

The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Chicago)

The half-preserved Milawata letter, a one-columned tablet, of which about one third of the righthand side including the name of the addressee in the opening lines is missing, is an archive copy of a letter from a 13th century Hittite king to an unknown ruler of a Western Anatolian state. It is an important piece of evidence for the reconstruction of the history and political geography of Western Anatolia in Hittite times.

The text (CTH 182) has no known duplicate and probably never had one. It has been edited twice. In 1929 E. Forrer discussed the letter in connection with the so-called Ahhiyawa problem and inter alia claimed to find in it a reference to the city of Troezen (rev. 6)¹. In 1932 F. Sommer edited it in his assessment of the Ahhiyawa question, giving a very cautious treatment in his transliteration and translation proper, but a much freer and more speculative translation in his commentary section entitled "Zur Rekonstruktion des Inhalts"². Because of the potential importance of the letter for determining the political geography of Western Anatolia in Hittite times, O.R. Gurney attempted an English translation in an appendix to Garstang and Gurney, *Geography of the Hittite Empire* (1959)³. To my knowledge no further attempt to translate or edit this letter has appeared since 1959. The tablet itself is in Berlin. The copy in KUB XIX, one of A. Götze's first, is inaccurate in several places. Corrections were published

both by Forrer and Sommer, and Frau Ehelolf's photo in Sommer's *Die Ahhiyavā - Urkunden* (hereafter AU) makes it possible to further control the text.

Regarding the historical context of the letter, the mention of what appears to be the same man Piyamaradu in the Milawata Letter (hereafter ML) and the Tawagalawa Letter⁴ suggested that the two letters are contemporaneous. But even if this is the same Piyamaradu in both letters, the context of ML in which he appears (rev. 10) is so broken, that one cannot tell if he is a contemporary or is mentioned only in retrospect. The other three persons mentioned by name in ML -- Agapurušiya, Walmu and a certain "Kiu" (so Sommer, but see below) -- appear in no other texts. Thus, while everyone recognizes the importance of this letter, little information of a political or geographical nature has been obtainable from its broken contexts.

It is especially satisfying, therefore, to be able to identify among Berlin fragments recently published in KUB XLVIII⁵ a join piece (no. 90) to ML which restores almost all of the last twenty lines of the reverse and the under edge. This new join makes it possible to reassess the contents of the previously published parts of ML and to correct previous readings. The join has been physically confirmed in Berlin by H. Klengel. In the following transliteration are incorporated the results of collations made at my request by H. Klengel and H.G. Güterbock.

Transliteration of KUB 19.55 + 48.90

(Reverse)

Line count

AU KUB

34	32	[nu-]uš-š[i] x[(about 26 signs missing)]
35	33	a-pa-a-aš-ma kiš?[-	(about 21 signs missing)]x x x[]
36	34	[nu] nam-ma ERÍN.M[EŠ	(about 21 signs missing)]x pa-it
37	35	na-aš-kán GE-za GAM?[-(-)	(about 17 signs missing)] KUR-e UL x[o? o?]
38	36	[n]u-kán GIM-an EN-ŠÚ me-m[i-	(about 12 signs missing)]x x x ħu-u-wa-a-i[š?]
39	37	[nu-]uš-ma-aš dam-ma-in EN-a[n	(9 or 10 signs missing)]x ħUL?-an (coll.) UL ša-qa-ħu-u[n]
40	38	A-NA ^m wa-al-mu-ma ku-e GIŠ.ĤU[R.ĤI.A i-ia-nu-un na-at]	^m KI.KAL.BAD-ZA pé-e ħar-ta	
41	39	na-at ka-a-aš-ma IT-TI DUMU-Y[A kat?-t]a?-an(-)x-[o] ú-da-i na-at a-ú ki-nu-un-ma DUMU-Y[A]		
42	40	ku-wa-pi ŠA ^d UTU-ŠI SIG ₅ -tar PAP-aš-ti tu-e-e[-za SILIM-an ^d UTU-ŠI ħa - a - mi		
43	41	nu-mu-kán DUMU-YA ^m wa-al-mu-un pa-ra-a na-a-i na-an EGIR-pa I-NA KUR Wi ₅ -lu-ša		
44	42	LUGAL-ez-na-ni ti-iĥ-ĥi na-aš ka-ru-ú GIM-an LUGAL KUR Wi ₅ -lu-ša e-eš-ta ki-nu-na-aš QA-TAM-M[A e-eš-du]		
45	43	nu-un-na-ša-aš ka-ru-ú GIM-an ĪR-DUM ku-la-wa-ni-eš e-[eš-ta k]i-nu-na<ša>-aš QA!-TAM-MA		
46	44	ĪR ku-la-wa-ni-es e-eš-du		
47	45	ZAG KUR Mi-la-wa-ta-ma-na-aš ^d UTU-ŠI DUMU-YA-ia GIM-an DU-u-en [o o o o t]u-e-e[l ... le-e]		
48	46	kar!-ša!-nu-si ^d UTU-ŠI-za tu-e-el SILIM-an ša-ku-wa-ās-sa-ri[-it ZI-it ħa-a-mi nu-]ut-ták-k[án ...]		
49	47	A-NA ZAG KUR Mi-la-wa-ta an-da ku-it UL pé-eĥ[-ħu-un o o o o o]x[...]		
(Lower Edge)				
1		A?-BU-KA-za [o o o] ku-is am-mi-el ĤUL-u?-wa?(coll.) i-la-liš-ki-z[i? ⁶ A-NA ^d UTU-ŠI-ma]		
2		ĤUL-u-wa-aš INIM.MEŠ-aš ku-iš INIM-aš SAG.DU-aš nu-mu a-pa-a-at iš[- ... nu-za-kán]		
3		am-mi-el x-iš?/ka? wa-li-at nu-za-kán ka-ru-ú ku-wa-pi ^{URU} TÚL-na-an wa-li-a[t nu me-mi-iš-ta ...]		
4		ši-ṣa-ri-ia-wi ₅ GIM-an-ma-mu A-BU-KA ^{LU} LI URU _U URU _{At} NU.SUM nu an-d[a UL u-uĥ-ħu-un(?)]		
5		nu ^m KI!.KAL!.BAD-ZA u-i-ia-nu-un		

Translation

" But he thu[s].
[And] further troop[s And . . .] went. And he [. . .] by night down [. . .] the land not [. . .].

And when his/its lord [. . . -ed] the wor[d . . . , . . .] fled. [And they made(?)] for themselves another lord. I did not recognize [. . . . ,] the wicked one(?)⁷.

But the documen[ts]⁸ which [I/they(?) made] for Walmu Kuwatna-ziti kept. Now behold he is bringing them to (you,) My Son; examine them! Now, My Son, as long as you protect the welfare (SIG₅-tar) of My Majesty, I, My Majesty, will trust your good will (SILIM-an ḫāmi)⁹. So, My Son, send me Walmu, and I will install him again in Wiluša as king. As he was previously the king of Wiluša, so now [let] him [be] (again)! As [he] w[as] previously our kulawaniš-vassal, so let him (again) be a k.-vassal!

"As we ...-ed¹⁰ for ourselves the border of the land of Milawata, My Majesty and (you,) My Son, [so] you [must not] omit/neglect(?) your [. . .]. And My Majesty [will trust] your good will with a true spirit. [And the ...] which I did not give to you in addition to the border of the land of Milawata, [. . . .].

Your father, who was¹¹ desiring my misfortune (lit. my evils), and who (was) the chief factor¹² among the evil factors, [he ...-ed] that ..[...] to me. [. . .] he boasted my When previously he boasted the city Arinna¹³, [he said:] "I will withhold(?) [.] But when your father did not give me the hostages of the cities Utima and Atriya, [I . . .

-ed,] and I sent Kuwatna-ziti."

Lines rev. 38f. and 41ff. introduce to us a previously unsuspected king of Wiluša by the name of Walmu. The newly recovered context informs us that this Walmu, who was previously the king of Wiluša and the vassal¹⁴ of both the addressee (hereafter: M) and the Hittite king, had been deposed and had taken refuge at the court of M, one of his overlords. The name of the new king of Wiluša, whom the anti-Walmu faction had raised to the throne, may be contained in the lacuna in line 37 in the sentence: "I did not recognize [. . . ,] the evil one"¹⁵. Since Walmu was with M at the time the ML was written, M hardly needed to be told about the coup itself. But in lines rev. 32ff. and esp. 35ff., the Hittite king seems to report events related to the Wiluša rebellion. His source for this information was a certain Kuwatna-ziti (written ^mKI.KAL.BAD-ZA rev. 38, lower edge 5)¹⁶, who was apparently in Wiluša at the time of the coup and managed to retain (*pē ḫarta*, rev. 38) critical documents (GIŠ.HU[R.HI.A], rev. 38) relating to Walmu's status as a Hittite *kulawaniš* vassal. It would be important that such documents not fall into the hands of the rebels, for they would destroy them and therewith all evidence of the legitimacy of Walmu's claim to the throne. The reminder in rev. 39f. to M to protect the Hittite king's welfare (SIG₅-tar) suggests that M might be tempted to hand Walmu over to the Wilušans and ally himself with the new power there. The Hittite king sought to forestall such a move by sending Kuwatna-ziti with this letter and the Walmu documents which the latter had retained. The request in rev. 41f. to transfer Walmu

from his temporary asylum with M to Hattuša was also a safeguard against M's possible change of heart.

All this raises a second important question: Who was M, and what and where was his land? Sommer's restoration *tiyawen* in rev. 45 suggested that M and the Hittite king together set for themselves the boundaries of the land (KUR) of Milawata. From this one could plausibly infer that Milawata was M's land. The join piece shows not *tiyawen*, but GUB-u-en¹⁷. In Hittite texts the logogram GUB (sign DU) represents the middle verb ar- "to stand". But reading "we stood ... the border of the land of Milawata" makes no sense. Since ML is a late text, and we know that in other late Hittite texts new values of logograms were introduced, I could conceive that a second reading of DU, namely TÚM (= Akkad. (t)abālu "carry off"), was introduced¹⁸. If that were the case, the two kings attacked the border of Milawata, which would eliminate the possibility that M was king of Milawata at that time. It might still refer to a joint conquest of Milawata, after which it was allotted to M.

Lines 46-47 with the join offer more evidence that Milawata was M's land. Because one must restore at least a noun object and the negative *lē* after *tuel* in line 45, space considerations favor the restoration of another word in line 46 after *nuttakkan*. And if this restored word were the direct object of *pehhun* "I gave", the -tta would be dative "to you" and we would translate: "The [. . .] which I did not give to you, in addition to the border of the land of Milawata, [. . .]."

If M's kingdom included border land of Milawata, the Milawata letter gives important information as to its general location¹⁹. If the deposed king of Wiluša fled to M for refuge, and M had been overlord of Wiluša, M's land must have been close enough to Wiluša to have vital interests there and to be able to exercise some military control over it. If, for example, Wiluša was in the vicinity of the Troad²⁰, M's kingdom is not likely to have been as far south as classical Miletos, much less Pamphylian Milyas²¹. Conversely, if M's kingdom was Milawata, and it were one of the latter two southern sites, Wiluša should be looked for further south than the Troad.

The new join piece enlarges our understanding of the activities and the political stance of M's father²². Lower edge 1 describes his regular activity (note the -ške-iterative) as always desiring the Hittite king's misfortune. What appears to be *ḫUL*. SIG₅-x[on Götze's copy could be *ḫUL-u-wa*, with the latter two signs over an incomplete erasure (collation Güterbock). Since *apāt* in lower edge 2 would have no antecedent if we read *iš[-PUR]* immediately following, it is tempting to read *apāt iš[- . . .]* plus verb. But I have no idea what Hittite noun would be most suitable as a restoration (*išḫiul?*). From what follows it is clear that M's father was in communication with the Hittite king. Sommer's translation of *wa-li-at* "he praised"²³ collapses with the join. For the same verb occurs on the join piece in a sentence whose introductory sentence particles are preserved, showing -za, which requires a translation "boasted, prided himself in"²⁴.

These same particles must be restored at the end of lower edge 2. *x-iš* (line 3) could be *DINGIR-iš*, or possibly *İR-iš* by emendation²⁵. The acc. pl. *-iš* is equally embarrassing with *DINGIR* and *İR*. The present tense of *šiwariyawī* only is comprehensible, if this is a quoted speech of M's father. From other contexts of this Luwian verb I propose that it means "refuse, begrudge, deny, withhold"²⁶. In the context of a boast against the Hittite king, it may be a threat to withhold tribute or deportees. This makes excellent sense, when followed by the statement: "But when your father did not give me the hostages ...". The *šiwariwi* clause expresses the intention positively; *NU.SUM* (*natta pešta*) reports the act negatively.

Finally, we must ask ourselves when these events occurred. Since *Piyamaradu* was a contemporary in the *Tawagalawa* Letter, but in *ML*'s broken context could be either a contemporary or someone from an earlier period mentioned in historical retrospect, *ML* cannot on this basis be dated to the same period as the *Taw. Letter*. As noted above, the other persons mentioned by name in *ML* are not known from any other text. On palaeographic and orthographic grounds²⁷ I would date the only copies which we have of the *Tawagalawa* Letter and the *ML* after the reign of *Muršili II*²⁸. From the fact that we possess

only one copy of most outgoing letters²⁹ it would appear likely that each of these was made at the time of dispatching the letter and was the only copy ever made for the Hittite archives. And since we know that the king of *Wiluša* during *Muwatalli*'s reign was *Alakšandu*³⁰, *Walmu* was a successor of *Alakšandu*, and the Hittite king who authored *ML* was a successor of *Muwatalli*.

It is impossible to be more specific than this in establishing a date for this letter. As for the events reported and the plans made therein, we do not know if the Hittite king succeeded in reinstating *Walmu*, or if we are observing the final severing of *Wiluša* from *Hatti*. The statement "I did not recognize [. . .]" might be taken to indicate that the new *Wilušan* government would have liked the formal recognition of *Hatti*. Whether or not such recognition, even if sought and refused, at this time was actually necessary or only desirable, cannot be determined.

[Korrekturzusatz:

On p. 133, instead of: "M's kingdom Troad" read:

M's kingdom might have been as far south as classical *Miletos*, but hardly *Pamphylian Milyas*²¹. Conversely, if M's kingdom abutted *Milawata*, and it were *Milyas*, *Wiluša* should be looked for further south than the Troad.]

¹⁾ E. Forrer, *Forschungen* I/2 (1929) 233-261.

²⁾ F. Sommer, *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden* (1932) 198-240.

³⁾ Pp. 114-115.

⁴⁾ E. Laroche, *Les noms hittites* 141 no. 981; F. Sommer, AU 75f., 206.

⁵⁾ H. Berman und H. Klengel, *Texte des hattischen Kreises und verschiedenen Inhalts, Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi, Heft XLVIII*, Berlin, 1977.

⁶⁾ The trace (coll.) is more likely -z[i than -i[t or -t[a. But if so, the form must be a historical present, for the sense is past tense.

⁷⁾ Collation by Güterbock showed that the traces after what appears to be either EG]IR,]ER]N, HU]B or SI]G₅ are HUL-an. For HUL-an one thinks of huwappan, but this is written logographically usually with LÚ.HUL, not simple HUL. One could always appeal to the late date and unusual spelling practices of this text in order to justify the HUL-an as huwappan. The writing ša-qa-hu-u[n] which immediately follows HUL-an is also atypical, since the verb šak- in first person singular forms is elsewhere always written with double ḫ. For this and other reasons I entertained for a while the idea that it was ša-an!-hu-u[n]. The idiom idalu šanḫ- cannot be extended to HUL-an šanḫ-, although, if one is willing to emend still further, HUL-an <-ni> šanḫ- is a known idiom (KBo 3.3 ii 16, etc.). But in this context one expects rather some expression of the Hittite king's position vis-à-vis the pretender, and "I did not acknowledge ..." fits that nicely without requiring emendation.

⁸⁾ GIŠ.HU[R.HI.A] "Die Aufzeichnungen(?) (AU 203), "the messages" (Gurney 115). On GIŠ.HUR see discussions by Th. Bossert, BiOr 9 (1952) 173, A. Archi, OA 12 (1973) 210 note 7, H. Hoffner, Or NS 49 (1980) 285f.

⁹⁾ The join shows that the response of the Hittite king was not the exactly equivalent action (SIG₅-tar paḫš-), but SILIM-an ḫā- (cf. also rev. 46, where ḫa-a-mi is the most likely restoration). For SILIM = aššul cf. Friedrich, HW 37 (Heil, Wohlergehen, Gruß) and 292 (gute Beschaffenheit, Heil, Wohlergehen, Gunst). With complement -an the reading DI (= ḫanneššar) is excluded. With Friedrich HW 292 s.v. SILIM and contra Sommer HAB 229 s.v. assul(a)-, the translation "favor, goodwill" (German

"Gnade, Gunst") is sometimes required. Hatt. I 30-32 (men saw the a. of Šauška and Muwatalli toward Hattušili), ibid. III 54-55, KBo 2.9 i 30 (O Šauška, take away from them your a.), and the adverb aššuli "in favor": nuza É.DINGIR-LIM-KA [E]N.SISKUR-ia EGIR-pa aššuli kappuwai nuššikan anda aššuli nāiš-ḫut "Reconsider in favor your temple and the sacrificer! Turn to him in favor!" KUB 10.72 ii 16-18 (festival). The collocation aššulan ḫā- is not attested elsewhere, but "trust your goodwill" makes excellent sense.

¹⁰⁾ The verb is written logographically with the DU sign. Collation by Güterbock confirmed this author's suspicion that the DU sign is drawn here as in obv. 10 (nu-ud-du-za), but unlike the shape in obv. 32, 44, and lower edge 2. For the possible reading TÚM-u-en see discussion below.

¹¹⁾ See note 6.

¹²⁾ Forrer 259: "Hauptstreitsache", Sommer AU 216: "Ausgangspunkt", Gurney 115: "the affair which was the origin of the bad relations". Note that the kuiš which occurs in lower edge 1 and 2 is not resumed by the apāt in the following clause (wrong gender). The two kuiš's seem to anticipate the subject of the clause of which apāt ... is the direct object.

¹³⁾ Since -z walliya- means "to boast", and the object of -z walliya- is that which one prides oneself in owning or controlling, the city URU.TÚL-na was once in the hands of the father of M. Unless we are prepared to locate M's kingdom much farther east than anyone has heretofore thought, this Arinna cannot be the famous Hittite cult center. But since at least three other cities by this name are attested in Hittite texts (cf. RGTC 6:32), at least one of them in the west (Xanthos in Lycia), and Mount Arinnanda lay in the Arzawa lands, it is quite likely that the URU.TÚL-na (Arinna) mentioned here was a city in Western Anatolia, which at the time was controlled by M's father. It may indeed have been Xanthos in Lycia, but then there is no certainty that it was not a homonymous city elsewhere in the west.

¹⁴⁾ "Vassal" is clear from ÍR. What a kulawanieš vassal is is unfortunately not clear. On the presumably Luwian term kulawani-, which only occurs here, see discussions in Forrer, *Forschungen* I 235f., Sommer, AU 225, 348 note 1, Th. Bossert, *Die Sprache* 4 118.

¹⁵⁾ See note 7.

¹⁶⁾ On the name in lower edge 5 cf. Forrer 261 and Sommer AU 231. But rev. 38 on the join piece removes all doubt. Although in lower edge 2 the name should be direct object and therefore accusative, the final -za remains. This might suggest that the name stem itself ended in -za.

¹⁷⁾ See note 10.

¹⁸⁾ "DU"-wen is clearly transitive here. For TUM and (t)abālu cf. CAD A/1 sub abālu.

¹⁹⁾ For bibliography and discussion of the localization of Milawata see RGTC 6: 268.

²⁰⁾ So Cornelius, *Geographie* 396 and Garstang and Gurney, *Geography* 101-105; further bibliography in RGTC 6:484f.

²¹⁾ RGTC 6:268 with bibliography.

²²⁾ Never named in this text; always referred to as ABUKA "your father".

²³⁾ AU 205, 230.

²⁴⁾ Distinction nicely illustrated already by Sommer, *Hethitisches* II (1922) 59. -z walliya- with direct object in *nuza apenzan GEŠPÚ ḫaštai walliškanzi šumaš=a=za DINGIR.MEŠ tepnuir* "(The Kaskaean) boast of their power and strength. They belittled you, O gods" KUB 4.1 i 17-18 (MH/NS). Note also: *nu URU^{URU} Timmuhalaš URU-aš [ŠA LÚ.MEŠ^{UR}] U Gašga walliyaš pēdan ēš-ta* "The town of Timmuhala was a place of pride [of the] Kaskaean." KUB 19.13+14 (DŠ frag. 34) i 47-48, cf. JCS 10:110.

²⁵⁾ The sign which Sommer read DINGIR is damaged in the center in such a way that virtually all that is visible is the first horizontal and the final vertical. Although IR-iš is not quite reconcilable with the meager traces, it might be plausible as an emendation of the sign written here. The father of M is later said to have refused to give hostages of certain cities to the Hittite king. These hostages, or others not mentioned here, might be the "subjects" (lit. "servants") of the Hittite king, which he had captured and now boasted in.

²⁶⁾ Puduhepa writes to Ramses: [*numukan*] DINGIR-LUM *kuiš kēdani pedi tittanut numukan UL kuitki ši-wa-ri-ia[-zi? ... numukan] aššulan UL ši-wa-ri-ia-at* "The deity who has installed [me] in this place withholds no favor from me" KUB 21.38 ii 15-16, ed. Helck, JCS 17:87-97; *nuwam[u ...] šallanut kinunmawa x[...] uieški[š]i am-mukmawa EGIR-pa ši-[w]a-re-eš-ši ammukwa uiya* "You(?) / he(?) raised me [...] But now you are repeatedly sending [...], but from me you are withholding. Send to

me!" KUB 23.97 ii 10-13 (letter, NH); [...] ZI-an UL : ši-ú-wa-ri-wis "I will not withhold [... my(?)] opinion (lit. mind, soul)" KUB 40.1 obv. 42 (letter, NH); [...] x ŠEŠ-YA DUMU.SAL-KA Ú-UL : ši-wa-ri-x[...] " ... will/did not withhold your daughter ... , my brother" KBo 18.23 obv. 10 (letter, NH).

²⁷⁾ Comparing Götze's handcopy with Frau Ehelolf's excellent photo published in Sommer, AU, Tafeln I und II, it is clear that the Tawagalawa Letter exhibits what can be called the later New Script (13th Century B.C.). Contra Götze's copy the DA and ID signs lack the broken middle horizontal. The signs IG, URU, LI, MEŠ, ŠAR, AH, ḪAR, ḪA all show their latest forms. ML (KUB 19.55 + 48.90) also shows this late NS. It differs from Taw. in the signs MEŠ, NAM, BUR and AL. But the differences are not such as to date either of these tablets earlier than the last 50 to 100 years of the Hittite Empire.

Although I cannot vouch for the accuracy or completeness of the sign tables made by I. Hoffmann in THeth 9 (1979) 103ff., it is nonetheless interesting that according to them the late forms of LI and IG (the only form of these signs to occur in Taw. and ML) appear first in Muwatalli texts, and the late form of NAM (not in Taw., but in ML without an example of the earlier NAM) appears first in Hattušili III texts. On pages 136ff. Hoffmann does not consider either Taw. or ML to be texts of contested or questionable date. They are therefore omitted from the corpus to be examined palaeographically.

Orthographically one can point to the following features of Taw.: consistent GIM-an with no *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an*; consistent GAM-an with no *kat-ta-an*; consistent *kiš-an*; several glossed Luwian forms such as :*ḫa-aš-pa-ḫa* (i 41), :*zaršiya-*, :*pašihai-*, etc.; many verbs written Akkadographically (*IQBI*, *AQBI*, *IDI*, *AŠPUR*, etc.); consistent IGI-an-da for *me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da*; the 1 sg. pres. of *dai-*, which in OS is occasionally *te-e-ḫé* or *te-e-ḫé-ḫi*, which thereafter is regularly *te-eḫ-ḫi*, in Taw. is twice *te-ḫi* (ii 35, iii 6), and in ML once *ti-iḫ-ḫi* (rev. 42). Without further examples of *te-ḫi* or *ti-iḫ-ḫi* from texts securely dated to Tudhaliya IV or Šuppiluliuma II it can only be a guess that these two spellings belong to the repertoire of the (later?) 13th century Hittite texts. But it is clear that out of the approximately 60 examples of *tehi* in published texts the only two examples of *te-hi* occur in Taw., and the only

example of *ti-ih-ḫi* occurs in ML. The spelling *te-eḫ-ḫi* certainly continues in the very latest texts (cf. *te-eḫ-ḫi* in the Suppiluliuma II text KBo 4.14 iv? 61).

²⁸⁾ I cannot agree, therefore, with E. Forrer, O. Carruba, J. Macqueen or T.R. Bryce, who date the Tawagalawa on nonphilological grounds to the reign of Muršili II. On historical grounds it is not impossible. For the ML to have been written in Muršili II's reign one would have to say that Walmu was a predecessor of Alakšandu. But this is highly unlikely on philological grounds. Both Tawagalawa and ML are linguistically later than Muršili II.

²⁹⁾ Of all the letters in the Hittite archives, registered in CTH under numbers 151-210, only three among the Egypto-Hittite correspondence (CTH 156, 159.1, 162) exist in more than one copy.

³⁰⁾ Cf. Muwatalli's treaty with Alakšandu of Wiluša (CTH 76) edited in J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hattireiches*, II (1930) 50ff.

[Korrekturzusatz:

Replace note 16 by:

¹⁶⁾ On previous readings of the name in lower edge 5 cf. Forrer 261 and Sommer AU 231. But rev. 38 on the join piece establishes the reading ^mKARAS-^uZA (= Kuwatnaziti or Kuwalana-ziti). For ZA = LÚ cf. Laroche, *Ugaritica* 5 pp. 8, 104, 147, where Muršili II on his seal is called ZA ^{du} "man of the Stormgod". Cf. also Á.MUŠEN-^uZA/LÚ KUB 22.51 rev. 3, obv. 15. I thank Prof. Güterbock for suggesting to me the reading ^mKARAS-^uZA instead of my earlier ^mKARAS-^uza (= Kuwatnanza?). That the name is the direct object in rev. 38 confirms his theory. Although the Kuwatnaziti in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma lived far too early to still be active in ML (reign of Hattušili III or Tudhaliya IV?), it is possible that the Kuwatnaziti in the Šahurunuwa land grant (CTH 225, reign of Tudhaliya IV) is the same man as ^mKARAS-^uZA of ML. Still, there is as yet no real proof.]