemschneider (KZ 90 [1976]: 150), according to which *parā neịant-* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL is a metaphor for '*membrum virile in statu erecto*'. The dependent noun LÚ-*aš* obviously squares well with this hypothesis. The fact that not only the king and the princes, but also the queen emerge as potential recipients of this divine weapon is mildly uncomforting, but one can argue that, after all, the queen had a vested interest in her husband's solid erection. On the other hand, one can understand the skepticism of those scholars who are reluctant to see the royal penis among the thousand gods of Hatti. For the time being, we accept Singer's agnostic translation, which is very similar to Tischler's "und gewähre ihnen die mächtige gezückte Waffe eines Mannes" (HEG, III: 169).

The parallel locus in CTH 376 A (KUB 24.3 +) III 29'-30' is damaged: [... -]x-*tar tar-ḫu-u-i*[-... ...]x *pa-ra-a n*[*e-ịa-an-ta-an* ...].

III 15' We cannot follow Singer in his restoration of the last clause "and [let them destroy] them" since no verb of destruction begins with *in-*, to our knowledge. The adverb *innara* 'right away' seems to be the only possible reconstruction for *in*[-, even if this idea, proposed already by Gurney (AAA 27: 73), somehow did not find its way to later publications. The idea that this adverb is followed by a verb of destruction, such as *ḫarganu-*, is born out by the general sense of the passage, even though space considerations speak in favour of a shorter 2 sg. impv. form. Compare the combination *innara ḫarkanu-* in KUB 54.1 I 36: *innara=uịa=mu=kan kuịēš ḫarg*[*an*]*uir* 'who have ruined me?' and ibid. II 48 (without -*kan*) *innarā ḫar^{h}kmi* 'I am ruined'.

III 16' *ta*[*pašan*] is restored after IV 7.

III 17' We prefer to reconstruct *a*[*rḫa dā*] 'take away!' here, as opposed to impv. *pāi* in IV 8. CHD, L-N: 204a reads *a*[*rḫa uiịa?*] 'drive away!'; Singer follows CHD.

III 18' Hitt. *šule*(*šš*)- is discussed by H. Craig Melchert in FS Herzenberg [2005]: 90ff. Melchert cogently argues that the meaning of this verb is 'to become

arrogant' rather than 'to quarrel', and so the participle *šullant-* characterizes the inimical lands as upstart and impious. Puhvel's translation of *šullanta ḫaršallanta* as 'quarelling and at odds' (HED, 3: 186) is thus superseded. The choice between the readings *ḫuršallanta* and *ḫaršallanta*, as well as the precise meaning of this epithet, remains a matter of conjecture.

III 18'-20' Cf. a similar sentence in Muršili II's prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna KUB 24.3 + 544/u +, II 62' *kuiš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*naš ŪL naḫḫanza* (// MS KUB 24.4 Rs. 10) 'He who is not respectful to gods', without the particle =*kan*. By contrast, the particle =*kan* is consistently used with the verbal phrase 'to be respectful to the gods' in genuine Neo-Hittite texts (CHD, L-N: 340-341).

III 21'-IV 6. The lacunae – [*Ú-NU-TE*^{MEŠ}] (IV 1), *ku-e-eš*[-*ma-aš-za*] (IV 2), [*ša-an-ḫi-iš-ká*]*n-zi* (IV 4) – are restored after CTH 376, KUB 24.3 +, III 2'-6'.

The form *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* (IV 5 and restored in IV 2) is not a scribal error for **ku-i-e-eš-ma-za* since we find the same form in the parallel passage of CTH 376, cf. (with division into clauses a-d):

KUB 24.1 III 21' – IV 6 (CTH 377)	KUB 24.3 +, III x+1-8' (CTH 376)
a. *ku-i-e-eš-ma-az*[65] ... *ụarnummanzi ilališkanzi*	a. [...] *il*[*ališ*]*kan*[*zi*]
b. *ku-e-eš-ma* ... *danna šanḫiškanzi*	b. [*ku-*]*i-e-eš-ma*[ ] ... *danna š*[*a*]*nḫiškanzi*
c. *ku-e-eš*[-*ma-aš-za*] ... *dannattaḫḫuụanzi* [*šanḫiška*]*nzi*	c. *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* ... *tannattauụanzi šanḫiškanzi*
d. *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* ... *danna šanḫiškanzi;*	d. *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* ... *tanna šanḫiškanzi.*

CHD, Š: 167a analyzes *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* as *kuiēš=ma=aš=za*, presumably taking =*aš* as a proleptic accusative plural clitic anticipating the following direct objects. This analysis is accepted in the present edition, even though the pragmatic function of proleptic clitic pronouns in Hittite remains to be elucidated. This syntactic construction is very rare, and characteristic of direct speech. For a list of its attestations in MS texts see now Kassian et al., Funerary Ritual: 620ff.

A different interpretation was put forward by Boley, The Hittite Particle -*z*/-*za*: 175, who proposed the segmentation *kuiēš*=<*š*>*maš*=*za*, with the duplication of the reflexive markers. We know that from MH on, acc.-dat. pronouns =*naš* and =*šmaš* began to replace the reflexive particle =*z*(*a*) with plural subjects (ibid: 198). One normally assumes, however, that in the history of a manuscript's transmission the innovative clitic could be appended on top of its archaic equivalent, but

---

65 Reading after B. Ex. A has the incorrect form *ku-e-da-aš-ma-az*, i.e. *kuedaš=ma=z* (an ungrammatical case attraction to *A-NA* DINGIR^{MEŠ} in the preceding sentence?).

not vice versa. In addition, Boley's interpretation implies that the contrastive particle =*ma* is present only in the first clauses: *kuiēš=ma=z ... u̯arnummanzi ilališkanzi* and *kuēš=ma ... danna šanḫiškanzi*, while the next two relative clauses with *šanḫiškanzi* lack =*ma* for no obvious reason.

As for the relative pronoun *kuēš*, we assume that it has the same referent throughout the period. The shift from neuter to common gender emphasizes the population of hostile lands, rather than the lands themselves. In an alternative a-nalysis, Singer took *kuēš* as an indefinite pronoun, referring each time to a par-ticular land or to a particular group of people in the inimical lands ("Some are not respectful ... others wish to burn down your temples ..." etc.), presumably implying that the contrast between these groups is expressed by the =*ma* particle. While this interpretation is grammatically possible, it is difficult to believe that the prayer lists mutually exclusive groups committed to specific acts of sacrilege.

IV 7-8 The conjunction =*i̯a* is erroneously doubled in [(*ka-aš-ta-an-na*)], re-stored after Ex. B, as opposed to *ka-aš-ta-an* in III 17. The parallel passage in CTH 376, KUB 24.3 III 9'-10', reads *ḫi-in-kán ga-aš-ta-an* without =*i̯a*.

IV 13 Note the lack of the expected ḪI.A in ŠAḪ-*aš*.

IV 15 Note 3 sg. impv. *mi-e-eš-du* vs. Ex. B *mi-e-eš-ša-du* 'may they/every-thing grow'. Contra the *communis opinio*, the verbal form *mi-e-eš-ša-du* does not need to be secondary. The stem *mi(e)šša-* is attested already in Middle Hittite (MS KBo 17.105 +, Rs. III 34 *mi-iš-ša-du*, CTH 433.3) and rather represents an original *išša*-iterative used simultaneously with *šk*-forms in Middle Hittite blessing formu-lae[66], while the athematic stem *mieš-* seems to represent the result of contamina-tion with *mieš-* 'to be mild' in the late texts[67].

The tentative restoration *ḫēmuš=<š>a* ⌈*ú*⌉ [-*u̯a-an-du*] 'and may the rains come', was proposed by the late Prof. A.A. Korolëv in his drafts. Compare the parallel passage in CTH 376, KUB 24.3 +, III 38'-41', where one can try to read it as follows[68]:

38' [...*ša-k*]*u-u̯a-an-du-uš*[69] *ḫ*[*ē*²-*e-mu-uš*]
39' ⌈*ú*²⌉ [-*u̯a-an-d*]*u*² *nu še-iš-du-u̯a-a*[*š* vacant]
40' IM-*an-te-eš i-i̯a-an-da-ru m*[*a-a-ú*]
41' *ši-eš-du* ...

IV 16 The forms IM^HI.A-*uš* 'winds' here and *ḫēmuš* 'rains' in the preceding line represent Late Hittite nominative plurals, which generalized the earlier ac-cusative plural ending. The same holds for Ex. B. *ḫūu̯aduš* 'winds'. The comparison with IM-*an-te-eš* 'winds' in CTH 376 shows that we are dealing with the moderni-zation of the original text in both A and B.

The same conclusion is likely in the case of *še-e-eš-ša-u-u̯a-a*[*š* (A) / *ši-*]*iš-ša-u̯a-aš* (B) corresponding to gen. *šeštuu̯aš* 'of prosperity' in CTH 376 (see the comm. to IV 15). We know that the latter form is regular because the infinitive *šišdu̯ar* 'prosperity' is independently attested in KUB 15.34 II 23. As for the forms *šeš-šauu̯aš/šiššau̯aš*, they formally belong to the paradigm of *šišša*- 'to seal; to pitch a tent', but neither of the two meanings makes sense in this context. Rather than fol-lowing Gurney (AAA 27: 115) in explaining these forms as an error of dictation, we prefer to assume that the scribe of the common prototype of A and B did not know the full paradigm of *šešt*- 'to be fruitful, flourish' and "emended" the correct form *šeštuu̯aš* based on the erroneous morphological analysis of *šešdu* 'let it prosper' in the following sentence, or some other sort of idiosyncratic linguistic considerations. Note that the variant *ḫuu̯ad*- is not likely to be a mere scribal error of omission since it is also attested in KUB 28.4 Vs. 20b *ḫu-u-u̯a-ta-aš-ša-aš-ši* EGIR-*an-da tar-na-aš* "he sent winds after him." This probably indicates the spread of nasalization to the root vowel, i.e. the respective form could be pronounced *ḫ(u)u̯ād*-, as per HE² , §31. For the discussion of apparent irregularities in the reflection of consonant clusters "nasal+stop" see Carter, JAOS 99/1 [1979]: 93-94 and Joseph-son & Stephens, JAOS 101/4 [1981]: 367-370.

IV 17 *nu INA* KUR ^URU *ḪATTI māu šešdu* 'let everything in the land of Ḫatti grow and prosper' is a formulaic expression that has parallels, e.g. in the Illui̯anka myth (KBo 3.7 I 5) *utni=u̯a māu šešdu* "let (everything) in the land grow and prosper" etc. (see the passages quoted in Sidel'tsev, "Middle Hittite -*ške*-forms in benedictions and curses", Atti del 6 Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia [forthcoming]). On possible Indo-European parallels to this formula see Watkins, Dragon: 155.

2.2. Ex. B: KUB 24.2.

Vs. (= A Vs. I 1 – II 2).
1 [*ki-i-*(*k*)]*án* ⌈*TUP-PÍ* DUB⌉ .SAR *A-NA* DINGIR^LIM *an*-⌈*da*⌉ UD- ⌈*at* UD-*at* ⌈*me-mi-* ⌈*iš*⌉ -*k*[(*i-i*)*z-zi*]
2 [*nu* DING]IR^LAM   *u̯a-al-li-iš-ki-iz-zi*

---

3   ⌜d⌝ Te-li-pí-nu-uš šar-ku-uš na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-uš zi-ik

4   u-i-ia-at-mu ᵐMur-ši-i-li LUGAL-uš tu-e-el ARAD-KA MUNUS.LUGAL-aš-
     ⌜ša⌝

5   tu-e-el GÉME-KA u-i-e-ir i-it-ia ᵈTe-li-pí-nu-un

6   an-zi-el EN-NI DINGIR^{LAM} ŠA SAG.DU-NI mu-ga-a-i

---

7   nu-za-kán ma-a-an na-ak-ki-iš ᵈTe-li-pí-nu-uš še-er ne-pí-ši

8   DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš iš-tar-na ma-a-an a-ru-ni na-aš-ma A-NA ⌜ḪUR⌝.SAG$^{MEŠ!70}$

9   ua-ha-an-na pa¡-a-an-za^{71} ⌜na⌝-aš-ma-za I-NA KUR ^{LÚ}KÚR za-ah-hi-ia pa-a-
     an-za

---

10   ki-nu-na-at-ta ša-ne-iz-zi-iš ua-ar-šu-la-aš ^{GIŠ}ERIN-an-za Ì-an-za

11   kal-li-iš-du na-aš-ta EGIR-pa ^{É}ka-ri-im-ni-it-ti an-da e-[h]u

12   nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša mu-ki-iš-ki-mi ^{NINDA}har-ši-it ^{DUG}iš-pa-an-du-zi-⌜it⌝

13   nu-uš-ša-an pa-ra-a ka-la-a-an-kán-za e-eš nu-ut-ta ku-it

14   me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu DINGIR^{LUM} iš-ta-ma-na-an la-ga-a-an har-ak na-at
     i[(š-t)a-ma-(aš-ki)]

---

15   zi-ik-za ᵈTe-li-pí-nu-uš na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR^{LIM}-iš nu-ut-ta DINGIR^{LIM}-I[(A)]

16   Ù É^{MEŠ}.DINGIR^{MEŠ} I-NA KUR ^{URU}⌜ḪA⌝-AT-TI-pát ta-aš-nu-ua-an nam-
     ma-ma-at-t[(a)]

17   ⌜ta⌝[-me-]⌜e⌝-da-ni KUR-e Ú-UL ku-ua-pí-ik-ki e-eš-zi

18   [n(u-ut-ta E)]ZEN₄$^{HI.A}$ SÍSKUR$^{HI.A}$ I-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI-pát pár-ku-i

19   [(šu-up-pí pí-iš-kán-)] ⌜zi nam⌝-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni

20   [KUR-(e Ú-UL ku-u)]a-p(í-i)]k-ki   pí-iš-kán-zi

---

21   [(É^{MEŠ}.DINGIR^{MEŠ}-ta pár-ku IŠ-T)]U KÙ.B]ABBAR KÙ.GI ⌜ú-nu-ua-an-
     ta⌝ I-NA KUR ^{URU}ḪA-AT[(-TI-p)át]

22   [nam-ma-ma-ta ...   ]x-x-x[...   Ú-U]L ku-ua-pí-ik-k[i e-eš-zi]

23   [GAL($^{HI.A}$-ta BI-IB-RI$^{HI.A}$ ... ^{URU}Ḫ)]A-⌜AT-TI-pát e⌝-e[š-zi]

(further broken)

Rs. (= A Rs. III 16' – IV 18).

---

x+1   IŠ-⌜TU KUR⌝ ^{URU}ḪA-A[(T-TI-ma-kán ...) ...]

2'   hi-in-kán ka-aš-⌜ta-an⌝[(ma-a-ša-an-na ...   ) ...]

3'   nu KUR.KUR$^{HI.A}$ ^{LÚ}KÚR ku-e šu-ul-l[(a-an-ta hur-šal-la-an-ta)]

4'   ku-e-eš-kán tu-uk A-NA ᵈ[(Te-li-pí-nu Ù A-NA DINGIR^{MEŠ} ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI
     UL)]

5'   na-ah-ha-an-te-eš ku-i-e-eš-ma-a[(z šu-me-en-za-an É$^{HI.A}$ DINGIR^{MEŠ}-KU-
     NU ar-ha ua-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zi)]

6'   i-la-li-iš-⌜kán⌝-zi ku-e-eš-m[(a)] ⌜BI-IB-RI⌝$^{HI.A}$ GAL$^{HI.A}$ [⌜Ú-NU-TE⌝^{MEŠ}]

7'   KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI da-an-na ša-an-⌜hi⌝-iš-kán-zi ku-e-⌜eš⌝ [-ma-aš-za
     ($^{A.ŠÀ}$A.GÀR-KU-NU)]

8' ^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN ^{GIŠ}MÚ.SAR ^{GIŠ}TIR$^{!72}$ dan-na-ta-ah-hu-u-ua-an-z[(i) ša-an-
     hi-iš-ká]n-⌜zi⌝

9'   ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$APIN.LÁ $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$NU.
     ^{GIŠ}M[(Ú.SAR MUNUS.MEŠ ^{N})]^{A₄}ARA₅

10'   da-an-na ⁝ša⁝-an-hi-iš-kán-zi nu i-da-lu-un ta-pa-aš-š[(an) hi-in-k]án

11'   ka-a-aš-ta-an-na ⁎ BURU₅$^{HI.A}$-ia a-pí-e-da-aš A-NA ⌜KUR.KUR⌝
     [^{L}]^Ú ⌜KÚR⌝ pa-a-i⌝

12'   A-NA LUGAL-ma MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MEŠ}.LUGAL Ù A-NA KUR
     ^{URU}ḪA-AT-TI TI-tar ha-at-tu-⌜la-tar⌝

13'   ⌜in-na⌝-ra-ua-tar MU^{KAM} GÍD.DA EGIR.U₄-MI du-uš-⌜ga⌝-ra-at-ta-an-na
     p[í-iš-k]i

14'   [nu ha]l-⌜ki-ia⌝-aš ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-aš ^{GIŠ}še-e-ša-na-aš GU₄$^{HI.A}$-aš UDU$^{HI.A}$-aš
     UZ₆$^{HI.A}$[-aš]

15'   [(ŠAḪ-aš ANŠE.GÌR.)] ⌜NUN.NA^{HI} .A⌝-aš ANŠE-⁝aš⁝ gi-im-ra-aš hu-u-it-ni-it

16'   [(DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš-ša Š)]A ⌜EGIR.U₄⌝-MI (erasure) mi-ia-a-tar pí-iš-
     ki nu mi-e-eš-ša-d[u]

17'   [(hé-e-mu-uš-ša) ... (nu) ši-]iš-ša-ua-aš hu-u-ua-du-uš i-ia-an-ta-r[u]

18'   [(nu I-NA ^{UR})]^U ⌜KÙ⌝.BABBAR^{TI} ma-a-ú ši-iš-du nu pa-an-ku[-uš]

19'   <(a-pa-a-at)>^{73} e-eš-⌜du⌝ hal-za-a-i

(the edge)

---

70   Both A & B read EŠ sign here.

71   Text: TÀŠ-a-an-za (A: correct).

72   Text: ^{GIŠ}ŠAḪ (photo confirms KUB edition).

73   The scribe omitted a-pa-a-at probably due to the lack of space.

2.3. Ex. C: Bo 8072[74] (= A Rs. III 2'-13').

x+1 *Ù*[...

  2' ᵈ*Te-li*[(*-pí-nu-uš* ...

  3' TI-*an ḫar-a*[(*k nu-uš-ma-aš*) ...

  4' EGIR.*U₄*[-

  5' *la-lu-u*[(*k-ki-ma-an* ...

  ─────────────────────────────────

  6' *nu-uš-ma-a*[(*š*) DUMU.(NITAᴹᴱ·ᴱˢ ...

  7' *tu-um-m*[(*a-an-ti-ja-an pí-eš-ki* ...

  8' DUMU.LÚ.U[(₁₉.LU-*ja* ...

  9' *pa-ra-a* [(*ne-ja*)*-an-ta-an* (...

 10]x x[

(further broken)

─────────────────────────

The Hittite Syllabification of PIE *CuR and *K^uR

Alwin Kloekhorst (Leiden)

(1) Within the field of Hittite historical linguistics, it is quite commonly assumed that the PIE sequences *CuR and *K^uR syllabify as Hitt. *CuR* in all circumstances (cf. Melchert 1994: 55; Kimball 1999: 249): *k^ur-*énti* > *kuranzi* 'they cut', *$g^{uh}n$-*énti* > *kunanzi* 'they kill', *k^u-k^urs-*ent*- > *kukuršant*- 'slandering', etc.

Oettinger (1979: 119) proposes a different syllabification before a consonant, however, namely *K^uRC > Hitt. *KuaRC*. This proposal was based on forms such as *kuuaraške/a*-, the -*ške/a*-imperfective of the verb *kuer*-^{zi}/*kur*- 'to cut', *kuuaške/a*-, the -*ške/a*-imperfective of *kuen*-^{zi}/*kun*- 'to kill', and *kuuakuuaraške/a*-, the -*ške/a*-imperfective of *kuk*(*k*)*urš*- 'to mutilate'. Nevertheless, under pressure of e.g. Melchert (1984: 52), who explicitly states that "a sequence *$CwRC$ does not syllabify as *$CwR̥C$ (> Hitt. *CwaRC*), but as *CuRC*", giving Hitt. *ḫurki*- 'wheel' < *h_2urg-*i*- as an example, Oettinger has retracted this view in 1992: 218.

(2) The Hittite imperfectives in -*ške/a*- clearly go back to the PIE present formation in *-$sk\hat{e}/o$-. In PIE, this suffix is always attached to the zero-grade of the verbal root: PIE *g^um-$sk\hat{e}/\acute{o}$- 'to go' > Gk. βάσκω, Skt. *gácchati*, Av. *jasaiti*; PIE *$pr\hat{k}$-$sk\hat{e}/\acute{o}$- 'to ask' > Skt. *pr̥ccháti*, Arm. *harcʻi*, Lat. *poscō*, OHG *forscōn*. In Hittite, we also find examples of this practice: e.g. *zikke/a*- (imperf. of *dai*-^{i} *ti*- 'to put') < *d^hh_1-$sk\hat{e}/\acute{o}$-; *appeške/a*- (imperf. of *epp*-^{zi}/*app*- 'to take') < *h_1p-$sk\hat{e}/\acute{o}$-. Moreover, in Hittite it is still a synchronic rule that imperfectives in -*ške/a*- are derived from the weak stem of the verb[1].

(3) If indeed the sequences *CuR and *K^uR always syllabify as Hitt. *CuR* (before vowel as well as consonant), the above-mentioned imperfectives *kuuaraške/a*-, *kuuaške/a*- and *kuuakuuaraške/a*- cannot go back to the morphologically expected formation *K^uR-$sk\hat{e}/o$-. Nevertheless, it is also difficult to assume a secondary, analogical origin of these forms. If we look at the paradigm of *kuen*-^{zi} 'to kill', for instance, we find three stems: *kue*(*n*)-, *kun*- and *kuua*(*n*)-. The stems *kue*(*n*)- and

───────────────────────────