
http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/13817

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this thesis, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", name of the School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.
HOW TO PRAY TO HITTITE GODS: A SEMANTIC AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF HITTITE PRAYER TERMINOLOGY WITH THE NEW EDITIONS OF SELECTED PRAYERS OF MURŞILI II

BY

IZABELLA SYLWIA CZYZEWSKA

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2012

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
Declaration for PhD thesis

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: Izabella S. Czyzewska       Date: 23 May 2012
ABSTRACT

This thesis examines five key terms employed in the colophons and in the main body of Hittite prayers as well as in festival, ritual and oracle texts to describe religious utterances (and rites) and are thus relevant for studying Hittite prayer terminology. These include the verbs *arkuwa*i-, *malda*-*, mugai*-*, talliya*-*, walla*/i*- and *wallu*- as well as the related nouns *arkuwar*, *malduwar*, *malteššar*, *mugawar*, *mukeššar*, *tallyawar* and *walliyatar*. The thesis is divided into four chapters.

Chapter one summarises the previous research on the topic of Hittite prayers and the terminology relating to Hittite prayer and praying. Issues and problems to be investigated in this thesis are identified; they pertain mainly to the function of these terms in the context of prayers. Furthermore, issues relating to the methodology used in this thesis are discussed.

In chapter two, all the terms named above are subjected to a detailed semantic and contextual analysis in order to determine their precise meanings and functions, or rather, the functions of the utterances and rites denoted by these terms, within the sphere of Hittite religion.

Chapter three investigates the usage of these terms in the prayer context and offers new important insights into the question of whether the various terms represent different prayer types or functional elements of a typical Hittite prayer and, in turn, provides a better understanding of the Hittite prayer system and its diachronic development.

Chapter four offers new critical philological editions of selected prayers of Muršili II, that is the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) as well as the first and the second plague prayers (CTH 378.I and CTH 378.II). It also contains a translation and transliteration of the hymn and prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377). These texts are of vital importance for the study of Hittite prayer terminology. The plague prayers are the first Hittite prayers which are labelled by Hittite scribes as *arkuwar*. The prayers to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to Telipinu are the first structurally complex compositions whose elements are explicitly labelled by Hittite scribes with specialised terms.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. General Background

Prayer was one of the fundamental features of the Hittite religion. The royal archives of Hattuša (Boğazköy), the capital city of the Hittite empire that flourished in central Anatolia in the late second millennium B.C.E., contained numerous festival, ritual and oracle texts that included short prayers spoken by a Hittite priest or a ritual expert. These prayers, which asked the gods for the general well-being of the king and his family and occasionally requested the gods to cure various indispositions of the human body, were part of the Hittite religious landscape since the Old Hittite period (c. the 16th to the first half of the 15th century B.C.E.) and continued to be an essential part of various festivals and rituals until the fall of the Hittite empire in the 12th century B.C.E.

The other group of prayers found in the royal archives consists of longer texts also called by some scholars “invocations” (Singer 2002b: 307) that were embedded in rituals and that were accompanied by various offerings. Although these texts were written down in the Middle and New Hittite periods, they show thematic and linguistic features of the Old Hittite texts. This group of texts includes three prayers:

(i) the prayer to the Sungoddess of the Netherworld (CTH 371), in which a Hittite priest appeals to the Sungoddess and asks her not to listen to the slander against the king brought by his relatives and political supporters. This appeal is also directed to the gods and goddesses that form the entourage of the Sungoddess.

(ii) The prayer to the Sungoddess and to the Stormgod (CTH 389.2.A), which apparently was to be recited by both a priest and the king. The king implores the gods to be his divine parents, while the priest asks the gods to lavish the royal couple with favours while destroying those who slander them.

(iii) The prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 385.10.A) that asks for the blessing of the royal couple and of Ḫatti.

The royal archives also included prayers whose composition was commissioned by members of the Hittite royal family. These texts date exclusively to the Middle (the second half of the 15th – the first half of the 14th B.C.E.) and the New Hittite (middle of the 14th - early 12th centuries B.C.E.) periods. They usually identify the name of the king
or queen who initiated the composition of a given text, and hence they have been labelled by students of Hittite prayer as either ‘personal’ or ‘royal’ prayers.

The first personal prayer is believed to be the prayer of Kantuzzili (Popko 1995: 103; Singer 2002b) which shows in its structure and theme the strong influences of the Babylonian hymn to Šamaš and of incantations for appeasing an angry deity (dingir šadabba). The royal prayers further developed in the New Hittite period and acquired their Hittite name *arkuwar* during the reign of Muršili II.

To date, several ‘royal prayers’ have been identified. These include:

(i) Five prayers of Muršili II in which the king asks various deities to remove the plague that broke out in the lands of Ḫatti during the reign of Šuppiluliuma; one prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna in which the priest-scribe, on behalf of Muršili II, asks the goddess to remove the plague and to stop the enemy invasion; one prayer to Telipinu in which the priest-scribe, on behalf of Muršili II and his wife, asks the god to bless the royal family and the Hittite lands; two prayers in which the king asks for the recovery of his wife Gaššuliyyawiya and two prayers in which Muršili explains his dealings with Tawannanna, his stepmother.

(ii) One prayer of Muwatalli, in which the king explains why the cult of the goddess Ḫepat in Kummanni was neglected and vows to renew the cult provisions; one ‘prayer’ addressed to the assembly of gods which reads more like a list of religious activities (including the presentation of an *arkuwar*) that are to be undertaken when a person is faced with a problem and wants to appeal to the gods.

(iii) Two prayers composed during the reign of Ḫattušili III and Puduḫēpa and addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna. In the first of these prayers the king dissociates himself from all the offences committed by his predecessors and lists all the favours that he bestowed on the Stormgod of Nerik. In the other prayer the queen Puduḫēpa asks for the well-being of Ḫattušili.

(iv) A fragmentary prayer of Tudḫaliya IV in which the king asks the Sungoddess of Arinna for a military success.
1.2. History of Research on the Hittite prayer

Thus far, the focus of Hittite scholarship has been primarily and invariably on the royal prayers and their termini technici. The main efforts have been directed towards the comprehensive editions of these texts, on their textual analysis, as well as on the semantic analysis of specialised terminology used in Hittite prayers.

Each individual royal prayer and groups of royal prayers have been edited. A group of prayers written in the Middle and New Hittite ductus and addressed to the Sungod (CTH 372-4) has been partially transliterated, translated and studied by Güterbock in a series of articles (1958, 1974, 1978, 1980). All three prayers have been recently edited in full by Schwemer in “Hittite Prayers to the Sun-God for Appeasing an Angry Personal God: A Critical Edition of CTH 372–74” (forthcoming).

The philological edition of two prayers of Muršili II, one addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II), the other to Telipinu (CTH 377), was given by Gurney (1940). Because of many textual similarities shared by both texts, Gurney treated them as one composition thus contributing greatly towards our understanding of the close relationship between these two texts.

While the prayer of Muršili to the Sungoddess of Arinna was later translated and transliterated by subsequent scholars without, however, being fully edited, the prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377) has been recently treated by Kassian and Yakubovich (2007:423-454). They provide a full edition of manuscript A (KUB 24.1+) and a transliteration and translation of manuscript B (KUB 24.2 +) of this text. The edition also includes general remarks on the structure of this complex text, on its affinities to the prayer of Muršili to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) and on the dating of both manuscripts.

The edition of another group of prayers of Muršili II, which dealt with the plague that broke out in Ḫatti at the end of the reign of Šuppiluliuma I (CTH 378.I-IV), was first undertaken by Goetze (1930: 161-251), who first referred to them as “plague prayers”. Goetze’s transliteration, translation and a full commentary of the four prayers of Muršili II, has stood the test of time admirably. Despite being partially outdated by the identification of new fragments of some of the prayers and by the general progress in the understanding of the Hittite language, his work remains an important and standard treatment of these texts.

New joins to the first plague prayer of Muršili II (CTH 378.I), have recently been presented by Miller (2007b: 135-6, 2010: 46-47) and by Grodek (2009). Miller gives the transliteration and translation of the beginning of the prayer. Grodek (2009) edits the
fragments of the prayer that have been completed by the new joins and comments on their historical implications.

Another text, published as KUB 48.111+, has been recently translated by Singer (2002a: 66), who treats it as the “fifth plague prayer” of Muršili II. The same text has been transliterated and translated by Güterbock (1960) and by Sürenhagen (1985). The latter scholar considers this text as a “purification oath” rather than a prayer and discusses this text as a historical source important for the study of the Hittite-Egyptian relations.

The prayer of Muršili II addressed to Lelwani, in which either the king himself or the Tawannanna\(^1\), asks the deity for the recovery of Gaššuliyawiya (CTH 380), was edited in full by Tischler (1981). In the same book, Tischler transliterates and translates all the texts that are concerned with or mention the woman named Gaššuliyawiya and discusses Gaššuliyawiya’s identity.

A prayer in which Muršili II accuses his stepmother, Tawannanna, of many abuses of power (CTH 70) has been treated by Cornelius (1975:27-40) and recently by de Martino (1998: 19-48). De Martino gives a new edition of this text, briefly discusses all textual sources that mention the conflict between Muršili II, Gaššuliyawiya and Tawannanna and gives a lively and insightful discussion of the content of the prayer and the interpretation of some of the lines that contributes to our better understanding of this text.

Another prayer of Muršili II containing the king’s dealings with Tawannanna, (CTH 71), has been studied and edited in full by Hoffner (1983). In his article, Hoffner joins a new fragment to the text and then transliterates and translates the prayer. He also discusses how this new fragment changes the historical context and betters our understanding of this text.

Houwink ten Cate and Josephson (1967: 101-140) edited one of the prayers of the king Muwatalli II addressed to the Stormgod of Kummanni (CTH 382). In a short introduction to their edition, both authors briefly discuss the content of the prayer and the structural division of the entire text. They place its composition in the scribal tradition influenced by Hurro-Luwian and Mesopotamian religious thought and point out the structural similarities between this prayer and another prayer of the same king addressed to the assembly of gods (CTH 381). According to Houwink ten Cate and Josephson, these similarities can be explained by the fact that both texts were commissioned by the same king and thus both show his personal touch.

\(^1\) Singer 2002a: 71-2 and Dinçol et al. 1993: 98.
A thorough and excellent new edition of another prayer of the same king addressed to the assembly of all gods (CTH 381) was published by Singer (1996), who also gives a palaeographic and linguistic analysis of two manuscripts of this text and discusses its content, purpose, composition and date.

Sürenhagen (1981) provides a full edition of two prayers composed during the reign of Ḫattušili III and Puduḫepa, one addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 383), and a second to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle of the lesser deities (CTH 384). The edition is followed by a description of the historical context of both prayers, as well as a brief discussion of the terms walliya- and wallyatar, arkuwar, malteššar, wek- and wekuwar. Sürenhagen regards these words as Hittite designations of a hymn, a plea, a vow and a request, which he considers to be the functional elements of both prayers.

The entire corpus of Hittite royal prayers was transliterated and translated by Lebrun (1980). His monumental work remains an important starting point for every student of Hittite prayer, despite its many flaws in transliteration and translation, and the absence of significant philological comments. The main merit of his work lies in short essays on the Hittite religion and religious thought reflected in prayers, in an attempt to provide a structural analysis of Hittite prayers and to classify them into types according to the native taxonomy.

Translations of the better preserved and historically important prayers have been included in the various compendia of Ancient Near Eastern texts in translation. Goetze in Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (1950) provided the translation of six prayers, including the prayer of Kantuzzili, the second plague prayer of Muršili II, the prayer of Muwatalli to the assembly of gods and the prayer of queen Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle. However, he presented these texts without any particular chronological order or even without a short introduction which would allow the general reader to place these texts in their historical context.

Kühne’s partial translation of the Kantuzzili prayer and the translation of the second plague prayer of Muršili II have been included in Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament (1978). Together with the translations of both prayers, Kühne also gives a brief introduction to Hittite royal prayers in general. He states that since there is only over a dozen royal prayers, they should not be regarded as a separate genre. He further argues that “In so far as Hittite prayer is a genre, however, it may be said to be essentially argumentative petition” (1978: 165). Kühne then summarizes types of requests and arguments that are included in the royal prayers and briefly compares these texts to the Old Testament petitions.
Christmann-Franck in *Prières de l’Ancient Orient* (1989) translates several prayers, including the prayer to the Sungoddess of the Netherworld, a prayer of a mortal to the Sungod for appeasing an angry deity, the prayer of Muršili II addressed to Telipinu and three plague prayers of the same king. She introduces each prayer with a short description of the specific historical event that induced the composition of a given prayer.

Ünal in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (1991) first gives a short introduction, in which he explains the religious context of the royal prayers. He then provides a generally reliable translation of six prayers and orders them chronologically from the oldest invocations to the prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna.

Beckman’s translations of four plague prayers of Muršili II are included in the *Context of Scripture I* (1997). Beckman introduces his translations with a short paragraph, in which he gives a historical background of the prayers and briefly comments on the main arguments which the king presents to his divine masters as well as on the chronological ordering of these four texts.

The most recent translation of two first plague prayers of Muršili II were published by van den Hout in *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation* (2006: 259-266). Together with the translations, van den Hout also gives a detailed discussion of the historical background, as well as a description of the content and the manuscripts of both prayers.

Transliterations and translations of several prayers were also included in the various corpora of Hittite religious texts. Bernabé provided translations of some of the Hittite royal prayers with brief introductions and summaries of their content in his *Textos literarios hetitas* (1979). He translated in full or in part several prayers, including the invocation to the Sungoddess of the Netherworld, some of the plague prayers of Muršili II, two prayers of Muwatalli and a prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle.

Singer in his excellent *Hittite Prayers* (2002a) provides translations of all reasonably well preserved royal prayers, that is, some 28 examples and gives brief and insightful introductions to each prayer. The book also includes an introductory chapter in which Singer analyses Hittite royal prayers as enactment of a case in the divine court and discusses briefly their terminology, structure, evolution and their cultic setting.

In the same year Trabazo published *Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituals* (2002) in which he included his excellent transliterations and translations of five royal prayers including a group of prayers to the Sungod for an appeasing an angry deity, Muršili II’s prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and the second plague prayer,
Muwatalli’s prayer to the assembly of gods and a prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle.

Specific groups of Hittite prayers have given rise to the study of the Mesopotamian and Hurrian (or Hurro-Mesopotamian) influence on the composition of individual texts and the formation of one type of Hittite prayers more generally. The most important studies on this are the articles of Güterbock (1958, 1974, 1978, 1980), who analysed a group of closely related prayers (CTH 372-374) and traced them back to a Mesopotamian prototype. He demonstrated that the hymn to the Sungod that accompanied these prayers was influenced by a Babylonian hymn to Šamaš and that the prayers themselves were inspired by the Sumerian and Akkadian incantations to appease an angry deity. Güterbock argued that the Hittite texts are not to be understood as translations or even faithful copies of their Mesopotamian prototypes, but rather that the Hittite scribes were inspired by the Babylonian models when composing their hymns. Güterbock also discussed how the hymn to the Sungod influenced the composition of hymns that accompanied the prayers of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna, the prayer for recovery of Gaššuliyawiya and the prayer to Telipinu.

Various overviews of Hittite prayers have been also produced within the framework of general descriptions of Hittite literature and religion and in separate studies. Güterbock (1964) focused on the definition of “literature” and what the Hittites considered a literary text, then gave brief overview and description of the genres of Hittite literature. With regard to prayer, Güterbock concentrated on a brief description of the plague prayers of Muršili II.

Houwink ten Cate in his important study of the Hittite royal prayer (1969), lists all the prayers that have been explicitly labelled by Hittite scribes as arkuwar, namely prayers of Muršili II, Muwatalli, Ḥattušili and Puduḫepa, but also includes in this type of texts the Middle Hittite prayers of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, of Kantuzzili with its parallels and a prayer of Muršili II addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna. In his study ten Cate also briefly discusses the meaning of the Hittite verb arkuwaı̈- and the noun arkuwar and analyses the individual prayers with regard to their content, composition, the gods addressed, the religious thought and themes employed.

Popko (1995) in his excellent history of Hittite religion, gives a brief overview of the diachronic development of the prayer genre, which is quite useful and a good starting point for the detailed analysis of the Hittite prayer system.

De Roos (1995) comments on the relationship between humans and the gods, the authorship of royal prayers as well as gestures that accompany the presentation of a
De Roos also subdivides Hittite prayers into types according to their native designations, briefly describes each type and discusses the content of a few prayers of the *arkuwar* type. In that sense, de Roos’ overview may be considered as one of the most comprehensive overviews of Hittite prayer. However, even this work is not free of problems. For instance, his division of the prayer into types is rather questionable, as is his definition of a Hittite prayer.

Surprisingly, the monumental work of Haas *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (1994) does not discuss Hittite prayers at all. Instead, Haas provides an overview of the Hittite prayer in his *Die hethitische Literatur* (2006), in which, following a short discussion of prayer terminology, he describes and partially translates each well-preserved Hittite royal prayer.

Singer (2002b) defines the Middle Hittite compositions, to which he applies the name invocations (*mugawar*) and argues that the prayers of Kantuzzili, Arnuwanda and Ašmuniikkal and the Hurrian prayer of Taduḫepa are the first personal prayers. He then discusses the authorship, the date, the structure and content of the prayer of Kantuzzili and its parallels. He also comments on its contribution to the introduction of the new genre of personal prayer into the Hittite religion.

Finally, the terminology referring to different types of prayers and their performance has been examined in a number of studies. Scholars have identified six terms which are classified as *termini technici* of Hittite prayer. They include the verbs *arkuwai-, mald-, mugai-, talliya-, walla/i-, wek-* and the nouns *arkuwar; malduwar, malteššar; mugawar, mukeššar; talliyawar, walliyatar* and *wekuwar*. The meaning and usage of individual Hittite prayer words have been analysed and commented upon in various studies, commentaries and dictionaries. For a detailed history of research with regard to each of these terms, see chapter two.

Also comprehensive studies of Hittite prayer vocabulary have been undertaken. Laroche (1964) translated all six specialised terms employed in prayer context, gave the most important examples of the texts in which the given term occurs and divided Hittite prayer into types based on the native taxonomy. He opposed a commonly held view that all terms were the Hittite words for ‘prayer’ and rightly argued that each term describes a very different religious utterance and serves a very different purpose. This detailed and ground-breaking analysis is still regarded as a fundamental work on Hittite prayer terminology. Lebrun (1980: 426ff) gives another overview of the prayer terminology and makes an attempt, however flawed it may be, at recreating the Hittite prayer system based on the Hittite taxonomy. Justus in a series of the articles attempted to show that the Hittite
prayer terms are related to the PIE (i.e. Proto-Indo-European) cultic sphere and, consequently, must be analysed within this context (1993, 1998, 2002, 2004).

1.3. Identifying the Problems

After nearly a century of research, all royal prayers have been edited, their content and language have been analysed, their literary history traced and the meaning and the usage of their *termini technici* have been examined. However, advanced our knowledge of this type of Hittite prayer may be, our knowledge of the Hittite prayer in general is still incomplete. To date, no clear definition of this genre of religious literature has been formulated that would include the features that are shared by all the Hittite prayers. Also, although the diachronic evolution of Hittite prayers has been sketched, no detailed synchronic and diachronic comprehensive study of the Hittite prayer system has been undertaken that would take into account the native taxonomy. Finally, no consensus has been reached with regard to the function of the Hittite prayer terms within the prayer context.

1.3.1. Definition of a Hittite Prayer

In the history of research several attempts have been made at defining Hittite prayer or at least at describing some of its most salient features.

Justus (2004: 270), whose main objective was to show the Indo-European core of Hittite prayers rather than to define the Hittite prayer *per se*, divided these texts into three structural elements: invocation (attention getting), basis (motivating a deity) and petition (communicating the supplicant’s purpose). She gave the most prominent grammatical features of each structural element as (i) the deity addressed in the invocation bears the vocative case ending, (ii) the verbs used in the basis or motivation part of Hittite prayers are always in the indicative mood and (iii) the petition employs verbs in the imperative mood. Although the points she made are fundamental in formulating a definition of a Hittite prayer, her “definition” is limited in scope to only three short prayers and by no means exhausts the topic.

Singer (2002b: 306-307; 2005: 557-567) argues that the Old/Middle Hittite “invocations”\(^2\) as well as personal and exclusively royal prayers of the late 13th and early 14th centuries B.C.E. can be regarded as prayers, with the restriction that the term

---

\(^2\) These texts are preserved in Middle or even Late Hittite *ductus* but show the linguistic characteristics of the Old Hittite texts.
“prayer” itself applies only to the latter texts.\(^3\) The personal prayers a) are evoked by a specific event: plague, illness, enemy invasion etc., b) the main concept underlying their argumentation is that of the personal responsibility for committed sins and their ensuing punishment, c) their purpose is to seek absolution from a sin through confession and restitution and d) they are initiated by the king or the queen and their authorship is clearly indicated in the text. The Middle Hittite invocations are different from the personal prayers in that they are embedded within ritual ceremonies; they are performed by a priest of the Sungoddess rather than the king himself; and they contain rather general requests for the blessing of the royal couple (Singer 2002b: 306). Although very insightful, Singer description is also limited in scope to one type of personal prayer.

Another much broader definition of Hittite prayer has also been advocated, according to which any address to the gods, including “spells” embedded in rituals (Engelhard 1970; Polvani 2004: 369; Popko 1995: 102) and even a curse in the text of a treaty (de Roos 1995: 1998) or a personal name (Lebrun 1980: 423) can be regarded as a prayer. These definitions, however, are much too broad to serve as meaningful categories. If a curse is understood as part of the prayer genre without any specific argument that the given curse shares specific formal features with typical prayers, all texts that somehow or other address a deity must be regarded as prayers, and then the genre designation has lost any purpose and meaning.

### 1.3.2. Termini Technici of Hittite Prayers

Although the study of Hittite prayer words has been mainly guided by linguistic and lexicographic interest with the main efforts directed towards a proper understanding of the meaning of these words, the context and the usage of prayer terminology has also been examined. Two main questions have been asked: (i) whether any of the terms represent a generic name for prayer and (ii) whether the diversity of terms is indicative of a subdivision of one genre into various types or whether each term should instead be regarded as a functional element of a typical Hittite prayer?

Most scholars agree that the noun *arkuwar* was the most common designation for Hittite ‘prayer’; however, no consensus has yet been reached with regard to the function of these terms (or rather the utterances and rites designated by these terms) within the prayer context.

---

\(^3\) Also Houwink ten Cate 1969: 82.
Some regard the terms as Hittite designations of different types of prayer. Thus, Laroche (1964-65) considered only *arkuwar, malduwar, and mugawar* as prayer types, Lebrun (1980: 435-449) argues that all terms refer to prayer types, while de Roos (1995: 1999) classifies *arkuwar, mugawar* and *walliyatar* as types of prayer. Justus (2004: 274) regarded the terms as representing both prayer types and prayer elements. She adopted the Indo-European tripartite structure for Hittite prayer (invocation, motivation, petition) and considered *talliyawar* as an initial vocative address, *wekuwar* as the final imperative request, and *arkuwar, malduwar* and *mugawar* as denoting the middle part of a prayer that had the function to motivate and predispose the deity to act. These she regarded as prayer types.

Singer (2002a: 5-6) considers the various terms as parts of the overall composition, with *arkuwar* ‘pleading’ being the main part of the text and *weku* expressing the supplicant’s “wish, request, petition”. Singer argues that a typical Hittite prayer contains, in different proportions, all these elements, but admits that rarely all of them are preserved.

All of the above suggestions are correct to some extent depending on what kind of evidence is considered. If all Hittite prayers are examined, that is, Old, Middle and New Hittite prayers embedded in the festival and ritual texts as well as the New Hittite personal prayers, the claim that some of the terms refer to prayer types is accurate. If only the New Hittite structurally complex compositions commonly referred to as “royal prayers” are taken into consideration, the proposition that some terms are the Hittite designations of the functional elements of these compositions is also true.

Despite being correct, both suggestions are not free of problems. First, the fact that prayers embedded in ritual and festival texts have been at the margin of scholarly attention, has led to the misleading statements that the royal prayers prevailed in the New Hittite period and that the noun *arkuwar* was either the most common designation of Hittite prayer or was the designation of Hittite prayer. The noun *arkuwar* was indeed used in religious context to designate Hittite prayer, but that is true only for one type of prayer, namely the New Hittite personal prayer (including also those texts whose composition was not commissioned by the members of the Hittite royal family). The textual evidence shows that the other types of prayer with other Hittite designations were composed in the Old, Middle and New Hittite periods; each type was employed in different context and all types of prayer coexisted in one system.

Second, not all the terms refer to prayer types or prayer elements. One has to exercise great caution when claiming that a certain term denotes a prayer element or a
prayer type, particularly in those instances in which the particular type or the part is not explicitly labelled by the Hittite scribe. This is particularly relevant for the noun *talliyawar* that supposedly designates the invocative address in a Hittite prayer and the verb *wek-* which has been interpreted as designating the request part of the prayer. To date no invocation or request introduced by either *talliyawar* or *wek-* have been identified.

Third, the claim that the various terms designate the functional elements of a typical Hittite prayer is not entirely accurate. While, the ‘prayer’ of Mušili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) and the ‘prayer’ of Mušili II to Telipinu (CTH 377) consist of a hymn, a prayer of the *arkuwar* type and a *mukeššar* ritual, and the fragmentary ‘prayer’ of Mušili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna for the recovery of Gaššuliyawiya (here CTH 376.III) includes a hymn and a prayer, the plague prayers as well as the prayers concerning Tawannanna consist of an *arkuwar* only. The prayer of Muwatalli to the Stormgod about the cult of Kummanni consists of an *arkuwar*, and the ‘prayer’ of the same king to the assembly of gods includes invocations which entail calling or addressing a deity by his/her name (not labelled by Hittite scribes as *mukeššar*), several *arkuwars* and various offerings. The *arkuwar*-prayer of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 383) is preceded by a hymn and the *arkuwar*-prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle (CTH 384) does not contain a hymn but includes vows instead. It seems that different kings or rather their scribes had a different approach to what a ‘typical royal prayer’ should entail.

Fourth, the introductory paragraphs of the hymn and the prayer of Mušili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna and of the hymn and the prayer of Mušili II to Telipinu mention that these compositions were accompanied by a *mukeššar* ritual. Since in both cases the *mukeššar* ritual was recorded on a separate tablet, it is conceivable to assume that it was a separate composition. Consequently, it seems that the *mukeššar* ritual cannot be regarded as a functional element of either of these ‘prayers’ but rather should be viewed as a religious activity that accompanied the performance of these prayers.

Fifth, since to date no clear definition of a Hittite prayer has been formulated, it is uncertain whether the compositions that contain a hymn and a prayer or a prayer and a vow should be, in their entirety, regarded as prayers (for the discussion of all of the above points see chapter three).
1.4. Main Research Objectives

The current thesis focuses on five lexemes connected with Hittite prayer, namely the verbs *arkuwai*- *mald*-, *mugai*-, *talliya*-, *walla/i*- and *wallu*- as well as the nouns *arkuwar*; *malduwar*, *malteššar*; *mugawar*, *mukeššar*; *talliyawar* and *walliyatar*. Since there is no clear indication in Hittite texts that either the verb *wek-* or the noun *wekuwar* were used to designate the request part of a Hittite prayer or any other religious utterance or rite, both words are excluded from this study.

The first objective of this work is to examine all well-preserved contexts in which the terms under study appear in order to determine their precise meaning(s) and their usage in the Hittite religious texts. The purpose of this analysis is to determine which of the terms were *termini technici* of only Hittite prayer and which terms were more widely used as designations of other religious utterances and rites, including prayer. The meaning of each term is studied because the semantics of these words gives insights into the way the Hittites perceived their relationship with the divine and the way they perceived prayer, the most direct means of this relationship. Any changes in the meaning and/or the usage of the prayer words reflect the change in Hittite prayer.

This semantic and contextual analysis, besides being the objective on its own, also, perhaps even more importantly, provides the basis for structural and textual study of Hittite prayers denoted by these terms. The three main questions are asked in this part of the dissertation:

- Did at any time during the Hittite history any of the terms represent a generic name “prayer” that equally referred to all types of Hittite prayer?

- What were the key grammatical, structural and textual features of each prayer designated by the terms under study? Does the textual evidence indicate why and when Hittite scribes began to use a particular word to denote a particular type of prayer? How did each type of prayer denoted by these terms evolve over time?

- What was the exact function of the terms under study in the complex compositions commonly referred to as “royal prayers”? Because the function of the terms, or rather the utterances and rites designated by these terms, is tied to the function of the texts in which they appear, two other questions arise: (i) was the primary function of the royal prayers literary or religious? And (ii) what is a Hittite royal prayer?
The third objective of this dissertation is to give new critical philological editions of the prayers of Muršili II whose most recent editions have become outdated by the advancements made in Hittite philology, grammar and palaeography and by joining new fragments to previously identified manuscripts. These include the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna, the first and the second plague prayer and the hymn and prayer to Telipinu. These texts are of vital importance in the study of the function of Hittite prayer terminology in the context of royal prayers. The plague prayers are the first texts in which the term *arkuwar* is attested. In two texts, one addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna and the other to Telipinu, prayers were accompanied by a *mukeššar* ritual and by a hymn of praise, referred to once by the verb *wallīa*-.

1.5. **Remarks on Methodology**

This dissertation relies equally on lexical semantics (the study of the meaning of individual words) and on the study of literary genre. It is not the intention of the sections below to give a complete description of either field, rather the purpose is to highlight the main points that are relevant for the study of the Hittite prayers and their terminology.

1.5.1. **Lexical Semantics**

The key notions of lexical semantics that are important in studying Hittite prayer terminology include “meaning”, “contextual variability” and “semantic change”.

Meaning is a vague concept. Various schools of thought have advocated different theories regarding linguistic meaning (i.e. the actual meaning of an expression in a language), without reaching a consensus. The meaning of a word has been explained as:
(i) the actual object it denotes, (ii) a combination of small, elementary, invariant units of meaning called semantic features, (iii) the totality of the relationship a word has with other words in a given language, (iv) a prototype to which all new meanings are attached.

---

4 Goddard (1998: 4-5), Akmajian et al. (1990: 198-199). According to this approach the language conveys meaning partly by “pointing” to various kinds of phenomena in the ‘real world’. These phenomena are termed denotations. Each linguistic form is associated with a concept and each concept is the mental representation of a phenomenon in the ‘real world’ (Lehmann 1992: 64-65).

5 The componential approach analyses the lexical meaning into components, otherwise labelled as semantic markers or semantic features (Lehmann 1992: 75; Cruse 2004: 95). The word ‘ram’ for instance has the semantic features [animal], [male], [adult]; ‘mare’ has the features [animal], [horse], [female], [adult] etc.

6 The structuralist’s approach relies on the principle that the units of a given language can be identified only in terms of their relationship with other units in the same language. Although various theories regarding the lexical meaning have been advocated within this school of thought, J. Lyon’s theory has been widely accepted. He acknowledges that aspect of meaning which is derived from the relationship of some linguistic forms with the ‘real world’ or world beyond
matched, (v) an idea or ‘concept’ in the mind of the person and less well-known, (vi) a type of translation, that is, the translation of one word with another, more easily understood word.

Although each approach has its merits, the definition of meaning that best describes the Hittite context combines the structuralist (i.e. iii) and denotation approach (i.e. i) to lexical meaning, with some minor modifications.

According to this definition each word has a root that contains information about the function of a given word in the real (non-linguistic) world. This set of information can be termed the literal or default meaning, which comes first to mind when a word is mentioned out of context. However, a word on its own does not convey ‘a whole thought’; the complete meaning is determined only through relations of a given word with the other words that appear in the same language and in any given context. These meaning relations include synonymy, polysemy, hyponomy etc. (Goddard 1998: 17; Lehmann 1992: 68).

The context shapes the meaning of a word in various ways. According to Cruse (2004: 118) the effects of the context on the meaning of a word, which he called “contextual variability”, are threefold: selection, coercion and modulation. In the selection the ‘ready-made bundles’ of meaning are selectively activated by the context. The readings which clash with the context are suppressed, and usually one meaning is

---

7 The main proponent of the prototypical approach is Rosch. According to her and other advocates of this theory people create in their minds, on the basis of their experience of the world, ‘ideal exemplars’ of particular categories of ‘real world’ phenomena with its ideal sets of characteristics. These ideal exemplars are the prototypes. When we come across further candidates for inclusion in the same category, we judge them against the prototype we have established (Lehmann 1992: 77). The members of a category are not equal – they vary in how good or how representative they are of the category. The best are the prototypical members and the category is built around these. The advocates of this theory postulate the prototypical sense of an expression/word (Cruse 2004: 98).

8 The conceptual approach has been advocated by Jackendoff (1983; 1990). According to his theory a person growing up acquires a number of concepts, in the form of word-meanings, shared by those around him/her. Because these underlying ideas are shared communication is possible (Goddard 1998: 7-8). Jackendoff suggests that semantic structure coincides with the conceptual structure and that semantic analysis is also an analysis of mental representations. The lexical meaning is the combination of our inborn conceptual primitives, our inborn concept-combination principles, our experience of the world and our experience of the language (Lehmann 1992: 78).

9 The main proponent of the semiotic approach, also called ‘translational’, approach is Goddard (1998: 10-11).

10 Real synonymy where the words have identical meaning in all the contexts is rare. Most synonyms are best termed “near-synonyms”.

selected. Sometimes none of the readings are compatible with the context; then the speaker searches through the meaning extensions for the reading that fits. If one is found, this will be taken to be the intended meaning, and we can say that context coerced a new reading. Some context effects do not go beyond the bounds of a single sense, these were called by Cruse “contextual modulations” and they include enrichment and impoverishment according to whether the context adds or removes meaning (Cruse 2004: 118).

Another point relevant to the study of Hittite prayer terminology is that most words refer to or describe phenomena in a real, non-linguistic world. These phenomena or referents and the situations in which they are employed are liable to change. Once the referent changes the meaning of a word that describes this referent also changes. This change in meaning is called semantic change, also known as semantic shift or semantic progression. The semantic change can be triggered by many factors, including the changes in the material culture, in technology, society, religion and other spheres of human life (Campbell 2004: 268; Antilla 1989: 136-7).

While there are numerous classifications of types of semantic change, the types relevant to this study include (i) widening, in which the range of meanings of a word increases, so that the word can be used in more contexts than before the change. The change from more precise to more abstract fits here and (ii) narrowing, when the range of meaning decreases so that the word can be used in a fewer context than before the change. The change from more general to more concrete fits here (Campbell 2004: 256-258, 259).

### 1.5.2. Generic Approach to Hittite Prayer

A generic approach adopted in studying the Hittite prayer and its terminology is based on the assumption that genres of text exist. Although each text represents an individual composition, several texts can share certain outer (structure) and inner (motifs, theme, rhetoric devices etc.) similarities that allow a researcher to study them as a group. Such a definition of genre as a group of texts can be further expanded by regarding literary genre as an act of communication between the author and his audience. Such communication is governed by rules which not only guide the author in his composition of a text, but also direct the proper interpretation of the text on the part of the reader/audience. In that sense, any new work is similar in form and content to something that was created previously.\(^{11}\)

Another point relevant to the study of prayers is that genres change and mutate over time. The diachronic approach to genres does not imply a mutually exclusive sequence of changes within a given genre. Rather one genre might give rise to another genre, but the former is not necessarily completely replaced by the new development; rather the two genres coexist and are still connected by some shared features.\textsuperscript{12}

Two kinds of approaches to the study of prayers as genre are employed in this dissertation. The first approach investigates the native designations generally and, more specifically, the relevant classifications found in the texts themselves; the second approach imposes a non-native view of literature and classification scheme onto the texts in order to categorize them in a way that not only leads to a better understanding of the texts and their development, but also enables us to study texts from a comparative perspective.\textsuperscript{13}

The aim of the first approach, e.g. the study of the Hittite genre terminology, is to gain insight into the notion of a Hittite (scribe) with regard to a particular text and its relations to other texts carrying the same designation(s); ideally, this would lead to the reconstruction of a whole set of native genres. One drawback of such an approach is a lack of any Hittite theoretical treatments of their religious literature that would provide us with information about their own attitudes and understanding of their texts. Nonetheless, the examination of the native prayer terminology and the contexts in which the individual terms are employed should not be dismissed as irrelevant to a differentiated perspective on the texts, nor should one ignore the fact that the transmitted body of texts contains important relevant information, even though we will not be able to discuss it with a native expert.

With the absence of any theoretical discourse in Hittite literature on prayers we must rely on the study of genre labels to comprehend how the Hittite terminology was actually used and which criteria underlie the distinctions apparent in the usage of different terms in relation to specific groups of texts. One element of this investigation must be the study of structure and language of the texts independent of their native genre labels in order to establish genre distinctions. However, one cannot rely solely on the analysis of genre terminology in studying Hittite prayers either. Rather two approaches must complement each other. We will never comprehend the phenomenon of Hittite prayer without investigating the Hittite terminology of prayers, imperfect as it may be. Conversely, we will not be able to recognize the purpose or the meaning of the Hittite

\textsuperscript{12} Longman (1991: 20).

\textsuperscript{13} The former approach has been labelled by the students of literary genres as \textit{emic}, the former as \textit{etic} genre. Longman (1991: 14).
prayer terms if we do not undertake the structural, formal and linguistic analysis of the relevant prayer texts in which these terms were employed.
CHAPTER TWO: HITTITE PRAYER TERMINOLOGY.
A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

2.1. Introduction

This chapter offers a comprehensive lexical discussion of verbs arkuwai-, mald-, mugai-, taliya-, walla/- and wallu- as well as the nouns arkuwar; maldwar and malteššar; mugawar and mukeššar; taliyawar and walliyatar. The main objective is to establish the precise meaning(s) of each term, to describe the semantic changes that each term underwent and to summarize the employment of these terms within the sphere of Hittite religion. The implications that the semantic changes have for our understanding of the composition and development of Hittite prayers will be fully discussed in chapter three.

The study of each term includes an overview of the previous research, a list of all attestations and the discussion of the meaning(s) based on the data available. All the passages where the verb and/or a noun appear in a relatively well-preserved context are given in Appendix 1. Within the lexical discussion, these passages will be referred to by the number under which they appear in the appendix.

2.2. Previous Research, Attestations and Meaning

2.2.1. arkuwai-, -za arkuwar iya, -za arkuwar ešša-, *arkueššar

Previous Research

The verb arkuwai- and the verbal noun arkuwar have been studied since the earliest days of Hittitology. The first to comment on arkuwar was Hrozný, who proposed that this noun, appearing in obv. 5 and 7 of a Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite lexical list (KBo 1.30), carries the meaning “Abwehr” and is cognate to Latin arceo and Greek ἀρκέω “keep away, ward off” (1917: 78). In 1919, in his edition of a text containing Syrian arbitrations of Muršili II (KBo 3.3), Hrozný (1919: 153) offered another translation of arkuwar, namely “request, plea,” but observed, in a footnote, that the same noun can also be rendered as “prayer”, for instance in a prayer of Muwatalli addressed to the assembly of gods (KUB 6.45 with the duplicate KUB 6.46).

Sommer and Ehelolf assumed that arkuwar in KBo 1.30 must mean “Entgegentretens”. They also observed that this noun resembles the Akkadian verb maḫāru in that both terms carry the same two meanings, maḫāru “to go against
somebody”, “to pray” and arkuwar “confrontation”, “prayer” (1924: 39-40). Nine years later, in his edition of a text commonly referred to as the “Tawagalawa Letter”, Sommer suggested yet another translation of arkuwar, namely “Bittgang”. He also noted that the general sense of the phrase, in which this noun appears in KUB 14.3, namely -za arkuwar iya-, is “mache ein Gegenübertreten = tritt als Bittender vor mich hin” (1932: 133).

Sturtevant (1931) translated the verb arkuwai- as “to plead” and gave its grammatical forms as arkuwanun (the first person singular preterite) and arkuwar (infinitive). He also rendered the noun arkuweššar as “plea”. In the Hittite Grammar, published two years later, although correctly assuming that the noun arkuwar means “prayer”, Sturtevant wrongly derived it from the verb ark- (1933: 222). He modified this view three years later in his 1936 edition of the Glossary. In this lexicon, Sturtevant listed arkuwar and arkuešni as nouns derived from the verb arkuwai- “to plead, to pray”, and accordingly translated them as “plea, prayer”, duly noting, that in this translation, he followed Sommer and Ehelolf 1924 and Sommer 1932 (1936: 27).

Friedrich, in his review of Goetze and Pendersen’s Muršiliš Sprachlähmung, noted that certain verbs always co-occur with the particle -za without, however, acquiring a reflexive meaning. He included in this group the expressions -za arkuwar iya-, -za arkuwar ešša- and -za arkuwar dai- and translated them as “to pray” (1936: 39).

Another discussion of arkuwar was offered four years later by Gurney in his Prayers of Muršili II where he observed that arkuwar is used to describe the prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu, the plague prayers (KUB 14.14, KUB 14.8+ with the duplicates KUB 14.12, KUB 14.13), the prayers of Ḥattušili and Puduḫepa (KUB 21.19 and KUB 21.27) and a prayer of Muwatalli to the assembly of gods (KUB 6.45 with the duplicate KUB 6.46). Although Gurney translated the noun arkuwar in the colophon of the Prayer to Telipinu as “prayer” (1940: 37), he suggested that the primary meaning of the verb arkuwai- is “to present oneself” (1940: 47 n. 3).

Seven years later, Sommer restated his argument, formed in 1924, that the double meaning shown in Akkadian maḫāru “to go against somebody” and “to appeal to” is also seen in the Hittite verb arku-, from which verb he presumably derived the noun arkuwar (1947: 85).

In the second half of the twentieth century the research into the meaning of the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar advanced further and yielded greater results; the standard Hittite dictionaries and ground-breaking studies on the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar were written and published.
During 1952-54 Friedrich published the *Hethitische Wörterbuch*, to which he added three supplements in 1957, 1961 and 1966. In the main volume of his dictionary (HW: 31), Friedrich translated the verb *arkuwai-* as “to pray” and the noun *arkuwar* as “prayer, plea, request” and referred for these meanings to the studies of Hrozný (1919), Sommer-Ehelolf (1924), Sommer (1932) and Gurney (1940). In the third supplement (1966), Friedrich fundamentally changed his idea with regard to the meaning of the verb *arkuwai-*, stating that it carries the meaning “to apologise, excuse oneself” rather than “to pray” (HW: 437). This modification was initiated by Laroche’s study on Hittite prayer terminology, in which he examined the non-religious and religious use of *arkuwai-* and *arkuwar* in order to establish their core meaning (1964: 13-20).

Laroche rightly emphasised the fact that both terms have a juridical background; however, because he focused only on those texts in which, according to him, a “plea” is made by a defendant, Laroche wrongly concluded that the inherited meaning of the verb *arkuwai-* is “to respond to a charge, to defend/excuse oneself.” This assumption was criticised by Houwink ten Cate (1967 but particularly 1969). He argued that Laroche was too specific in his translations of both terms as “to excuse oneself, to plead” and a “defence, excuse, justification.” He noted that these translations of the verb and the noun may fit well in royal prayers, in which, according to Houwink ten Cate, a feeling of guilt is expressed; however, in other texts, the same verb and noun are also used to explain one’s merit or to complain about injustice. Consequently, he proposed to translate the verb as “to present oneself, to argue, to plead” and the noun as “argument, proposition”.

A few years later, von Schuler commented on the form *kattan arkuwanzi* employed in lines ii 3 and 6 of a fragmentary Proto-Hattic text. Assuming that *arkuwanzi* is a verbal form derived from *arkuwai-*, von Schuler argued that, in the context of this text, the verb can mean neither “to pray” nor “to apologise.” Instead he offered a new meaning “to answer”, “to object to something.” Although the interpretation of *arkuwanzi* as a form of *arkuwai-* was wrong (see Melchert 1998 and here infra), von Schuler’s suggestion that *arkuwai-* can mean “to respond” proved to be correct (1968-69: 4-5).


Kammenhuber lists all the texts in which the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* appear in a relatively well-preserved context. She postulates the core meaning of the verb
to be “to pray”, which would manifest itself in Old Hittite as “to psalmodize, to recite a hymn or a song” but in New Hittite mostly as “to pray, plead for”, rarely as “to excuse, justify oneself, request”. Kammenhuber also translates the noun arkuwar appearing in prayers, oracles and rituals as “prayer” but in non-religious contexts as “justification, defence, apology.” Tischler observes that the core meaning of the verb arkuwai- remains unclear and he cites diverse translations of the verb and the noun by Goetze (1928), Laroche (1964), von Schuler (162) and Houwink ten Cate (1967, 1969). Puhvel offers eight meanings for the verb arkuwai- (“to plead, argue, rejoin, riposte, respond, explain oneself, make excuses, offer defence”) all of which reflect earlier proposals.

Lebrun (1980), following Laroche, translates arkuwai- and arkuwar as “to defend oneself, to excuse oneself” and “excuse, plea”. He also rightly observes that arkuwar denotes a New Hittite prayer type in which a human being was allowed to reason with the divine and justify his/her actions.

Eleven years later Alp’s edition of the letters from Tapikka (Maşat Höyük) appeared in print, in which he suggests that the noun arkuwar employed in the Maşat Letters carries the meaning “request” (1991: 333).

Singer, in Muwatalli’s Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-god of Lightning (1996), notes that the verb arkuwai- expresses the notion of praying and that the noun arkuwar is a Hittite word for prayer. He then lists all the grammatical forms of this verb and noun attested in this text and translates them as “to plead, exculpate oneself, argue” and “plea, argument.” He also comments on the use of the particle -za in the expressions -za arkuwar iya-/dāi-, briefly discusses arkuešni, the dative/locative form of *arkueššar, appearing only in this text and comments on the expression arkuwar tiyauwar (1996: 47-49, 74-75).

Melchert (1998) argues that the basic meaning proposed for the verb arkuwai- by Laroche, namely “to respond to a charge, to defend/justify oneself”, is incorrect. To prove this point he briefly discusses one of the examples used by Laroche, a text containing the Syrian arbitration of Muršili II (KBo 3.3). Melchert also argues that, contrary to Laroche, none of the Hittite royal prayers involves someone with a guilty conscience justifying himself/herself before the gods. Rather he/she, as a slave, appeals to his divine masters for a solution to a problem. Consequently, Melchert proposes that the basic meaning of arkuwai- is “make a plea/case, present arguments”; however, he does not deny that contextually it can come to mean “to explain”, “to respond”, “to justify oneself.” Melchert also separates the verb arku- from arkuwai- and convincingly argues, contrary to von
Schuler, Kammenhuber, Puhvel and other scholars, that the forms *arkutta and *kattan arkuwanzi belong to the paradigm of arku- rather than to arkuwai- (1998: 45-51).

Singer (2002a: 5) follows previous studies of Houwink ten Cate (1969), Lebrun (1980), Sürenhagen (1981) and Melchert (1998) and argues that arkuwar designates Hittite prayer and should be regarded as a juridical term used when a servant justifies himself before his master, when a vassal king argues his case before his suzerain, or when the king presents arguments before the divine judges.

Ünal (2007) lists the grammatical forms of the verb arkuwai-, which he translates as “to plead, to argue, to proclaim, to rejoin, to riposte, to respond, to explain oneself, to exculpate oneself, to make excuses, to offer defence, to make plea (prayer); to speak or sing antiphonally”. For the noun arkuwar he proposes the meanings “plea, prayer, supplication, argument” and for the expression arkuwar ešša- “make a plea” but for arkuwar iya- “to make a petition”. Ünal also translates the noun arkueššar as “response, defence, plea, argument, prayer” (2007: 54-55).

Kloekhorst translates the verb arkuwai- as “to make a plea”, the verbal noun arkuwar as “prayer, plea, excuse” and the noun *arkueššar/arkuešn- as “prayer”. He also provides a brief paragraph on the etymology of these terms (2008: 205-206).

Grammatical Forms

The verb arkuwai- appears in Hittite texts without the particle -za and with a noun in the dative case denoting a person/deity to whom the action of arkuwai- is addressed. The only noted exception occurs in KUB 6.45 iii 33.

The verbal noun arkuwar appears mostly in the nominative/accusative case within the following constructions:

1. -za arkuwar iya- / -za arkuwar ešša- with arkuwar in the accusative case “make arkuwar”
   -za arkuwar iya- with arkuwar in the accusative and another noun in the accusative “make sth. (usually words) into arkuwar”
2. arkuwar dāi- “to present arkuwar”
   arkuwar tiyawar “presentation/presenting arkuwar”
3. arkuešši ḫalziya- “to invoke with arkuwar”
4. arkuwar ḫatrai- “to write arkuwar”
5. arkuwar ištamaš- “to hear/listen to arkuwar”
6. arkuwar šak- “to know arkuwar”
7. arkuwar uda- “to bring arkuwar”

For the oblique cases the noun *arkueššar is employed, thus far only attested in KUB 6.45 iii 22, where it appears in the dative/locative case (arkuešni).

A. Well or relatively well preserved contexts

arkuai-: 1.sg.pres. arkuwam[mi] (KUB 14.14 obv. 6); 1.sg.pret. arkuwanun (KUB 6.45 iii 35 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iv 3; KBo 4.8 iii 22’); 3sg.pret. arkuwait (KBo 11.1 obv. 18, 32, rev. 4’(2x)); 1.sg.pres.iter. arkuešši (KUB 14.8 rev. 37’ and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iv 2’, arkuešši (KUB 6.45 iii 19), arkuešši (KUB 6.46 iii 59), arkuešši (KUB 6.45 iii 33); 2.sg.pres.iter. arkuišši (KBo 18.24 i 12). -za arkuwar iya: 1.sg.pres. arkuwar iyami/DÜ-mi (KUB 6.45 i 22-23 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 23; KUB 6.45 i 25, 27-28, 30 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 26, 28, 31; KUB 6.45 iii 38, 42 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iv 7, 11-12; KBo 11.1 obv. 11?, 12; KUB 54.1 ii 18); 3sg.pres. arkuwar iyazi/DÜ-zi (KBo 13.161 iii 1, 5, 10, 14; KBo 3.3 iv 10’ and the duplicate KUB 19.44 line 10’; KUB 14.8 line 114’ (rev. 24’); KUB 6.45 + KBo 57.18 i 3 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 3; KUB 6.45 iv 45-47 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 ii 1, iv 46-47; KBo 1.30 obv. 5’; KUB 24.5 rev. 3 and the duplicate KUB 36.93 rev. 8’; KBo 15.7 line 14’; KUB 16.78 iii 10’; KUB 16.72 line 9’, 25’; KUB 22.39 iii’ 8’; KUB 55.66 iv 3’; KUB 57.37 obv. 4’; KUB 58.41 obv. 7’ ii 9’; KUB 44.50 i’ 16’; KBo 41.210 line 6’); 1.sg.pret. arkuwar iyanun (KUB 54.1 i 34, ii 16; KUB 36.87 iv 10’; KUB 21.27 ii 13, rev. 20’, 34’); 3sg.pret. arkuwar iyat (KUB 14.14 colophon; KUB 21.19 i 15; KBo 32.202 rev. 9’); 2.sg.imp. arkuwar iya/DÜ-ia (KBo 5.9 iii 4 and the duplicate KBo 50.25 line 1’); 1.sg.pres.iter. arkuwar eššaḫḫi (KUB 14.14 obv. 6-7; KUB 21.27 iv 46’; KUB 14.8 rev. 20’ and the duplicate KUB 14.11 iii 45’; KBo 11.1 obv. 18; HKM 52 obv. 9); 3.sg.pres.iter. arkuwar eššai (KUB 24.1 i 21); 1.sg.pres.iter. arkuwar eššaḫḫun (KUB 54.1 i 13, 20; KUB 14.10 i 23-24 and KUB 14.11 i 17’); 3.sg.pres.iter. arkuwar eššēšta (KUB 15.1 ii 45-51; KUB 15.19 obv. 12’). arkuwar dāii-: 3.sg.pret.act. arkuwar dāēš (KUB 6.54 iv 53 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iv 51); arkuwar tiyawar (VBoT 121: 10’); KUB 6.45 iv 48 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iv 47-48); arkuwar tiyawaš (KUB 6.45 i 34 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 35, 37; KUB 22.57 obv. 14-15; KBo 11.1 iv 24’; 354/z: 8’); arkuwar tiyauwanzi (KUB 15.22: 3’; KUB 36.92: 4’). arkuešni ḫalziya- dat/loc.sg.n. (KUB 6.45 iii 22 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 iii 61-62). arkuwar ḫatrai-: 2.sg.imper.

14 The list of attestations is based on Puhvel HED vol. 1, on HW^2 and on the lexical card catalogue of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz.
arkuwar ḫatrāī (HKM 89 = Mšt. 73/78 rev. 26-27). arkuwar ʾištamaš-: 3.sg.pret. arkuwar ʾištamašṭa (KBo 6.1 = KUB 8.53 iv 12); 2pl.pret./imper. arkuwarriʰˡᵃ ʾištamašṭen (KUB 6.45 i 22-23 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 23); 3pl.imper. arkuwar ʾištamašdu (KUB 6.45 i 35-36 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 36-38). arkuwar šak-: 3.sg.pres. arkuwar šakki (KBo 1.30: 7').

arkuwar ištamašta (KBo 6.1 = KUB 8.53 iv 12); 2pl.pret./imper. arkuwarriʰˡᵃ ʾištamašṭen (KUB 6.45 i 22-23 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 23); 3pl.imper. arkuwar ʾištamašdu (KUB 6.45 i 35-36 and the duplicate KUB 6.46 i 36-38). arkuwar šak-: 3.sg.pres. arkuwar šakki (KBo 1.30: 7').

arkuwar ūda-: 3sg.pres. arkuwar ūdai (HKM=Mšt. 75/49 obv. 10-11)

B. Fragmentary contexts

arkuwai-: 3.sg.pret. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12'); 3sg.pres. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12'); 3sg.pret. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12').

arkuwai-: 3.sg.pret. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12'); 3sg.pres. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12'); 3sg.pret. še-er ar-ku-wa-ar-[t] (KUB 50.53: 12').

The expression -za arkuwar iyami was restored in line obv. 8 of this New Hittite letter fragment by Hagenbuchner (1989 vol.2: 48): nu-za A-NA ḪU-[U ... ] / ar-ku-wa-ar i-ia-mi(? ... ) (lines 7-8).

Restoration suggested by Roos 2007: 301.
C. Restored forms

3.sg.prs. arkuwa[izzi] (KUB 5.7 obv. 50'); 1sg.prt. [a]rkwa[n] (KUB 14.13 iv 28); [arkuwanun] (KUB 14.12 rev. 2'); 3.sg.pres.iter. ar[kuar iyazi] (HKM 57 = Mšt. 75/60 obv. 26); 2.sg.pres. arkuwar [daitti] (KUB 14.1 rev. 36)

D. Notes

1. 3.sg.prs. arkuwaizzi is employed in Bo 3786 line 3’ and in KUB 43.57 iv 7. However, in both texts, this form appears due to a scribal error.

Bo 3786 (CTH 678) is a New Hittite fragment of a festival text. Although it is considered a duplicate of KUB 2.15+ (CTH 678.A), it shows a closer affinity to KBo 8.115 (CTH 678.B).17 It is therefore reasonable to assume that Bo 3786 and KBo 8.115 are duplicates, or close parallels, and that both represent shorter versions of KUB 2.15+.

Bo 3786: (1') [LUGAL M]UNUS.LUGAL TUŠ-aš _WIDGET-iš-ta-nu / (2') [a-ku]-wa-an-zi LUGAL-uš kat-ta / (3') [a]r-ku-wa-iz-zi ALAM.ZU / (4') [me]-ma-i ki-i-ta-aš

KBo 8.115: (4') [LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL AL TUŠ-aš IDGET-iš-t[a-nu] / (5') [a-ku-wa-an-zi // (6') [LUGAL-uš kat-ta UŠ-KE-EN / (7') [ALAM.ZU me-ma-i


The sitting king (and) the queen drink to/for Izzistanu. The king bows down. (KUB 2.15: The lamentation priests from Kaneš sing, (and) play (a musical instrument)). The performer speaks, (KUB 2.15: the crier cries), the kita-man calls out.

Because the verb aruwai-/ŠUKÊNU- “to bow/prostrate oneself” is employed after LUGAL-uš katta in KUB 2.15+ and KBo 8.115, probably the same verb must have been intended in line 3’ of Bo 3786 and arkuwaizzi must be regarded here as a scribal error (see already Otten-Rüster 1967: 61-62 and Yoshida 1995: 242 n.152)

---

17 Both fragments (Bo 3786 and KBo 8.115) omit the entire paragraph that is present in KUB 2.15: LU.MES.GALA Kani-iš SIR-RU wa-al-ḫa-an-zi-iš-ša-an as well as the sentence LUP pal-wa-tal-la-aš pal-wa-a-iz-zi.
According to Puhvel HED vol. 1: 148 and Kloekhorst (2008: 205), the verbal form arku[wa]izzi appears in line 7 of a Middle Hittite/New Script ritual of Ḥantitaššu from the City of Ḫurma (KUB 43.57 = CTH 395.C)


The ritual practitioner (lit. lord of word/s) says as follows: “As soon as /When on the ninth day, you (the king) have placed the conjured (CHD L-N p.360 5.1’.b) /slaughtered (Ünal 1996: 31 and 75-76) things of the living around yourself, let all the gods call to you.” The ritual practitioner bows (aruwaizzi) to the king and he leaves (lit. comes forth). The ninth day comes to the end.

Since the duplicate text KBo 11.14 (CTH 395.A) employs the verb aruwa- “to bow” in the same sentence: ud-da-a-na-aš / EN-aš [LUGAL-i ar-ra]-wa-i-zi-be (line iv 10′), it is reasonable to assume that the same verb should also appear in KUB 43.57. The form aruwaizzi must be a scribal error (see already Kammenhuber HW: 311 II d).

2. 3sg.pret.act. kattan arkutta and 3pl.pres. kattan arkuwanzi are listed under arkuwai-in Friedrich HW: 31; Kammenhuber HW: 309 and Puhvel HED vol. 1: 148. For assigning these forms to the verb arku- “chant, intone” rather than arkuwai- see Melchert (1998: 47-50). 3.pl.prs. iter. kattan arkuiškanzi is probably also a grammatical form of arku- rather than arkuwai- (KUB 17.9 i 19′; KUB 36.12 + KBo 26.64 ii 4/12).

Discussion

The verb arkuwai- and the verbal noun arkuwar show a wide range of meanings from “respond” to “pray”. While, the noun arkuwar is attested in Old, Middle and New Hittite texts, the verb arkuwai- is found only in texts dated to the Middle and New Hittite periods.

In the Old Hittite Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite lexical list (KBo 1.30 = I.E.3) the noun arkuwar is employed in the two constructions -za arkuwar iya- and -za arkuwar

---

\[18\] See Ünal 1996: 82.
\[19\] The following discussion of the relevant attestations is structured diachronically.
\[20\] Friedrich-Kammenhuber derive the verb arkuwai- from PIE *'erh* - “praise, sing”. Laroche (1964), Lebrun (1980), Puhvel (1984), Melchert (1998), Singer (2002) and Kloekhorst (2008), among others, opt for a PIE root (*argu ye/o) that gave rise to Latin *arguere* and whose basic meaning is “to present arguments.” Tischler (HEG vol. 1: 60-61) cites both etymologies; Oettinger (1979: 369) leaves the question open.
šak(k)- as a translation of Akkadian têrtam īrtam. The relationship between the Hittite and Akkadian sentences that contain above phrases is problematic. According to Laroche (1964: 16), the Akkadian sentence has military implications and can be translated as “celui qui (au combat) ne fait/sait pas la poitrine tournée” in the general meaning “qui n’a pas de défense, qui ne fait pas front, ne va pas à la rencontre.” With regard to the Hittite sentence, he translates it as “celui qui dans une chose ne fait/ne sait pas d’excuse/de défense”, rightly observing that it does not carry any military connotations and that Hittite uddani does not correspond to Akkadian īrtum. The translation of the Hittite sentence offered by the authors of Chicago Hittite Dictionary (volume Š: 22-23) as “he who does not know an (oracular) answer to the matter/word” is also unsatisfactory in the present context as it does not reflect the Akkadian phrase. One possible interpretation of the Akkadian sentence is based on the assumption that īrtum is a form of *īru (‘īr), a verbal adjective of (w)āru(m) (root w’r), meaning “to go, to confront.” 21 If that hypothesis is correct, the Akkadian sentence would probably translate as “who does not have/does not recognize a confronting message” (for a different, but semantically problematic interpretation, see CAD T 367). Such sentences could be understood in Hittite as “he who does not respond to the word/matter” and “he who does not know the answer to the matter/word.”

While the translation of the phrase -za arkuwar iya- as “to respond” is only assumed in the Old Hittite trilingual lexical list, it is assured by the context and by the use of the preverb appa in three Middle Hittite texts, namely two Maşat Letters (HKM 52 = I.E.1, HKM 64 = I.E.5) and a letter of an unknown Hittite dignitary (KBo 32.202 = I.E.2). On one occasion the preverb appa is missing from the text; however, the context secures the meaning “response” for the noun arkuwar. In a Maşat letter (HKM 89 = I.E.6) the sender asks the recipient to write him an arkuwar (i.e. “response”) regarding the actions of a certain Luparrui.

In two noteworthy Middle Hittite examples, an arkuwar involves self-justification or explanation. First, in his letter to Piyama-Tarḫunta (HKM 63 = I.F.3), Ḫimmuiili complains that he has not received any arkuwar or “answer-explanation” with regard to the matter about which he has been inquiring. Second, a passage appearing in KUB 14.1, a texts commonly referred to as “Indictment of Madduwatta” (KUB 14.1 = I.F.2), mentions that Madduwatta has occupied cities and has been accepting the refugees whom

21 On analogy to the verb wiāšum, ľu “to be(come) little” and its verbal noun ľus “little.” The relationship between the adjective *īru and the adjective īru attested in Mesopotamian lexical lists (see CAD I-J 188b) remains unclear.
he is not supposed to welcome in his territory. Since both activities are outside his authority, the Hittite kings have been writing to him. Madduwatta, as a subordinate to the Hittite kings, would have to account for his actions. Unwilling to do that, he ignores the Hittite royal letters and does not respond (appa arkuwar dai-) to the queries of the Hittite kings.

The noun *arkuwar* can, in some contexts also mean “petition”; this meaning can be ascertained for at least one Middle Hittite Mašat letter (HKM 57 = I.D.b.4). The text deals with a legal case against Ḫimmuili and Tarḫumuwa, two men of Ḫaššarpanda, who are charged with stealing a woman belonging to Kašanda, a slave of a “son of a priest.” Two men who bring the case to the court of law, namely Ilali and Kašilti, mediate in this matter, because the owner of the slave is reluctant to make *arkuwar* or “petition” in support of his slave.

The verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* continue to be used in the sense “to respond”, “to explain; to justify oneself” (a prayer of Muršili II containing the king’s exculpation for the deposition of Tawannanna, KBo 4.8 = I.F.1, discussed in chapter three), “to petition”, and less formal “to request” in the New Hittite period.

The meaning “to respond” is found in KUB 5.7 (I.E.4), a text that deals with “something unfavourable” that has been established with regard to the temple in the town of Kizmara. The questions are posed to the Temple-men regarding the nature of the ‘unfavourable’ deed and the answers are given. In the passage where a grammatical form of the verb *arkuwai-* appears, most likely the third singular present *arkuwaiizzi*, questions are asked of the gods Ziparwa, Ḫalki and GîR and again the answer(s) is/are given by a deity, which is expressed by the verb *arkuwai-*.

The noun *arkuwar* carries the meaning “petition” in three New Hittite texts: in the letter of Manapa-Tarḫunta to a Hittite king (KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79 = I.D.b.2); in a treaty of Muršili II with Tuppi-Tešub (KBo 5.9 = I.D.b.1) and in a text commonly referred to as the “Tawagalawa Letter” (KUB 14.3 = I.D.b.3).

The first text is about the abduction of two groups of *ŠARIPŪTU*-men or “purple-dyers” by Piyamaradu. One group belonged to Manapa-Tarḫunta, the king of the Seṭa River Land, and the other to the Hittite king. After their abduction, the “purple-dyers”, led by a man whose name ends in -ḫuḫa, appealed to Atpa, Piyamaradu’s son-in-law. In their petition, which is introduced and finished with the expression -za arkuwar iya-, the “purple-dyers” state their profession and “mission”, namely the preparation or a

---

22 For the discussion of this form see appendix 1, texts I.E.4.
presentation of the purple-dyed textiles(?) in Lazpa. They also maintain that it was a certain Šiggauna who sinned; they were not involved in this matter (whatever that might refer to) and therefore they should be released.

One clause in a treaty between Muršili II and Tuppi-Tešub describes a plausible situation in which the latter receives an order from the Hittite king that for some reason he cannot carry out. In that case Tuppi-Tešub is advised to make arkuwar in which he would have to explain why he cannot fulfil the royal orders. In this context the main focus of arkuwar is a formal request to be excused from an obligation.

The “Tawagalawa Letter” deals with one part of the affair of Piyamaradu, an Arzawan prince, who found asylum in the kingdom of Aḫḫiyawa and who, with the support of the king of Aḫḫiyawa, had been raiding Hittite territory in Western Anatolia. To solve the “Piyamaradu problem” the Hittite king proposes three alternatives: a) to persuade Piyamaradu to submit once more to Hittite sovereignty b) to provide him with a safe haven in Aḫḫiyawa on the understanding that he will not engage any more in any anti-Hittite activities, or c) to compel him to move to another country, taking his family with him. The passage in which the expression -za arkuwar iya- is employed is concerned with the first alternative. Piyamaradu would have to appear before the Hittite king in order to negotiate a settlement with the assurance that if it is not reached, he will be sent back to Aḫḫiyawa unharmed. The negotiation of a settlement is expressed here with the noun arkuwar and would probably involve the presenting of arguments by Piyamaradu.

The noun arkuwar in the meaning “request”, which is closely related to “petition” but slightly less formal, is employed in two fragmentary ritual texts composed during the New Hittite period. In a substitute ritual for a Hittite king (KBo 15.7 = I.D.a.1), the king addresses a deportee who is acting as a king’s substitute. In this passage it is not credible that the former would justify himself, nor would he be giving an answer since the king initiates the speech. Consequently, the translation of arkuwar as “request,” the meaning first proposed for this noun by Friedrich-Kammenhuber, fits the context very well. Alternatively, since the deportee acts as the king’s substitute and wears the king’s impure attire, the meaning of -za arkuwar iya- as “to beg, earnestly entreat” could also fit the present context. In another ritual (KBo 13.161 = I.D.a.2), a “sacrificer” (EN SISKUR) is presenting the Stormgod with gifts, which are then asked back by the “sacrificer” with the promise that they will be available to the god. The only meaning of the expression -za arkuwar iya- that makes sense in this context is “to request.”

Kümmel assumes that calling a deportee “my lord” presupposes some sort of dressing up of a deportee as lord/king (Kummel 1967: 42).
In New Hittite texts the verb arkuwai- also acquires juridical overtones and, in some contexts, carries the meaning “to plead” in the general sense “to present a case/plea.” The most significant examples in profane contexts are found in a treaty between Muršili II and Tuppi-Teššub (KBo 3.3 = I.A.1) and in a letter of a Hittite king to Shalmaneser (KBo 18.24 = I.A.2).

In the first text, Tuppi-Teššub complains that the King of Karkamiš, Tudḫaliya and Ḥalpaḫi have gained control of captives that have fled Amurru and he demands that the captives be returned to him. The document is directed against the three individuals, who, along with their accuser, are to appear before Muršili II to lay the matter to rest by sealing the agreement. As pointed out by Melchert (1998: 46), the translation of the expression -za arkuwar iya- as “to justify oneself,” suggested here by Laroche, does not fit the present context; arkuwar refers here equally to the presentations of arguments by each party (kuiš); at least one of whom, namely Tuppi-Teššub, is not guilty. Consequently, the meaning of the expression arkuwar iya- is “to plead” in the general sense “to make a case,” “to present arguments.”

In the second text the verb arkuwai- has to be read in the context of the previous paragraph:

As for the fact that a legal dispute arose between us, and that we withdrew from the legal dispute - which messages should I be sending you? If I write to you in a friendly way, you call it ‘ingratating (myself)’; whereas if I write to you about (our) legal dispute you keep cursing me.

Because of the slightly sarcastic tone of the above passage, it would seem that the verb arkuwai- in obv. 12 refers not as much to the habitual action of praying but rather to Shalmaneser’s alleged endless pleading with the gods in this specific matter - probably an allusion to references to divine justice in Shalmaneser’s own letter. The meaning of arkuwai- is here “to plead” or “to justify oneself” already proposed by the scholars who worked on this text (see Appendix 1 under I.A.2).

By the 14th century B.C.E. the meaning of the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar as “to present a plea/case”, and “plea” had been transplanted into the religious context, where it mainly appears in Hittite royal prayers as well as in ritual and oracle texts.

---

In royal prayers the verb *arkuwai*- and the noun *arkuwar* are used when a supplicant, usually the Hittite king or the Hittite queen, as a servant, addresses his/her divine masters, as dispensers of justice, for the solution to a problem. The supplicant must present arguments to convince the gods that he/she deserves assistance. The beginning of a long composition attributed to king Muwatalli II (KUB 6.45 = I.A.7) and addressed to the entire Hittite pantheon contains a statement of purpose of this type of prayer: “If some matter weighs on a man, he makes a plea to the gods”.


In a fragmentary prayer to the Stormgod of Nerik (KUB 36.87 = I.A.11), if all the restorations are correct, the supplicant acknowledges that the Stormgod is angry with him. The reason of the divine anger was probably communicated to the supplicant by the god (through an oracle) and probably involved some wrong-doing on the paart of the supplicant. The petitioner then declares that he corrected his error(s) and made an *arkuwar*. Had the words of this *arkuwar* been given in this text, they would probably comprise a presentation of arguments that would include a confession of petitioner’s wrong-doing and a promise of penitence.

Also in oracle and ritual texts (KUB 22.39 = I.A.12; KUB 22.57 = I.A.13, KBo 41.210 + I.A.14 and KUB 58.41 = I.A.15) the noun *arkuwar* denotes one element of a process whose sole purpose is to appease an angry deity. In that context *arkuwar* appears together with making sacrifices, performing rituals, offering gifts and reparations and would probably entail a search for the causes of divine anger, promises of penitence and perhaps some arguments to appease the angry deity. In those contexts the translation “to make a plea” in the general sense to “make arguments” would make perfect sense.

During the New Hittite period, the verb *arkuwai*- and the noun *arkuwar* also acquired the general meaning “to pray” and “prayer”, found in prayers whose main subject is a mistreatment of cult centres or a termination of the cult practices caused either by the enemy invasion or by neglect, usually by a previous king. These texts resemble in form reports on the conditions of the state cults, in which supplicant(s) promise amends to the deities whose cult was neglected but does not necessarily present arguments (KUB 6.45 = I.B.a.4.(1)). Another type of prayer that does not entail a presentation of arguments
is that which asks for the general well-being of the supplicant (KUB 24.1+ = I.B.a.3; KUB 6.45 = I.B.a.4.(1),(3),(4)), for intercession on behalf of the supplicant (KUB 6.45 = I.B.a.4.(2)), for removing the plague and an enemy invasion (VBoT 121 + I.B.a.2), for curing an illness (KUB 24.5+ = I.B.a.7) or for accepting a substitute offered during the substitute ritual (KUB 55.66 = I.B.a.8). In all these texts, the supplicant does not reason with the gods, rather he prays or personally entreats the gods.

The meaning “prayer” is also assured for the noun arkuwar in KUB 54.1 (I.B.a.6), which is either a prayer or a legal text (see chapter three pp 113-115); in votive texts (KUB 15.1 = I.B.b.1; KUB 15.19 = I.B.b.2; KUB 15.22 = I.B.a.14) as well as in ritual, festival and oracular texts (KUB 16.72 = I.B.a.11; KUB 16.78 = I.B.a.13; 354/z + = I.B.a.12; KUB 57.37 = I.B.a.9; KUB 44.50 = I.B.a.10; KBo 6.1/KUB 8.53 = I.B.a.1).

The words of arkuwar are preserved partially only in KUB 15.1 and KUB 15.19 (for a discussion of these two texts see under mald-), KUB 54.1, KUB 57.37 and KBo 6.1/KUB 8.53.

In KUB 54.1 the author, a certain high-ranking individual named IŠTAR-ziti, requests from the gods that they examine the legal matters for him and complains to or even reproaches the gods for his unjust treatment. Since gods are addressed, arkuwar in these passages can indeed be translated as “prayer”, but the focus of these ‘prayers’ is clearly a complaint. In KUB 57.37 the petitioner asks the gods for benediction, in KBo 6.1/KUB 8.53 Gilgamesh appears to present some arguments to the Sungod.

Finally, the verb arkuwai-, as attested in New Hittite texts, also acquired a meaning “to complain”. The one crucial attestation of this usage is Muwatalli II’s prayer to the Stormgod (KBo 11.1 = I.C.1), which consists of a systematic search for the causes of the Stormgod’s anger and the king’s promise to make amends. The author of the text suggests that the Stormgod is angry because a local deity, a mountain, a šinapši sanctuary, a holy pit or an orphan has been mistreated and they arkuwai-ed or “complained” about it to the Stormgod.

2.2.2. (-za) mald-, mammalt-, malduwar, malteššar, mielteššar, malteš(ša)nala-

Previous Research

Words that share the stem malt-/melt- have been subject of scholarly investigation for nearly a century. Their meaning, orthography, grammatical forms and etymology have been examined and commented upon in various editions of Hittite texts, linguistic studies and in Hittite dictionaries.
The first comment on the verb mald- was offered by Hrozný (1919: 44 n. 1, 45) who observed that this verb is related to the noun malteššar, which denotes a divine answer to a human request, and gave its Old Saxon cognate as meldon meaning “angeben, verraten, ankündigen, melden.”

Three years later Forrer rendered mald- employed in KUB 48.13 as “geloben” (1922: 191). In 1928 Goetze translated the verb as “recite” and the noun malteššar as “hymn” (1928: 63). Based on these translations, Benveniste proposed that the verb mald- is the Hittite reflex of the PIE root *meld- whose basic meaning is “to announce; to pray” (1932: 133-135).

In the first edition of his Glossary, Sturtevant followed Goetze and translated the verb mald- as “to recite”, the noun malteššar as “hymn” and the Akkadogram IKRIBU as “prayer, votive offering” (1931: 43, 26). In the second edition of the Glossary, Sturtevant offered another translation for the verb malt-/malta- and its grammatical forms maldiyale- and malzakela- (1.sg.pres.iter. malžakimi): “to pray (in some certain way)”. He also rendered the noun malteššar as “prayer (of some certain kind)”, the adjective *malteššanalaš that appears in KUB 7.5 i 22 and in KUB 7.8 iii 13, as “invoked by malteššar” and the Akkadogram IKRUB as “he prayed” (1936: 57, 96).

The next comment on this word family was made thirteen years later. In 1949, Laroche noted that the first person singular preterite maldaḫḫun appearing with the particle -za, does not, in the context of one of the votive texts (CTH 585), carry the meaning “to recite.” He observed that the particle -za signals that the action of mald-affects directly the person who is performing it. He further noted that this verb designates the type of prayer in which the queen promises offerings in exchange for certain benefits from the deity, hence he translated the verb in that text as “j’ai fait ce voeu” (1949: 66-67).

Next to comment on mald- was Kronasser who translated the verb as “geloben” and drew attention to Lithuanian meldžiū as a cognate of the form maliyya (1956). In 1962-1966 Kronasser published Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache in which he further commented on the words built on the stem malt-. In volume 1 (1962) he noted that the adjective maltešš(a)nala- meaning “durch Gelübde angerufen” is an r/n- stem derivative from the noun malteššar “Gelübde” (172). In vol. 5 (1966) he translated the verb malt(a)- as “beten” and observed that in some texts the verb is followed by the actual words of a prayer (IBoT 1.30, KUB 17.28). In the same volume, Kronasser noted that the consonantal stem of this verb is seen in its iterative form malzakimi.
In the main volume of *Hethitische Wörterbuch* (1952-54: 134) Friedrich translated the verb *mald-* and its iterative *malzak-* as “geloben” and the noun *malteššar* as “Gelübde; Spende an die Gottheit”, noting that *malteššar* is often represented in Hittite texts by the Akkadogram *IKRIBU*. He also rendered the adjective *maltešš(na)šar-* (*maltešnala-*) as “durch ein Gelübde angerufen” referring for this translation to Sturtevant’s *Glossary* (1936). In his third supplement to the dictionary (1964), Friedrich, influenced by Laroche’s study on Hittite prayer terminology, translated the verb *mald-* appearing without the particle *-za* as “feierlich erklären”, with the particle *-za* as “sich feierlich verpflichten, geloben” and the noun *malteššar* as “feierliche Erklärung, Gelübde” as well as “Opferspende.”

Laroche (1964-65: 8-13) distinguished two constructions in which the verb *mald-* appears. In the first the verb occurs without the particle *-za* and can be regarded as *verbum dicendi* carrying the meaning “to recite, to announce/proclaim publicly, to affirm solemnly” and alternating with the verbs *memai-* and *te-* “to say/speak”. In the second construction the verb *mald-* appears with the particle *-za* and acquires a specific, almost technical meaning, “s’engager par une declaration solennelle” and “vouer pour sa part, dans son propre intérêt, sous sa responsabilité personnelle”. In this second construction the third singular preterit *-za maldi* is equivalent to Akkadian *ikrub*, and the noun *malteššar* to Akkadian *ikribu*. Laroche also argued that since the noun *malteššar* is occasionally represented in Hittite texts by the Akkadogram *IKRIBU*, and *IKRIBU* does not carry the meaning “hymn”, Goetze’s translation of the noun *malteššar* as “hymn” (1927: 63) is inaccurate (1964-65: 9).

Five years later, Benveniste gave the form of the verb as *maltai-* and proposed that it reflects the PIE word for prayer. He then translated the verb as “to recite the invocations; to pray” and the verbal noun *malduwar* as “prayer, invocation.” He also gave the Indo-European cognates of this verb and noun, attested almost exclusively in the Balto-Slavic branch of the Indo-European languages, as Lithuanian *meldžiū*, *melsči* “to pray” and the noun *meldà* “prayer”; Old Church Slavonic *moljo* and the middle form *moliti* (sę); Polish *modlić się* “to pray”; Czech *modal* “idol; temple”. Benveniste added to these forms the Germanic *melden* “say, announce” and suggested that all of them, including Hittite *maltai-* and *malduwar*, are derived from the PIE root *meld-yō* (1969: 246-247).

While most scholars examined the meaning and etymology of the verb *mald-* and its derivatives, Neu commented on the orthography of this verb. He noted that, in the Old Hittite manuscript of the text commonly referred to as “Anitta’s Proclamation” (KBo
3.22), the first person singular preterite is spelled *ma-a-al-ta-ḫu-un* and in the New Hittite copy of this text (KUB 26.71) *ma-al-da-aḫ-ḫu-un*. The latter spelling is also found in other New Hittite texts, namely KUB 15.17+ and Bo 5956. Neu also observed that the third person singular present form *maldi* is written as *ma-a-al-di*, *ma-al-di* or *ma-al-ti* already in the Old Hittite texts; that the first person singular present form is written in Hittite texts as either *ma-al-da-aḫ-ḫi* or *ma-al-ta-aḫ-ḫi*; that the spelling of the infinitive *ma-al-tu-u-an-zí* is attested already in the 13th century text; and that the third person singular preterite is written as *ma-al-ta-aš* (1974: 44-45).

Next to comment on the verb *mald*- was Oettinger, who translates the verb as “aufsagen, geloben” and notes that this verb belongs to the II 1 b inflectional group. He also gives the grammatical forms of *maldi*, found in the Old Hittite texts, as *maldí/málí* (third person singular present) and *maldaḫḫun* (first singular preterite); he notes that the *ske*- form *malzak*- is first attested in the 14th century and that *mald*- “recite” is a terminus technicus in festival texts. Oettinger further assumes that the verb *mald*- is derived either from the iterative *moldʰ-éye-ti* or from the perfect of the PIE root *moldʰ* (1979: 443-444).

Lebrun lists the main texts which employ either the verb *mald*- or the nouns *malduwar/malteššar* and comments on the meaning that these terms assume in those texts. For instance in the “Proclamation of Anitta” (KBo 3.22), Lebrun translates the verb *mald*- as “vouer officiellement”; in IBoT 1.30, which includes a passage describing Hittite kingship, Lebrun renders the verb as “proclamer officiellement” and finally, in a group of texts that contain Hattic-Hittite invocations of the Hattic deities (CTH 733), Lebrun observes that *malteššar* and *mald*- are used to introduce short prayers. He further argues that *malteššar* also refers to Hattic chants/hymns/psalms that are inserted in the texts of some festival, for instance in KUB 28.74 (CTH 744.4), IBoT 2.44 (CTH 744); KUB 28.89 (CTH 678). Another meaning of the verb *mald*- and the nouns *malteššar* and *malduwar* discussed by Lebrun is “to vow”, “vow” which is mainly found in the group of texts that are assigned numbers 583-590 in Laroche’s Catalogue and that comprise vows of the king and the queen as well as dreams of the Hittite dignitaries. Lebrun suggests that the *malteššar*, “votive prayer”, shows how, in the Hittite religious thought, a human and a deity benefit equally from their relationship: a supplicant promises to offer a gift and that promise becomes a condition/guarantee that a deity will grant supplicant’s wish (1980: 443-449).

In a commentary to his edition of two prayers of Ḥattušili and Puduḫépa, Sürenhagen argues that *malduwar* is a Hittite designation for a vow. This vow exhibits a
rigid structure, namely a conditional clause that also contains a request and the main clause which comprises a promise of gifts or worship made to a deity. According to Sürenhagen, *malduwar* had a typically mercantile character with regard to the form and content, which implies that vows were not understood as literary texts. Rather, *malduwar* resembles a ritual and as such is closely related to the Babylonian *ikribu* which he translated as “temple donation”. However, unlike Babylonian *ikribu*, Hittite *malduwar* has not developed into a prayer type (1981: 143-144).

A year later, in his *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis*, Tischler translates the verb *mald-* and its grammatical forms *maltuwanzi* (infinitive) and *malzak-* (iterative) as “aufsagen, geloben”, the noun *malteššar* as “Gelübde; Opferspende”; the adjectives *maltalli-* and *malteššanala-* as “zum Gelübde gehörig” and “durch ein Gelübde angerufen” (1982: 50).

In the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, Güterbock and Hoffner translate the verb *mald-* as “to recite, make a recitation” and as “to make a vow, to vow (something)” when the verb appears with the particle -za. Searching for an area of common meaning for the various usages of this verb, they observe that *mald-* is occasionally used with the adverb *duddumili* “quietly, silently, secretly,” therefore, they conclude that the recitation of *malteššar* was not necessarily heard by a human audience. Consequently, Laroche’s suggestion that the common meaning for the verb *mald-* is to be sought in a solemn, public declaration or pronouncement cannot be maintained. Both authors also observe that the recitations quoted in Hittite often contain imperatives and therefore should be regarded as requests. Also a vow, according to the authors of the dictionary, is a promise in return for a requested benefit, hence a kind of contractual request (1983: 132-135).

Güterbock and Hoffner translate the noun *malteššar* as “recitation, hymn(?), prayer(?); vow, votive offering (represented also by the Akkadogram *IKRIBU*); ritual” and briefly discuss the relationship of this noun with the logogram *SISKUR*. They note that in a prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal, in which the noun *malteššar* is written with the Sumerogram *SISKUR*, *malteššar* should be translated as “ritual/offering performed in fulfilment of a vow” (1983: 136-137).

Güterbock and Hoffner then render the adjectives *maltalli-* and *malteššanala-* as “obliged to make a *malteššar*” and as “recipient of *malteššar* (chants, vows, votive offerings).” With regard to the adjective *maltalli-* they note that it seems to be derived from the verb *mald-* to which they added another meaning “to treat (a deity) with a ritual.” They briefly discuss the meaning of this adjective in the context of KBo 8.68, a very fragmentary text, in which this adjective is used attributively with the Sumerogram
UN “person”. They conclude that the *maltalli*-man must be someone obliged to make a *maltesššar* offering (135).

Finally, in 1986 Güterbock and Hoffner translate a noun showing the stem *melt-*, namely *melteššar*, employed twice in Meskene 74.57, as “votive offering” (1986: 253).

In volume six of *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* Tischler translates the verbs *mald-/malda*- as “rezitieren, geloben” and *mammalt*- in KUB 30.68 as “rezitieren.” He observes that there are no Anatolian cognates of the verb *mald- except perhaps Lydian *mìatalad “Versprechen”* for which form he refers to Gusmania’s *Lydian Wörterbuch Ergänzungsband*: 75. Tischler also gives an overview of various theories regarding the etymology of the verb *mald-/malda-* and translates the verbal noun *malduwar* as “Versprechen” and the noun *malteššar* as “Rezitation, Gebet; Gelübde; Ritual.” In the same dictionary, Tischler maintains the translation of the adjective *malteš(ša)nala- which he offered in 1982 and comments on the adjective *maltalli- “durch Gelübde zum Opfer verpflichtet(?)” appearing only in a Kizzuwatna ritual (KBo 8.68), which describes religious activities of the *maltališ UN-aš or maltališ-man* (1990: 109-112). In 2001, in *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*, Tischler offers the same translations for the verb *mald-/malda- (adding only the meaning “opfern”), for the nouns *malduwar and malteššar, and for the adjectives malteš(ša)nala- and maltalli- (2001: 98).

Gamkrelidze and Ivanov derive the Hittite verb *maldai- from the PIE root *meldʰ-, meaning “to pray offering sacrifice; to offer prayerful words to gods”. They translate the Hittite verb as “to pray, to promise solemnly to the gods to offer a sacrifice” and gave its Indo-European cognates as Armenian *malt’em “I pray”, Lithuanian meldžiū “I pray”, Old Church Slavonic moliti “pray”, Old Russian molit “pray while making a sacrifice”, Old High German meldōn “communicate, report” (Ger. melden) and Old English meld “acquaintance” (1995: 703-704).

In 2004, Justus argued that the Hittite verb *mald- reflects the non-sacral PIE root *meldʰ- meaning “to announce, to inform”. Over time, the root would have acquired the connotation “to pray” in Hittite, Armenian (*malt’em “to pray”), Old Church Slavonic (*moliti “to pray”) and Lithuanian (*meldžiu “I pray”). Justus considered Hittite *malduwar* as a designation of a prayer type which is based on the *do-ut-des* principle: first a deity grants a request whereupon the supplicant will give promised gifts or worship (2004: 270, 272-274, 275, 280).

In volume six of his *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* Puhvel translates the verb *malt(a)- as “to utter, to pronounce, to declaim, to recite” as well as “to commit oneself (to), to vow, to make vow(s)” and “to treat to commitment, to engage with vow(s) (in
expectation of divine reciprocity)” when this verb appears with the particle -za. He notes that when malt(a)- is employed in the latter sense, it is occasionally represented in Hittite texts by the Akkadogram KARĀBU “to pray, consecrate”.

Puhvel translates the noun malteššar as “declamation, prayer, ritual (utterance)” and observes that it is occasionally written with the Sumerogram SISKUR. However, if the same noun carries the meaning “vow(s), votive offering(s)”, it is written with the Akkadogram IKRIBU.

Puhvel translates the verb mammalt-, which shows the reduplicated root malt-, as “declaim repeatedly” and the adjective malteš(ša)nala-, attested in KUB 7.8+ KUB 7.5, the ritual against the impotence, as “votive (beneficiary)”. He then comments on the etymology of this word family noting that the noun melteššar points to the PIE root *meldh-, while the verb malt- reflects *moldh-, a perfect stem. He gives the Indo-European cognates of the verb malt- attested only in Balto-Slavic, Germanic and Anatolian languages (Hittite malt- and Lydian mλatalad “vow”(?)) and concludes that the verb malt- reflects a Baltic-Germanic-Anatolian isogloss (HED vol. 6: 31, 34, 36).

Rose translates the verb mald- employed in prayers and rituals as “to recite, to pray (use words magically), to vow (something)”, noting that the latter meaning is attested in the post-Old Hittite periods and only when the verb appears with either the particle -za or the dative singular personal pronoun -ši. In that observation she follows CHD. Rose further notes that although the verb is occasionally used with the adverb duddumili “quiet, silently, secretly”, it was probably also used to denote a public religious utterance for the benefit of the entire community. Rose also gives a brief overview of the main theories regarding the etymology of the verb mald- as either mêldh- (e-grade root) or móldh- (o-grade root) and discusses selected attestations of this verb (2006: 319-321).

A year later, de Roos’ Votive Texts appeared in print. It is divided in two parts. In part one (pp. 3-70) de Roos defines a typical vow and lists the main elements of the most complete vows. In part two (pp. 71-129) he offers the transliteration and translation of Hittite votive texts. In part one de Roos also comments on various aspects of votive texts such as: fulfilment or negligence to fulfil the vows; the relationship between gods and humans; the locations where the dreams or vows occur; the gods invoked and the purpose of their invocation; the dating of the votive texts; the objects promised in the vows; vows in the other parts of the ancient Near East and finally the persons mentioned in the votive texts. A major section of de Roos’ work is dedicated to a discussion of the meaning of malteššar. He proposes that the meaning of this noun shifted from Old and Middle Hittite
“offering”, “ritual” to New Hittite “vow”. According to de Roos, the noun malteššar acquired the meaning “vow” only during the reign of Ḫattušili.

In Multilingual Hittite Dictionary Ünal translates the verb mald- as “to recite, to make recitation, to make a vow, to vow” and the noun malteššar as “recitation, prayer, hymn; vow, votive offering; ritual”. He also gives the Akkadian and Sumerian equivalents of the noun malteššar- as IKRIBU and SISKUR (the latter with a question mark) and translates the phrase maltešnaš išḫaš as “the ritual’s master” without, however, giving the reference to the text in which this phrase appears (2007:421-422).

Kloekhorst translates the verb mald- as “to recite, to make a vow” and its derivatives: mammalt- as “to recite”; malteššar/malteš- as “recitation, vow, votive offering, ritual” (also written as an Akkadogram IKRIBU); malteš(ša)nal- as “recipient of malteššar”; mielteššar/mieltešn- as “votive offering” and maltalli- (adj.) as “obliged to make a malteššar”. He gives as Indo-European cognates of this verb an Armenian malt’em “to pray”; Old Saxon meldon “to tell”, Lithuanian maldà “prayer”, meldžiū “to pray” and Old Church Slavonic moliti ‘to ask, to pray” and suggests that the PIE root of this verb was *móldh-ei/*mldh-énti. Kloekhorst also comments on the inflection of the verb and notes that if the noun melteššar, attested only twice in the New Hittite text (Meskene 74/57), is a real form it shows an e-grade stem *meldh- which stands in contrast to the o-grade *móldh-ei in strong forms like maldi, and to the zero grade in weak stem forms maltant- < *mldh-énti.

Attested Grammatical Forms

As noted by various scholars, the verb mald- appears in two constructions: (i) without the particle -za and (ii) with the particle -za or with the dative singular personal pronoun -š (after the Old Hittite period). In the first construction the verb carries the meaning “to recite, to offer” and occasionally alternates with the verb memai- “to say/speak”; in the second construction the verb means “to make a vow, to vow (sth.)” and is often written akkadographically with the forms of KARĀBU. When the noun malteššar carries the meaning “ritual, offering,” it is sometimes written with the Sumerogram SISKUR.

A. Well or relatively well preserved contexts

mald-: 3.sg.pres. mālti (KUB 30.42 iv 10; KBo 19.132 rev.7 12’; KBo 21.80 + KBo 20.44 i 17’), māldi (KBo 20.71 + KBo 20.76 + KBo 23.99 i 20; KBo 30.31 + KBo 25.51: 23’;
KUB 28.75 iii 24’ with QATAMMA; KUB 28.77 i 3 with kišan; KBo 8.133: 11’; KUB 25.120: 10’ with QATAMMA; KBo 25.112 + ii 15’), m[a-a-al-di ...] (KUB 28.75 ii 24’); malti (KUB 41.44 vi 8; KUB 25.36 v 10-11, 17, 23-24, 29 with ṣatili; KUB 11.45 iii 15’, 18’-19’ with ṣatili; KUB 20.10 i 12, ii 9; KUB 17.28 iii 7; KUB 25.37 iii 8’); maldi (KBo 11.30 rev.13’); KUB 25.17 vi 8; IBoT 2.101 v 14’; KUB 48.9 ii 15 with kiššan; KUB 56.44: 4’ and restored in line 1’; VSNF 12.12 i 8; KUB 34.115 + KBo 30.28 iii 8’, 11’; KUB 58.33 iv 21’; KBo 21.84 iv 1; KUB 1.14 ii 14; KUB 28.74 ii 4’; IBoT 1.30 obv. 1; Bo 68/525: 7’), [ma-a]l-di (KUB 28.96: 18’), ma-al-[di] (KUB 25.17 vi 8; IBoT 2.101 v 14’; KUB 31.52 iv 3 and KUB 31.54 iv 15’); maldai (KBo 9.115 ii 2); 1.sg. pret. malda (KUB 28.80 iv 8’); 3.sg. pret. maldakanta (KUB 30.68 iii 9); maldakanta (KUB 31.52 iv 15’); KUB 25.81 ii 12; KUB 25.38 v 20, 24, 32 and restored in v 11); malteššar: nom.-acc.sg.neut. malteššar (KUB 31.51 obv. 6; KUB 27.1 i 11, 26, 31, 33; KBo 22.242 + KBo 52.225b ii 7), mieleššar (Meskene 74/57: 50); gen.sg.neut. maltešnaš (KUB 30.68 iii 4, 6; KBo 51.17: 5’; KUB 22.70 obv. 22; KUB 44.12 ii 8’); abl.sg. mielešnaza (Meskene 74/57: 50); acc.pl.neut. mal[teš]šar (KUB 28.80 iv 8’); gen.pl.neut. maltešnaš (KUB 28.80 iv 1’); dat.pl.neut. maltešn[aš], m[altešnaš] (KUB 8.41 ii 13’, 17’), maltešnaš (KUB 31.143 ii 17; VBoT 124 + KUB 31.143a ii 17’; KUB 28.80 iv 10’), malt[ešnaš] (KUB 31.143 ii 23); malteš[n]aš (VBoT 124 + KUB 31.143a ii 12’); abl.pl.neut. maltešnaš (KUB 5.24 ii 2); mammalt-: 3.pl.pres.mid.iter. mammalzika (KUB 30.68 iii 9); malteš[ša]nal-a: acc.sg.c. maltiešnašalan (KUB 7.8 iii 13’), miltiešnanalan (KUB 7.5 i 22).

KARĀBU: 1.sg.pret. AKRUB (KBo 15.33 iii 21); 3.sg. pret. IKRUB (KBo 16.98 i 4; KBo 44.210 obv. 19’; KUB 15.3 i 5 with kišan; KUB 15.11 + KBo 60.99 ii 5; KUB 15.1 i 4 with kiššan, ii 2 with kišan, ii 10, 12, 41, iii 12’, 17’, 22’ with kišan, restored in iii 28’; KUB 15.23 rev. 18’; KUB 56.31 rev. 8’, 14’ with kišan; KUB 10.11 + i 9’); IKRIBU: nom.sg. IKRIBU (KBo 2.2 iii 33; Meskene 74/57: 37, 45); acc.sg. IKRIBU (KBo 44.210 obv.8’; 16’); nom.pl. IKRIBI[^1] (KBo 2.2 iii 45, iv 7; KUB 31.52 iv 3 and KUB 31.54 iv 15); acc.pl. IKRIBI[^1] (KUB 14.10 i 24; KUB 22.38 ii 2’); dat.pl. A-NA IKRIBI[^1] (KBo 2.2 ii 11, 15, 31), A-NA IKRIBI[^1]-pat (KUB 6.22 iii 13).
B. Fragmentary context

The verb mald- and the nouns malduwar, malteššar/melteššer have in Hittite context exclusively religious connotations and carry the meanings “to recite; to pray; to vow; to
make an offering (in fulfilment of a vow)” and “recitation; prayer; vow; (votive) offering; ritual.”

The Old and Middle Hittite compositions that employ the verb *mald-* and the noun *malteššar* include “shelf-lists” as well as festival and ritual texts.

“Shelf-lists” record tablets kept in the state archives of Ḫattuša. Each entry in these catalogues includes the author and/or title/incipit of the composition, how many tablets it comprised, the tablet’s form (either an ordinary tablet DUB, or a special tablets called IM.GÍD.DA or “long tablet”), and whether or not all known tablets were found. Two noteworthy examples of shelf-lists include KUB 30.42+ and KUB 30.68++. KUB 30.42+ (II.A.1) is an Old Hittite catalogue of the DUBxKAM type that registers, among others, a tablet of a festival celebrated for the goddess Inara. During this festival, the LÚNAR “singer” libates to the goddess, breaks the offering bread and “recites” (*mald-*) in Hattic. KUB 30.68++ (II.A.2), a catalogue of the DUB UMMA/mān type compiled in the Middle Hittite period, mentions a tablet that contains the *malteššar* of a certain Tatta, the man of the Stormgod, and of Waḫuturai. Both men perform their *malteššars* while the prince worships the gods of Zalpuwa. Their recitations are also referred to by the verb *mammalt-* “to recite (chants)”, a reduplicated form of the stem *mald-*. The words that would be introduced by the verb *mald-* or by the noun *malteššar* are not given in the above texts. Consequently, the meaning of these terms in the shelf-lists remains ambiguous and they are best understood as “to recite” and “recitation.”

The vast majority of the Old and Middle Hittite festival and ritual texts describe religious rites performed by either the king or the prince that usually include libating to deities and breaking offering breads. Although the king or the prince participated in the festivals, the oral rites, denoted by the verb *mald-*, were nearly always performed by Hittite priests. As in the shelf-list, also in most ritual and festival texts the actual words denoted by the verb *mald-* are not cited (KBo 21.80 + KBo 20.44 = II.A.5; IBoT 2.101 = II.A.6.(3); KUB 34.115 + KBo 30.28 = II.A.11; KBo 20.10 = II.A.12; KUB 25.36 = II.A.9.(1); KBo 11.45 = II.A.9.(2); KBo 30.31 + KBo 25.51 = II.A.8), therefore the best rendering of *mald-* in those contexts is the general “to recite.”

A number of Old Hittite texts preserved in the New Hittite script, indicate that king was not always involved in the part of the festival in which the recitations were spoken. The crucial examples include various manuscripts of the text of the “Haste

---

27 After nearly a century of research, a consensus has been reached that the verb *mald-* and the nouns *malduwar, malteššar/melteššer* are Hittite realisations of the PIE root *mVldh-*. It has been proposed that while the noun *melteššer* reflects the e-grade (*meldh-*), the verb *mald-* shows the o-grade or zero grade (*mőldh-/*mldh-*) of this root (Kloekhorst 2008, Puhvel 2004).
festival,” namely KBo 11.30 (II.A.6.(1) and KUB 41.44 (II.A.6.(2)) as well as KUB 25.17 (II.A.6.(4)). In lines rev. 11’-14’ of KBo 11.30 and lines vi 6-10 of KUB 41.44 a huppar-vessel of wine is given to the performer (LÜ ALAM.ZU₉) who then recites what seems to be a “wine-formula” or wine blessing, as is suggested by the Hittite wording ta GEŠTIN mali “he recites wine/about wine.” In lines vi 4-8 of KUB 25.17 the chief of the bodyguards seems to announce that the performers (LÜ.MEŠ ALAM.ZU₉) will receive a huppar-vessel of wine, which is then given to them. Then one of the performers is said to recite. Neither text mentions the presence of the king and neither text incudes the words of recitations.

Several texts include the words denoted by the verb mald-. In one Old Hittite festival text the verb mald- introduces words, which can be best regarded as prayer-request (KUB 41.23 = II.A.4. This text is discussed in section 3.2.2. of chapter three). In a Middle Hittite ritual (KUB 17.28 = II.A.16), the verb introduces request addressed to the table that was earlier placed in front of the Sungod; the ritual client asks the table to intercede on his behalf. While in KUB 41.23 the verb mald- could be rendered by either “to recite” or “to pray”, in KUB 17.28 the verb is best translated as “to recite.”

In the Old Hittite texts grouped under CTH 733 (II.A.17.1-6) the verb mald- and the noun malteššar introduce invocations of Hattic deities. The deities are invoked by two sets of names and epithets, one used ‘among humans’ and the other ‘among gods.’ No requests seem to accompany the invocations. These invocations are spoken at various cultic centers by the GUDU-priest and by the prince (KUB 28.75 = II.A.17.1, KUB 28.77 = II.A.17.2.(1)), only by the prince (KUB 25.120 = II.A.17.2.(3)), by the GUDU-priest and the king (KBo 25.112 = II.A.17.6) or only by the LÜ.NAR “singer” (KUB 8.41 = II.A.17.3, KUB 31.143+ = II.A.17.4, VBoT 124 + KUB 31.143a = II.A.17.5). In KUB 8.41, KUB 31.143 and VBoT 124+ the noun malteššar has been rendered as “prayer” by Laroche (1947: 188) and as a “ritual” by Neu (1983: 114). However, because in VBoT 124+ the noun malteššar is represented by the Akkadogram AWAT “word”, Neu’s translation of malteššar as “ritual” is very unlikely in this context.

The verb mald- continues to be used in the meaning “to recite” in the New Hittite period. As in Old and Middle Hittite texts, also in the New Hittite rituals and festivals the oral rites denoted by the verb mald- are spoken almost exclusively by the members of the Hittite priesthood. As in most Old and Middle Hittite texts, the words that would follow the verb mald- are either missing from the text or are given in Hattic (VsNF 12.12= II.A.10; Bo 68/525 = II.A.13; KBo 8.117 = II.A.14; KUB 58.33 = II..A.15; KBo 19.132 =
II.A.3.(2); KUB 48.9 (II.A.7). Consequently both terms are understood in these texts as “recite” and “recitation.”

A number of texts that have been assigned to CTH 744 (II.A.19.1-3) pertain to festival(s) that include some cultic recitations in Hattic. Only three texts of this group that contain the verb *mald-* are relatively well preserved, namely KBo 21.84 (II.A.19.1), KUB 1.14 with its duplicate KUB 28.96 (II.A.19.2) and KUB 28.74 (II.A.19.3). In KBo 21.84 a GUDU-priest recites (*mald-*) in Hattic; in KUB 1.14, *zilipuriyatalla*-men strike themselves while their overseer recites (*mald-*) in Hattic, and in KUB 28.74 someone libates a *tawal*-drink, a *walḫi*-drink, beer and wine and recites in Hattic. All three texts give the wording of the Hattic recitations.

KUB 28.80 (II.A.18) records a festival celebrated at Nerik. The recitations included in the text (but not introduced by the verb *mald-*) are in Hattic. The colophon, in which the noun *malteššar* appears three times, mentions the fact that during the year in which a war disrupts the regular celebration of the festival in Nerik, the celebrations are carried out in the city of Ḫakmiš. For those celebrations a new tablet of recitations is made. The nature of these recitations remains unknown.

In one instance the verb *mald-* introduces words that refer to actions performed during the celebration of a festival. KUB 25.37 + KUB 35.132 (II.A.20) is a ritual performed by the “men of Lallupiya” on behalf of the king and the queen that contains songs sung in Luwian. In lines iii 8'-13’ someone announces (*mald-*) who should drink the ritual wine. In that context the only plausible translation of the verb *mald-* is “to recite.”

Only in one New Hittite ritual text the verb *mald-* introduces words of prayer-request (IBoT 1.30 = II.A.21. For the discussion of this text see section 3.2.2. in chapter three) and can be translated as either “to recite” or “to pray.”

While in catalogues, festival and ritual texts the verb *mald-* can be regarded as *verbum dicendi* employed mostly when a prayer, invocation or incantation is spoken before a deity and is occasionally replaced by the verb *memai-* “to speak”, in some Old, Middle and New Hittite texts the same verb can be interpreted as a verb of motion. In these contexts the verb and the noun *malteššar* carry the meaning “to offer” and “offering; ritual (performed in fulfillment of a vow).”

In lines 6-7 of Anitta proclamation (KBo 3.22 = II.C.3) the king declares that he built temples for Ḫalmaššuit and for the Stormgod in which he deposited spoils that he brought from the campaigns. Then he says *nu maldabḫunu nu ḫuwartabḫunu*. The verb
mald- has been rendered here by most scholars as “to vow/ to make a vow.” This translation would be justified only if objects or worship were promised in exchange for a successful hunt. This, however, is not indicated in the text. According to the text, the king has come back from a successful campaign. To thank the gods for his military victory, he built temples and made offering(s) to the gods probably in fulfilment of a vow. This offering of gifts is expressed here with the verb mald-.

The verb mald- carries a similar meaning in KUB 7.20 (II.C.2), a Middle Hittite ritual of Palliya, the king of Kizzuwatna. The line of arguments presented by the authors of the CHD (L-N: 134) with regard to the meaning of this verb in this context is very convincing and therefore it is summarized here. Güterbock and Hoffner note that what follows mald- is a purification ritual, therefore mald- cannot mean here “to vow”, as suggested by Laroche 1964-65: 11. Since the text is a purification ritual that probably includes offerings, and since, according to the colophon, the king re-erected the statue of the god it is conceivable that the ritual was meant to fulfill a vow to replace the previous statue. The authors of the dictionary give a tentative translation of mald- as “provide (a deity) with offerings or with a ritual in fulfillment of a vow.”

In KBo 51.17 (II.C.1.(2)), a New Hittite copy of the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal to the Sungoddess of Arinna, the genitive plural maltešnaš is used instead of the logogram SISKUR.ḪI.A that appears in the Middle Hittite manuscript of this prayer, KUB 17.21 = II.C.1.(1) (line 19’). The meaning of the noun malteššar has to be read here in the context of the logogram SISKUR, which in Hittite texts is used for both “offering” and “ritual”. The definition of SISKUR offered by Kammenhuber in HW²: 85 as “magische Ritual” is too narrow as this logogram also represents the noun mukeššar. A solution to this problem has been suggested by the authors of the CHD (L-N: 137), who propose that mukeššar could be a ritual (including words and offerings) aimed at invoking the gods, while malteššar was a ritual performed in fulfillment of a vow. The translation of malteššar/SISKUR in KBo 51.17 and KUB 17.21 as “ritual (performed in fulfillment of a vow)” is very plausible, particularly because it appears in the part of the text that deals with temples, precious objects and statues, rituals and festivals.

Another text that employs the noun malteššar in the sense “offering” is KUB 27.1 (II.C.6). In lines i 7-11 and i 20-34 Ḫattušili III describes how his father, Muršili II, celebrated a festival for his tutelary deity on military campaigns, the mighty Ištar of the Field and how he, Ḫattušili, celebrates the same festival for his goddess, Ištar of the Field.

II.C.1 note 398.
of Samuḫa. Muršili had acted as follows: for the campaigns, which he undertook in the years after the goddess was last venerated, the oracular inquiries were made about ambasši, keldi offerings and about malteššar. Then the ambasši and keldi were given to the goddess and raw meat was placed for her. Ḫattušili then states that in the year in which he himself did not go on campaigns he did not give ambasši, keldi or malteššar. However, in the year, in which he goes on campaign, he makes ambasši, keldi offering and malteššar to Ištar of the Field of Samuḫa as was determined by the oracle. For the mighty Ištar of the Field of Muršili only ambasši and keldi offering are given but no malteššar. In the year when the king does not go on a military expedition he does not give any offerings. The above description of a festival indicates that malteššar is given only in the year in which the king goes on a campaign and is given only to the tutelary goddess who is expected to support the king during his campaign. It seems that the malteššar of Muršili includes meat-offerings and is given to the goddess to thank her for the former campaigns. Because nothing in the text suggests that Ḫattušili gives his malteššar after the military campaign, this noun cannot mean here an “offering of thanks” (suggestion of de Roos 2007: 41) or “ritual/offering in fulfilment of a vow,” which is another meaning proposed for that noun. On the contrary, it seems that Ḫattušili offers malteššar before he goes on campaign and thus malteššar denotes perhaps a votive offering/ritual given to the goddess to secure the military success.

In KUB 5.24 + (II.C.4), a New Hittite oracle text, the noun malteššar is used in the oracle question. The diviner is asking the Sungoddess Kauri, whether the queen should give compensation together with proprietary gift and with malteššar. The fact that the noun malteššar is employed here with the verb ānī- “to give” suggests that it denotes an offering or a ritual of some kind, perhaps a ritual performed in fulfillment of a vow.

In one text, KBo 22.242 + KBo 52.225b (II.D.1), a New Hittite fragmentary text that contains cultic itinerary of the king, the noun malteššar seems to carry the more general meaning “offering.” Nothing in the text indicates that this offering was made in fulfillment of a vow. Lines ii 5-8 describe the gift of the elders of Anniyatta which consists of a goat, beer and bread. It is then said that the malteššar of the king is the same. Since the gift of the elders included offerings, then what was provided by the king on his visit was probably also an offering of some kind.

In texts dated to the Middle Hittite and New Hittite periods, the verb mald- and its derivatives are also attested in the meanings “to vow” and a “vow”. In that sense the verb is often written akkadadographically with forms of KARĀBU; likewise, Akkadian IKRIBU is used as an Akkadogram for the noun malteššar. The main texts that contain vows or
that refer to vows include oracles (KBo 24.126 = II.B.7.II, KUB 22.70 = II.B.4, KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 + II.B.5, KBo 2.2 = II.B.7.I; KUB 6.22 = II.B.7.III; KBo 16.98+ = II.B.7.IV; KUB 22.38 = II.B.6) votive texts (KUB 15.3 = II.B.9; KUB 15.11+ = II.B.10, KUB 15.17+ = II.B.12.; KUB 15.23 = II.B.11), dreams (KUB 15.1 = II.B.8; KUB 56.31 = II.B.13), rituals (KBo 15.3 = II.B.2), festivals (KUB 44.12 = II.B.14, KUB 10.11+ = II.B.15), and prayers (KUB 14.4 = II.B.1; KUB 14.10 and KUB 14.11 = II.B.3). In all these texts some objects or animals are promised to a deity in order to receive a favour or in order to alleviate misfortunes caused by an angry deity.

In a few texts containing liver, bird and KIN oracles, the Akkadograms **IKRIBU** and **IKRIBI** as well as **-za mald**- are used in the sense “to vow” and “vow” in the questions directed to a deity (KUB 6.22 = II.B.7.III). The questions are twofold; either the deity is asked whether or not a vow should be made (KBo 2.2+ lines ii 39-40 = II.B.7.I) or whether or not a deity is angry because of an unfulfilled vow (KBo 2.2+ lines iii 10-16; Meskene 74.57 = II.B.16).

In KBo 16.98 + KUB 49.49 (II.B.7.IV), rather than being employed in the oracular question the Akkadogram **IKRUB** seems to introduce the actual words of an oracular question in which the queen asks whether or not the king’s military campaign will be successful.

As noted above, the phrase **IKRUB kiššan** “he/she vowed as follows” introduces words of a vow which consist of the formula “if you O deity....., then I will ...” and is often made in or because of a dream. In well preserved votive texts (II.B.8-13), the vow is usually made by the queen. The request that is most often found in these texts concerns the well-being of the king (lines i 2-11 and iii 12’-16’ of KUB 15.1 (II.B.8); lines i 5-16 and i 17-21 of KUB 15.3 (II.B.9); lines rev. 17’-22’ of KUB 15.23 (II.B.11) and lines i 1-9 of KUB 15.17++ (II.B.12). In two instances (lines ii 5-12 and ii 37-41 of KUB 15.1 = II.B.8), the queen promised precious objects to the gods Šarruma of Urikina and Šarruma of Laiuna because she had a dream in which she was “trapped behind the bathhouse” by young men. In KUB 15.11+ (II.B.10) the queen asks the goddess Allani for deliverance of the land from a drought or similar natural disaster (lines ii 5-11) and promises offerings if the goddess grants this wish. In lines ii 12-26 the queen promises a propitiatory gift because of unfulfilled vows. In KUB 56.31 (II.B.13) the queen asks various deities to support the king in a military campaign, while in KUB 15.1 and KUB 15.11+, both the king and the queen make vows for successful military campaigns.

The phrase **IKRUB kiššan** has been considered to be the akkadographic writing for only Hittite **kiššan maltaš**. However, in at least two texts, that is KUB 15.1 (I.B.b1) and
KUB 15.19 (I.B.b.2), the phrase -za arkuwar eššešta is used instead. Enough is preserved of both texts to conclude that what follows that Hittite phrase is a typical vow, which comprises a wish of the supplicant (here: the queen) and the promised objects if the wish is fulfilled.

At least two other texts suggest that there might have been yet another Hittite word that carried the meaning “vow” but was written in Hittite texts as IKRIBUI/IKRIBI^HLA. KUB 22.38 (II.B.6) is a New Hittite oracle text that deals with the divine anger. In lines i 1-2 it is stated that IK-RI-BI^HLA have been spoken in front of a deity to appease his/her anger. Güterbock and Hoffner (CHD L-N: 136) as well as Lefèvre-Novaro and Mouton (2008: 20) translate this noun as “vows”; Güterbock and Hoffner further note that this noun agrees with the plural common gender meqauš. Laroche (1958: 151) rendered this noun here as “prayers” and argued that this common gender agreement suggests that the Hittite noun, which is written akkadographically IK-RI-BI^HLA, must also be common gender. This in turn, excludes nouns such as malteššar and arkuwar. That Laroche might be right in his claim is shown by another text, Meskene 74.57 (II.B.16 and II.C.7). This text contains an oracular inquiry into the causes of divine anger. The oracle inquiry determined that the goddess dNIN.KUR was angry because of some matters in her temple (i.e. sacrilege, neglected festivals and damaged or missing implements), and because the king was guilty of IKRIBU merranza, an “unfulfilled vow”. Another oracular inquiry has been carried out and it was determined that this IKRIBU merranza concerned a ritual (SISKUR) not yet performed and a votive offering (mieltešna) not yet presented. In this text IKRIBU clearly covers both SISKUR and mielteššar and shows common gender agreement.

In one attestation IKRIBU denotes an object in the KIN oracle. In KBo 44.210 (II.F.1), a New Hittite text containing KIN and SU oracles, the meaning of IKRUB and IKRIBI is ambiguous. It may be understood as either “recitation” or “vow”, the usual rendering of these Akkadograms in Hittite, but the context does not secure either reading.

The word family derived from the stem mald/t- also includes malteššanala-, an adjective derived from the oblique stem of the noun malteššar. This adjective is only attested in KUB 9.27++ (II.E.1), a Middle Hittite text recording a ritual against impotence. In lines i 11'-22' and iii 7'-14', the woman named Paškuwatti, who performs the ritual, summons the goddess to the client’s location so that the deity can hear and grant his wish. Paškuwatti promises the goddess, on behalf of the petitioner, the temple, servants and the offerings. Also, if the goddess grants the petitioner’s wish, he will make her his personal deity and will make her malteššanala-. The only meaning of this
adjective, which appears here in the accusative case, that makes sense in the present context is “the recipient of malteššar” (see CHD L-N: 135), which can here mean “offering” or a “vow.”

2.2.3. mugai-, mugawar, mukeššar

Previous Research

The verb mugai- and its derivatives have been subject of scholarly investigation since Goetze’s Hattušiliš: der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten, published in 1925. In his commentary to that text, Goetze translated the verb mugai- as “klagen” (1925: 100). Two years later, in his edition of “Madduwatta text”, Goetze maintained the same translation of the verb mugai- and rendered the noun mukeššar as “Klage-Gebet” (1928: 63 n 1).

In the first edition of his Glossary, Sturtevant translated the verb mugai- as “to lament, to implore” and the noun mukeššar as “complaint, lamentation” (1931: 46). For these translations he referred to Goetze 1928. In the second edition of his Glossary, Sturtevant offered the same rendering of the noun mukeššar but expanded the semantic range of the verb mugai- by the meaning “to cry” (1936: 104). Finally, in A Hittite Chrestomathy, published in 1935, Sturtevant argued that the primary meaning of the noun mukeššar, employed in ritual of Anniwiyani (VBoT 24), should be “lamentation” since it is derived from the verb mugai- “to lament, to implore”. However, in the context of this text, the noun refers to materials used in the ritual that accompany a prayer of lamentation (1935: 126 note to line iv 17 of VBoT 24).

Another important observation on mugai- was made by Gurney (1940: 17, 39) who translated this verb in the introduction and in the colophon of the prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna as well as in a preface to the prayer to Telipinu as “entreat.” He also observed that in a trilingual lexical list (KUB 3.103) the verbal noun mugawar is employed to translate the Akkadian noun tazzimtu that carries the meaning “complaint” (< nazāmu “complain of”). Next, Gurney drew attention to several Hittite texts in which mugai- does not mean “to complain”. According to Gurney, in some of these texts, namely KUB 9.27+, KUB 15.32, KUB 15.34, KUB 15.35+, KUB 24.2, the verb refers to a prayer consisting of (i) “evocatio” (calling the deity to the location of the supplicant) and (ii) a request for the blessing for the land of Ḫatti. The prayer is accompanied by various sacrifices and rituals of “drawing” the deity from whatever place he/she is. In two other texts (KBo 3.7 and KUB 23.77) the verb mugai- refers to a demand or request of
some kind. Since the verb is used in those texts with regard to an inferior addressing a superior with a request, the verb must mean “entreat, beseech” and the etymological connection of this verb with Greek μυζώ “moan” and with Latin mügio “roar”, suggested by some scholars, is problematic. In four other texts (VBoT 58, KUB 17.23, KUB 20.1 and KUB 27.16) the verb mugai- does not seem to be connected with prayers at all. From all the available data Gurney concluded that the inherited meaning of the verb mugai- must be “to entreat” and the noun mugawar must denote prayer of the evocatio type. Gurney also suggested that the Akkadian tazzimtu, in some context, carried the meaning “prayer” rather than “complaint” and that perhaps the Hittite scribe who wrote the lexical list (KUB 3.103) had the former meaning of the Akkadian noun in mind when he translated it into Hittite as mugawar (1940: 45-51).

In the main volume of his Hethitische Wörterbuch, published between 1952 and 1954, Friedrich translated the verb mugai- as “beten, bitten, anflehen” and as “sich erbitten lassen” when the verb appears in the mediopassive voice. For these translations he referred to his own comment on this verb in ZA NF1: 12 as well as to Gurney 1940. Friedrich also gave the Indo-European cognate of the verb mugai- as Latin mugire “brüllen?” in which he followed Benveniste 1932: 140, and rendered the noun mukeššar as “Bitte, Bittegebet” (144-145). In the third supplement to his dictionary, Friedrich, influenced by Laroche’s study on Hittite prayer terminology, added another meaning to this verb and noun, that is, “(durch ein magisches Ritual einen Gott) zu Hilfe rufen” and “magisches Ritual, rituelles Fest” (1966: 450).

Two years before Laroche’s article appeared in print, Otten made some observations on the verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar. First, he pointed out that, occasionally, the verb mugai- alternates with the verb aniya- “to celebrate” and the noun mukeššar with the logogram SÍSKUR “offering”. He did not, however, venture to offer a translation of either Hittite word. Second, Otten suggested that the phrase 𒆠𒆠 EN-aš, appearing in the ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna (CTH 330), might correspond to the logographic writing EN.ŠISKUR (1962: 77 n.5).

Laroche focused on the verb mugai- and the verbal noun mugawar. He rejected the meaning “complaint, lamentation” proposed for mugawar by some scholars and drew attention to other semantic equations mugawar = SISKUR and mugai- = aniya- “perform (a ritual)” found in the catalogue texts. Laroche observed that both verbs, namely mugai- and aniya-, refer to magical rites performed by the Old Woman and that they are both verbs of action rather than verbs of speech. According to Laroche while the verb aniya- and the noun aniur designate rituals of a medical-magical nature performed on humans,
whose function was to cure the illnesses caused by bewitchment, the verb *mugai-* and the noun *mugawar* describe a ritual that focuses on a deity. The function of the *mugawar* ritual was to induce a deity to abandon hostility, retreat and inactivity. After a brief analysis of a few texts which employ either the verb *mugai-* or its derivatives, Laroche concluded that the basic sense of the verb *mugai-* is “to move, to stir, to set in motion” and that it should be derived from the PIE *meug*-w “to move” (1964-5: 20-24). Laroche’s arguments and translation of the verb *mugai-* were followed by Glocker (1997) and recently by Melchert (2010b: 207-215).

Next two brief notes on the verb *mugai-* were made by Neu and Oettinger. Neu (1968: 118) followed Friedrich (HW) and translated the verb *mugai-* as “beten, bitten, anflehen.” Oettinger renders the verb *mugai-* as “klagen” and “wehklagen” and notes that it might be derived from the PIE *múg-eh*, which has the Greek cognate μυγμός “Seufzer” (1979: 33, 369).

Lebrun (1980) translates the verb *mugai-* as “traiter rituellement, magiquement” and the verbal noun *mugawar* as “invocation”. He argues that, on the one hand, *mugawar* denotes a prayer that usually accompanies the ritual, whose purpose is to draw a deity out of its anger (*mukeššar*). On the other hand, the noun *mugawar* describes “mise en marche” of the deity and it is a type of *aniur* or “action (exercé sur la divinité).” This *mugawar*-ritual often contains the recitation of a myth, whose function is to support and explain the magical rites performed during the ritual. According to Lebrun, the *mugawar* ritual was performed to catch the attention of a deity; create, with scent, offering and words (prayer of *evocation* type), an ambiance that will entice the deity to leave his/her anger and torpor and that will mobilise the deity to act. In this context the verb *mugai-* appears together with the verbs *talliya-* “evoke” and *ḫuittiya-* “to draw.” Lebrun, following Laroche (1964), derives the verb *mugai-* from the PIE root *meug*-w meaning “remuer” (1980: 414, 416, 431-440).

Güterbock and Hoffner, in the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, render the verb *mugai-* as “to invoke, evoke, entreat” and the noun *mukeššar* as “invocation, evocation, invocation/evocation ritual”. They observe that this noun can be an object in the lot oracle and, like the verbal noun *mugawar*, can denote materials used in the invocation/evocation ritual. The noun *mukeššar* denotes a concrete object or thing when it appears with the verbs *pai-* “to give”, *ašnu-* “to provide for (a ritual with offerings), *šarā da-* “to pick up” and *parā peda-* “to carry off.” Güterbock and Hoffner also argue that while in some
contexts this noun is a Hittite reading of the logogram SISKUR, in other texts, for instance KUB 15.34, this equation must be excluded (1986: 319-322, 324-326).

Kellerman (1986: 115-123), in her discussion of various aspects of the first manuscript of the Telipinu myth (KUB 17.10), argues that this myth gave the performer of a mugawar ritual, who was almost exclusively the female ritual expert called “Old Woman”, the means of pacifying an angry deity. The myth teaches the exorcist how to act if a disaster strikes, which is caused by an angry deity.

In volume six of Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar Tischler translates the verb mugai- as “beten, bitten, anfehlen, beschwören” and as “sich bitten lassen” when the verb appears in the middle voice. In these translations, Tischler follows Gurney (1940), Kronasser EHS and CHD (1986). Tischler also comments on the orthography of the verb mugai- and gives an overview of the main theories regarding the etymology of this verb and its derivatives. He also translates the nouns mugawar and mukeśšar as “Anrufung” and “Anrufung, Bitte” and the phrase 𒈗 mukišnaš EN-ašššaš as “Opfer-/Ritualherr” (1990: 226-228). Tischler maintains the above translations in his Hethitisches Handwörterbuch (2001:107).

Gamkrelidze and Ivanov translate the verb mugai- as “to pray” and the noun mugawar as “prayer”. They derive this Hittite verb from the PIE root *muk’- meaning “to pray, pronounce the words of a prayer”. They also give the Indo-European cognates of this word family as Umbrian muga- “whisper; pronounce in low voice” and Latin con-mūgentō “I call together”, mūgio ‘I moo’ (1995: 703).

De Roos argues that mugawar denotes both a prayer, which invites a deity to approach and a ritual that accompanies the recitation of this prayer indicating the route to be followed by the deity. De Roos rejects the semantic equation of mugawar with words meaning “lament, desire, prayer” and translates this noun as “(the ritual of) invocation,” “entreaty.” According to de Roos, mugawar also denotes the purpose of the invocation ritual, namely, the activation of the deity, so that he/she will reverse his/her hostile attitude and will stand behind the supplicant (1995: 2000-2001).

Puhvel HED vol. 6 translates the verb mugai- as “to implore, to pray (to), to beseech, to entreat, to invoke (deities, rarely mortals); to summon up, to evoke (deities, revenants); to treat (ritually) by prayer”. He renders the noun mugawar as “invocation, imploration and evocation” and the noun mukeśšar, occasionally used as an animated abstraction in KIN oracles and sporadically written with the logogram SISKUR, as “invocation (rite), prayer”. Puhvel also comments on the etymology of the verb mugai-. He observes that most scholars derive the verb mugai- from the PIE root which also gave
rise to Latin *mūgiō* “bellow, roar” and Greek *μόζω* “moan”. He also notes that another etymology was suggested by Laroche, namely a non-vocalic root with the meaning “to stir (into action)” cognate with Latin *moveō*. Puhvel supports the first etymology (HED vol. 6: 177-184).

The most recent translations of the verb *mugai-* and the nouns *mukeššar* and *mugawar* can be found in Ünal’s 2007 *A Concise Multilingual Hittite Dictionary* and in Kloekhorst’s *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* published in 2008.

Ünal translates the verb as “to impetrate, to entreat, to invoke, to evoke, to complain, to pray”, the noun *mukeššar* as “invocation, evocation, evocation ritual; materials used in an invocation/evocation ritual; object of a lot oracle” and the verbal noun *mugawar* as “materials used in an invocation/evocation ritual” (2007: 456-457).

Kloekhorst translates the verb *mugai-* as “to invoke, to evoke, to entreat”, the verbal noun *mugawar* as “materials of an invocation/evocation ritual” and the noun *mukeššar* as “invocation, evocation”; he also observes that this noun can denote materials used in an invocation/evocation ritual as well as an object in a lot oracle. Kloekhorst also notes that the verb *mugai-* belongs to the *ḥatrae*-class and therefore is very likely derived from a noun *mūga*-.. According to Kloekhorst, this verb is connected to Latin *mūgīre* “to roar” and Greek *µυγµός* “sigh”, for which a semantic link is provided by the noun *GIŠmūkar-* denoting an implement that makes noise to invoke the gods. This led Kloekhorst to reconstruct a PIE root *meug-* “to make noise (in order to invoke the gods)”, which would give rise to the Hittite nouns *mukeššar* and *GIŠmukar*-. From this root a noun was formed *moug-o-* meaning “invocation of the gods through noise” from which the verb *moug-o-ie/o-* was derived. This verb then yielded the Hittite verb *mugae-* meaning “to invoke” (2008: 585-586).

**Attestations**

The verb *mugai-* is employed in Hittite texts in two constructions (i) intransitively with the noun in the dative case denoting either the invoked deity or the spirit of a deceased and (ii) transitively with the noun in the accusative case. In a prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) *mugai-* is employed in the middle voice as reflexive verb with the particle -za.

Occasionally, the finite forms of the verb *mugai-* occur with nouns in the dative-locative case to express to what or to where a deity is invoked: for instance *ḥaršiya pedi*

---

30 The list of attestations is based on Puhvel HED vol. 6, on CHD L-N and on the lexical card catalogue of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz.
(KUB 15.32 i 48), parā Ḫandanni (KUB 15.32 i 50), kuedani uddani (KUB 7.8 ii 20), kuedaš Ḫ-ns (KUB 20.1 ii 33); and with instrumental of means NINDA Ḫuršiš DUG išpanduzit (KUB 24.2 obv. 12).

Although, in Hittite texts, the noun mukeššar is written occasionally with the logogram SISKUR, the fact that, in some text, SISKUR appears side by side with mukeššar shows that mukeššar is only one possible reading of this logogram (e.g. mukišnaš SISKUR in KBo 15.34 = CTH 330.1.O).

A. Well or Relatively Well Preserved Context

mugai: 1.sg.pres. mugami (KBo 31.5 ii 6, 8, 9; VBoT 58 iv 10’), mugāmi (KBo 41.1.b obv. 2; KBo 31.5 + ii 6, 8, 9; KBo 31.26 obv. 3, 5, 6; KUB 30.42 iv 7’; KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 i 26’; KUB 36.80 i 4; KUB 30.58 i 24’, 25’), [m]ugāmi (KBo 41.1.b. rev. 32’); mug[āmi] (KUB 7.5 iv 5; KBo 14.68 i 4’), mūgāmi (KUB 7.5 ii 21’; KUB 30.57 i 6’); 2.sg.pres. mugāši (KUB 23.77: 66); 3.sg.pres. mugāizzi (KBo 12.116 rev. 8’; KBo 31.8 + iv 4; KUB 8.71 obv. 15’; KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 i 20’; KUB 30.58 i 19’), mugāizzi (KBo 31.5 + ii 10; KUB 56.55 iv 9’), [m]ugāizzi (KBo 31.26 obv. 7’); 3.pl.pres. muganzi (KUB 30.42 + i 4; KUB 30.58 + KBo 14.68 i 18’, 20’; KBo 45.16 ii 7’; ABoT 1 i 7), mūgānzi (KUB 30.27 obv. 4’; KUB 32.130: 18; KUB 36.80 iv 6’; KUB 45.16 ii 11’), mūgānzi (KUB 10.20 ii 31), mūgānzi (KUB 10.20 iii 43, 45’), mug[ānzi] (KUB 30.58 i 22’); 3.sg.pret. mūgāit (KBo 3.7 i 13); 2.sg.imp. mugai (KBo 3.16 rev.10), mugāi (KBo 3.18 rev. 14; KUB 30.51 i 4, KUB 24.2 obv. 6); 1.sg.pres.iter. mukiškimi (KUB 24.1 i 14; KUB 24.2 obv. 12), mūkiškimi (KUB 7.5 i 23’); 3.sg.pres.iter. mukiškizzi (KUB 7.28 + KBo 8.92 obv. 3’), mukeškizzi (KUB 27.16 iii 15); 3.pl.pres.iter. mukeškanzi (KUB 32.130: 17), mukiškanzi (KUB 23.77: 75); 1.pl.pres.iter. mukišgaueni (KUB 15.32 i 51; KUB 15.34 iv 31’; KUB 23.115 + KUB 23.17 + KUB 31.117 ii 14’), mukeškueni (KUB 7.8 ii 20), mukiškuni (KUB 15.31 i 50); [m]u-šu-ke-u-ni (KUB 13.29 + Bo 3444 iv 7’); 1.sg.pret.iter. mukiškinun (KUB 14.4 iii 29) muleškinun (KUB 24.3 + iv 48’, 50’); 3.sg.pret.iter.act. mukiškit (KUB 15.32 i 49); 1.pl.pret.iter. mukiškueni (KUB 23.50 ii 13’); 3.pl.pret.iter.act. mukiškir (KBo 17.105 ii 18’); 2.sg.imp.iter.mid. muleškiḫḫut (KUB 24.3+ iii 13’); 3.pl.imp.iter. mukiškandu (KBo 11.14 iii 30’); supine.iter. mukiškuwan (KBo 3.16 rev. 13; KBo 3.19 rev. 2’); inf. mugauwanzi (KUB 17.23 i 1; KUB 24.3+ iv 45’); mugāwanzi (KBo 15.32 i 5); nom.sg.com.part. mugānza (KUB 33.21 i 19’); nom.-acc.n.part. mugān (KUB 15.31 i 45; KUB 15.32 i 47); mugawar: nom.sg.
mugau[war] (KUB 3.103 obv. 5), muqāuwar (KBo 26.20 iii 11), mugāu[war] (KBo 1.42 iii 57); nom.-acc.pl. mugāuwar (KUB 30.27 obv. 2'; KUB 31.127 i 6), mugāuar (KUB 30.27 obv. 3', 5'); gen.sg. mugawaš (KBo 14.70: 10', 11', 14'), mugauwaš (KBo 14.68 i 5'; KBo 14.70: 16'), mugāuaš (KUB 24.3 + iv 51; KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 i 10', 19'; VBoT 58 iv 13'), mugāu[aš] (KBo 31.26 obv. 10), mūgau[waš] (KBo 14.68 i 7'); mūgauwaš (KUB 33.68 ii 3); mukeššar: nom.-acc.sg. mukiššar (KBo 2.6 ii 40; KUB 5.1 ii 43, iii 45, 58, 99, iv 44, 74, left edge right line 2; KUB 5.3 i 32; KUB 5.6 ii 34', 35'; KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 i 16'; KUB 18.62 + KUB 6.13: 7'), mukiššar (VBoT 24 iv 17; KUB 32.130: 7), mukišnaš (KUB 30.27 obv. 8'; KUB 36.81 i 18'), mukišnaš (KUB 24.3 i 18'); dat.-loc.sg.neut. mukešni (KUB 7.5 iv 17; KUB 33.75 ii 8'); mukišni (KBo 15.32 i 6); nom.-acc.pl. mukeššar[HI.A] (KUB 14.68 i 8')

B. Fragmentary Contexts

Discussion

See below after talliya- (pp. 71ff).
2.2.4. talliya-, talliyawar

Previous Research

The first noted comment on the verb talliya- is that of Sturtevant and Bechtel, who following Goetze and Friedrich (1930: 24), translated this verb as “to propitiate” and observed that talliya- has always a human subject and takes a deity as its direct object (1935: 125).

In his 1940 study of two prayers of Muršili II, Gurney translated the verb talliya- as “entreat(?)” and suggested that talliya- is practically synonymous with mugai-. He observed that both verbs appear together in the evocatio type of prayer (KUB 15.34 +, KUB 15.32, KUB 15.34 and KUB 9.27 +) and that talliya- appears alone in a similar context in KUB 7.60 (1940: 49 n. 3).

In his discussion of the verb talliya- and the noun talliyawar, Laroche made the following observation: (i) the action denoted by talliya- should be considered as a type of mugawar; (ii) talliyawar is the Hittite denotation of “invocation”; (iii) the verb talliya- is a transitive verb of movement like ḫuittiye/a- and mugai- with which it is often paired; (iv) the fundamental sense of the verb talliya- is “to draw, to lure, to attract”; (v) the construction arḫa talliya- expresses the idea that a deity, whom one is luring, has turned away from the supplicant. This construction can be translated as “détourner”; (vi) the precise meaning of the expression šer talliya- and katta talliya- must remain undetermined because both constructions appear in fragmentary contexts; (vii) it is difficult to decide whether or not the verb tallieš- is connected semantically to the verb talliya- (1964-65: 24-27). The similar analysis of the verb talliya- was recently offered by Melchert (2010a: 226-232).

Oettinger argues that the verb tallieš- meaning “gewogen werden” might be related to the verb tallye- mi, which he translates as “milde machen, beruhigen” on page 251 and as “anflehen, beschwören” on page 346 (for the latter translations he refers to Laroche 1964-5). He then suggests that the verb tallye- mi might be derived from the PIE root *tlh₁-yé- meaning “ruhig machen” and might be related to OCS u-toliti “beruhigen” (1979: 251, 346; similarly Kassian, Korolëv and Sidel’tsev who suggest that the participle talliyant- might be a denominative from the adjective talla-, meaning “mild”. 2002: 545 note on line iv 17).

Lebrun translates the verb talliya- as “évoquer” and notes that the noun talliyawar corresponds to Latin evocatio. Lebrun argues that as in ancient Rome, the Hittite talliyawar was performed to lure the deities of the enemy lands. The Hittite ecovatio
contained the ritual of “pulling” a deity on the path and was performed so that the gods were more inclined to hear prayers. Following Laroche, Lebrun suggests that talliyawar can be regarded as an integral part of the mugawar (1980: 415, 440-442).

Mazoyer, following Laroche, translates the verb talliya- as “se tourner (favorablement)” and the construction arba talliya- as “se détourner” and observes that talliya- is used when a performer of a ritual is asking a deity to turn favourably towards the king. Mazoyer also notes that this verb often appears with the verbs huittiya- “tirer” and mugai- “évoquer, mettre en mouvement”, with which it sometimes alternates. According to Mazoyer, since the verb talliya- in the texts dated to the Old and Middle Hittite periods is occasionally employed in the same contexts as the verb mugai-, perhaps talliya- is the older and mugai- the younger designation of the same ritual activity (2003: 99-100; 112).


Friedrich, in the main volume of his dictionary, translated the verb talliya- as “(Götter) anrufen, anflehen” and referred for these translations to his work in 1930: 24, to Goetze in Sturtevant 1935: 125 and Gurney 1940. He also rendered the construction arba talliya- as “wegbeten(?), durch beten wegrufen(?)” and made a note that talliya- employed in KUB 29.3 is replaced by the verb wek- in the duplicate of this text (KUB 29.1). In the third supplement to his dictionary, Friedrich, influenced by Laroche’s study of Hittite prayer terminology, translated the verb talliya- as “(eine Gottheit) beschwören” (1952-54: 206, 1966: 457).

Kronasser rendered the verb talliya- as either “anrufen” or “abzurufen” and the construction arba talliya- as “wegrufen, wegbeten”. As Friedrich before him, Kronasser also noted that the verb talliya- (KUB 29.3) seems to correspond to the verb wek- in KBo 29.1 (1987: 488).

In Hethitisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis and in Hethitisches Handwörterbuch, Tischler translates the verb talliya- as “(Götter) anrufen, anflehen, gewogen machen” and notes that the noun talliyawar denotes a type of evocation prayer (1982: 82; 2001: 161). In Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar Tischler renders this verb as “(Götter) anrufen, anflehen”, lists the main scholars, who either translated or commented on this verb, gives a brief overview of the etymologies proposed for this verb and gives attestations of this verb and of the noun talliyawar. Tischler also comments on some of the grammatical forms of this verb and following Friedrich and Kronasser, observes that the verb talliya-
in KBo 29.3 is replaced by the verb wek- “to wish, ask” in the New Hittite copy of this text (KBo 29.1) (1991: 58-60).

Ünal translates the verb talliya- as “to call upon, to invoke, to implore a deity, to entreat, to conjure” and the construction para talliya- as “to call forth”. He notes that the verb talliya- also appears with the preverb arḫa but he does not offer any translation of this construction (2007: 672-3).

Kloekhorst renders the verb talliye/a-zi as “to pray to, to evoke (a deity).” He criticises the semantic connection made by some scholars between the verb talliya- and the adjective talli- “pleasant (?)” and the verb talliyēšš-zi “to be pleasant(?)” and leans toward Tischler’s suggestion that the verb talliya- is connected with OE telja, OE talian “to tell” and Greek δόλος “guile, trick” (1979: 26). Kloekhorst argues that if Hittite talliye/a- is indeed related to the above words, then the Hittite geminate -ll- points to *-lH- sound sequence and to the restoration of the PIE root *delH-, with Hittite talliye/a- reflecting either *delH-ye/o- or *dolH-ye/o- (2008: 819).

Attestations

The verb talliya- is a transitive verb that typically takes deities or the spirits of the dead as its direct object. The verb is also employed in Hittite texts with the preverb arḫa and a noun in the dative case denoting a person to/for whom a deity is lured or with nouns in the ablative case denoting place/s from which a deity is attracted. Other preverbs/adverbs used with the verb talliya- include appa, parā, katta and šer.

A. Well or Relatively Well Preserved Context

talliya-: 3.sg.pres. talliyazi (KUB 7.60 ii 20 and KBo 43.52: 5’), talli[iyazi] (KUB 29.3: 7’); 3.sg.imp. talli[ei]d[u] (KUB 17.10 ii 14’), [tall]liyadu (HT 100 + KUB 33.69 + KBo 26.131 obv. 5’), tall[iē]d[u]liyadu (KUB 33.75 ii 9); 1.sg.pres.iter. talleškimi (KUB 7.5 i 23’); 1.sg.pret.iter. talliškinun (KUB 14.4 iii 29); 3.sg.pret.iter. talliškit (KUB 19.49 i 12); 1.pl.pres.iter. talliškiueni (KUB 15.34 iv 31’), talliškiuwani (KUB 15.32 i 51), [tall][iškiyaueni (KUB 13.29 + Bo 3444 iv 6’); 1.pl.pret.iter. [talliški]iuen + arḫa (KBo 23.50 + ii 13’); nom.sg.part.c. talli[yanza] (KBO 33.75 ii 11), [talli]yanza + arḫa (KBO 14.70 i 16’), talliyanja + arḫa (KBO 31.5 ii 8 and KBO 31.26 obv. 5), talliya[ança] + arḫa (KBO 41a + b obv. 1-2), [ta]l-ši-an-za + arḫa (KBO 41a + b rev. 31’), talliya[ança] + parā

31 The writing talliyēšš with a macron follows Kloekhorst (2008: 219).
32 The list of attestations is based on Tischler HEG and on the lexical card catalogue of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz.
(KUB 33.62 ii 14’); nom.-acc.sg.part.n. tallian (KUB 15.32 i 47), talliyan (KUB 15.31 i 45); inf. talliyauwanzi (KUB 7.60 iii 6’); talliyauwar: nom.-acc.sg.n. talliyauwa[r] (KBo 26.20 iii 12); gen.sg.n. talliyauwaš (KUB 58.11 obv. 6), [talli]iyauwaš (KUB 58.11 obv. 15), talliyauš [KUB 28.92 i 6’], talliyyaš (KUB 28.92 i 9’).

B. Fragmentary Context


Discussion

A review of the available evidence shows that the verbs mugai- and talliya- are contextually and semantically related; their semantic fields overlap and in some contexts they can be regarded as partly synonymous. Consequently, both verbs are treated in one section. First, each verb is discussed in texts in which it appears alone, then both verbs are examined in contexts in which they appear together or they replace each other.
A. mugai-

The verb *mugai-* is principally a motion verb. In the Old Hittite “Illuyanka” myth (KBo 3.7 = III.A.a.3), in the Old/Middle Hittite historical text entitled “Deeds of Naram-Sîn” and in the Middle Hittite treaty between the Hittite king Arnuwanda I and a ruler of the Kaška lands (KUB 23.77 = III.A.a.1), the verb carries the meanings “to induce; to urge (into action)” (cf. Laroche 1964-5; Melchert 2010). The beginning of the first text tells the story of how the Stormgod was defeated by Illuyanka and how he urged all the gods (*mugai-*) to stand by his side.

In the “Deeds of Naram-Sîn” (KBo 3.16 = III.A.a.2), the Assyrian king is advised by the goddess Ištar to practise incubation with the intention of experiencing a divinely-inspired dream. This entailed ritual purification, sleeping on a holy bed, wearying out (*tariyanut*) and urging (*mugai-*) the gods to give an answer to Naram-Sîn’s question about the planned military campaign.

In the Middle Hittite treaty the verb *mugai-* appears twice: in the first relevant passage (lines 65-67) it is declared that when the Hittite king sends a “runner” in the land of Kaška, the Kaška king shall not ... him and shall not induce him (*mugai-*). In the same treaty, in the clause about fugitives (lines 71-75), both sides agree that when a Kaška man comes to the land of Ḥatti, he shall not be induced (*mugai-*) to return to the kingdom of Kaška. The author of this dissertation agrees with Melchert who argues that the intention of the Hittite king is on the one hand to prohibit the Kaška people from inducing his own messenger to desert the king, and on the other hand to prohibit the Kaška fugitives from returning to their own country. According to Melchert the inducement probably involved concrete rewards (2010: 213).

In religious contexts, the verb *mugai-* along with its derivatives, is used mainly to designate a ritual whose function was to induce the return of an absent or an angry deity or the alienated spirit of the dead person (Melchert 2010: 207). This ritual entailed both magical and verbal acts, including a prayer. The primary function of this prayer was to summon a deity or a spirit of the deceased. In these contexts the verb *mugai-* is best translated as “to invoke” and the nouns *mukeššar* and *mugawar* as “invocation”.

The following catalogues, festivals, rituals and prayers record or mention the action but not the reason for summoning a deity. Not all rituals listed below involve oral rites, which suggests that the invocation ritual might but did not need to include speech.

---

33 The verb *mugai-* has been derived either from the PIE root *meug-* meaning “to make noise”, which also gave rise to Latin mūgīre “to roar” and Greek µυγής ‘sigh’; from the PIE root *meug-* “to move” (Laroche 1964: 24) or from the PIE root *meuk-* “be pointed” (Melchert 2010b: 214).
One text (i.e. viii) suggests that the noun *mugawar* referred to the words of an invocation prayer:

(i) a Middle Hittite manuscript of the Old Hittite ritual of invoking the Stormgod (KUB 33.68 = III.A.b.10) in which the noun *mukeššar* refers to words spoken during the performance of the ritual,

(ii) a New Hittite invocation ritual of the deities Anzili and Zukki (KUB 17.23 = III.A.b.21), in which the verb *mugai-* seems to denote both ritual and verbal acts,

(iii) a New Hittite copy of the Old Hittite shelf list of the DUBxKAM type (KUB 30.42 + KBo 31.8 = III.A.b.2 and KBo 14.70+ = III.A.b.5) as well as the New Hittite shelf-lists of the TUPPU type (KBo 31.5 = III.A.b.6.I and KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 = III.A.b.6.II),

(iv) a New Hittite copy of the Middle Hittite ritual performed for the Stag-god of the Hunting Bag and for the Heptads (KBo 17.105 = III.A.b.20.I),

(v) a New Hittite text that outlines and gives a cult inventory of the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (KBo 10.20 = III.A.b.33). This text mentions various offerings and rites performed during the celebration of the festival, including invoking (*mugai-*) the goddess Ištar of Ḥattarina, the Mother Goddess as well as the Stormgod of Ḫuršanašša by both the royal couple and by **LÚ.MES ḤAL,**

(vi) a New Hittite festival (ABoT 1 = III.A.b.34) in which the scribe and a priestess of the Mother Goddess invoke (*mugai-*) the Stormgod of the Head, while the queen worships the god,

(vii) a New Hittite festival performed for the goddess Ištar of Nineveh (KUB 27.16 = III.A.b.36), in which the queen invokes (*mugai-*) the goddess. The verb *mugai-* refers here to various religious activities that are described earlier in the text, but which do not seem to include oral rites,

(viii) a New Hittite hymn that precedes a “Prayer of a Mortal”(KUB 31.127+ = III.A.b.13), in which the Sungod is addressed as the god who fulfils/acts upon (*ešša-*) *mugawars.* Manuscript B of this text (i.e. KUB 31.128 i 5) employs in the same sentence the finite form of the verb

---

34 The wording of the *mukeššar* invocation is not preserved in the text.
ištamaš- (ištamaskiši) “to hear”, which suggests that the verbal noun mugawar referred here to the spoken word,

(ix) a New Hittite copy of a prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal to the Sungoddess of Arinna (KUB 23.115+ = III.A.b.14)

(x) a New Hittite version of the Middle Hittite ritual of Ḥantitaššu from Ḥurma performed in case of/against the difficult times (troublesome years) (KBo 11.14 = III.A.b.18). The third plural imperative iterative mukiškandu appears in a prayer addressed to the door bolt which is asked to release the netherworld deities so that they can invoke (mugai-) the gods.

In several texts, namely the invocation ritual of the Stormgod of Kuliwišna (KBo 15.32+ = III.A.b.9.I, KBo 15.34 = III.A.b.9.II, 34.35 = III.A.b.9.III), a few catalogues (KUB 30.51+ = III.A.b.6.II; KUB 8.71 = III.A.b.4.(1)), several oracles and a myth about the disappearance of a Sun deity (VBoT 58 = III.A.b.7) the verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar refer to the ritual performed in order to appease an angry deity who has ceased his or her proper functions and retreated into inaction. The other aim of the ritual is to compel the angry deity to return and resume his or her beneficent role.

The invocation ritual is performed for the same reasons also in a New Hittite catalogue listing several tablets whose common denominator is DINGIR GE, “The Deity of the Night” (KUB 8.71 = III.A.b.4.(1); KBo 12.116 = III.A.b.4.(2); KUB 56.55 = III.A.b.4.(3)) as well as in one Middle Hittite (KBo 16.97 + III.A.b.28) and six New Hittite oracle texts.

The former mentions the mukeššar performed by the priest of the deity of the night and by Arzakiti, the katra-woman. The ritual is performed because the angry goddess has left her temple and is being invoked (mugai-) to come back by her servants.

In two of the oracle texts the mukeššar is performed alone (KBo 15.32+ = III.A.b.9.I; KUB 8.71 + KUB 18.54 = III.A.b.27), or together with a propitiatory gift (maškan-) and reparation(s) (zankilatar) (KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 = III.A.b.27), or together with a propitiatory gift (maškan-), reparation(s) (zankilatar) and the presentation of a plea-prayer (arkuwar tiyauwaš) (354/z+ = III.A.b.29), or together with an offering/ritual (SISKUR) (KUB 22.40 + KBo 43.61= III.A.b.31) or together with a ritual (SIKUR) and a propitiatory gift (maškan-) (KUB 18.62 + KUB 56.55 = III.A.b.27). In one oracle text (KUB 22.57 = III.A.b.30), a deity named ḤAL is asked whether performing certain religious activities would be pleasing to him/her. These activities
include offering a propitiatory gift (maškan-) and reparation(s) (zankilatar), presenting a plea-prayer (arkuwar tiyauwaš) and cancelling one of the mukeššar rituals, which will be performed until the king, with whom the deity is angry, appeases him/her. In all other oracle texts mentioned above, the mukeššar was one of the activities undertaken to appease an angry deity. It is therefore unclear why, in this text, it is the cancellation and not the performance of the mukeššar that is mentioned along with propitiatory gift (maškan-), reparation(s) (zankilatar) and the presentation of a plea-prayer (arkuwar tiyauwaš).

In three noteworthy examples, the verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar describe or refer to either the oral rites or the entire ritual whose main objective was to induce and summon a deity to come back so that he/she could hear a prayer or give an answer to a question.

At the beginning of an Old Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of the Netherworld (KUB 7.28+ = III.A.b.12) an unidentified priest libates to the goddess and mentions that the king is invoking (mugai-) and kneeling down before the goddess. The priest then utters a prayer, in which he requests that the Sungoddess disregard slanders directed against the king by members of his own family and associates and that she brings prosperity and well-being to the land and the king.

In two prayers composed during the reign of the king Muršili II, namely a ‘prayer’ to the Sungoddess of Arinna (KUB 24.3+ = III.A.b.15) and a ‘prayer’ to Telipinu (KUB 24.1+ = III.A.b.17), the verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar are employed in the introduction, colophon and the main body of texts to designate the ritual of invocation which accompany the prayer of request. In both texts, the deities are summoned back to their temples so that they can hear the words of the prayer.

In two rituals (VBoT 24 = III.B.1 and KUB 30.27 = III.A.b.22) the noun mukeššar rather than referring to the invocation ritual, denotes the materials used in an invocation ritual.

The verb mugai- is also used in Hittite texts to express the notion of summoning and inducing a soul of the deceased to come (KUB 30.57+ = III.A.b.3; KUB 30.27 = III.A.b.22). Unfortunately, nothing is mentioned of what these rituals consisted.

In several New Hittite oracles, the noun mukeššar is employed as an object of the KIN oracle (KUB 5.1+ = III.C.1; KUB 5.3+ = III.C.2; KBo 2.6+ = III.C.3; KUB 49.14+ = III.C.4; KBo 41.199 ++ = III.C.5; KUB 16.29 + = III.C.6).

Finally, in three trilingual lexical lists, the noun mugawar was chosen by Hittite scribes as a translation of various Akkadian and Sumerian words. In a New Hittite lexical
list of the type diri DIR siaku = watru (KUB 3.103 = III.D.1), the noun mugawar is used to translate the Akkadian tazzimtu(m) “complaint” (“prayer” see Gurney 1940 and here supra); in a New Hittite lexical list of the series erim.ḥuš = anantu (KBo 26.20 = III.D.2), mugawar translates Sumerian [š]u-bal and Akkadian supû “prayer, supplication” and in a New Hittite lexical list of the izi = išatu series (KBo 1.42 = III.D.3), the Hittite mugawar is an equivalent of Sumerian si and Akkadian ṣebû “wish; desire”. The equation of mugawar and the Akkadian supû “prayer, supplication”, ṣebû “wish” and tazzimtu, which can also mean “wish” and which is used similarly to ṣebû (CAD T: 302-304), can be justified in the Hittite context: the noun mukeššar designates some texts a prayer that is embedded in the invocation ritual and that always includes a wish or a request.

B. talliya-

Like mugai- also the verb talliya- is principally a verb of motion designating the ritual of attracting a deity or the spirit of a dead person.35 This ritual entailed both magical and verbal acts. Consequently, the main meaning of the verb talliya- and the noun talliyawar are “to lure” and “allure”. In one text the verb talliya- is best rendered as “to exhort”. In some instances the verb talliya- can also be interpreted as a verb of speech meaning “to implore.”

The noun talliyawar in the sense “allure” is employed in two New Hittite texts that record a ritual for the Stormgod of Nerik (KUB 58.11 = IV.B.15 and KUB 28.92 = IV.B.16). In both texts, the noun talliyawar refers to words spoken during the performance of the ritual. The preserved part of the first text gives the order of the ritual actions. Before the king goes to the daḫanga-house, certain officials perform a ritual which includes a recitation of talliyawar. The offerings are carried to the daḫanga-house, the mukar instrument is placed before it and more words are recited. Then, the scribe offers a lamb and the words of talliyawar to the Stormgod of Nerik. In the second text the noun talliyawar refers to words of luring and attracting the divine mountains, rivers as well as the deity Zaḫaliqa. Although the wording of the respective talliyawars is not included in either of the texts, one could suggest that it may have comprised prayer spoken during the ritual of attracting the deity.

---

35 One etymology suggested for the verb talliya- is the PIE root *del- that is the source of the Old Norse telja, Old English talian “to tell” and Greek δόλος “guile, trick”. Another etymology has been recently suggested by Kloekhorst (2008) and by Melchert (2010a: 230-31) who propose the PIE root *deH- meaning “to draw, to allure” which gave rise to Middle English tollen/tullen and to Hittite talliya-.
In a New Hittite ritual aimed at luring and diverting the favour of the deities of a foreign city to the land of Ḫatti and to the Hittite king (KUB 7.60 = IV.B.9), the finite form of the verb talliya- appears at the end of sections that describe the rite of preparing paths on which the gods are to come. After the paths are drawn, the Old Woman takes some objects, lures (talliya-) the gods and utters a prayer, in which she implores the gods to travel to the Hittite king and to turn towards him in favour. Also the infinitive of verb talliya- refers in this text to the action of attracting the gods by means of/from the paths.

The verb talliya- carries the meaning “to exhort” in the New Hittite treaty of the Hittite king, Muršili II, and Manapa-Tarḫunta of the land of the Šeḫa River KUB 19.49+ (IV.A.1). In the introduction to this text, the scribe describes how the Hittite king saved Manapa-Tarḫunta from certain death at his brothers’ hands and how he, the king, protected his young charge by sending him to the people of Karkiš. The king and his brother kept sending gifts and kept exhorting (talliya-) the people of Karkiš to offer an asylum and protection to Manapa-Tarḫunta. It is improbable that either the Hittite king or his brother would implore the men of a minor western Anatolian country. Rather, the king or his brother exhorted the men of Karkiš to the action desired by both with deeds and words (so Melchert 2010: 230).

The meaning “to implore” and “entreaty” is attested in two texts: (i) the Old Hittite manuscript of the ritual for the erection of a new palace (KUB 29.3 = IV.C.2) and (iii) in a New Hittite trilingual lexical list (KBo 26.20 = IV.C.1).

In the first text the king implores (talliya-) the Stormgod to allow him (i.e. the king), to cut down the trees that will be used to build a new palace. The sense “to implore” is secured not only by the context but also by the fact, that in the New Hittite manuscript of this text (KUB 29.1), the verb talliya- is replaced by the verb wek- “to request”.

In a New Hittite lexical list the verbal noun talliyawar is chosen as a translation of the Sumerian šu-lum and Akkadian sullû. In view of the fact that the main meanings of the Akkadian verb sullû(m) are “to implore (gods)”; “to pray to”, “to beseech, to appeal” (CAD Š: 366-368), the translation of the Hittite noun talliyawar in the lexical list as “entreaty” is very plausible. The fact that the nouns mugawar and talliyawar are mentioned in this text one after the other also supports the argument that the verbs mugai- and talliya- and their derivatives are related contextually.
C. mugai- and talliya-

In several texts, the verbs *mugai-* and *talliya-* either replace each other or appear in one text as verbs that designate various aspects of the same ritual activity. While *mugai-* refers to the action of inducing the gods or spirits of the dead to approach and resume their beneficent role; *talliya-* designates the action of luring the deities or spirits.

One passage of the myth about the disappearance of the Stormgod, the personal deity of queen Ašmunikkal (KUB 33.21 = III.A.b.8), describes how an altar is erected and a hunting bag is hung on a tree. Inside the bag, among other things, are *galaktar* and *parHuena-*; *galaktar* is placed to soothe (*gala(n)k-*) and *parHuena-* to *mugai-* the god. The verb *mugai-* replaces here *talliya-* that is typically employed with the noun *parHuena-* in the context of myths about the disappearing gods (e.g. the Telipinu myth KUB 17.10 = IV.B.4 or the myth about the disappearance of the goddess Ḥannahanna HT 100+ = IV.B.6). There seems to be a particular relationship between the noun *parHuena-* and the action denoted by the verb *talliya-*, much the same as between the noun *galaktar* and the verb *kala(n)k-lgala(n)k-*. As *galaktar* is able to soothe a deity, *parHuena-* is able to *talliya-* and, in one instance to *mugai-*, a deity. One may suggest that perhaps the nouns, *galaktar* and *parHuena-*, denote substances that have similar qualities; as *galaktar* soothes a deity, *parHuena-* perhaps relaxes and puts a deity in a pleasant mood. Here the connection with the verb *tallieš-* “to be pleasant” and the adjective *talli-* “pleasant” suggested by Oettinger (1979: 251) and Kassian et al. (2002: 545) would make sense. However, since the verb *mugai-* is never employed in Hittite texts in the sense “to please” or “to be pleasant” and since *mugai-* is interchangeable with *talliya-* in this context, this meaning has to be ruled out for both verbs (i.e. *mugai-* and *talliya-*).

Another, more plausible, meaning is suggested by the invocation ritual of the Stormgod of Kuliwisna (KUB 33.62 = IV.B.5) and by the myth and the invocation ritual of the goddess Ḥannahanna (DINGIR.MAḪ) (KUB 33.75 = III.A.b.11 and IV.B.7). In the first ritual the noun *parHuena-* is used to attract the god so that he can return all the favours to persons who commissioned the ritual (i.e. “the lord of the house” and his wife). The attracting is denoted by the expression *para talliya-*. The *parHuena-* grain along with other materials, such as figs, wine or water, is also used to lure a deity in the Ḥannahanna myth. Since the *parHuena-* grain has a quality that is able to lure a deity, it is reasonable to assume that the verbs *talliya-* and *mugai-* employed with this noun in the context of myths about the disappearing gods carry the meaning “to lure, to induce”.
Both verbs carry their basic meanings, that is “to induce, to invoke” (mugai-) and “to lure” (talliya-) in the texts in which both verbs appear together, namely several invocation rituals, a few rituals of summoning the soul of a deceased and one New Hittite prayer.

The invocation rituals include:

(i) a Middle Hittite ritual performed by the woman named Paškuwatti to cure impotence (KUB 9.27++ = III.A.b.19 and IV.B.8),
(ii) a Middle Hittite invocation ritual of the Stag-god of the Hunting Bag (KBo 20.107++ = III.A.b.20.II and IV.B.10),
(iii) a Middle Hittite ritual of invoking the male Cedar-gods (KUB 15.34 = III.A.b.24 and IV.B.12),
(iv) a New Hittite copy of a Middle Hittite invocation ritual (KUB 15.31 = III.A.b.26 and IV.B.14)
(v) a late New Hittite copy of the invocation ritual of the male Cedar-gods (KUB 13.29 + III.A.b.25 and IV.B.13).

In all these texts the verbs mugai- and talliya- are employed together in a prayer spoken during the performance of the ritual to emphasise the action of summoning and attracting the deities, motivating as well as activating the deities to come or to return to the side of the supplicant and listen to his/her request.

Both verbs are also used to lure a deity or the soul of a deceased (KBo 14.70 + KUB 30.60 = III.A.b.5 and IV.B.2; KBo 31.5 + = III.A.b.6.I and IV.B.3; KBo 41.1a + b = III.A.b.23 and IV.B.11). While, in these contexts, the verb talliya- always expresses the notion of drawing or luring a deity or a soul away from someone; the noun mukeššar always denotes a ritual performed to induce the deity or the soul of a deceased to come back to the supplicant so that he/she can resume his/her protective roles.

Finally both verbs are employed together in a New Hittite prayer of Muršili II in which the king accuses his stepmother of killing his wife and of a series of abuses of power (KUB 14.4 = III.A.b.1 and IV.B.1). In one passage, the king or the scribe, on behalf of the king, mentions the neglected cult of the goddess Ḥebat of Kummanni; Muršili’s father promised the goddess a festival of invocation but did not perform it, causing the goddess’ wrath. The task of appeasing the angry goddess fell on Muršili II. In the relevant passage, the king reminds the goddess that he already has given
compensation gifts and that he has been constantly luring (talliya-) and invoking (mugai-) the goddess on behalf of himself, his family and his land.

To sum up, mugai- and talliya- are both verbs of motion that describe various aspects of ritual actions that are to summon and lure the deities and souls of the deceased. The verbal acts also designated by both verbs are the integral components of these rituals.

2.2.5. walla/i-, wallu-, walluške/a-, walli-, walliyatar/walliyann-

Previous Research

The first noted comment on the group of words based on the stem walli-/wallu- was made by Sturtevant (1931: 76, 1936: 176). He translated the verb walliya/e- and its iterative walleške/a- without the particle -za as “to praise” and with the particle -za as “to boast”. He rendered the noun walliyatar as “glorification, praise” but the verb walluške/a- as “to be strong(?).”

Gurney (1940: 42-44) rendered the verb walliya- employed in an introduction to a hymn and prayer to Telipinu (KUB 24.1) as “to praise” and commented on the meaning of this verb in other Hittite texts. After examining the available evidence, he observed that this verb occurs in two constructions (i) without the particle -za and with a noun in the accusative case denoting a praised deity (KBo 4.6; KUB 24.7) and (ii) with the particle -za (KUB 4.1; KUB 5.6). In the first construction the verb carries the meaning “to praise” and in the second “to praise oneself, to boast.” Gurney connected this verb to the noun UZU walla- “leg, thigh” and concluded that at some point in time there was a shift in meaning from “thigh” to “strength.”

In the main volume of his Hethitisches Wörterbuch Friedrich translated the verb walla- without the particle -za and the verb wallu- (with its iterative wallušk-) as “rühmen, preisen” and the verb walla- with the particle -za as “sich rühmen, prahlen.” He rendered the noun walliyatar as “Ruhm, Lobpreis; Preislied” and the adjective walliwalli- as “ungestüm(?) , stürmisch(? )” (HW: 242-243). In the third supplement to his dictionary published in 1966, Friedrich, following Laroche, derived the verb walla- from *wal- “to be strong” and gave as its cognate Latin valere (1966: 461).

Laroche (1964: 27-29) began his discussion of the verb walliya- with a brief definition of a hymn as a poem that is composed to honour a particular deity. It usually contains the most important attributes of a given deity, mentions the position held by the deity in the pantheon, recalls episodes of the deity’s life and occasionally but not necessarily introduces a prayer. Laroche argued that since all the hymns that have been found in the Hittite archives at Boğazköy are Akkadian compositions or Hittite
translations of Akkadian hymns or, at least, are heavily influenced by Akkadian phraseology, the hymn was not a genre native to the Hittite literary system. Laroche did not mean to say that the idea of praising a deity as such was alien to the Hittites, but that such praise would have assumed a different form. Rather than composing hymns, the Hittite scribes employed short phrases and formulas that formed part of a ritual. Laroche also noted that the Hittite verb for “to praise, to glorify” is *walliya- and argued that in religious context it assumed the more specific meaning “to recite a hymn”. He also briefly discussed words that, according to him, belong to the same semantic family. Thus, he observed that -za *walliya- and its iterative -za wallu(šk)- “to praise oneself”, the noun *walliyatar “glory, renown, boastfulness, pride”, the negative niwalli- “powerless, helpless, innocent”, *walliwalli- an epithet of the winds and the goddess Ištar and waliwaliya “to strengthen” are all derived from the adjective *walli/u- “strong, powerful” which is related to Indo-European *wal- “to be strong” and is a cognate of Latin valeo, Gothic walda etc.

Neu translated the verb wallu- as “rühmen, preisen” (KUB 48.99: 14’). Although he interpreted walluškiddumatwa=za, which appears in line i 14’ of KUB 36.44, as the second person plural preterite (walluškiddu=ma=at=wa=za), he observed that this form can also be read as imperative (walluškiddu=ma=at=wa=za) (1968: 188 with notes 1 and 2).

Oettinger (1979: 490-491) translates the verb wallie-ḥhi as “rühmen”, identifies its grammatical forms as wallaḥbi (first person singular present) and waliyanzi (third person plural present) and observes that the iterative form wallišk- is ambiguous. He regards the verb walluₘi(?) the Luwian *wallyi- and the adjectives *walli- “strong” (the meaning prompted probably by the cuneiform Luwian niwalli- “innocent”) and walliwalli- “quick” as belonging to the same semantic group as wallie-ḥhi. He connects this word family with Latin valēre “to be strong” and Tocharian B walo “king” and derives it from the PIE *ualH-.

Lebrun (1980: 415, 416, 442-443) follows Laroche in deriving the verb *walliya-, its iterative *wallišk- and the adjective walliwalli- (an epithet of Ištar of Samuha) from the adjective *walli/u- “strong, powerful” for which he gives the Indo-European cognates, namely Latin valeol/validus and Old Church Slavonic vlado, as well as a PIE root *wal-meaning “to be strong”. He then translates the verb *walliya- as “to celebrate, praise” and argues that this verb describes the laudatory part integrated into a malteššar. Lebrun also comments on the semantic shift of the verb *walliya- from “to be strong” to “praise”. According to Lebrun the Hittites regarded their gods as supernatural kings, who expected and relished flattery. The Hittite deities particularly enjoyed it when their divine power
was mentioned and praised. The more adulation the gods received, the more inclined they were to fulfil the request(s) of a supplicant. Therefore, according to Lebrun, it is not a coincidence that the Hittites employed the verb \textit{walliya- “to strengthen” in the specific meaning “to praise”}.

Hoffner (1982: 135 note 13) notes that the verb \textit{walliya-} with the particle \textit{-za} means “to boast” and that, in the context of the Milawata letter, the object of \textit{-za walliya-} is what one prides oneself on owning or controlling.

Melchert treats the verbs \textit{walla-} and \textit{wallu-} as closely related to one another and translates them as “to praise, boast”. He reconstructs \textit{walla-} as PIE *\textit{wal-ne}, and \textit{wallu} as PIE *\textit{wal-neu} and gives the semantic evolution of the verbs \textit{walla-/wallu-} from “make strong” to “magnify” to “praise”. Melchert also identifies the Cuneiform Luwian cognate of Hittite \textit{walliya-} as \textit{walliya- “to lift, raise”} (1994: 81). He mentions the same cognates, that is, Cuneiform Luwian \textit{walli(ya)- “to raise, lift”}, Hieroglyphic Luwian \textit{wa/i-li-ia- “exalt”} and Hittite \textit{walli- “praise”} in his \textit{Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon} (1993: 252).

De Roos classifies \textit{walliyatar} as a prayer type (1995: 1999) and observes that in the structurally complex royal prayers, the noun \textit{walliyatar} also designates a hymnic part (1995: 2001-2).

Tischler (2001: 193) translates the verb \textit{walla-/walliya-}, the iterative \textit{wallešk-/wallišk} without the particle \textit{-za} as well as the medio-passive verb \textit{wallu-} as “rühmen, preisen” and the verb \textit{walla-/walliya-} with the particle \textit{-za} as “sich rühmen, prahlen.” He renders the nouns \textit{walli-} as “Ruhm, Stolz” and \textit{walliyatar-} as “Ruhm, Preislied” and derives these forms from the adjective *\textit{walli- “kräftig”}, arguing that this meaning of the adjective *\textit{walli} is secured by the existence of such forms as \textit{walliwallai- “kräftigen”} and the adjective \textit{walliwalli- “stark, kräftig”}.

Trabazo (2002: 513 n. 18) follows Gurney (1940: 42-44) and translates the verb \textit{walla-/walliya-} with the particle \textit{-za} as “vanagloriarse, jactarse” and without \textit{-za} as “ensalzar, rezar.”

Mazoyer notes that \textit{wallušk-} is “formation distributive, doublet de -\textit{za walliya- se vanter”}. He also notes that the verb \textit{wallišk-} with the particle \textit{-za} often appears with the name of a deity in the sense “célébrer un hymn” and, following Laroche, observes that in religious context the Hittite verb \textit{walliya- “to praise, to glorify” carries a specific meaning “to recite a hymn” (2003: 185).

Ünal (2007: 780, 783) treats the verbs \textit{walla- , wallai- , walliya- , and wallu-} as related to one another. He translates them as “to extol, to glorify, to praise” when they appear without the particle \textit{-za}, and as “to boast about; to take pride in possession of’
when they co-occur with the particle -za. He also translates the nouns walliya- as “praise, boast, fame, reputation, glory”, walliyatar- as “praise, hymn of praise, glorification” and the adjective walliwalli- as “mighty, strong, powerful, violent.”

Kloekhorst (2008: 948-952), proposes, as others before him, that the stem walli- is the source of the derivates walliyatar/walliann- “(song of) praise”, walli- “pride” and the verb walla/i- meaning “to praise, to honour” when the verb appears without the particle -za and “to boast, to brag” when the verb appears with -za. For the verb, Kloekhorst employs the form walla/i- rather than walliya- since the exact inflection of this verb is unknown. Kloekhorst also comments on the adjective walliwalliya-, which appears mostly as an epithet of the goddess Ištar and on one occasion as an epithet of “winds” (KUB 33.112). As Gurney (1940) also Kloekhorst does not believe that there is a connection between the verb walla/i- and walluške/a- and he translates the latter as “to pray to, to ask (of a deity)”, although, he notes, that in KUB 29.1 this meaning is not ascertained.

Attestations

Verbs and nouns that share the root wall(l)- and that carry the meanings “to praise, to honour, to boast” and “praise, pride, glory” include the nouns walli-, walliyatar/walliann- and the verbs walla/i-36 and wali- attested once (KUB 19.55+ = V.B.2) as waliat (hapax). To date, no consensus has been reached as to whether or not the verb wall(l)u- and the iterative walluešk- also belong to the same semantic group. Most scholars argue in favour of such a connection (Oettinger 1979, Laroche 1964, Lebrun 1980, Melchert 1994), others either firmly oppose it (Gurney 1940) or are hesitant to acknowledge it (Kloekhorst 2008). A review of all the available evidence shows that wallu- and walla/i- are semantically related to each other. In four well-preserved texts, in which the form of wallu- and wallušk- appear (one Old Hittite, one Middle Hittite and two New Hittite texts), the meanings “to boast; to praise, to honour” are assured by the context.

As already observed by previous scholars, two constructions with the verbs walla/i- and wallu- are attested in Hittite text (i) without the particle -za and with a noun in the accusative case designating the praised person/deity/object and (ii) with the reflexive particle -za. In the first construction both verbs carry the meanings “to praise, to honour”; in the second construction, when used intransitively both verbs mean “to praise

---

36 This dissertation follows Kloekhorst 2008: 944, 945 in citing the verb as walla/i- rather than as walliya-.
oneself, to boast” and when used transitively “to boast about sth.” with the object of boasting appearing in the accusative.

A. Well or Relatively Well Preserved Contexts


B. Fragmentary Contexts

\textit{walla-}: \textit{tu-uk DINGIR-IA wa-al-la-aḫ-ḫi nu-ud-du-za-kán ŠA} [ ... ] (KUB 31.127 iii 37); x x /// \textit{wa-al-la-an'(qa)-ti-iš} (KBo 26.34 i 11) \textit{walli-}: \textit{na-aš-za-kán wa-al-[i- ... ]} (KBo 19.80: 13’); \textit{na-aš-za wa-al-li-[š-ki ...]} (KBo 12.26 obv./rev. 9’); [ ... \textit{wa-al-li-iš-ki-id-du A-NA DINGIR} ... ] (KUB 31.125: 9’), [ ... ] \textit{wa-al-le-eš-ki-id-du} (KUB 22.116 rev. 2’), [ ... ] x \textit{wa-li-ia-wa-an-za} (paradigm of the verb \textit{walli-?}) (KUB 8.17 i 7’), \textit{w[a'2-][l]'i-\textasciitilde{iš}-}\textit{kir ḤUR.SAG-a[z-...]} (KBo 16.21: 3’); \textit{wallu-}: \textit{wa-al-lu-u[š- ...]} (KBO 54.33: 3’); \textit{wa-al-lu-wa-an-za} (KBO 26.34 i 3); \textit{walluške-}: [ ... ] x \textit{ANŠE.KUR.RA \textit{wa-al-lu-uš-ki-

\textit{ši am-mu-ga-za ŠA} (KUB 19.20 + rev. 15); ku-in-ki DINGIR-LAM wa-al-lu-\textit{uš-ke-zi} [ ... ], ku-e-da-ni-ia še-er wa-al-lu-uš-kā[n-zi] (KUB 34.53 ii 12’, 13’); [ ... \textit{wa-al-lu-uš-ki-zi nu a-pé-e-da-ni-ia} (KBO 32.16 iii 6’); \textit{walli-} (noun): [ ... NINDA.GU\textit{R}4,RA A-NA \textit{dIŠTAR wa-al-li-ia-aš pár-ši-ia} (KUB 59.55: 4’); [ ... ] x \textit{wa-al-li-wa-al-li-ia-aš ŠA aMur-[ši]-li / [ ... ] x A-NA \textit{dIŠTAR LÍL wa-al-li-ia-aš} (Bo 3320: 19’- 20’); [ ... \textit{wa-al-li-ia-}\textasciitilde{aš} (KUB 54.16 iv 1’); \textit{walliyatar/walliyan-}: [ ... ] x \textit{wa-al-li-ia-tar} x [ ... ] (KUB 31.125: 10’); \textit{wal-lu-ia-an-ni ú-[ ... ]} (888/z i 7’).

\footnote{The list of attestations is based on the lexical card catalogue of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz.}
C. Restored Forms

\textit{walla}-: [wa]-al-la-[aḫ-ḫi]-ia-an (KUB 8.57: 1); \textit{walliyatar}: wal[liyatar ėšdu(?)] (KBo 11.1 rev. 21).

KUB 8.57 + (CTH 341.III.1.A + H) is a fragment of the New Hittite version of Gilgamesh. The present fragment preserves the beginning of the first tablet of the series.

Friedrich (1930: 2) read the first two lines as: (1) x-x-x-x-ia-an x x [.........] / (2) [U]R.SAG-in [.................]; Otten (1958: 98) as: (1) [w]a²-[a]-l-[i]-i-an’ x x [...] / (2) [U]R.SAG-in [...] restoring an accusative singular of the noun \textit{walliyatar} and translating it as ein “Preislied” (Ein Preislied [auf Gilgamesch] den Helden [will ich singen:]); Bachvarova (2002: 142), following Laroche (1964: 28, n.8), reads the first two lines as \textit{wa-al-la}’-[aḫ-ḫi]-i-an ‘G[ILGAMEŠ] / UR ‘prai[se] him. G[ilgamesh]/ the hero.”

Beckman (2001:158) and Haas (2006: 274) give the first two lines of KUB 8.57 as “[Of Gilgamesh], the hero, [I will sing his praises]” and “[Gilgameš], den Helden, [will ich preisen ...]”, indicating that neither the verb \textit{walla/i-} nor the noun \textit{walliyatar} is preserved on the tablet.

Since the traces on the photograph are consistent with \textit{wa-al-la’}-[x x]-i-an, Laroche’s reading \textit{wa-al-la-[aḫ-ḫi]-ia-an “je vais célébrer” is accepted here.}

Discussion

Most written evidence for the verbs \textit{walla/i-} and \textit{wallu-} and the nouns \textit{walli-} and \textit{walliyatar} comes from the Middle and New Hittite periods.\footnote{The verb \textit{walla/i-} has been traditionally derived from the PIE root *\textit{wal}- meaning “to be strong”.

If a New Hittite duplicate of a ritual for the erection of a new palace (KUB 29.1 = V.A.10) was copied verbatim, there is at least one instance of the verb \textit{wallu-} employed in an Old Hittite composition.

The verbs \textit{walla/i-} and \textit{wallu-} and the noun \textit{walliyatar} are employed in Middle and New Hittite texts when a person is praised for his/her accomplishment(s) (KUB 21.38 = V.A.3) or a handiwork (KBo 32.14 = V.A.13), a hero is glorified for his qualities and exploits (KUB 8.57 = see above under “restored forms”) and an object is admired for its exceptional features (KBo 32.14 = V.A.13; KBo 32.19 = V.A.14).

KUB 21.38 is a letter commissioned by queen Puduḫepa to respond to an angry communication from Ramses II complaining about the delay in the dispatch of the Hittite princess to Egypt. The sole purpose of the letter is to explain the Hittite position and smooth over the dispute. In lines 47-52 of the obverse the queen draws an analogy. She
has selected Babylonian and Amorite princesses as her daughters-in-law, although there were more than adequate candidates among the Hittite women. By doing so she allied the kingdom of Hatti with the great powers of the time and hence brought glory and renown (\textit{walliyatar}) to herself, the king and her own people. Accordingly, if the pharaoh takes the Hittite princess for a wife he will do it for his own renown and glory.

KBo 32.14 or the Middle Hittite “Song of Release” mentions a smith who cast a cup “for praise” (\textit{walliyanni}) and a builder who built a tower “for praise” (\textit{walliyanni}). On the one hand the noun \textit{walliyatar} expresses idea that a cup was made to be praised for its exquisite beauty and a tower for its sturdiness; on the other hand, it implies that the creators of this exceptional object and building will be praised for their skills.

In another fragment of the “Song of Release” (KBo 32.19) two human speakers, namely Meka and Zazalla, argue, in the assembly of Ebla, over freeing the captives. In lines ii 9-26 and iii 33’-51’of KBo 32.19 the god Tešub is threatening Ebla, in words conveyed by Meki: if the Eblait release Purra and the men of Ikinkalis, they will be victorious in battles and their fields will thrive; if they do not release the captives, the city will be destroyed. The noun \textit{walliyatar} refers here to \textit{AŠÀḫuršāuar} or an “agrarian field” and must mean in the present context “praise.” The general sense is that the god will make the field so productive that it will become a source of praise for the Eblaites.

In the following two examples the verbs \textit{walla/i-}, \textit{wallu-} and the noun \textit{walli-} carry the meaning “to honour” and “pride.”

A treaty between the Hittite king Arnuwanda I and the Kaška people (KUB 23.77+ = V.A.2) includes passages that define an enemy of the Hittite king, namely a person who attacks a Hittite city. The Hittites and the Kaška people alike, shall not allow him into their cities, shall not give him food and drink, but most importantly, the Hittites shall not abandon to him the city of Ḥattuša. Instead they shall defend the city and treat it with the outmost respect and reverence (\textit{wallu-}). A similar use of the verb \textit{walla/i-} is found in a fragment of the “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” (KUB 19.13+ = V.A.1). The fragment describes how the king attacks the Kaška people by burning down the land of the river Daḥara and the land of Tapapinuwa. The king is at the brink of destroying also the town of Timuḫala but the Kaška people submit to the rule of the Hittite king. The town of Timuḫala is described as a place \textit{walliyaš} of the Kaška people, which probably means the core of the kingdom. If the city falls into the hands of the enemy, the entire kingdom would collapse. In that context the noun \textit{walli-} can only mean a place of pride in the sense of “dignity, honour”.
In religious context, the verb and noun that share the root *wall-* are employed in the sense “to praise” when (i) a deity is praised in order to be motivated to fulfill the supplicant’s requests, (ii) a deity is praised as part of a worship and (iii) a deity is praised because he/she heard and fulfilled requests of the supplicant.

In “praise to receive” the verb and the noun are used to designate a religious utterance that is to empower and motivate a deity to act. The worshipper reminds the deity of his/her divine attributes, which the worshipper wishes to see put to work for him/her. He/she also reminds the deity of the divine right and obligation to take the lead in this matter. A typical example of this type of praising is found in KUB 24.1 (V.A.6), a prayer and hymn of Muršili II to Telipinu (the text will be discussed in full in chapter three).

In “praising to worship” a supplicant does not approach a deity to present a request or wish but to praise a deity for his/her cosmic functions and his/her divine attributes in the hope that the deity will be well disposed towards the worshipper in case his/her good will and assistance is needed. The finite form of the verbs *walla/i-* and/or the noun *walliyatar* are employed in this sense in three texts: in a Hittite version of the hymn to the goddess Ištar (KUB 31.141 = V.A.4), in a hymn to Ištar and her circle (KUB 24.7 = V.A.12) and in a fragment belonging to the Kumarbi myth (KBo 26.88 + HFAC 45 = V.A.5). In KBo 26.88 + the god Takidu, who acts on behalf of the goddess Ḫepat, goes to the city of Simmurra to investigate a woman called Kutiladu. After being questioned by the god, Kutiladu is said to “abandon the sin” and praise (*wallišk-* the goddess. One must conclude that the “sin” must have been that previously she did not worship the deity. In this context *wallišk-* clearly means “to praise, to worship.”

The following attestations of *walla/i-* and *wallu-* involve praising a deity as a form of payment for the fulfillment of the supplicant’s requests. The *walliyatar* presupposes the reciprocal giving, the deity gives and then the supplicant will give, and it serves as a commodity in this mutual relationship. In KBo 4.6 (V.A.7), a prayer of Muršili for the recovery of Gaššuliyawiya, the goddess Lelwani is promised praise and worship if the queen is cured. The same pledge of respect/worship is made in prayers of Muwatalli (KUB 6.45 iii 59 = V.A.8 and KBo 11.1 = V.A.9) and in the New Hittite copy of the ritual for the erection of a new palace (KUB 29.1 = V.A.10). In KUB 6.45 the king promises that he and his successors will praise the gods, if they fulfill the king’s plea to remove an “evil thing” from his soul. In KBo 11.1 the noun *walliyatar* is employed in the request part of the prayer. The king asks the Stormgod to return the favour to Kummanni. When the people are content they will praise the Stormgod. In KUB 29.1, in his speech to
the divine throne, the king mentions that he has been selected to the Hittite throne by the Sungoddess and by the Stormgod. Since his installment on the Hittite throne the king has been worshipping (wallu-) the Stormgod in exchange for the favour the god has shown him.

When the verbs walla/i- and wallu- are employed with the particle -za they carry the meaning “to praise oneself, to boast.” Typical examples of this use of the verb include KBo 5.6 (V.B.1), KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 (V.B.2) and KUB 4.1 (V.B.5). In all three texts either nations or rulers boast about their strength and invincibility. Two other texts show that also gods can boast (KUB 36.44 = V.B.3; KUB 48.99 = V.B.4).

Occasionally, the nouns walliyatar and walli- are used as divine epithets. In KUB 59.55 line 4’ we read [ ... NINDA.GU|RA A-NA dIŠTAR wa-al-li-ia-aš pár-ši-ia “he/she breaks the thick bread [...] for Ishtar of glory/praise”; in Bo 3320 line 20’ [ ... ] x x A-NA dIŠTAR LÍL wa-al-li-ia-aš “for Ishtar of the field of glory” and in KUB 2.1 (V.A.11) dA-a-la-aš wa-al-li-[a-an-na-aš] “Ala of praise/glory.” The meaning of walliyatar in these contexts is ambiguous. However, since this noun is used in the sense “praise” in other contexts, it is reasonable to assume that it carries the same meaning in the above texts.

2.3. Conclusion: Summary of Semantic Development and the Usage of Hittite Prayer Terminology

The analysis of all the evidence shows that the verbs arkuwai-, mald-, mugai-, talliya-, walla/i-, wallu- and the nouns arkuwar, malduwar, malteššar, mugawar, mukeššar, talliyawar and walliyatar were employed in Hittite religious contexts to denote various religious utterances and rites, including prayer. All verbs together with their derivatives are polysemic, that is, have more than one related meaning. The paragraphs below summarise the semantic development and the usage of each term. The table at the end of this section provides a summary of the usage of the religious utterances and rites denoted by the terms under study.

The sense that underlies all the meanings assumed by the Hittite verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar, is “to argue”. In the Old Hittite lexical list as well as in Middle Hittite letters discovered in Tapikka (Maşat Höyük) and in the royal archives of Ḫattuša (Boğazköy), the noun arkuwar carries the meanings “response”, “petition” or “explanation”. Because arguments can often be made when responding, petitioning or explaining, the semantic connection of these meanings to the sense “to argue” is easily recognised. In the New Hittite period the meanings “petition” and “to respond” are still
attested for the noun *arkuwar* and for the verb *arkuwai-* in letters and treaties, but certain semantic and contextual changes also take place. First, the noun *arkuwar* expands its sphere of reference and takes on an additional meaning “request”, which is found in at least one ritual text. Even though “request” does not necessarily imply a presentation of arguments, the connection with the meaning “to argue” is through the sense “petition”, since a request may be considered a less formal type of petition. Second, in the profane context, the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* acquire juridical overtones and are used in the sense of “to make a plea/case” and “plea” when a vassal king argues his case before his suzerain (New Hittite treaty) or a ruler makes a plea before his gods (New Hittite letter). It is in this juridical sense that the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* are first used in prayers of Muršili II to denote a prayer, in which the king as a supplicant personally presents arguments before the gods as if in a court of law. Once *arkuwai-* and *arkuwar* became the established designation for one type of personal prayer, the verb and the noun are then employed to designate all types of personal prayers, even those that do not entail arguments, including vows and prayer-requests. Also in the New Hittite period the noun *arkuwar* begins to denote a physical object in KIN oracles.

The noun *arkuwar* and the verb *arkuwai-* show the semantic change from specific to general with two meanings “to plead” and “to pray” becoming more central and prominent in the New Hittite period. The other meanings “to respond, to petition” either disappear or become more peripheral. The transfer of meaning and usage of the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* from profane to religious context, particularly to the context of Hittite prayer, reflects the changes that occur in the Hittite prayer system and in the relationship between the supplicant and the Hittite gods during the New Hittite period (on this, see chapter three).

Contrary to *arkuwai-* the verb *mald-* and its derivatives, the nouns *malteššar* and *malduwar*, are employed exclusively in religious contexts. In the Old Hittite shelf-lists as well as in the ritual and festival texts, the verb *mald-* carries the meaning “to recite; to pray” and refers to words spoken before a deity during the performance of a ritual or a festival. When the words introduced by the verb *mald-* are included in a text, they entail Hattic incantations, invocations (summoning a deity by uttering his/her name), recitations of activities undertaken during the performance of the ritual/festival, blessings over wine and prayers of request. When used in this meaning the verb *mald-* alternates with the verb *memai-* “to speak”. In the Old Hittite period the verb *mald-* is also used in the sense “to make a votive offering”. The semantic connection of this meaning to the sense “to recite” is through the fact that making an offering would also include the spoken word.
In the Middle and New Hittite periods the verb *mald-* and the noun *malteššar* continue to be used in the festival and ritual texts to denote words spoken before a deity but also seem to expand their sphere of reference to denote an oracular question (in one New Hittite oracle text) and to designate all aspects of vow-making, including a vow itself, a ritual or offerings made in fulfilment of a vow and as the reference to a deity that is the recipient of vows (*malteššanala*). The meaning “to vow” might have been associated with the verb *mald-* already in the Old Hittite period but has so far not been attested due to the scanty evidence. In the sense “to vow”, the verb *mald-* and the noun *malteššar* are often written in Hittite texts with the Akkadograms *KARĀBU* and *IKRIBU*. The Hittite scribes chose Akkadian *karābu* (“to pronounce formulas of blessing; to pronounce formulas of praise, adoration, homage and greeting; to invoke blessing; to pray to the gods”, see *CAD* vol. K: 192-3) and *ikribu* (“blessing; money or goods pledged by a vow to a deity; prayer”, see *CAD* vol. I: 62) as semantic equivalents of Hittite *mald-* and *malteššar* probably because both the Akkadian *karābu* and *ikribu* and the Hittite *mald-* and *malteššar* combined the meanings “prayer” and “vow”. This and the fact that, on a few occasions, the Akkadogram *KARĀBU* is replaced by the Hittite expression -za arkuwar ešša-, suggest that the Hittites perceived the vow as a type of prayer.

In the New Hittite period the noun *malteššar* also assumes a more general meaning “offering”, occasionally written logographically as SISKUR (in a cultic itinerary of the king, festival, oracle texts). This extension of meaning was a natural development from the meaning “to make votive offerings”, which the verb *mald-* carries already in the Old Hittite texts.

When describing the semantic development of the verb *mald-* and its derivatives, one cannot really speak of a semantic shift, rather the meanings are selectively activated by the context. The only semantic developments detected for this verb and noun are: (i) the change of meaning of the noun *malteššar* from specific “votive offering” to general “offering” and (ii) the extension of referent from “votive offering” to all aspects of vow making.

The sense that underlies all the meanings assumed by the verb *mugai-* and its derivatives is “to induce”. In the Old, Middle and New Hittite texts the verb *mugai-* and the nouns derived from this verb, namely *mugawar* and *mukeššar*, carry the meanings “to invoke; to induce; to urge into action” and “invocation”, without any semantic changes noted. While the meanings “to induce; to urge into action” are attested in both profane and religious contexts, the meaning “to invoke” is found only in the religious texts. In festivals, rituals, prayers, oracles and myths the verb and the noun *mukeššar* denote every
aspect of a ritual of invocation; that is, the offerings made, the rites performed, the materials used in the ritual and the oral rites spoken, including a prayer of invocation. The main function of this ritual was to induce an angry or an absent deity to return so that he/she could hear a prayer, or could cure various physical and mental indispositions of the human body or could resume the roles which he/she abandoned. The verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar were also used when a ritual expert induced a soul of a deceased to return to the ritual client and to resume its protective functions. In the New Hittite oracles, the noun mukeššar was also employed to denote a physical object in KIN oracles.

In the Old Hittite period, the verb talliya- is attested once in the meaning “to implore”. In the Middle Hittite rituals, festivals, prayers and myths the verb talliya- and the noun talliyawar carry the meaning “to lure” and “allure”; in the New Hittite texts, the verb and the noun are attested in the meanings “to lure (away); to exhort” and “supplication”. It is uncertain whether the meanings “to lure; to exhort” were associated with the verb talliya- already in the Old Hittite period but have so far not been attested due to the scanty evidence, or whether they developed from the meaning “to implore”.

The verb talliya- and the noun talliyawar are partially synonymous with the verb mugai- and the nouns derived from this verb. Like mugai-, the verb talliya- is used mainly to attract a deity or the soul of a deceased. Differences in the usage of these two verbs are that talliya- is used when a deity or a soul of a deceased is lured away from someone and the verb mugai- is used to induce the deity or the spirit of a deceased to return to the supplicant. Besides designating the ritual of drawing or luring a deity, the noun talliyawar possibly denotes also a prayer recited during the performance of this ritual. This, however, must remain a mere suggestion, since in the text that would attest such usage of the noun talliyawar, namely a New Hittite ritual for the Stormgod of Nerik, the words of talliyawar are not included.

In Old, Middle and New Hittite profane and religious texts the verbs walla/i- and wallu- and the noun walliyatar carry two main meanings: “to praise (a deity)” and “to honour”. In the New Hittite religious context, a semantic change takes place from the specific “to praise” to the general “to worship” which implies that, at least in some contexts, “to worship” equalled “to praise”. In Middle Hittite myths and New Hittite historical texts the verb walla/i/u- with the particle -za carries the meaning “to praise oneself”. Occasionally, the noun walliyatar is used as a divine epithet.

In most religious texts the noun and the verb denote short phrases of praise or when the words of walliyatar are not included, they refer to praising a deity. One text provides evidence that the verb could denote a hymn of praise. In the introduction to the
prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu the scribe-priest mentions that he was sent by the royal couple to praise the god and a phrase that can be regarded as an excerpt from the hymn of praise is included. This may suggest that the noun *walliyatar* in fact denoted the hymn of praise as a specific section of structurally complex Hittite royal prayers.

**Hittite Prayer Terms in Religious Context**

The table below provides an overview of the usage of the terms under study in the religious contexts. The verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* were used to designate various types of personal prayer. The verb *mald-* designated mainly all types of ritual speech during the state festivals and rituals, but also denoted a personal prayer-vow and a ritual performed in fulfillment of a vow. The verb *mugai-* as well as the nouns *mukeššar* and *mugawar* denoted a ritual of invocation as well as the offerings given, the materials used and the prayer spoken during the performance of this ritual. The verb *talliya-* and the noun *talliyawar* designated the ritual of luring a deity or the spirit of a dead person and perhaps a prayer spoken during the performance of this ritual. On one occasion, the verb *walla-* designated a hymn of praise that accompanied the recitation of a personal prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb/Noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *arkuwai-* | personal prayer: 
plea-prayer 
prayer-complaint 
prayer-vow (also *IKRIBU*) 
prayer-request 
object in KIN oracle |
| *arkuwar* | 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb/Noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *mald-* | prayer – request 
incantation in Hattic 
blessing over drinks libated to a deity 
prayer-vow 
ritual/offering performed in fulfillment of a vow 
offering 
oracular question |
| *malteššar* (*IKRIBU*) | recipient of a vow |
| *mugai-* | invocation prayer 
invocation ritual 
materials used in invocation ritual 
offerings given in invocation ritual 
object in KIN oracle |
| *mugawar/mukeššar* | 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb/Noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>talliya-</em></td>
<td>ritual of conjuring a soul of the deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>talliyawar</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| walla/i and wallu-walliyatar | • a ritual of luring a deity  
• prayer spoken during the performance of the ritual of luring a deity (?)  
• hymn of praise |
CHAPTER THREE: PRAYER TERMS IN CONTEXT

3.1. Introduction

The semantic and contextual analysis of the *termini technici* of Hittite prayer carried out in the last chapter showed that at least three of those terms designated prayer types. These include the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar*, the verb *mald-* and the noun *malteššar* as well as the verb *mugai-. The verbs *walla/i*- and *wallu-* were used in religious context to denote an action of praising a deity. The verb *talliya-* and the noun *talliyawar* designated the ritual whose objective was to lure a deity or the spirit of a deceased. It would be tempting to assume that *talliya-* and *talliyawar* also designated prayers that were spoken during the performance of this ritual. Since, however, none of them are introduced by or even alluded to by either of these two terms, this must remain a mere suggestion.

In two New Hittite composite texts commissioned by Muršili II, one addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II), the other to Telipinu (CTH 377), a prayer was accompanied by a ritual designated by the verb *mugai-* and by a hymn of praise. In CTH 377, the hymn is denoted by the verb *walla/i-* and the prayer is labelled as *arkuwar*. Another prayer of the *arkuwar* type, composed for Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa and addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 383), is preceded by a short hymn of praise. In a longer composition that contains prayers of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle, the short prayers-requests to Lelwani, to Zintuḫi, to Mezzulla and to the Stormgod of Zippalanda are followed by vows (CTH 384).

These facts about Hittite prayer prompted scholars to suggest that the *termini technici* named above designated either prayer types or the functional elements of a typical Hittite prayer. Both suggestions are correct, but only to a certain extent (see chapter section 1.3.2). For instance, only three out of five terms represent prayer types. Second, the Hittite evidence does not support the claim that the verb *talliya-* and the noun *talliyawar* designated the invocative part and the verb *wek-* the request part of a Hittite prayer. Third, it is not certain that those “royal prayers” which comprised a ritual, a hymn and a prayer, or a hymn and a prayer or a prayer and a vow can and should be viewed as unified literary compositions. Finally, it is unclear what a typical Hittite prayer is and what a typical Hittite prayer entailed.

The issues investigated in this chapter pertain to the problems outlined above and answer the following questions posed in chapter one:
(i) Did any of the terms represent a generic name “prayer” that referred equally to all prayer types?
(ii) When did a particular term begin to be used as a designation for a particular type of prayer?
(iii) What were the key elements of each prayer type?
(iv) How did the use of each term in prayer context evolve over time?
(v) What can semantics of the terms reveal about the way the Hittites perceived their relationship with the divine and the way they perceived prayer, the most direct means of this relationship?
(vi) What is a Hittite royal prayer?

It is assumed here that one of the fundamental features that classifies a given text as a prayer is its tripartite structure\(^{39}\). In most cases a Hittite prayer comprises three elements: (i) an invocation, whose objective is to address a deity usually by pronouncing his/her name, (ii) a motivation that is to convince the deity to hear and grant the request and (iii) a request itself (Justus 2004: 270 and chapter one section 1.3.1). The order in which these structural elements appear in a given text is not fixed and while the address or an invocation may, on some occasions, be absent, the request is always present. This suggests that the essence and the ultimate objective of each prayer was to present a request.

The prayers introduced by the verbs *arkuwai-*，*mald-*，*mugai-* and the noun *arkuwar* as well as selected royal prayers are first studied separately and then together within the reconstructed Hittite prayer system.

### 3.2. Hittite Prayer Terminology and Taxonomy of the Genre

This section examines those types of Hittite prayer that are explicitly labelled or referred to by the verbs *arkuwai-*，*mald-* and *mugai-* and by the noun *arkuwar*. A general description of each type of prayer is followed by a detailed analysis of selected typical examples.

---

\(^{39}\) The structural division of a prayer into an opening *invocatio*, a closing *prex* and intervening *pars epica*, motivation was proposed for Greek prayers by Ausfeld (1903). Another nomenclature for this structure was proposed by Bremer (1981: 196) as ‘invocation’ (to address a given deity), ‘argument’ (motivation of a deity to act) and ‘petition’ (request).
3.2.1. MALD-

prayer-request

The verb *mald-* designates a prayer recited by a Hittite priest on behalf of the king or another member of the royal family during the performance of a state festival or ritual. The official and impersonal character of this type of prayer is reflected in the use of verbs in the third person.

Only two prayer-requests introduced by the verb *mald-* are preserved. One appears in the OH/NS conjuration ritual (KUB 41.23+ = II.A.4), the other in the New Hittite ritual of unknown nature (IBoT 1.30 = II.A.21). In KUB 41.23 the name of a deity addressed is unknown; it must have been mentioned in the part of the text that is now missing. In IBoT 1.30 the addressed deity is the Stormgod of Ḫatti.

The primary function of both prayers is to present a request. To motivate the deity, the priest either reminds him/her of the petitioner’s piety (KUB 41.23) or of the personal relationship between the god and the supplicant. Because of this relationship, the god is believed to be personally responsible for the health and prosperity of the petitioner (IBoT 1.30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 41.23 (CTH 458.10.A)</th>
<th>IBoT 1.30 (CTH 821.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officiant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Officiant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÚAZU “exorcist”</td>
<td>LÚGUDU₁₂ “GUDU”-priest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjuration ritual</td>
<td>festival/ritual of an unknown nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the priest asks for the</td>
<td>the priest asks the Stormgod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejuvenation and the</td>
<td>to be well-disposed towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-being of the king</td>
<td>the king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the priest reminds the</td>
<td>the priest reminds the god that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deity that the king has</td>
<td>he appointed the king as his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been worshipping him/her</td>
<td>governor on earth and therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incessantly and thus has</td>
<td>the god is personally responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a claim on the deity’s</td>
<td>for the well-being of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the priest asks the deity</td>
<td>the priest asks the god for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for preventing an “evil</td>
<td>continual successful reign of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curse” being pronounced</td>
<td>of the king and for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against the king</td>
<td>destruction of those who wish to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In texts dated to the Middle and New Hittite periods, the verb *mald-* also expresses the notion of vow making. The actual words of prayer-vows are preserved mostly in the New Hittite dreams and votive texts where they are typically introduced by the phrase *kiš(š)*an *IKRUB*. In a few instances the vow is introduced by the verb *mald-* (KUB 15.3 = II.B.9, KUB 15.17+ = II.B.12) and in two cases by the phrase *-za arkuwar kiš(š)*an *ešša* (KUB 15.1 = I.B.b.1 and KUB 15.19 I.B.b.2).

A vow is a promise made to a deity by the petitioner. The supplicant either promises precious objects, metals or minerals, or vows to worship the deity, if the deity grants his/her request. The most complete vows contain the name of a deity to whom the vow is made, the circumstances in which the vow is made, the person who makes it, the condition(s) imposed on the deity by the petitioner and the promised objects or religious acts. While some of these features may be absent, the elements that are always present are the name or the social status of the petitioner, the condition(s) imposed on a deity and the promised objects/worship (de Roos 2007: 4-5).

All preserved prayer-vows are usually made by the queen and occasionally by the king.40

The primary function of a prayer-vow is to present a request and to convince the gods to grant this request by making promises. The formula used in prayer-vows is *da-ut-dem* “give so that I may give”. It is grammatically marked by the conditional clause *mān … nu… “if you…, then I …”*.

KUB 15.1 (II.B.8) is a New Hittite text in which the queen makes several vows to different deities. The queen makes her vows either in a dream or because a deity or a person has instructed her in a dream to make a vow. Two vows from KUB 15.1 are analysed below; one is introduced by the phrase *kišan IKRUB*, the other by the expression *-za arkuwar kišan ešša*. KUB 15.3 (II.B.9), contains two vows. The first is introduced by the phrase *kišan IKRUB*, the second by the expression *kišan mald*; only the latter is examined.

---

40 For the detailed discussion of the votive texts see deRoos 2007: 22-70.
### KUB 15.1 (CTH 584)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner:</th>
<th>the queen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deity:</td>
<td>Hepat of Uda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the queen makes a vow in a dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>motivation request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>the queen promises the goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a golden statue, a golden rosette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and a golden pectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the queen asks for the life and safety of the king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduced by:** *IKRUB kiššan*

### KUB 15.3 (CTH 584)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner:</th>
<th>the queen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deity:</td>
<td>Ningal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the queen has been instructed in her dream to make a vow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>motivation request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>the queen promises the goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a golden talla inlaid with lapis lazuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the queen asks the goddess to cure inflammation of the king’s feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduced by:** *kišan mald-

### KUB 15.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner:</th>
<th>the queen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deity:</td>
<td>a deity called “Queen” of Tarḫuntaša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the queen makes her vow in a dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>motivation request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>the queen promises the goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precious objects? of silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(context too fragmentary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the king asks the goddess to support the king and grant him success in some unspecified matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduced by:** *-za arkuwar kišan ešša-

### 3.2.2. MUGAI-

The hymn and prayer of Muršili to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) and the hymn and prayer of Muršili to Telipinu (CTH 377) are the only Hittite texts in which the verb *mugai-* is used to designate a type of prayer. In the prefaces to both texts, the verb *mugai-* denotes the ritual of invocation and introduces the words of a prayer that was
spoken during the performance of this ritual. Both texts include only excerpts of the invocation prayers; according to the colophon of manuscript A of CTH 376.II, the complete ritual of invocation was written on a separate tablet.

These two excerpts employ the most salient feature of an invocation prayer, namely the summoning of a deity marked by the formula nu-za ma-a-an ....appa ... e-ḫu “If you are .... come back!” Another expression, also commonly used in this type of prayer, is arḫa uwa- .... or appa uwa-. .... “come away/back ....”

The invocation prayer was typically spoken on behalf of a client by a ritual expert who also performed the invocation ritual.

The primary function of the invocation prayer was to summon a deity either back to his/her temple, or back to the land of Ḥatti, or to the location of a petitioner, so that he/she can approach and grant the request of the petitioner. A deity was also summoned and asked to resume his/her cosmic functions and his/her roles as the protector and benefactor of the petitioner, which functions the deity has abandoned.

The examples below include the excerpt of the invocation prayer employed in NH/NS ‘prayer’ of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (ms. A = KUB 24.3+ and ms. B = KUB 36.80 = III.A.b.16) and the prayer appearing in the MH/NS ritual of Paškuwatti (KUB 9.27+ = III.A.b.20; IV.B.8). The ritual of invocation mentioned in the Muršili II’s ‘prayer’ summons the Sungoddess of Arinna, the ritual of Paškuwatti summons the goddess named Uliliyašši.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 9.27 (CTH 406)</th>
<th>KUB 24.3+ (CTH 376.II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officiant:</td>
<td>Paškuwatti from Arzawa, a priest or a ritual expert acting on behalf of the king Muršili II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a ritual expert called “Old Woman”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the prayer was spoken during the ritual of invocation performed to cure impotence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 The full philological edition of the ‘prayer’ of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) is included in chapter four.

42 The identity of the person who performs the ritual and who utters a prayer of invocation is unknown. However, because this type of prayer was typically spoken by a ritual expert who also performed a ritual of invocation, it is reasonable to assume that the officiant was also a ritual expert.
remove the plague from Hatti and to stop the enemy invasion

**Structure:** introduction calling motivation calling request motivation request motivation

**Introduction:** the petitioner has lost his reproductive powers and seeks the help of the goddess Uliliyašši

**Calling:** formula used *nu-za ma-a-an* … *eḫtu* “if you are … come!” the goddess is summoned from mountains, meadows, valleys or from any other place in which she could be

**Motivation:** Paškuwatti declares that the petitioner promises to worship the goddess, to make her his personal deity and to make vows to her

**Calling:** the goddess along with the moon, stars, the nocturnal sun and her entourage is summoned to the location of the petitioner

**Request:** Paškuwatti asks the goddess to return the reproductive powers to the petitioner

**Motivation:** the petitioner’s children, whom he will have if the goddess cures him, will worship the goddess in the future

**Request:** Paškuwatti asks the goddess to show her divine power and mercy to the petitioner

**Motivation:** the petitioner will make the goddess his personal deity

---

43 The motivation part of the prayer is not included in this text.
3.2.3. ARKUWAI-, ARKUWAR

The verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* begin to be used in Hittite texts as designations of prayer type only in the New Hittite period. The main characteristic that distinguishes the *arkuwar* prayer from other prayer types, except prayer-vow designated by either the verb *mald-* or the noun *arkuwar* (see pp. 97-98), is its personal character, expressed either by the employment of the verbs in the first person and/or by mentioning the name of the person for whom the prayer was composed. This type of prayer was usually recited by the petitioner himself/herself.

The noun *arkuwar* and the verb *arkuwai-* were used to designate various types of personal prayer, namely prayer-plea, prayer-vow, prayer-complaint or prayer-request. According to Singer (2002a: 5), the personal or royal prayers labelled by Hittite scribes as *arkuwar*, resemble in their form a court case, with the king playing the role of defendant, the offended god(s) acting as prosecutor, and various other gods as witnesses for the defence. Although some elements of plea-prayers may indeed resemble the proceedings in the court of law, the other types of personal prayer do not conform to Singers’ definition.

**plea-prayer**

The plea-prayer was one element of a process whose sole purpose was to appease an angry deity. In that context the plea-prayer appears with making sacrifices, performing rituals and/or offering gifts and reparations.

In the plea-prayer the supplicant, usually the Hittite king or the Hittite queen, as a servant, addresses his/her divine masters, as dispensers of justice, asking for a solution to a problem. The supplicant must present arguments, as he/she was making a case in the court of law, to persuade the deity that he/she deserves assistance. These arguments are included in the motivation part of the *arkuwar* prayer.

Arguments can be presented either to convince the gods to stop the plague and/or the enemy invasion, to excuse or explain one’s conduct, or to find the causes of the divine wrath. The motives that reappear in most of the plea-prayers are the confession of sins usually committed by the petitioner’s predecessors, insistence of the petitioner’s innocence and the promise of penitence. In some of the plea-prayers, the supplicant is allowed to complain to the gods or even to reproach the gods for the unfair treatment.
The beginning of a long composition attributed to the king Muwatalli II (KUB 6.45 = I.A.7) and addressed to the entire Hittite pantheon contains a statement of purpose of the plea-prayer: “If some matter weighs on a man, he makes a plea to the gods”; the plea-prayer was thus spoken in times of mental distress or adversity.

A. Plague Prayers

Two arkuvaw prayers included below, namely KUB 14.14+ and KUB 14.8+ (for the full editions of these two texts see chapter four), deal with the plague that broke out in Ḫatti during the reign of Muršili’s father, Šuppiluliuma I. The first prayer (KUB 14.14+) is addressed to all the male and female gods, all the male and female gods of the oath, all the male and female primeval gods, mountains, springs and underground watercourses. The second prayer addresses the Stormgod of Ḫatti and other Hittite gods.

Although these two prayers differ in details, the general structure of both texts is the same. Both prayers show tripartite structure (i.e. address, motivation and request). Both prayers include the presentation of the case; the confession of the possible offences that might have caused the plague and that have been confirmed by the oracle; the punishment that ensued these offences; the promise of reparations or reminding the gods that reparations had been made in the past and continue to be made in the present; the insistence of the petitioner’s innocence and the request to remove the plague.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officiant:</strong></td>
<td>the king, Muršili II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the priest(?) reciting Muršili II’s personal prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure:</strong></td>
<td>address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation (plea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation (plea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation (plea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation (plea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction:</strong></td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the officiant declares that he was sent by the king to speak the prayer before the gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
<td>the presentation of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the outbreak of the plague in Ḫatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the presentation of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the outbreak of the plague that devastated Ḫatti in the time of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the king’s father and during the reign of the king’s brother

**Argument 1**
the king reminds the gods that he himself has been worshipping all the gods and that he has been making pleas and vows to them, but they did not hear the king’s appeal. The plague continues to ravage the Hittite lands and the people who attend to the gods continue to die

**Argument 2:**
the king consulted the oracle which determined that the offence was the murder of the legitimate heir to the Hittite throne, Tudḫaliya the Younger, by the members of the Hittite nobility and by Šuppiluliuma

**Argument 3:**
the king confesses his father’s sins because it has been determined by the oracle that he does so

**Argument 4:** penitence
the king declares that he has been giving and that he will continue to give reparations for the offences of his father

**Request:**
the king begs the Stormgod to hear his pleas and to stop the plague

**Motivation:**
the king claims that the reparation for the sin has been paid by the culprits and by the population of Ḫatti and is being paid by Muršili himself

**Request:**
the king asks the gods to have pity on him

the king announces that he has already celebrated the ritual of the oath for the Stormgod of Ḫatti and for the other gods and that he will also celebrate the neglected ritual of the Mala River
Motivation:  
**Argument 3: Exculpation**  
Muršili’s exculpates himself from any guilt. The culprits are dead, but because the sin of his father passed to him, the king is making restitutions and is paying compensation.

**Argument 5: Exculpation**  
the king admits that his father sinned but he is innocent. However, because sins pass from father to son, the king accepts the responsibility for his father’s sin.

Request:  
the king again asks the gods to have pity on him.

Motivation:  
**Argument 4**  
it is in the gods best interest to stop the plague lest no one remain to attend to them.

**Argument 6**  
to convince the gods to grant his wish the king uses analogy: as a bird seeks the security of his cage and the cage saves it, as a servant appeals to his master for help and his master hears his plea, as a servant commits an offence and confesses to his master and the master forgives his servant, so the king expects to be saved and forgiven because he has confessed the sin of his father and accepted the responsibility for his father’s offences. The king and the population of Ḫatti have paid the price for the sin of Šuppiluliuma, but the gods are still not pleased.

Request:  
the king asks the gods to remove the plague from Ḫatti, send it to the enemy lands and spare those bread makers and libation pourers who are still alive.

the king asks the gods to save him and Ḫatti, to remove the plague and to spare those bread makers and libation pourers who are still alive.

the kings also asks the gods to inform him of any restitution that still need to be paid and to reveal to him, through a dream any other offences that might have caused the divine anger and consequently the plague.

---

**B. exculpation prayer**

In this type of the plea-prayer the supplicant pleads with the divine judges and presents arguments that are to explain or justify his conduct. One can interpret this type of prayer as a defence in the court of law, where the gods are the judges and the king is the defendant.

The fragmentary prayer included below and labelled by the Hittite scribe with the verb *arkuwait-* was commissioned by the king Muršili II. It was probably addressed to the
entire assembly of the Hittite gods (the beginning of the prayer is lost, however, within the prayer the king asks the gods to investigate the king’s case) and was spoken by the king himself.\footnote{Edition: Cornelius 1975; Hoffner 1983: 187-192.}

In this prayer the king promises penitence, expresses his dissatisfaction with the gods and complains about the unjust treatment.

---

**KBo 4.8+ (CTH 71)**

**Officiant:** the king

**Context:** after the passing of his wife, the king turns against Tawannanna, his stepmother, who was allegedly responsible for her death. However, because Tawannanna was the priestess of the Sun goddess of Arinna, the king fears divine punishment and makes this exculpation prayer to avoid the divine wrath

**Structure:** motivation request motivation request

**Motivation:** the king declares that the oracular investigation confirmed the guilt of Tawannanna and determined that she should be dethroned and put to death

However, the king did not execute her but instead deposed her from the office of the priestess. He also banished her from the palace and gave her an estate, where she lives in peace and prosperity

the king now asks the gods to carefully consider the case and to determine who has been really punished in this situation: while guilty Tawannanna, although dethroned and deposed from her office, is still alive and well, the king has lost his beloved wife. The king declares that it is him who has been punished and expresses his surprise at the divine failure to recognise the truth

Still, the king promises that for the deposition of Tawannanna, he will provide the gods with offerings and he will worship them regularly

**Request:** in exchange the king request that the gods do not reinstate Tawannanna to the priesthood.

**Motivation:** The king reminds the gods that she was an evil person when she was the queen and she continues to be a malevolent
woman now; she keeps cursing the king, the god’s servant and priest

**Request:** The gods listened to her before and the king’s wife is dead. Now, the king asks that the gods hear his plea instead and stop listening the “word of evil”

```
C. prayer of confession and penitence

Two arkuwar prayers of this type are analysed below. The first prayer (KBo 11.1 = I.A.8)\(^{45}\) was composed during the reign of Muwatalli and was addressed to the Stormgod. The occasion for the prayer was probably a general decline in the state of Kummanni/Kizzuwatna that was regarded to have been caused by a prolonged neglect of its cults by Muwatalli’s father, Muršili II. The second prayer (KUB 21.19 = I.A.9)\(^{46}\) was commissioned by Hattušili III and was addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna.

Both prayers were spoken in order to appease an angry deity through confession of sins and a promise of penitence. In both prayers, the Hittite king does not know the real cause of the deity’s anger and thus seeks to discover it through listing the possible reasons.

In the first of those prayers (KBo 11.1) the king searches through the offences committed by local gods and offences committed by people (either human transgressions against local gods and holy places, or violation of codes of social justice, or desecration of holy entities, expropriation of divine property or inadmissible speech). The king promises to make amends, if the offence/sin is a human’s transgression. However, if the Stormgod’s anger was caused by a deity, the king invokes the netherworld deities and asks them to reconcile the discordant parties. In the second prayer (KUB 21.19), the king provides a list of offences committed by his father and his brother and focuses on his own innocence.

```
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBo 11.1 (CTH 382)</th>
<th>KUB 21.19 (CTH 383)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officiant:</strong></td>
<td>the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure:</strong></td>
<td>invocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(^{st}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(^{nd}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(^{rd}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(^{st}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(^{nd}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(^{rd}) offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(^{th}) offence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{47}\) The deity addressed in this prayer is named in the short hymn of praise that precedes this prayer.
Invocation: various deities are invoked to witness the expiation of the sins by Muwatalli and to dispel the Stormgod’s anger. These include: the Stormgod, the goddess Hepat, the god Šarruma, the deities of the lands, mountains, rivers, sources and springs, deities Ḫuzzi and Ḫutanni, the Sungod of Heaven, Heaven and Earth.

Request: the king asks the Stormgod to look upon the Hittite land and its population with conciliatory eyes, to hear the king’s plea and to dispel the sin of the Hittite land.

Context: in twelve paragraphs the king lists possible reasons for the Stormgod’s wrath. Most paragraphs are concluded with a request. The king declares his own innocence in the matter of all the sins.

1st offence: a god of the land has angered the Stormgod.

the Sungoddess of Arinna is praised as the Queen of Hatti and as the protector of the Hittite king and queen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request:</th>
<th>the king asks the Netherworld deities to reconcile the gods and requests that the Stormgod gives to the land of Hatti wealth, peace, well-being, growth and prosperity</th>
<th>the king requests that the goddess does not hold him responsible in that matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd offence:</td>
<td>mountains, rivers, wells and springs have angered the Stormgod</td>
<td>Muwatalli, the king brother’s, transfer of the capital from Ḫattuša to Tarḫuntašša. The king declares that this was done against his own wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the king asks the Netherworld deities to reconcile the gods and asks the Stormgod to give to the land of Ḫatti wealth, peace, well-being, growth and prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd offence:</td>
<td>a man offends a local god. If that god complains to the Stormgod, the king promises to make a plea and to reinstall the cult of the god according to the instructions found the in old records or according to the instruction of a “venerable old man”</td>
<td>Muwatalli’s case against Danuḫepea and her sons. The kings states that the one who was responsible for ruination of Danuḫepea has paid the price with his life. Again the king declares his own innocence in this matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the king asks the Stormgod to give to the land of Ḫatti wealth, peace, well-being, growth and prosperity</td>
<td>the king requests that the goddess does not hold him responsible in that matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th offence:</td>
<td>mountains, rivers, sources, springs or fountains of the land keep making the Stormgod angry</td>
<td>the king declares that he installed on the Hittite throne Muwatalli’s son, Urḫi-Tešub, but does not take responsibility for the war that ensued between them, nor does he take responsibility for the offences against the gods committed by the latter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>the king asks the Netherworld deities to reconcile the gods and requests that the Stormgod gives to the land of Ḫatti wealth, peace, well-being, growth and prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th offence:</td>
<td>if a human desecrated or neglected a mountain, a šinapši-sanctuary or another holy place and if that place complains to the Stormgod, the king promises to make amends and to re-consecrate the neglected sanctuary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ḫattušili emphasises his own piety and his dedication to recapturing and rebuilding Nerik, the city of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sungoddess’ son, the Stormgod of Nerik. For his self-sacrifices and dedication to the matter of Nerik the king expects the Sungoddess of Arinna to reciprocate the favours

**Request:**

The king asks the Stormgod to hold responsible and to punish only that place/person who committed the offence and not the entire land.

the king asks the goddess to disregard any sins of his father, his mother or any older sin that might have caused the goddess’ anger.

The king asks the goddess to spare his life and spare the life of his wife and children.

The king also asks that the goddess protects Hattuša, Arinna, Zippalanda and Nerik, the cities that are the places of residence of the goddess herself and of her son, the Stormgod of Nerik.

**6th offence**: if somebody has expropriated the property of the Stormgod, the king promises to correct the situation.

**Request:**

In case the king does not find the written records that would instruct him how to do it or if a “venerable old man” does not remember how to make amends, the king asks the god to reveal to him in a dream the manner in which the amends should be made.

**7th offence**: if an orphan has been mistreated and he/she appealed to the Stormgod, the king promises that people responsible will pay for it.

**Request:**

The king asks the Stormgod to take vengeance only on the guilty party not on the entire land.

**8th offence**: the king declares that people who …-ed from an evil bird by an augur or defiled bread offered to the dead, have treated and released the bird and purified the bread.

**9th offence**: the father of the king has neglected the cult in Kummanni.

**Request:**

the king asks the god to take vengeance only on the father not on the son.

**10th offence**: if an inadmissible speech is the cause
for the Stormgod’s anger,

**Request:** the king asks the Netherworld deities to dispel it. The king also requests that the Stormgod looks on Kummanni with conciliatory eyes and asks the god to allow himself to be appeased.

**Motivation:** the god will be provided with unlimited supply of offerings and libation.

---

**prayer-request**

The verb *arkuwai-* also introduces the personal prayer-request. The argumentation presented in the motivation part of this prayer type is similar to the motivation of short prayers-requests introduced by the verb *mald-*: The petitioner expects his/her request to be granted because he/she has been worshipping the addressed deity incessantly or because the relationship between the petitioner and the addressed deity is of a personal kind. The main difference between the *arkuwar* prayer-request and the prayer-request designated by the verb *mald-* is that the former is spoken by the petitioner, who personally addresses a deity; the latter is recited by a Hittite priest, who addresses the deity on behalf of the petitioner.

This prayer type does not entail confession of sins or the statement of innocence, only arguments.

The first example of the personal prayer-request appears in a composition commissioned by the queen Puduḫēpa (KUB 21.27 = I.A.10)\(^{48}\), in which the queen pleads for the well-being of her husband, Hattušili III. The composition includes the *arkuwar* prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and prayers-requests to four deities of the goddess’ entourage, namely the goddesses Lelwani, Zintuḫi and Mezzulla and the Stormgod of Zippalanda. Only the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna is labelled as *arkuwar*.

The queen reminds the goddess of her piety and obedience to the goddess’ wishes and of the dedication of her spouse to the matters of the goddess’ son, the Stormgod of Nerik. The queen feels in her right to request and demand that the goddess reciprocates all the favours.

---

The other prayer-request appears in the long composition commissioned by the king Muwatalli and addressed to the Stormgod of Lightning and to the entire Hittite pantheon (KUB 6.45 iii 25 - iv 2)\(^49\). The composition includes invocations and prayers to various Hittite gods.

The king motivates his requests with the fact that the Stormgod of Lightning raised him and appointed him to Hittite kingship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 6.45+ (CTH 381)</th>
<th>KUB 21.27 (CTH 384)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officiant:</td>
<td>the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the king makes this prayer after invoking all the gods of all the Hittite lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction:</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>the king addresses the Stormgod of Lightning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>Argument 1: personal relationship the king focuses on his personal relationship with the god, who reared him, made him the priest of the Sungoddess of Arinna and of all the gods, and finally appointed him to kingship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request:</td>
<td>because of this close relationship the king asks the god to intercede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for him with all the gods, whom
the king invoked, and to pass and
support the plea the king is making
to the gods

Motivation:  \textit{Argument 2}  
\textit{Hattušili’s piety}
the queen now reminds the goddess
of the king’s dedication and self-
sacrifice to recapturing of Nerik, the
seat of the goddess’ beloved son, and
restoring the city to its former glory

Request:  
the king now asks the god to transmit
his plea to all the gods

Motivation:  \textit{Argument 3: promise}  
in exchange, the king promises
\textit{Hattušili’s dedication to Nerik}
the queen reminds the goddess how,
Hattušili after the death of his brother,
installed on the Hittite throne his
brother’s son, Urḫi-Tešub, and how the
latter with the members of Hittite
nobility oppressed Hattušili because of
Nerik. Despite this abuse, Ḫattušili,
defended Nerik

Request:  
the king asks the god to stand by
his side and protect him

Motivation:  \textit{Argument 4: promise}  
the queen promises the gods (of Nerik?)
that their neglected rituals and festivals
will be observed regularly once more

Request:  
the queen asks the goddess to hear her
plea and to grant Hattušili long life and
health. She also asks that the goddess to
intercede for her in the assembly of all

\textit{Argument 5: Puduḫepa – a woman of the
birth stool}  
Puduḫepa enhances her arguments by
referring to a saying: “to a woman of the
birth stool the deity grants her wish.
Since I, Puduḫepa, am a woman of a
birth stool…grant me what [I ask of
you]!” This either refers to Puduḫepa as
a woman who is about to give birth or
her abilities as a midwife, in either case
she deserves to be heard

\textit{Argument 4: promise}  
the king promises that he will exalt the
Stormgod, will build him temples
and will provide the god with rituals
and offerings

\textit{Argument 3: promise}  
in exchange, the king promises
to praise the Stormgod. The king
is certain that the gods will
hear his plea and will find the
solution to the problem that troubles
him. Then, after observing how the
Stormgod takes care of the king, the
people of Ḫatti will praise the
god. The king promises that in future,
king’s descendants, the future kings
and the queens of Hatti, the noblemen
as well as the gods of heaven,
mountains and the rivers will also
praise the god

\textit{Argument 3: promise}  
the queen reminds the goddess how,
Hattušili after the death of his brother,
installed on the Hittite throne his
brother’s son, Urḫi-Tešub, and how the
latter with the members of Hittite
nobility oppressed Hattušili because of
Nerik. Despite this abuse, Ḫattušili,
defended Nerik
the gods and asks them to grant her husband life and well-being

**Motivation:**

Argument 6: Puduḫepa's piety

to support further her request, the queen reminds the goddess that she, the queen, fulfilled all the wishes and orders of the goddess and now the goddess should reciprocate the favour and fulfil the wishes of the queen

---

**prayer – vow**

On a few occasions, the noun *arkuwar* also denotes a prayer-vow. On the description of this type of prayer and the example of the prayer-vow introduced by the expression -za *arkuwar ešša*—see above (pp. 97-98).

**prayer-complaint**

In two texts the noun *arkuwar* denotes the prayer whose aim was to file a complaint to a god.

In the prayer commissioned by the king Muwatalli and addressed to the Stormgod (KBo 11.1 = I.B.a.5), a mistreated orphan makes a prayer-complaint (referred to by the verb *arkuwai-*) to the deity named Šarruma. The words of this complaint are not included in this text.

Another prayer-complaint is preserved in the New Hittite text (KUB 54.1 = I.B.a.6) catalogued as a fragment of a prayer on the Hethitologie Portal (CTH 389). The same text was placed by Collins in her emendations to Laroche’s Catalogue of the Hittite Texts under the heading “Legal Texts” and categorized as possibly a deposition. Collins assigned this text the CTH number 297. Since the first paragraph is missing, it is at present impossible to reach a decision with regard to the nature of this text.

In the *arkuwar* prayer contained in this text, a certain high-ranking individual named IŠTAR-ziti, requests from the Sungod of heaven and from the deities of Liprašša that they examine his legal matters. He also reproaches the gods of Liprašša for his unjust treatment (as compared to those who ruined him, including a Hittite king). Because the petitioner addresses different gods, first the gods of Liprašša, then the Sungod of heaven and then an unnamed deity, it is possible that this text contains three different *arkuwar*-prayers. First, the prayer-complaint, then prayer-request and again prayer-complaint.
The motive of complaining and reproaching the gods also appears in the exculpation prayer of Muršili II (see above). However, while in the prayer of Muršili the main objective was to explain the conduct of the king and the complaint was one of the arguments, in this prayer the sole objective is to complain.

**KUB 54.1 (CTH 389/297)**

**Officiant:** a high-ranking individual named IŠTAR-ziti

**Context:** IŠTAR-ziti describes his dealings with Nanizi, with the family of Mutti and with other unnamed individuals

**Structure:**
- Prayer 1: complaint
  - Prayer 2: request
  - Prayer 3: complaint

**Prayer 1**

**Complaint:** IŠTAR-ziti complains to the gods of Liprašša, who are the deities of his mother and the gods of his grandfather. When he presented his case before the gods and asked them to investigate it the gods did not listen.

When IŠTAR-ziti became ill, he prayed again to the same gods and again he complained about injustice. He reproaches the gods, because they support the one who ruined IŠTAR-ziti.

**Prayer 2**

**Request:** IŠTAR-ziti asks the Sungod of heaven to investigate his case

**Prayer 3**

**Complaint:** IŠTAR-ziti complains that he has been mistreated by an unnamed god, who harmed him, brought him to the place of isolation and separated him from his relatives.

---

### 3.3. Hittite Prayer Terminology and Structure of Royal Prayers

This section analyses the structure of the well-preserved complex compositions dated to the New Hittite period and termed by students of Hittite prayer as “royal prayers”. These composite texts comprise, in various combinations, several religious utterances and rites, including a mukeššar ritual, a hymn of praise (walla-), a personal prayer (arkuwar) and a vow. While these structurally complex compositions may or may not contain an
invocation ritual, a hymn or a vow, they always include a personal prayer commissioned by the Hittite king or the Hittite queen. Some of the religious utterances and rites included in these compositions are explicitly labelled by the Hittite scribes. Those which are not, exhibit enough features that can safely classify them as either a personal prayer, an invocation ritual, a hymn or a vow. While each composition has a macro-structure, each of its elements retains its own internal structure.

### 3.3.1 Invocation Ritual, Hymn and Prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II)

This composite text can be divided into three structural elements:

- preface that contains excerpts from the invocation ritual labelled with the verb *mugai-*
- hymn of praise in two parts (unlabelled)
- a personal prayer in two parts (unlabelled):
  - prayer against the plague
  - prayer against the enemy invasion
  - address
  - motivation
  - request
  - motivation
  - request
  - motivation

#### PREFACE

The composition begins with the preface, in which a priest-scribe address the Sungoddess of Arinna. He announces that he has been sent by the king and asked to invoke (*mugai-*) the goddess. He then utters a few lines of the invocation prayer, in which he asks the goddess to come back to her temple and to listen to what he is about to say (on this invocation prayer see section 3.2.2. of this chapter).

---

50 For the full edition of this prayer see chapter four.
51 The person who composed this composition also recited it before the goddess. Since it is unlikely that a regular scribe would be allowed to address the goddess personally, the person who wrote this composition and the person who spoke the prayer must have been a Hittite priest.
HYMN

The hymn of praise comprises two parts, both of which begin with the phrase zik=za 4UTU URU ARINNA nakkiš DINGIR-LIM-iš “You, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are an honoured goddess”.

The first section of the hymn (lines 15-38) has probably been inspired by lines i 1’-27’ of manuscript A and lines i 9-17 of manuscript B of the Middle Hittite prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal (CTH 375), which it resembles in wording and spirit. The goddess is assured that nowhere except in Ḫatti, she is piously worshipped and provided with temples, precious objects, festivals and rituals, offerings and libation. Only the Hittite king, Muršili II, respects and celebrates the goddess so devoutly.

The first six lines of the second part of the hymn (lines 39-44) praise the goddess as the most important and most honoured goddess in the entire Hittite pantheon.

The next lines (44-77’) were clearly inspired by or even copied from the hymn to Ištanu that was attached to the prayer of a mortal (CTH 372) (on this see chapter four, the edition of CTH 376.II). This part of the hymn praises the goddess as a divine judge, who is merciful and just. It exalts the goddess as the queen of heaven and earth, a queen who sets the borders of the land, who hears the prayers, who protects the just person and who assigns the shares of offerings for the gods. All the gods of heaven and earth bow to her and submit to her will. In short, the priest reminds the goddess of her divine attributes and her right and even obligation to take lead in the matter, which will be laid out in the prayer. All these qualities were those of Ištanu in the CTH 372 hymn. The only passages that were omitted from that hymn describe the god’s physical attributes and his filial relationship to Ningal.

The hymnic part of this composition ends with a request. The priest asks the goddess, on behalf of the king Muršili II, to protect and sustain the king and to listen to the words of the king’s prayer.

PRAYER

Lines 78’-154’ of this composition contain a prayer in two parts, which was copied almost verbatim from the Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (on this see chapter four edition of CTH 376.II). Lines 139’-154’ show many similarities to a fragmentary prayer found in private collection (on this prayer, published by Schwemer
plague-prayer

Address: the Hittite gods

Motivation: The prayer begins with the presentation of the case, namely the outbreak of the plague in Ḥatti. The general population and those who attend to the gods died and the offerings for the gods ceased. For this the gods hold people responsible. The people did all they could to appease the gods, but all their efforts were in vain. Now the people are lost, they do not know what to do.

Request: The priest asks the gods to show mercy and to reveal the cause of the divine anger so that people can act accordingly and appease the gods.

prayer against the enemy invasion

Motivation: The priest declares that the lands, which are in the kuriwana relationship with Ḥatti (i.e. Arzawa and Mitanni), do not respect the Hittite gods and are seeking to despoil their temples.

Request: The priest asks the gods to take vengeance on those lands and to send there the plague and all the evils.

The priest reminds the gods that lands which act against the divine will are prosperous, while Ḥatti is oppressed by the plague. He asks the gods to rectify the situation and to reverse the fortunes.

Motivation: Now the priest addresses the Sungoddess of Arinna. He declares that the lands that are bound to Ḥatti by treaties (i.e. Kaška, Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka and Pitašša) do not respect the goddess. They stopped paying tributes and began to attack Ḥatti. The priest reminds the goddess how, in the past, she protected Ḥatti and how, with her help, Ḥatti attacked and conquered other lands. Now all has changed and the goddess does not support the Hittite cause anymore.

Requests: The priest asks the goddess to take vengeance on the enemy lands and to resume her role of the protector and defender of Ḥatti.
The priest asks the gods to punish only those towns, household, or a person that do not respect the gods. He requests that the gods have mercy on Ḫatti, send the plague and all the evils to the enemy lands and return the prosperity to Ḫatti.

The priest asks the Sungoddess of Arinna to send the plague and all the evils the enemy lands and to return all the favours and prosperity to the king, Muršili II and to the Hittite lands.

Motivation: The priest promises that when all the requests are granted, all the gods will be provided with bread offerings and libation.

In the colophon the priest declares that he invoked (mugai-) the Sungoddess of Arinna in Hattuša and in Arinna. In each city, the priest invoked the goddess for seven days. He also mentions that the invocation ritual (mukeššar) has been recorded in writing on a separate tablet.

3.3.2 Invocation Ritual, Hymn and Prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu (CTH 377)\(^{52}\)

This composition is very similar to the previous one. It is divided into three separate parts:

- preface containing excerpts from the invocation ritual labelled with the verb mugai- and from the hymn of praise labelled with the verb walla-
- hymn of praise (walla-)
- personal prayer (arkuwar)

PREFACE

The composition begins with a statement that the priest-scribe reads this text daily before the god Telipinu and praises the god (walla-). This is followed by excerpt from the hymn of praise and the scribe’s declaration that he has been sent by the king Muršili II and by the queen to invoke (mugai-) the god. He then utters a few lines of the invocation prayer, in which he asks the god to come back to his temple, to be pacified and to listen to what he, the scribe-priest, is about to say.

\(^{52}\) For the transliteration and translation of this text see chapter four.
HYMN (walla-)

Because of numerous textual similarities, it is generally assumed that the hymn to Telipinu has been copied almost verbatim from the hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II). The hymn to Telipinu, however, is somewhat shorter.

As the hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna, it is also divided into two parts, both of which are introduced by the sentence zik=za "Telipinuš nakkiš DINGIR-LIM-iš “You, Telipinu, are an honoured god”

The first part of the hymn (lines 18-46) assures the god that nowhere except in Ḫatti, he is piously worshipped and provided with temples, precious objects, festivals and rituals, offerings and libation. The priest-scribe also asserts the god that he is respected and worshipped devoutly only by the Hittite king, Muršili II, by the queen and by the royal princes.

Only three lines of the second part of the hymn (lines 47-49) are preserved. They praise the god as the most important and most honoured god in the entire Hittite pantheon. The rest of the hymn is missing, but probably continued only for a few more lines.

The part of the hymn in which the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) is praised as the divine judge, as the queen of heaven and earth who protects and supports the just person and who hears and fulfils the prayers, as well as the mistress of all the gods, was probably not included in the hymn to Telipinu. This part was omitted since it did not describe the qualities nor the status of Telipinu in the hierarchy of the Hittite gods.

PRAYER

Only the prayer against the enemy invasion was included in this composition. Due to the fragmentary state of preservation, the address and the motivation parts of the prayer are not preserved.

Requests:

The requests presented in this prayer are similar to those included in the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna. The priest-scribe asks the god to give all the favours, prosperity and the well-being to the king, the queen and the royal princes. He also asks the god to remove all the evils from Ḫatti and to send them to those enemy lands, which do not respect the Hittite gods.
In the colophon the priest-scribe declares that this tablet records the presentation of the *arkuwar* before the god Telipinu.

### 3.3.3 Muwatalli’s “Prayer” to the Assembly of the Hittite Gods (CTH 381)

This long composition contains various prayers-requests, invocations and offerings presented to all the Hittite gods and the gods of all the lands. The structure of this composition is as follows:

- preamble
- prayer-request addressed to all the gods of Ḫatti (*arkuwar*)
  - address
  - request
  - motivation (agenda of prayers)
  - request
- prayer to Šeri, Champion of Ḫatti (*arkuwar*)
  - address
  - request
- invocation of the gods of all the lands
- prayer to the Sungod of Heaven (*arkuwar*)
  - address
  - praise
  - request
- prayer to the Stormgod of Lightning (*arkuwar*)
  - address
  - motivation
  - request
  - motivation
  - request
- a list of offerings presented to the gods of Ḫatti before the personal plea-prayer is recited
- a list of offerings given to the gods of all the lands after the personal prayer is spoken
PREAMBLE

The text begins with the statement of purpose: when something troubles a human being and he/she needs a divine assistance he/she should make a plea (arkuwar). This statement is followed by presenting offerings to the Sungoddess of Arinna, the Sungod of Heaven and to the male gods.

PRAYER-REQUEST TO THE GODS OF ḪATTI (arkuwar)

Address:
The king, Muwatalli, addresses all the gods of Ḫatti, starting with the most important deities (i.e. the Sungod of Heaven, the Sungoddess of Arinna, the Stormgod) and ending with all the male and female gods, mountains and rivers of “the land of Ḫatti”; in short all the gods whom he serves as priest and who conferred on him the kingship in Ḫatti.

Request:
The king asks all the gods to listen to his pleas.

Motivation (Agenda of Prayers):
The king presents the agenda of prayers which he will make. First, he will utter a prayer, in which he will report to the gods on the state of their cult centres. Then, the king will make his personal prayer, in which he will present the problem(s) that trouble his soul.

Request:
The king asks the gods to listen to his prayers and to grant the request presented in them. The king also asks the gods to disregard those pleas, which the gods do not want to hear. He will nonetheless keep making them.

PRAYER-REQUEST TO ŠERI (arkuwar)

Address:
The king addresses Šeri as the bull of the Stormgod, the champion of Ḫatti.

Request:
The king asks Šeri to intercede on his behalf with the gods and pass on his plea so that the gods can hear and fulfil the requests of the king.
INVOCATION OF THE GODS OF ALL THE LANDS

The king invokes and addresses all the gods of all the lands, beginning with the most important gods in the Hittite pantheon and then moving to all the gods of all the lands under Hittite control.

PRAYER-REQUEST TO THE SUNGOD OF HEAVEN (arkuwar)

Address:
The king addresses the god and praises him as the shepherd of mankind and as the Supreme judge of men and animals alike

Request:
The king asks the god to stop the gods in their tracks and to summon from heaven and earth, mountains and rivers, temples and thrones all the gods, whom the king have just invoked and to whom he had just made a plea.

PRAYER-REQUEST TO THE STORMGOD OF LIGHTNING (arkuwar)

For a detailed analysis of this prayer, in which the king asks the god to intercede on his behalf with the gods, to pass on and to support his plea see section 3.2.3 under the heading “prayer-request.”

RITUAL OFFERINGS
A list of offerings and libation that are to be given to the gods of Ḫatti follows the prayer to the Stormgod and precedes the presentation of a personal prayer. Because the personal prayer is not included in this composition, the entire text should be regarded as a model text (see section 3.4.2 of this chapter).

RITUAL OFFERINGS
Another list of offerings that are to be given to the gods of all the lands is included here. These offerings are to be given after the recitation of a plea-prayer.

3.3.4. Hymn and Prayer of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 383)

This text comprises two religious utterances:

- hymn of praise (unlabelled)
• a personal prayer (arkuwar) comprising motivation and request

HYMN
The text begins with a short hymn, in which the king, Hattušili III, names the goddess to whom he will be directing his plea, as the Sungoddess of Arinna. In the thirteen lines of the hymn, the goddess is praised and identified as the queen of heaven and earth, as the Queen of Ḫatti and as the protector and supporter of the kings and the queens of Ḫatti.

PRAYER-PLEA (arkuwar) (for a detailed analysis of this prayer see above in section 3.2.3 under the heading “prayer of confession and penitence”)

Motivation:
The king lists the offences committed by his predecessors that might have caused the divine anger. In all those offences the king declares his own innocence. The king also reminds the goddess of his own dedication and self-sacrifice in the matter of Nerik.

Request:
The king asks the goddess to dispel the known and unknown sins of his predecessors, to spare and protect the life on the king, the queen and their children, to stand by the king in the assembly of gods and repress all evil things said against the king, and finally to protect the cities which belong to the goddess and to her son Stormgod of Nerik, namely Hattuša, Arinna, Nerik and Zippalanda.

3.3.5 Prayers of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and Her Entourage (CTH 384)

This composite text contains five independent prayers:

• prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (arkuwar)
• prayer and a vow to Lelwani (unlabelled)
• prayer and a vow to Zintuḫi (unlabelled)
• prayer and a vow to Mezzulla (unlabelled)
• prayer and a vow to the Stormgod of Zippalanda (unlabelled)
PRAYER TO THE SUNGODDESS OF ARINNA (*arkuwar*) (this prayer is analysed in section 3.2.3 under the heading “prayer-request”)

- introductory statement
- address
- motivation
- request

PRAYER-REQUEST AND A VOW TO LELWANI

*Prayer*

- address
- motivation
- request

*Vow 1*

- request
- motivation (missing due to a break in the tablet)

*Prayer*

- request

*Vow 2*

- request
- motivation

PRAYER AND A VOW TO ZINTUHI

*Prayer*

- address
- praise
- request

*Vow*

- request
- motivation

PRAYER AND A VOW TO MEZZULLA

*Prayer*

- address
- motivation
• request

**Vow**

• request

• motivation

**PRAYER AND A VOW TO THE STORMGOD OF ZIPPALANDA**

*Prayer*

• address

• motivation

• request

• motivation

*Vow*

• request

• motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prayer to Lelwani</th>
<th>prayer to Zintuḫi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>prayer-request</strong></td>
<td><strong>prayer-request</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the queen addresses</td>
<td>Zintuḫi is addressed by the queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelwani, the goddess of</td>
<td>as the grand-daughter of the Stormgod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Netherworld</td>
<td>and the Sungoddess of Arinna and as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goddess watched over by her divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grandparents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praise:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Praise:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>the goddess is praised as an ornament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the breasts of the Stormgod and of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Sungoddess of Arinna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Motivation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the queen reminds the goddess</td>
<td>missing due to the broken tablet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that all the gods always listen to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Request:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the queen asks the goddess to</td>
<td>the queen asks the goddess to intercede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support her in the matter in which</td>
<td>with the Stormgod and the Sungoddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she is making the request, namely,</td>
<td>of Arinna. She also requests that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the alleged illness of Hattušili</td>
<td>goddess asks her divine grandparents to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grant Hattušili a long life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the queen asks the goddess not to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen to the words that were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uttered with the purpose of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaming the king but also not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to listen to words spoken by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king that might have offended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the gods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the queen requests that the goddess protects the queen and the king from their enemies

**prayer-vow 1**

**Motivation:** if the goddess keeps the king alive, does not listen to the evil words and speaks well about the king in front of the gods

**Request:** the queen promises to make for her a great ornament

**prayer-request**

**Request:** the queen asks the goddess to intercede with the gods and ask for Ḥattušili’s life. The queen asks that also the goddess grants the royal couple a long and healthy life

**prayer-vow 2**

**Motivation:** if the goddess fulfils all of the above requests

**Request:** the queen promises to offer her a full-sized statue of Ḥattušili made of silver with its head, hands and feet made of gold

**prayer to Mezzulla**

**prayer-request**

**Address:** the goddess is addressed as the daughter of the Stormgod and of the Sungoddess of Arinna

**Motivation:** the goddess’ parents listen to her and always grant her requests

**Request:** the queen asks the goddess to pass on the words of the *arkuwar*, which the queen makes to the Stormgod and to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to support her, the queen, in her plea

**Motivation:** to motivate the god the queen declares that she is a woman of the birth stool and that she has personally made restitutions to the god. She also reminds the god of her husband’s dedication to

**prayer to the Stormgod of Zippalanda**

**prayer-request**

**Address:** the god is addressed as the son of the Stormgod and of the Sungoddess of Arinna

**Motivation:** the god’s parents listen to him and always grant his requests

**Request:** the queen asks the god to pass on to his divine parents the words of the *arkuwar*, which she is making and to support the queen in her plea

**Motivation:**
the matter of Nerik, the god’s beloved city.

Request:

the queen asks the god to intercede on her behalf with the Stormgod and with the Sungoddess of Arinna, to be well-disposed towards Ḫattušili, her husband and to pass on the words of arkuwar, which the queen makes to the Stormgod and to the Sungoddess of Arinna

prayer-vow

Request: If the goddess fulfils this request,

if the god fulfils the queen’s requests and saves Ḫattušili from evil

Motivation: the queen will dedicate to her towns and will give her deportees as servants

the queen will make for him a golden shield weighing two minas, she will also make an unspecified object (break in the tablet) and will consecrate to the god the town of Puputana

3.4. Summaries and Conclusions

The last two sections described and analysed in detail those types of prayer which were designated by the verbs mald-, mugai- and arkuwai- as well as several longer compositions commonly referred to as “royal prayers”. This section places these texts within the reconstructed Hittite prayer system and answers the questions of whether any of the terms named above represent a generic name for prayer, when a given term was used to designate a particular type of prayer and how the prayer system evolved over time. The below paragraphs also examine Hittite “royal prayers”. Of particular interest are the following questions, what is a typical Hittite royal prayer, did it exist? What was the primary function of these structurally complex compositions? Why were the utterances and rites designated by the verbs mald-, mugai-, arkuwai- and walla- used in these compositions? Do all these terms designate the functional elements of a typical Hittite prayer or perhaps a prayer along with the other utterances and rites could be regarded as an element of a religious activity?
3.4.1 The Usage of mald-, mugai-, arkuwai- and arkuwar in Prayer Context: A Diachronic and Synchronic View

While the verbs mald- and mugai- were used in Hittite texts as designations of a prayer-request, a prayer-vow and an invocation prayer from the Old to the New Hittite periods, the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar make their first appearance in the prayer context only in the New Hittite period.

The employment of the verb arkuwai- to designate a personal prayer reflects the change that took place in the Hittite prayer system. This change is not viewed as a linear development (i.e. one type of prayer developed into another and then replaced it); rather it is seen as an addition of a new type of prayer and its coexistence with other prayer types in one system. Each type of prayer was used in a different context and, in most cases, the function and the usage of one type of prayer did not infringe the function and the usage of the other. All the texts which include or mention prayers designated by the verbs mald-, mugai- and arkuwai- or which contain hymns of praise (walla-) were found in the royal archives of Hattuša, and therefore belong to the sphere of the state religion.

The table below summarises the usage of the termini technici in the prayer context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLD HITTITE</th>
<th>MIDDLE HITTITE</th>
<th>NEW HITTITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arkuwai-</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>personal-prayer: prayer-plea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arkuwar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prayer-complaint, prayer-request,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prayer-vow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mald-malteššar</td>
<td>prayer-request</td>
<td>prayer-request</td>
<td>prayer-request, prayer-vow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mugai-</td>
<td>invocation prayer</td>
<td>invocation prayer</td>
<td>invocation prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukeššar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OLD HITTITE**

In the Old Hittite period the verb mugai- expresses the notion of inducing the return of an absent or an angry deity or the alienated soul of a deceased through performing an invocation ritual, which also included the recitation of an invocation prayer. However, the actual words of this type of ritual and prayer are preserved only in the texts dated to the Middle and New Hittite periods.

In the Old Hittite period the verb mald- designates a type of prayer whose primary function was to present a request to the gods. It was recited by a Hittite priest on behalf of the supplicant, usually the Hittite king or other member of the royal family, during a state festival or a ritual. Although the king participated in the festival and/or ritual by making
offerings, pouring libations and occasionally addressing a deity by pronouncing his/her name or repeating some formulas spoken first by the priest, the prayer-request was recited only by the Hittite priest. It follows, that the language of those prayer-requests was official and was dictated by the conventional rules of prudent phrasing. The requests were general, usually asking for the well-being of the king or another member of the Hittite royal family and the motivation included reminding the god(s) of the supplicant’s piety or of the close relationship the deity has with the petitioner and hence the responsibility the deity has to protect the supplicant and to grant him/her all the favours.

The meaning of the verb *mald-* “to recite” indicates that to pray meant simply to pronounce words before a deity. Since the verb *mald-* was also used to introduce other utterances recited during the state festivals and rituals, such as invocations in Hattic and in Hittite, Hattic incantations, blessings and the like, this verb can be considered as the word for communicating with the divine. However, that communication was entirely in the hands of Hittite priests and was solely conducted in the cultic setting. The Old Hittite prayer then placed a restriction on who was permitted to pray and when.

**MIDDLE HITTITE**

In the Middle Hittite period the verb *mald-* continues to designate an official prayer-request recited during the state festivals and rituals but also begins to express the notion of vow-making. The latter is reflected in the new meaning “to vow, to promise” assumed by this verb. The actual words of prayer-vows or prayer-requests are not attested in the Middle Hittite period.

The verb *mugai-* is used in the texts dated to the Middle Hittite period to designate a ritual of invocation and a prayer recited during this ritual. The prayer was spoken on behalf of the client by a ritual expert who also performed the ritual. As in the prayer-request denoted by the verb *mald-*, the client could participate in the ritual by making offerings, pouring libations and performing other actions required by the ritual, but all the oral rites including the invocation prayer were recited by the officiant of the ritual. The main function of the prayer was to summon a deity to the location of the supplicant or back to his/her temple and to present a request.

Although the language of the invocation prayer was official and formulaic and although the requests were, for the most part, general (i.e. asking a deity to hear the supplicant’s request), this prayer also contained personal elements. The personal ‘touches’ could be discerned in the motivation part of this prayer type. To motivate a deity to hear the request, the ritual expert often promised that the client and occasionally
also his descendants will worship the deity in the future. Although the promise was that of the supplicant, it was spoken by the ritual expert, since only the ritual expert was permitted to perform the ritual and to speak directly to the deity.

A new type of prayer, in which the petitioner himself/herself presents his requests and talks to the gods without the mediation of a priest or a ritual expert, makes its first appearance also in the Middle Hittite period. The emergence of this type of prayer coincides with the Hittite annexation of Kizzuwatna, a hybrid Luwian-Hurrian zone in Cilicia, and renewal of contacts with other regions where the Hurrian culture prevailed. This in turn led to adoption of Hurrian, and through the Hurrian mediation, of Mesopotamian literary and cultural elements into the various domains of the Hittite culture and religion.

All prayers of this type were commissioned by members of the Hittite royal family; hence they have been labelled by modern scholarship “royal prayers”. Some of them appear independently (i.e. out of the ritual or festival context), others occur in the structurally complex composition, inspired by the Babylonian prayers.

The first prayers of this type composed in the Middle Hittite period are prayers assigned to CTH 372-4 (i.e. the prayer of Kantuzzili, the prayer of a mortal and the prayer of the king), as well as the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal (CTH 375). In the first prayer the supplicant begs his personal god to relieve him from sufferings caused by the grave illness and to reveal to him the cause of god’s anger. The supplicant claims that he has not transgressed any religious taboos. This prayer shows a new motive not present either in the prayer-requests or invocation prayer, namely the belief that sin was a breach of laws established by gods. This resulted in the divine anger that expressed itself in various disasters that befell an individual or the country (i.e. Ḫatti), if the individual was the king.

In the second prayer the royal couple lists the harm done to the gods and their cults by the Kaška people, emphasising and contrasting the personal piety of the Hittite royal couple.

To sum up, in the Middle Hittite period, the Hittite prayer system comprises three main types of prayer, an official prayer spoken during the state festivals and rituals and denoted by the verb *mald-*; an invocation prayer recited during an invocation ritual and designated by the verb *mugai-*; and a personal prayer. The personal prayer is divided into two subtypes: (i) prayer-vow also denoted by the verb *mald-*; in which the petitioner bargains with the gods and promises gifts and worship only if the deity first grants the supplicant’s request and (ii) a prayer, in which the petitioner himself/herself speaks to the
gods and either begs the gods for help, or reminds the gods of his/her piety. This type of prayer is not labelled by any technical term in the Middle Hittite period.

In the Middle Hittite period, the Hittite priests and ritual experts retain their right to pray in the cultic setting, but outside of the festival and ritual context, also an individual is permitted to speak to the gods directly. Although, the supplicant’s attitude towards the divine is that of submission, timid attempts to defend oneself in front of the gods and to change the gods’ will are already made. A bolder attitude of the petitioner is seen in prayer-vows, in which he/she is allowed to bargain with the gods. The phrasing of these texts leaves no doubt; the petitioner will offer gifts and worship to the deity, but only if and when the deity first grants the petitioner’s request.

NEW HITTITE

In the texts dated to the New Hittite period the verb mald- continues to designate an official prayer-request and a personal prayer-vow. The verb mugai-, as in the Old, and Middle Hittite periods, denotes an invocation prayer spoken by a ritual expert during an invocation ritual. The verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar are used for the first time in religious context to designate a personal prayer.

The first prayers explicitly labelled by Hittite scribes as arkuwar are the plea-prayers of Muršili II dealing with the plague, in which the king, as a servant, appears before the gods, as divine judges, to ask his divine masters for help. The king presents arguments to convince the gods that he deserves their assistance.

The employment of the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar as Hittite designations of a plea-prayer can be understood in the context of another text composed during the reign of the same king, namely the treaty between Muršili II and Tuppi-Teššub (KBo 3.3 = I.A.1 and chapter two p. 39). In this text Tuppi-Teššub, complains to the Hittite king that the King of Karkamiš, Tudḫaliya and Ḫalpaḫi have gained control of captives that fled Amurru and he demands that the captives are to be returned to him. All four individuals are to appear before Muršili II to present their arkuwars ‘pleas’ in that matter. The king must have viewed his relationship with the gods, in the same way as his relationship with his vassals. With his vassals the king acted as the judge who hears arguments of each party and declares his verdict, in his relationship with the gods the king became a servant who has to present arkuwar to his divine judges.

Once the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar began to denote one type of personal prayer, namely the plea-prayer, it was only natural that, in time, they would also be used to designate all types of personal prayer. This must have occurred sometime
between the composition of the plague prayers and the composition of the prayer to Telipinu. In the latter text, which was composed after the plague prayers (see chapter four), no arguments of any kind are given. Rather a priest, on behalf of the king and the queen, asks the gods for the well-being of the royal family. The noun arkuwar is also used in prayers in which the petitioner defends or explains his own conduct (prayer about Tawannanna see section 3.2.3 under the heading ‘exculpation prayer’) or when he/she complains to the gods about unjust treatment (KUB 54.1 see section 3.2.3 under the heading ‘prayer-complaint’). Finally, during the reign of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar begin to designate a personal prayer-vow, until then denoted only by the verb mald-.

In the New Hittite period, the three main types of prayers that have been part of the religious landscape since the Middle Hittite period, are well established and coexist in one prayer system. All prayer types are labelled by specialised terms, either by the verbs mald-, mugai-, arkuwai- or by the noun arkuwar.

The verb mald- continues to be the word for communicating with gods carried out by members of the Hittite priesthood in the official festival and ritual contexts; the verb mugai- continues to be the word for communicating with a deity in the context of invocation rituals which was solely in the hands of the ritual experts; and the verb arkuwai- and the noun arkuwar became the words for personal communication with the divine.

The petitioners, usually members of the royal family, become even more daring in their personal communication with the gods than in the Middle Hittite prayer-vows. Now, they not only bargain with the gods but also argue, defend and justify their actions, complain to the gods about injustice that has been done to them and even reproach the gods for their unjust treatment. Thus, in the New Hittite period one can detect a change of relationship between the gods and the Hittite ruling classes that evolved from a total submission to reasoning with the gods and gaining the power and ability to change the god’s will.

However, this is true only for personal prayers. The prayers set in the cultic and magic spheres continue to be spoken only by the Hittite priests and ritual experts and continue to be ruled by the conventions of prudent phrasing.
3.4.2. Function of *mald-, mugai-, arkuwai-, arkuwar and walla/i/u-* in Royal Prayers

The conclusions of the discussion of the specific meaning and connotations of *mald-, mugai-, arkuwai- and walla-* in the preceding sections may be briefly summarised as follows: the verb *mald-* denoted a prayer-request spoken during a state festival or ritual as well as a personal prayer-vow; the verb *mugai-* designated an invocation ritual and a prayer recited during that ritual; the verb *arkuwai-* and the noun *arkuwar* denoted a personal prayer, usually commissioned by members of the royal family; on one occasion the verb *walla-* can be shown to refer to a hymn of praise.

Each of these utterances and rites was used in different religious contexts and situations. However, beginning with the New Hittite period, they were also employed, in different combinations, as structural elements of compositions that have been traditionally labelled “royal prayers”. This labelling possibly results from the difficulty of finding a proper designation for these texts, but is rather due to the fact that the arkuwar prayer was a core element of these complex compositions and was therefore, *a potiori*, used as label for these texts (Güterbock 1958: 242, Houwink ten Cate 1969:82). For the same reason, the traditional term ‘prayer’ is retained for these compositions in this dissertation though it is used with quotation marks.

These composite texts, in their entirety, do not match all the criteria that form part of the definition of a Hittite prayer accepted in this dissertation. According to this definition a prayer is a text addressed to a deity that is characterised by a tripartite structure: invocation, motivation and request; the essence and ultimate goal of the text is the presentation of a request. Bearing this definition in mind only certain elements of these complex texts can be called prayers, namely the arkuwar prayer and prayer passages that are usually text-internally referred to by the verbs *mald-* and *mugai-*.

Since these composite texts as a whole do not conform to the above definition of a prayer, one could argue that they should be regarded either as a new type of prayer or as a new literary genre altogether not seen in Hittite religion before the Middle Hittite period and created through an aggregation of several self-contained shorter texts that were combined in one composite. This composite, then, would represent a new genre or type of text, and the originally individual elements of the composite would be the typical components of the new genre. One would then expect each new text of this new genre to contain these typical elements.

The Hittite evidence does not support the latter argument. While a hymn (*walla-* nearly always accompanies the arkuwar prayer when the latter is addressed to the Sun
deity (CTH 376.II, CTH 376.III, CTH 383) and therefore these compositions in their entirety can indeed by viewed as belonging to one prayer type, the combination of other utterances and rites appears to be optional. The only regular element of each complex composition was the *arkuwar* prayer.

**Literary or religious?**

The above difficulties in determining the character of these complex compositions are mainly due to the fact that they have been traditionally classified as literary texts. This author does not deny that once these compositions had served their primary purpose and were kept in the archives, they may have been valued as literary compositions. However, their primary function was within the religious practice. The composite texts record and prescribe a religious activity whose core was the personal prayer and whose objective was to present the supplicant’s request in the most persuasive way.

The terms *mald-*-, *mugai-* and *walla-* designate independent types of religious utterance that were occasionally spoken during this kind of religious activity. Their overall function was to support and strengthen the requests presented in the *arkuwar* prayer and to predispose the deity to hear and grant these requests. In that context, one may view these utterances as a frame within which the *arkuwar* prayer was set. Consequently, the terms *mald-*-, *mugai-*-, *arkuwai-* and *walla-* in these complex compositions designate the functional elements of a religious activity rather than textual constituents of a typical Hittite prayer as a literary genre.

Although this activity had a single purpose, each type of ritual speech or rites retained its own internal structure and its own function, which also characterised these types of speeches and rites when used outside of the composite texts. Thus, the main function of a vow (*mald-/arkuwar*) was to bargain with the deity and promise him/her gifts if (and only if) the deity grants the request of the petitioner. The invocation ritual (*mugai-*-) summoned and attracted a deity to the location of the supplicant, so that the deity could approach and pay attention to his plea or request. The hymn (*walla-*-) reminded the deity of his/her divine attributes and qualities which the supplicant wished to see put to work for him and drew attention to the deity’s right and obligation to take the lead in the matter in which the petitioner presented his plea.

**Experimenting with the frame**

The selection of the utterances and rites that accompanied and supported the presentation of the *arkuwar* prayer varies from composition to composition and it seems that the
choice of components depended on the author. All royal ‘prayers’ show a different structure which reflects the respective approach to choosing the most effective method of presenting the request. The following table gives a comparative overview of the structure of the compositions in question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MURŠILI II</th>
<th>MUWATALLI</th>
<th>ḪATTUŠILI III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTH 376.II</td>
<td>CTH 377</td>
<td>CTH 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH 383</td>
<td>CTH 384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- preface with excerpts of the invocation prayer (*mugai-*)
- preface with excerpts of the hymn of praise (*walla-) and of the invocation prayer (*mugai-*)
- preamble
- ________
- ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hymn</th>
<th>hymn (*walla-)</th>
<th>________</th>
<th>hymn</th>
<th>________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- prayer dealing with the plague and the enemy invasion
- prayer (*arkuwar*) concerning the enemy invasion
- prayer-request to all the Hittite gods (*arkuwar*)
- prayer (*arkuwar*) of confession and penitence
- prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (*arkuwar*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intercession prayer to Šeri, Champion of Ḫatti (<em>arkuwar</em>)</th>
<th>prayer and a vow to Lelwani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>invocations of all the gods of all the lands</td>
<td>prayer and a vow to Zintuḫi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer-request to the Sungod of heaven (<em>arkuwar</em>)</td>
<td>prayer and a vow to Mezzulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercession prayer to the Stormgod of Lightning (<em>arkuwar</em>)</td>
<td>prayer and a vow to the Stormgod of Zippalanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerings to be given to the gods of Ḫatti before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prayers of Muršili II

Only two well-preserved personal prayers (arkuwar) of Muršili II were accompanied by other religious utterances and rites. The prayer addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) and the prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377) were both preceded by a hymn of praise (walla-). In both compositions, the recitation of the hymn and the prayer was accompanied by an invocation ritual (mugai-).

The composite ‘prayer’ to the Sungoddess of Arinna was labelled in the colophon as mukeššar; the ‘prayer’ to Telipinu as arkuwar. It seems that the authors of these compositions focused on two different aspects of presenting a personal prayer, in CTH 376.II the emphasis was laid on the ritual actions, in CTH 377 on the prayer itself.

The frame employed in these two compositions (invocation ritual – hymn – prayer) was a mix of old and new traditions of praying. The recitation of the prayer-request during the ritual of invocation by a Hittite priest on behalf of the king belonged to the old tradition. New features include the naming of the specific person who commissioned the prayer, thus giving the prayer a personal character and specifying the event that led to the composition of this text. Also new was the addition of a hymn of praise. The hymn of praise began to be used with personal prayers in the Middle Hittite period (i.e. a group of related prayers CTH 372-4).

Not only the frame shows influence of older traditions, also the particular structural elements of that frame were inspired by or even occasionally copied from earlier texts. Thus, while parts of the hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna were inspired by the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, other parts were copied from the hymn to Ištanu that preceded the Middle Hittite prayer of a mortal (CTH 372); large parts of the prayer itself were copied almost verbatim from the Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddes of Arinna (CTH 376.I) and other parts were based or inspired by another prayer (edited by Schwemer 2006; see also chapter four and appendix 3 under CTH 376.V). The hymn and prayer to Telipinu was composed by copying the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna almost verbatim with only some minor modifications.
This frame was employed only in two ‘prayers’ of Muršili II and possibly in the prayer of the same king for the recovery of his wife (CTH 376.III, see appendix 3). This prayer addressed also to the Sungoddess of Arinna was preceded by a hymn of praise and perhaps also by an invocation ritual. But the text is too fragmentary for a meaningful inclusion in the present discussion.

The available texts suggest that the hymn and ritual were used as a framework of the personal prayer only when the prayer did not contain a presentation of arguments. All plea-prayers which comprise the presentation of arguments appear without this frame; they were only accompanied by offerings. Apparently, the Hittites considered reasoning with the gods and making offerings as sufficient for convincing them to grant a request. No flattery (in form of an introductory hymn) was needed.

**Prayers of Muwatalli**

Only two composite ‘prayers’ commissioned by Muwatalli are preserved. One is addressed to the Stormgod (CTH 382), the other to the assembly of Hittite gods (CTH 382). Neither of these two prayers follows the structure of the ‘prayers’ of Muršili II discussed in the preceding paragraphs.

In the prayer to the Stormgod (CTH 382), the personal prayer (*arkuwar*) is preceded by an invocation of various deities. This invocation was not labelled with the verb *mugai*; therefore one may assume that the king invoked the deities by uttering their divine names rather than by performing a ritual of invocation (*mugai*). The deities are invoked to witness the expiation of sins by Muwatalli and to dispel the Stormgod’s anger.

The other composite royal ‘prayer’ commissioned by Muwatalli is addressed to the entire Hittite pantheon (CTH 381). The preamble of this text states the purpose of the long composition, namely the presentation of a plea-prayer (*arkuwar*).

The composition contains a series of offerings, invocations (not labelled with the verb *mugai*) and prayers (*arkuwar*), which were to be performed and recited in support of the main plea-prayer. The main plea-prayer is not included in this long composition, which led Singer (2002: 86) to suggest, probably correctly, that we should regard this text as an all-purpose model prayer. The actual plea was to be inserted when the need arose.

This composition to the assembly of Hittite gods contains the personal prayer-requests to all the Hittite gods and separate prayers to the main gods of the Hittite pantheon, that is, the Sungod of Heaven and the Stormgod of Lightning.

As in the ‘prayers’ of Muršili II, the frame in which the personal prayer was set is new and original. At the same time, some of the elements of that frame are inspired by
older texts. Thus, the prayer to the Sungod contains a few phrases of praise; this follows the tradition according to which a prayer addressed to a solar deity was always accompanied by a hymn. That model first appears in a group of related prayers (CTH 372-4), namely the Kantuzzili prayer, the ‘prayer of a king’ and the ‘prayer of a mortal’. The prayer to the Stormgod is a prayer-request in which the petitioner asks his personal god to intercede on his behalf with the other gods and to present and support his plea before other gods. This motif of intercession is also first encountered in the text group CTH 372-4.

**Prayers of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa**

Only two composite royal ‘prayers’ of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa are known at this point; the first is the so-called exculpation prayer of Ḫattušili to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 383), the other the prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her entourage for the well-being of Ḫattušili (CTH 384). Both compositions are unique with regard to their structure.

CTH 383 is addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna and preceded by a short hymn, which seems to be an originally Hittite composition (rather than an adaptation of a Babylonian model). It praises the Sungoddess as the Queen of Ḫatti and as the protector of Hittite kings and queens.

In CTH 384 the hymn is omitted altogether. One may argue that this composition was influenced by Muwatalli’s model prayer with regard to its structure. Like Muwatalli’s composition, it also contains various prayers to different gods. This, however, is the only similarity between the two texts. In the Puduḫepa ‘prayer’ the main plea-prayer (arkuwar) addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna is followed by prayer-requests and vows addressed to the lesser deities that form the entourage of the Sungoddess; these deities are either the Sungoddess’s children or grandchildren. Each of these shorter prayers is a prayer of intercession, which is composed in the tradition of other intercession prayers (e.g., the Kantuzzili prayer or the prayer to the Stormgod of Lightning included in Muwatalli’s ‘prayer’ to the assembly of Hittite gods). However, while in the older intercession prayers the focus is on the relationship between the god and the supplicant, in the prayers of Puduḫepa the emphasis is laid on the relationship of these lesser deities to their divine parents, the Sungoddess of Arinna and the Stormgod, and on the fact that this divine couple always grants the requests of its children. Each intercession prayer is followed or combined with vows, which is not surprising, since this
type of personal prayer became prominent only during the reign of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa.

To conclude, only two personal prayers of Muršili II were embedded in a ritual of invocation, and this tradition seems to have been abandoned during the reigns of Muwatalli and Ḫattušili. Also, the long and elaborate hymns to the Sun deity that preceded the prayers of Muršili were replaced in the ‘prayers’ of Muwatalli and Ḫattušili by either a short hymn or just a few phrases of praise. In the prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess the hymn is not included at all. During the reign of Ḫattušili the personal prayer-requests begin to be employed together with a prayer-vow. The prayer-vows were not used by either Muršili or Muwatalli.

Only once, during the reign of Muwatalli, the Hittite scribes attempted to standardise the method of presenting a personal prayer (arkuwar). However, this standard was not adhered to by later authors, and it seems that a strict formal tradition of how to compose a royal prayer never established itself. Each king (or rather his scribes) had a different approach of how to present a prayer in the most convincing way. Consequently, the structure of each royal ‘prayer’ is different; strands of continuity can only be seen in individual textual elements, not in the overall structure that frames the personal prayer.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRAYERS OF MURŠILI II. CRITICAL EDITIONS.

4.1. Introduction

Nearly all prayers in this chapter can be dated to the reign of Muršili II. His famous plague prayers (CTH 378.I-V), which are concerned with the deadly epidemic that ravaged the Hittite lands for over twenty years, contain ample historical references, as the king explores the possible political and religious causes of the divine anger that has become manifest in this disaster. Also, perhaps more importantly, these texts are the first Hittite prayers labelled by the scribes as arkuwar (CTH 378.I and CTH 378.II) in which the author presents the arguments before his/her divine overlords. Two of the prayers of Muršili, CTH 376.II and CTH 377, are accompanied by the ritual of invocation and a hymn and are thus the most important texts in studying the role of the prayer terminology in the context of Hittite ‘royal prayers’. The prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.I) is known since the Middle Hittite period and provides important insight into the techniques that the Hittite scribes employed in their composition of prayers. The other group of texts requests the recovery from illness of Gaššuliyawiya, Muršili II’s wife (here CTH 376.III. and CTH 380), and the third group of Muršili prayers (CTH 70, 71) is concerned with his dealings with his stepmother.

This chapter includes the new critical philological editions as well as the transliterations, translations and brief editorial notes to those prayers of Muršili II which are relatively well preserved and which are explicitly labelled by the Hittite scribes either in the invocation/address, the colophon or within the main body of the prayer texts. These include the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) and its precursor, a Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.I), the first and the second plague prayers (CTH 378.I, CTH 378.II) and the hymn and prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377).

4.2. Prayers Concerning the Plague and Enemies (CTH 376)

Two prayers are included in this section, namely, a Middle Hittite prayer addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna composed possibly during or before the reign of Muršili’s father, Šuppiluliuma I (here CTH 376.I) and a prayer of Muršili II addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II). The Middle Hittite prayer deals with enemy invasion and

---

53 For the distribution of the manuscripts of CTH 376 see pp. 141-144.
with a plague, probably the same plague that broke out in the “land of Ḫatti” during the reign of Šuppiluliuma I and that continued to ravage the Hittite population during the first years of Muršili II. This prayer was incorporated almost verbatim with some minor modifications and changes by scribes of Muršili II into a larger composition including the hymn and the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II). Both the Middle Hittite and the New Hittite prayers to the Sungoddess were recited during an invocation ritual; however, it is uncertain whether the Middle Hittite prayer was also accompanied by a hymn.

### 4.2.1. CTH 376 Manuscripts

Distribution of the manuscripts according to Laroche (1975) and followed by Lebrun (1980: 155):

**Prayer of Muršili to the Sungoddess of Arinna (376)**

- **A.** KUB 24.3 + 544/u + KUB 31.144 + 401/u + 1947/u
- **B.** KUB 30.13 (+) KBo 7.63 = A ii 13ff.
- **C.** KUB 24.4 + 30.12 = A ii 9ff.
- **D.** VBoT 121: parallel to C rev. 11ff.
- **E.** KUB 36.80
- **F.** KUB 36.81 = C i 1ff.

Most scholars do not agree with the above grouping of the manuscripts. Thus, Güterbock (1958: 244) labels KUB 24.4+ (CTH 376.C) as a short Plague Prayer and further observes that “at least two of the existing copies contain only this prayer, namely KUB 24.4 + 30.12, KUB 30.13 and VBoT 121, the latter two possibly parts of one copy”. Carruba also separates KUB 24.4 + 30.12 from the prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna. His decision is based on orthographic and linguistic features as well as on the fact that the text mentions the land of the Hurrians and Kizzuwatna as separate countries which suggests a Middle Hittite composition of the text prior to Šuppiluliuma I (Carruba 1969: 247f; 1983: 5, 80; Güterbock 1978: 136; Houwink ten Cate 1970: 68f). Carruba suggests the following distribution of the manuscripts of CTH 376 (1983):

**376 Hymn and prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna**

- **A.** KUB 24.3 + 544/u + KUB 31.144 + 401/u + 1947/u
- **B.** KUB 30.13 (+) KBo 7.63
- **C.** KUB 36.80
376.2 (or 375) Middle Hittite Prayer against troubles and disasters

A. KUB 24.4 + 30.12
B. VBoT 121

376.3 (or 376.2) Prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna for the recovery of Gaššuli�awiya

A. KUB 36.81

Carruba’s division of the manuscripts is followed here with some modifications and the addition of new fragments that have been joined to the manuscripts of the MH prayer (here 376.I) and Muršili’s prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here 376.II):

376.I. Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here pp. 145-155)

A. KUB 24.4 + 30.12
B. KBo 58.7 + KBo 53.9 + KBo 58.6
C. KBo 55.22
D. KBo 7.63 (+) KBo 57.20

1) Singer (2002a: 113) lists the manuscripts of this Middle Hittite prayer as: KUB 24.4 + 30.12; VBoT 121 and KBo 7.63 omitting KUB 30.13 in which he follows Carruba (1983) who treats KUB 30.13 as a copy of KUB 24.3. However, since KUB 30.13 shows the same paragraph division as KUB 24.4+, it seems more probable that it either represents a copy of KUB 24.4+ or that it is modelled on KUB 24.4+. KUB 30.13 is treated here as a separate prayer (here CTH 376.IV) whose composition was inspired by KUB 24.4+.

2) KBo 58.7 (here ms. B.), KBo 53.9 (here ms. B.) and KBo 58.6 (here B.) are treated here as fragments of one text (manuscript B of CTH 376.I), which follows a suggestion of Miller (2008a: IV).

3) Also, according to Miller (2008b: 128), KBo 7.63 and KBo 57.20 show a similar handwriting. Since KBo 7.63 resumes the text when KBo 57.20 breaks off, both fragments are likely to have belonged to the same tablet (manuscript D of CTH 376.I).

4) The join KBo 7.63 + KUB 30.13 suggested by Laroche (1975) and followed by Carruba, was refuted by van den Hout, because the fragments were found in different finding spots (van den Hout 2007: 406). Miller suggests a new join KBo 7.63 + KBo 57.20 (see above), which is followed here.
376.II. Prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here pp. 156-196)

A. KUB 24.3 + 544/u + 1947/u + 401/u + KUB 31.144 + 107/u
B. KUB 36.80
C. 1229/u (+) Bo 4328
D. KBo 53.13

376.III. Prayer of Muršili II for the recovery of Gaššuliyawija (here vol.II, pp. 139-141)

A. KUB 36.81

376.IV. New Hittite Prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (?) (here vol.II, pp. 142-145)

A. KUB 30.13 (+) KBo 12.132 (+) VBoT 121

According to Torri, KUB 30.13 and KBo 12.132 belong to the same manuscript. Following Güterbock (1958: 244 n. 48), she also suggests that VBoT 121 may be a fragment of the same text (Torri 2010: 362-369).

To date, KUB 30.13 and VBoT 121 have been regarded as copies of either KUB 24.4+ or KUB 24.3+, while KBo 12.132 has been considered to belong to the CTH 375 manuscripts, based on the textual similarities to the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal.54

In terms of paragraph division, the fragments KUB 30.13 and VBoT 121 show similarities to the Middle Hittite prayer (KUB 24.4+); both KUB 30.13 and VBoT 121 have the same paragraph division as KUB 24.4+ and seem to duplicate obv. 1'-10' and rev. 10-17 of KUB 24.4+ respectively. However, lines 8'-11' of VBoT 121 contain a KIN oracle, which is not present in KUB 24.4+.

KBo 12.132 employs some phrases that are also present in KUB 24.4+: (i) [...]i É.MEŠ.DINGIR.MEŠ-ma (corresponds to the end of obv. 19' of KUB 24.4+), (ii) šu-ul-l[a-an-da KUR.KUR-TIM (corresponds to obv. 23' of KUB 24.4+) and (iii) [...] ka-r[u-ú KUR ŠR[H]A'-AT'[TI …] (corresponds to rev. 2' of KUB 24.4+). However, the fragments of the text that appear between these phrases do not correspond to KUB 24.4+. Also, KBo 12.132 does not have the same paragraph divisions as KUB 24.4+.

Consequently, if one accepts that the three fragments belong to the same manuscript, this text, numbered here CTH 376.IV, due to the textual differences between KBo 12.132 and KUB 24.4+ and between VBoT 121 and KUB 24.4+, should be regarded as a new composition modelled on KUB 24.4+, rather than as a duplicate of this

54 The latter suggestion has been disputed by Neu 1983: 396 and van den Hout 2007: 404.
55 Because the final paleographical analysis of either of the three fragments cannot be carried out at this stage, Torri’s suggestion that they belong to the same manuscript is tentatively accepted.
text (this already Torri 2010: 367). For a transliteration and translation of this text see Appendix 3).

376.V. A New/Middle Hittite Prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle (here vol. II, pp. 146)

A small fragment of a two column tablet from a private collection has been recently transliterated and translated by Schwemer (2006: 239-241) and dated to either the reign of Muršili II or to the Middle Hittite period. Schwemer observes that lines iii 4’-11’ of this text resemble lines iii 1’-8’ of manuscript A (KUB 24.3+) of the prayer of Muršili II to Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II) as well as lines iii 18’- iv 4 of manuscript A (KUB 24.1+) and rev. 3’-10’ of manuscript B (KUB 24.2) of the prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu (CTH 377).

The phrasing of the relevant lines of both prayers of Muršili and of this fragment is indeed similar, but is by no means identical. One may propose three possible interpretations of the relationship between this fragment and both prayers of Muršili II: (i) this fragment was a Middle Hittite prayer that was used by the scribes of Muršili II as a reference when they were composing prayers to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to Telipinu, (ii) this was a New Hittite prayer whose composition was inspired by either the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna or by the prayer to Telipinu and (iii) this prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle, the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and the prayer to Telipinu were three prayers of Muršili II that were modelled on one, to date unknown, archetype.

Whatever the right interpretation of this fragment may be, this text seems to belong to a group of texts that have been assigned the number 376 in Laroche’s catalogue of Hittite texts. The text is numbered here 376.V. For a full transliteration and translation of this fragment see Schwemer (supra). The transliteration of the relevant fragment is reproduced from Schwemer (2006: 240-241) in Appendix 3.
4.2.2. Texts

A MIDDLE HITTITE PRAYER TO THE SUNGODDESS OF ARINNA (376.I)

The text of this prayer is preserved in five manuscripts. All show the same paragraph division.

Manuscript A (KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12) is a single-column tablet written in the Middle Hittite script (note the old sign shapes of al, du, gi, ik, li, nam, ni, šar, tar, URU). This text has not been preserved in its entirety. The parts missing include: the first lines of the prayer, the beginning of lines 1’-8’ and 19’-28’ of the obverse as well as lines 1-7 of the reverse, the end of lines 1’-14’ and 27’-28’ of the obverse and lines 1-4 and 16-24 of the reverse. The language of the text exhibits a large number of linguistic and orthographic features that safely date the text to the Middle Hittite period. The most salient of these include: the use of the locative particles -an and -ašta, the older spelling of the third plural preterite of the verb ak(k)- as a-ki-ir and the use of this verb in the middle voice with the meaning “to die”, the older spelling of the third plural present of the verb iya- as i-en-zi, a tendency to use the syllabic writings rather than their logographic variants (HA-AT-TI often replaced in NH manuscripts with the logographic URUKÚ.BABBAR, kunnan instead of ZAG-an, URUDUšepikuštaš instead of URUDUZI.KIN.BAR-aš, appa instead of EGIS-pa etc.) and the use of enclitic possessive pronouns.

To date, only three fragments belonging to manuscript B have been identified, KBo 58.7 (here ms. B₁), KBo 53.9 (here ms. B₂) and KBo 58.6 (here B₃). The numbering of the fragments as B₁, B₂ and B₃ reflects their place within the manuscript, at the beginning, the middle and the end of the manuscript. KBo 58.7 duplicates obv. 1’-7’, KBo 53.9 rev. 1-6 and KBo 58.6 rev. 12-17 of manuscript A. All fragments of the manuscript B are written in the Middle Hittite script (the employment of the older variants of the signs az, du, li, ni and URU).

The small fragment KBo 55.22 (here manuscript C) duplicates obv. 25’- rev. 2 of manuscript A. Although all lines of manuscript C are written on the same side of the tablet, they show the same paragraph division as manuscript A. Lines 1’-5’ of manuscript C copy obv. 25’-28’ of manuscript A and lines 6’-7’ of manuscript C duplicate rev. 1-2 of manuscript A. Not enough is left of manuscript C to date this text safely. Of the diagnostic signs used for dating Hittite texts, two uk and URU appear in their older variants. The fragment is dated to New Hittite period in Konkordanz and by Torri (2010: 369).
Two fragments of manuscript D, KBo 57.20 (here D₁) and KBo 7.63 (here D₂) duplicate obv. 6’-18’ of manuscript A. The fact that the manuscript mentions the “land of the Hurrians” would suggest either a Middle Hittite composition or a verbatim New Hittite copy of the Middle Hittite manuscript. The latter could be supported by the usage of the new variant of the sign URU. However, not enough of this text is preserved to either confirm or refute this suggestion. Both fragments are dated to the New Hittite period in Konkordanz and by Torri (2010: 369).

This Middle Hittite prayer was incorporated almost verbatim into the larger New Hittite composition of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna, but also continued to be copied in the Middle and New Hittite periods as a separate and independent text. This is suggested by the numerous New Hittite copies of this prayer.
Manuscripts:\(^{56}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KUB 24.4 +</th>
<th>Bo 2605 +</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 30.12</td>
<td>Bo 3556(^{57})</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>KBo 58.7 (+)</td>
<td>95/w (+)</td>
<td>T.I(^{58})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>KBo 53.9 (+)</td>
<td>1795/u (+)</td>
<td>T.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>KBo 58.6</td>
<td>79/w</td>
<td>T.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>KBo 55.22</td>
<td>369/v</td>
<td>T.I(^{59})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>KBo 57.20 (+)</td>
<td>863/v (+)</td>
<td>T.I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>KBo 7.63</td>
<td>2039/k</td>
<td>T.I(^{60})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transliteration\(^{61}\)

1' A obv. 1' [ … DINGI]R.'MEŠ\(^{\dagger}\) N[INDA.GUR..RA.ḪI.A] ku-i-e-eš
   B\(_1\) 1' [ [ ] ]
   A ctd. ma-al-le-eš-ki-ir]
   B ctd. [ ] \(\rightarrow\)
2' A obv. 2' [na-at a-ki-ir nu] nam-ma NINDA.'GUR..RA'.[ḪI.A] 'Ū\(^{1}\) -[UL] ' naï-a[t\(^{1}\)] \(\rightarrow\) Ú'-UL
   B\(_1\) 1'-2' [ ] [ ]
   A ctd. [ku-iš-ki ma-al-zi]
   B\(_1\) 2' 'ku-iš\(^{\ddagger}\)-[ki ]

AB\(_1\)

3' A obv. 3' [UDU a-ú-li-ú-u]š-kán GU.ḪI.A UDU.ḪI.A ḫa-\(^{\dagger}\)a-[i-ia-az]
   B\(_1\) 3' [ ] [ ]
   A ctd. [ ku-e-ez-za-(uš/aš) kar-aš-ki-ir]
   B\(_1\) 3'-4' a-ša-a-\(^{\ddagger}\)-a-[na-az ] [ ] \(\rightarrow\)
4' A obv. 4' [nu LŪ.MEŠ SIPA.GU, LŪ.MEŠ SIPA.UDU a-ki-ir ḫa-a-li-[a a-ša-a-u-wa-ar]
   B\(_1\) 4' [nu LŪ.MEŠ SIPA.G]U, LŪ.MEŠ SIPA.'UDU a-ki-[r ]]

\(^{56}\) A join sketch of ms A is included in Appendix 2.

\(^{57}\) Text D in Gurney 1940.

\(^{58}\) T.I = Temple 1 (great temple). Fragments KBo 58.6 and KBo 58.7 were found in the storeroom 12 of temple 1.

\(^{59}\) At the time of completion of this edition, the fragment 369/v was unpublished. The photograph of this fragment was sent to me by Prof. J. Miller, when he held a research position at the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz. The fragment is now published as KBo 55.22.

\(^{60}\) Fragment KBo 7. 63 was found in room 10 of temple 1.

\(^{61}\) All restorations are based on the duplicates of this Middle Hittite prayer and on the New Hittite text incorporated into the composition of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna (here CTH 376.II).
A ctd.  

\[\text{kar-ša-an-da-ri(?)}\]

B, ctd.  

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ]}
\end{array}
\]

AB,

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{__________________________}
\end{array}
\]

5’ A obv. 5’  
\[\text{[nu ú-íz-zi A-N]A DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.GUR,RA.ÂH.I.A}

B, 5’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ]}
\end{array}
\]

A ctd.  
\[\text{DUG} \text{iš-pa-an-d[u-uz-zi} \text{ A-ú-li-uš-ša]\]}

B, 5’-6’  
\[\text{[DUG} \text{iš-p[a-]an-du-uz-zi} \text{ / [ ] }\)

6’ A obv. 6’  

B, 6’-7’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[nu-un-na]-aš ú-wa-at-}^3\text{ni} / [ ]
\end{array}
\]

A ctd.  
\[\text{[a-pé-e-da-ni]}

B, 7’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ] }\)
\end{array}
\]

D, 1’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ... ] 'ud-da-ni}^3\text{-i[a]}
\end{array}
\]

7’ A obv. 7’  
\[\text{[wa-aš-du]-ű}^3\text{li₃ ūar-te-ni}

B, 7’  
\[\text{[wa-aš-du]-ű}^3\text{li₃ ūar-te-ni]}

D, ctd.  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ]}
\end{array}
\]

AB,D,

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{__________________________}
\end{array}
\]

(B, breaks)

8’ A obv. 8’  
\[\text{n[a-aš-t]a A-NA DUMU.LÚ.U₃.LU ū-at-ta-ta-šum-mi-it}

D, 2’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{DUMU.LÚ₃.LU ū-at-[ta-tar-šum-mi-it]}
\end{array}
\]

A ctd.  
\[\text{[ ūar-ak-ta]}

D, 3’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ] }\)
\end{array}
\]

9’ A obv. 9’  
\[\text{nu 'ku'₁-un-na-an ku-it i-ia-<u>-e-ni na-at NU.G[ÁL]}

D, 3’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ku-i]t i-ia-}^3\text{-ni} / [ ]
\end{array}
\]

AD,

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{__________________________}
\end{array}
\]

10’ A obv. 10’  
\[\text{nu DINGIR.MEŠ ku-it wa-aš-du-ul uš-ka-at-te-ni nu na-aš-šu}

D, 4’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{uš-kat-}^3\text{ni} / [ ]
\end{array}
\]

A ctd.  
\[\text{[DINGIR.MEŠ-ni-ia-an-za ū-id-du]}

D, 4’-5’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ] / [ ] }\)
\end{array}
\]

11’ A obv. 11’  
\[\text{na-at me-e-ma-a-ú na-aš-ma-at}^\text{MUNUS.MEŠ} \text{SU.GI LÚ.MEŠ AZ[U]}

D, 5’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{me-(e)-m[a-a-ú]}
\end{array}
\]

A ctd.  
\[\text{[LÚ.MEŠ MUŠEN.DÛ me-mi-ia-an-du na-aš-ma-at]}

D, 5’-6’  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[ ] / [ ] na-aš-ma-at }\)
\end{array}
\]

12’ A obv. 12’  
\[\text{za-aš-ḥé-az DUMU.LÚ₃.LU ú-wa-an-du}

D, 6’ ctd.  
\[\text{za-a[š-}]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{__________________________}
\end{array}
\]
13' A obv. 13' na-āš-ta URUDU še-pi-ik-ku-uš-ta-as GIS sar-pa-az ku-un-ku-[u-e-en] na-āš-ta URUDU' [ ]
D2 7'

D2 8'
A ctd. da-[at-te-en]
D2 ctd. []

15' A obv. 15' ke-e-[e]z-za-at ši-in-ka-na-an-za ta-ma-a-āš-ta ke-e-[e][z-za-at-ta]
D2 9'
ke-e-ez-za-at ÚŠ-a[n-]

16' A obv. 16' ku-u-r[u-r]a-an-za ta-ma-aš-ta nu ku-ri-wa-na-aš KUR.KUR-TIM ku-ru-ra-an-ťa [a-ma-aš-ta]
D2 10'
A ctd. k[u]-ş a-ra-ah-za-an-d[a]
D2 ctd. []

D2 11'
A ctd. nu šu-[u]-ma-an-za šu-ul-[i-e-et]
D2 12' nu šu-[u]-ma-an-za [] → nu šu-[u]-ma-an-za []

18' A obv. 18' [ ] nu-[a]-š-ta-an DINGIR.MEŠ ša-ra-a Ī-UL 'i-en'zi na-aš-ta NI-IS
D2 12'-13' [ ] / 'na'[aš-ta ]
A ctd. D[INGIR].MEŠ šar-ra-an-ta-ti
D2 13' [ ]

19' A obv. 19' 'nu1 KURURU HA-AT-TI i-da-a-la-u-wa-an-ni ša-an-ši-[iš]-[kā]n-zi É DIN.ISK MEŠ-ma [a-u-wa-ar-ru-na]

20' A obv. 20' [š]a-an-ši-š-kān-zi na-at DINGIR.MEŠ-aš kat-[a]-wa-[a]-tar n[am]-ša-ra
A

21' A obv. 21' [nu]-u[š]-š[aš]-ši-in-kān ku-u-ru-ur ka-[a]-ša-an A-NA 'KURURU
A
22' A obv. 22'  

23' A obv. 23'  

24' A obv. 24'  

25' A obv. 25'  

26' A obv. 26'  
[NA-AT L]₃[U₄ME₃SIP₃] H E-SI-E R ḪU L₃ME₃S GADA.HI.A

27' A obv. 27'  
[ḪUR₃-R₄U₅-A₃-WA] A-RU WA-AN-NA KUR⁴[RUr] KU₃-LA-A₃[ME₃]

28' A obv. 28'  
[ḪUR₃-R₄U₅-A₃-WA] A-RU WA-AN-NA KUR⁴[RUr] KU₃-LA-A₃[ME₃]

29' A rev. 1  

This restoration is uncertain. Manuscript A (KUB 24.3 +) of the prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna employs in this sentence the construction supine with the verb da-i- “to put”:
GUL-ḫa-an-ni-ia-u-wa-an di-[a-a]-ir (iI 50). To maintain the same construction one would have to restore in rev. 2 of ms. A of this Middle Hittite prayer, the form ti-(ia)-. However, because ms. C employs here the third plural present da-an-zi, this verb may have also been employed in ms. A. The usage of the verb da- here could indicate either a different construction from supine + dai-itiya- or a scribal error.

Similar spelling of the third singular preterite of the verb dā- also appears in KBo 18.151 obv. 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14 (MH/MS). The other spelling da-<a>-a[š] with the restoration of ‘a’ is also possible here.
The hand copy ms A preserves more text at the beginning of rev. 8-9 than the photograph. Line rev. 8 \[ki-nu-na a-ra-a₇-z]é-ni-e-e\[66 ud⁻¹-ne⁻¹-e-an-te-eš, \{KUR.KUR.MEŠ\} KUR\[URU] \[HA-[AT-TI]\]

The noun kardimiyatt- is usually written with the sequence -di-mi- or -tim-mi-, with the former spelling found mostly in the MS manuscripts. Since this noun here is spelled with -di-|dim~|-mi-\[67\], the sign dim is considered a scribal error.

Traces visible on the hand-copy of this text suggest the reading \[i⁻¹-d[a-[a-la-u-wa-a₈]ṣ an-da]\[68\] ṭar-kán-zī na-a₈ ma-a[a₈]n\]

The lacuna at the beginning of this line accommodates only three signs.
Translation:

1'-2' [The women of the mill-stone who used to mill/grind (the flour for) the thick breads of the gods]s [have died]. No one [mills/grinds] (the flour for) the thick breads anymore.

3'-4' The corrals and sheepfold[s from which they used to select the sacrificial animals], (such as) cattle and sheep, [(now when) the cowherd]s and shepherds have died, the corral and the sheepfold are neglected).

5'-7' [So it happens] that the thick breads, the libation [and the sacrificial animals for the gods are neglected]. And you, o gods, proceed to hold us guilty in that very matter.

8'-9' (To us), to mankind, our wisdom [has been lost] and we cannot do anything right (lit.whatever right we do, it does not exist).

10'-12' O gods, whatever sin you perceive, either let a man of gods come] and pronounce it, or let the old women, the divine[rs or the augurs pronounce] it, [o]r let (some) men see it through a dream.

13'-14' W[e have been] dangling/swaying from the point of a needle. O gods, tak[e] pity on the land of Ḫatti again!

15'-16' On the one hand the plague has been oppressing it, on the [other hand] hostility has been oppressing it. The lands of kuriwana, which are around,
namely the land of the Hurrian (D: Hurrian land), the land of Kizzuwatna and the land of Arzawa, each (of them) quarrel[ed]. They do not extol the gods; they transgressed the oaths.

They continually seek to harm the land of Ḥatti and [to] despoil the temples (lit. house of the gods). May this become an [additional (cause for) vengeance for the gods.

Turn the plague, the hostility (and) the famine toward the land of Mitanni, [and the land]d of Kizzuwatna and the land of Arzawa.

[Res]ted are the quarrelsome lands, but the land of Ḥatti is a tired [land]. Unhitch the ti[re]d one, and hitch the rested one.

Further[more, these] lands [belonged to the land of] Ḥatti itself: the land of Kaška – [they] were [swineherd]s and they were weavers –

the land of Arauwanna, the land] of Kalašpa, the land of Lukka and the land of Pit[ašša. Also these] lands became free from the Sungoddess of Arinna.

They have repudiated [(their) tributes] and again [be]gan [to attack] the land of Ḥatti. Formerly, the land of Ḥatti [with the (help of) the Sungoddess of] Arinna [used to] overpow[er] the foreign lands like a lion.

[Further]more, (as to) Aleppo and Babylon, which it (i.e. the land of Ḥatti) used to destroy, it [took] their goods [of] all [the lands], namely silver, gold (and) gods, and deposited [them before] the Sungoddess of Arinna.

[Now], all the [surround]ding lands began to attack the land of Ḥat(ti). May this become an additional (cause for) vengeance for the Sungoddess of Arinna. O Goddess, do not continue to degrade your own name!

And if any[one] is (a cause of) anger to the gods and is not respect[ful] of the gods, let not the good ones perish together with the ev[il ones]. Whether it is a single city or it is a single house [or] a single person, o gods, d[estroy] only that single one!

O g[ods], behold the land of Ḥatti [with favorable] eyes. [G]ive the evil plague to [the evil] land[s].

But in the land of Ḥatti [let (everything) thrive and prosper … ], and let the land of Ḥatti be[come] again as (it was) before.

lit. they continually seek the land of Ḥatti in malice
46’-50’ When [there is continual dying] in the land. His Majesty [entrusted] the words to me. I went and [invoked] the gods [in Ḫattuša], in Arinna, in Z[ippalanda …, and I spoke] these words.

51’-52’ [By the hand(?) of Z]uw[a … ]

Comments:
For the commentary to this prayer see the New Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II).
HYMN AND PRAYER OF MURŠILI II TO THE SUNGODDESS OF ARINNA

(376.II)

This long composition comprising a hymn and a prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna is preserved in four manuscripts.

Manuscript A (KUB 24.3+) is a four-column tablet that has been restored to a large extent through newly identified joins. The beginning of column ii (lines 1-12) is completed by KBo 51.18a (544/u + 1947/u) and lines 18-37 of column ii by KBo 51.18b (401/u). Lines 13’-25’ of column iii are completed by KUB 31.144, and partially by the fragmentary 107/w, which also fills the middle parts of lines iii 22’-27’. Lines 25’-38’ of column iii are completed by KBo 51.18b (401/u) and lines 43’-44’ by KBo 51.18a (544/u). Despite the identification of these joins, some small parts of manuscript A are still missing (see commentary).

Manuscript A employs exclusively older forms of ab, ik, li, nam, ni, šar, du, KÙ, URU; older and newer variants of ak, tar, gi and new forms of al, az, Ū, uk and zu. The scribe who wrote manuscript A consistently used the plural marker MEŠ with logograms that designate people and deities and ḤLA with all the other logograms. Although this distribution of plural markers is typical for the Old Hittite period, it can also be found in Middle Hittite and New Hittite compositions that belong to traditional genres, such as prayers (Hoffner 2010: 184-158). While the orthography and the usage of plural markers on the logograms could indicate the Middle Hittite date of this manuscript, the linguistic and textual evidence safely date this text either to the reign of Muršili II or to a later period. First, the text identifies the name of the king who commissioned this hymn and prayer as Muršili. Second, the text is concerned with the plague that ravaged the Hittite lands during the reign of Šuppiluliuma and in the first years of the reign of his son, Muršili II. Third, the text mentions the kingdom of Mitanni and Arzawa as neighbouring lands that were bound to Ḫatti by various treaties. Fourth, the scribe, while incorporating the Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna into this composition, modernized the language and replaced most of the Middle Hittite linguistic features with New Hittite ones. The most salient of those include:

(i) spelling of the third plural preterite of the verb ak(k)- as e-kir rather than MH a-ki-ir and the third plural present of the verb iya- as i-ia-an-zi instead of MH i-en-zi.

(ii) employment of the CVC signs rather than CV-VC sequence found in the Middle Hittite text (wa-aš-túl for MH wa-aš-du-ul; tar-na-at-tén for


(iv) replacement of the phonetic writing with the logographic writing (URU KÙ.BABBAR for MH URU HA-AT-TI, ZAG-an for MH ku-un-na-an, URUDÚ ZL.KIN.BAR-aš for MH URUDÚ še-pi-ku-uš-ta-aš and EGIR-pa for MH a-ap-pa).

(v) replacement of the local particle -an with -kan

(vi) omission of the enclitic possessive pronoun (a-aš-šu for a-aš-šu-<uš>-mi-it).

Only one small fragment of manuscript B (KUB 36.80) has been identified. It is inscribed on both sides, which probably represent column i and iv. The text of column i gives the beginning of the prayer that is missing from manuscript A, although it seems to contain more lines and more text than manuscript A (see commentary). The fragments of column iv contain a colophon that differs from the colophon of manuscript A. This fragmentary tablet employs the new forms of the signs du, SAG and URU, mentions the name Muršili and employs either the particle -za and/or the dative of the personal enclitic pronoun in the nominal sentences with the second person subject. These orthographic, textual and linguistic features date this fragment to either the reign of Muršili II or to a later period.

Manuscript C is preserved in three fragments, 1229/u, Bo 4328 and AnAr 11621c, which join directly and duplicate lines iii 11'-iii 27' of manuscript A. This fragmentary text mentions the name Muršili, and uses the new forms of the signs ḫa, ik, li, tar, uk, URU. Otten 1991: 110 dated this manuscript to the second half of the 13th century BCE.

A fragment of manuscript D (KBo 53.13) is inscribed on both sides and copies lines 13-24 and 47-54 of column ii of manuscript A. The text employs the new forms of the signs li and az and although it does not mention the name of the king who commissioned this text the fact that the scribe uses the plural markers MEŠ with all logograms, those that designate persons and deities and those that designate objects and animals, safely dates this manuscript to the New Hittite period.
Manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 24.3 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBo 51.18.a +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBo 51.18.b +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KUB 31.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>KUB 36.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>KBo 52.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>KBo 53.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Transliteration:

1 B i 1 \[d^\text{UTU URU}A-RI-IN]^1NA^3u-ia-it-mu \text{rm}^m\text{Mur}^3\text{ši-l}[i-iš \text{LUGAL-uš]}
2 B i 2 \[tu-e-el IK-A\text{i-it-wa am-me-el A-NA BE-EL-TI-IA]}
3 B i 3 \[A-NA^d\text{UTU URU}^UA-RI-IN-NA me-mi nu-wa \text{d}^\text{UTU URU}^U^UA-RI-IN-NA]}
4 B i 4 \[\text{DINGIR-LAM ŠA S}^\text{AG.DU-IA} mu-ga-a-mi nu-za-k[àn ma-a-an]}
5 B i 5 \[na-ak-k]^3i-iš \text{d}^\text{UTU URU}^A^A-RI-IN-NA ne-pi-š[i DINGIR.MEŠ-aš]
6 B i 6 \[iš-tar-na] še-er ma-a-an-za a-ru-ni ma-a-an-za \text{A-N}^\text{A ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ]}
7 B i 7 \[\text{ku-e-da(?)-a]}^\text{š}^2 qa \text{`wa-aḥ-ḫa}^1\text{-an-na pa-i}^3\text{a-a-an-[za]}
8 B i 8 \[\text{na-aš-ma]}^\text{t}^\text{at-ta MÊ}^2\text{-ia}^2\text{p}^2\text{-a}^3\text{-an-za WindowText Êa-s-s[a}^3\text{at-ta ša-ne-ez-zi-iš(?)]}
9 B i 9 \[\text{wa-ar-šu]}^\text{š}^2\text{la}^1[aš kal-li-iš]-du nu-ut-ta^3[k-a-aš(a\?)]

---

1 For the join sketches of ms A and ms C see Appendix 2.
2 Text C in Gurney 1940.
3 The find spot of KUB 24.3 and KUB 31.144 has been determined through joining these two fragments to KBo 51.18.a, KBo 51.18.b and 107/u.
4 The unpublished photograph of this fragment was sent to me by Prof. J. Miller, when he held a research position at the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz. The 107/w fragment was found in the storeroom 12 of temple 1.
5 The find spots of Bo 4328 and AnAr 11621c have been determined by join.
6 The unpublished photograph of this fragment was sent to me by Prof. J. Miller, when he held a research position at the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz.
7 KBo 53.13 fragment was found in the “fill” or secondary deposited earth of storeroom 12 of temple 1.
10 B i 10  [mu-ki-iš-ki-mi(?) GIŠERIN-aš(?)) Ì-aš-ša š[a-ne-ez-zi-it(?)]
   A i 1'  [ ... ] x

   A i 2'  [ ... ] na-aš-ta EGI[ ]pa¹[E]ka-ri-im-m[a'-at'-ti¹] / [an-da] →

12 B i 12  [e-ḫu nu-ut-ta(?) ka-a-ša(?)-š][a' m[u'-ki-iš-ki-mi(?)] NINDA ḫur-ši-it]
   A i 3'  [e-ḫu nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša mu-ki-iš-ki-m]i NINDA ḫur-ši-it

13 B i 13  [pa]-¹ra¹-[a

(B i breaks)

14 A i 5'  [nu-ut-ta ku-it me-mi-iš-ki-mi na-at iš⁴]ta³-ma-aš-ki

16 A i 7'  [nu-ut-ta DINGIR-LIM-IA (Û) É.DINGIR.MEŠ 1-NA KU]R
   URU KÜ.BABBAR-TI-<pát> ta-aš-ša-nu-wa-an

17 A i 8'  [nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni KUR-e] É.DINGIR-LIM-KA
18 A i 9'  [Ú-UL ku-wa-pí-ki e-eš-zi nu-u]¹ta³ EZEN₄/HI.A SÍSKUR.HI.A-ia
19 A i 10'  [I-NA KUR URU KÜ.BABBAR-TI-pát šu-up-pí pár-ku]-¹i³ pé-eš-kán-zi
20 A i 11'  [nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni KUR]-¹e³ Ú-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki pé-eš-kán-zi

21 A i 12'  [É.MEŠ.DINGIR.MEŠ-ta pár-ga-u-wa I]Š-TU KÜ.BABBAR KÜ.SI₂₂
22 A i 13'  [ú-nu-wa-an-ta I-NA KUR URU KÜ.BABBAR-TI-pá³t e-eš-zi nam-ma-ma-
   at-ta
23 A i 14'  [ta-me-e-da-ni KUR-e Ú-UL ku-wa-pí³-ik-ki e-eš-zi
24 A i 15'  [GAL.HI.A-ta BI-IB-R₁ H₄ KÜ.BABBAR KÜ.S]₂₂ NA₄.HI.A I-NA KUR
   URU KÜ.BABBAR-TI-pá³t
25 A i 16'  [e-eš-zi EZEN₄.HI.A-it-ta EZEN₄.IT]U.HI.A <EZEN₄.HI.A> MU-ti mi-i-
   ia-na-aš
26 A i 17'  [gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš zé-na-an-d[a-aš ḫa'-me-eš-ḫa-an¹'da-aš
27 A i 18'  [a-ú]-¹li-uš³ m[u-ki-iš-na-aš-ša EZ]EN₄.HI.A I-NA [KUR U]RU
   KÜ.BABBAR-TI-pá³t
28 A i 19'  e-eš-ša-an-zì nam-ma⁻²[-at-ta] ta-me-e-da-ni 'KUR¹-e
29 A i 20'  Ú-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-eš-[a-a]n-zì
A

31 A i 21' nu tu-el ŠA dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA DINGIR-LIM-ia-tar I-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI-pát

32 A i 22' na-ak-ki'-ia'-aḫ-ḫa-an nu-ut-ták-kán ṠMur-ši-DINGIR-LIM-iš LUGAL-uš īR-i KAR

33 A i 23' I-NA KUR URU KÙ.BABBAR-TI-pát 'na'-aḫ-ḫa-an-za nu tu-el ŠA dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA

34 A i 24' ṣi-im-mu-uš 'SÍSKUR'.ḪI.A 'EZEN,'ḪI.A i-ia-u-wa-an-zi


36 A i 26' pé-eš-kán-zi nam-ma-aš-ša-an É.DINGIR-LIM-KA A-NA KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.SI 22

37 A i 27' na-aḫ-ša-ra-az ti-ia-an-za nu ma-ni-in-ku-wa-an

38 A i 28' 'Ū'-UL ku-iš-ki ti-ia-az-zi

A

39 A i 29' 'zi'-i-k-za dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-LIM-iš

40 A i 30' 'nu'-ut-ták-kán ŠUM-an lam-na-aš iš-tar'-na na'-ak-ki-i DINGIR-LIM-ia-tar-ma-ták'-kán 1

41 A i 31' DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-'tar'-na na-ak-ki-i nam-ıma'-za-ša'-kán 1 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-'tar'-na

42 A i 32' zi-ik-pát dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA na-ak-ki-iš 'šal-le'-eš-ša-az

43 A i 33' zi-ik-pát dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA nam-ma-ták-kán 'da'-ma-a-iš 'DINGIR'-LUM

44 A i 34' 'na-ak'-ki-iš šal-li-iš-ša Ū-UL e-eš-zi ṭa-an-ta-an-da-ša'-az 1

A

45 A i 35' [ḫa-an]-ni-eš-na-aš EN-aš zi-ik-pát ne-pi-ša-aš-ša

46 A i 36' [ták-na]-a'-aš-ša' LUGAL-u-iz-na-tar zi-ik-pát du-ud-du-uš-ki-ši

47 A i 37' [KUR.KUR.HL.]¹ A-aš'-kán ZAG.ḪI.A-uš zi-ik-pát zi-ik-ki-ši

48 A i 38' 'mu-ga-wa'-ar-ra zi-ik-pát iš-ta-ma-aš-ki-ši

49 A i 39' [zi-i]k-pát-za dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA gi-[i]-zu-wa-la-aš DINGIR-LUM {zi-ik} 1

50 A i 40' 'nu gi'-in-zu zi-ik-pát da-aš-ši-[š]i pa-ra-a ṭa-an-da-an-za-ša'-kán 1

51 A i 41' 'an-šu'-uḫ-wa-aḫ-ḫa-aš tu-uk-pát A-NA dUTU URU A-RI-IN-NA aš-ši-ia-an-za
A i 42' na-an zi-ik-pát UTU A-RI-IN-NA [ša] r-le-eš-ki-ši

A i 43' ne-pí-ša-aš-ša-az ták-na-aš-ša ḫu-u-la-le-eš-ni

A i 44' zi-ik-pát UTU A-RI-IN-NA la-lu-uk-tí-[m]a-aš

A i 45' KUR.KUR.ḪA-ša-za-kán iš-tar-na zi-ik-pát aš-[a-nu-w]a-an-za

DINGIR-LIM-ši

A i 46' nu-za KUR-e-aš ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš at-ta-aš an-na-aš 'zi-ik'

A i 47' ḫa-an-ni-eš-na-ša-az pa-ra-a ḫa-an-da-an-za EN-aš zí-ik

A i 48' nu-tí-ta ḫa-an-ni-eš-na-aš pl-di 'tar'-ri-ia-aš-ḫa-aš NÚ.GÁL

A i 49' ka-rú-ú-i-li-ša-za-kán DINGIR.ḪEŠ-aš iš-tar-na zi-ik-pát

A i 50' aš-ša-nu-wa-an-za DINGIR.ḪEŠ-na-aš-ša-aš-ša-an SÍSKUR.ḪA-ši-ik-pát

A i 51' UTU A-RI-IN-NA zi-ik-ki-ši ka-rú-ú-i-li-ia-ša-ša-ša-an

A i 52' DINGIR.ḪEŠ-na-ašḪA.LA-ŠU-NU zi-ik-pát zi-ik-ki-ši

A i 53' 'ne-píša-ša-aš-ša-ḫa aš-GES EGIR-pa tu-uk-pát ḫa-aš-ša-ša-ša


A i 55' [dUTU A-RI-IN-NA ša]r-rí-iš-ki-it-ta ne-píša-ša-ša


(A i breaks. Approximately 3-4 lines missing)

A ii 1 [a]n-tu-phši-ia-za-kán ku-e-da-ni DINGIR.ḪEŠ ś[a-a-an-zi]

A ii 2 [n]a-an-ša-an ar-ḫa pa-aš-ku-wa-an-zi[i]

A ii 3 [zi-ik-pát UTU A-RI-IN-NA g[e-en-zu-wa-ši]

A ii 4 ki-nu-na MUR-ši-DINGIR-LIM-in LUGAL-u[n] dUTU A-R[I-IN-NA]

A ii 5 lu-lu-wa-a-i nu MUR-ši-DINGIR-LIM-in LUGAL-un ḫa-an-da-a[n-da-an]

A ii 6 ÍR-KÁ dUTU A-RI-IN-NA ki-iš-šar-ta ḫa-ra[k]

A ii 7 nu-ut-ta MUR-ši-DINGIR-LIM-iš́ (uš) LUGAL-uš ud-da-a-ar

A ii 8 'kuu-e 'me-mi-eš-ki-iz-zi nu dUTU A-RI-IN-NA GEŠTUG-[an]

A ii 9 pa-ra-a l[aga-a]-an ĥar-ak 'na-at iš-ta-ma-aš-ki
78' A ii 10  
[k]i-i DINGIR.MEŠ Š ku-it] 'i'-i[a]-at-tén nu ḫi-in-kán tar-na-a[t-tén]

79' A ii 11  
'nu' KUR URU.KU,'BABBAR'-T[I ḫu-u-m]a-an-pár BA.ŪŠ nam-ma A-NA D[INGIR.MEŠ]

80' A ii 12  
'NINDA') ḫar-ši-in [DUG]iš-pa]-an-du-zi-ia Ū-UL ku-iš-k[i]

81' A ii 13  
i-ia-zi LÜM[-EŠ APIN.L]Á AŚĀ A.GÂR.ḪI.A DINGIR-LIM ku-i'-e3-[eš] [  ] →
D obv. 1'

82' A ii 14  
an-ni-eš'-kir3 na-a[t] 'e1-kir nu nam-ma AŚĀ A.GÂ[R.HI.A]
D obv. 1'-2'  
[an-ni-i]š3'-ki3-[ir] / [ ]
A ctd.  
[DINGIR-LIM]  
D obv. 2'  
DINGIR-LIM

83' A ii 15  
a-ni-ia-an-zi w[a-a]r-aš-ša-an-zi Ū-UL ku-[it-ki]  
D obv. 3'  
[ ]  'Ū'-UL [k]u-it-ki

84' A ii 16  
MUNUS.MEŠ NA-ARA. ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.GUR..RA.HI.A  
D obv. 4'  
[  ]
A ctd.  
ku-i-e-e[š]
D ctd.  
ku-i-e-eš 'ma'-al-le-eš-ki-ir

85' A ii 17  
na-at e-kir nu nam-ma NINDA.GUR..RA Ū-UL' ku-iš-ki  
D obv. 5'  
[  ]
A ctd.  
ku-i-e-eš 'ma'-al-le-eš-ki-ir
D ctd.  
NINDAGUR..RA.MEŠ Š

86' A ii 18  
a-ú-li'-ú'-uš-kán GU-.ḪI.A UDU.HI.A  ḫa-a-l[i-ia-az]  
D obv. 6'  
UDU.MEŠ  ḫa-a-li-ia'-az3

87' A ii 19  
a-ša-u-na-az ku'-e3-[e]z-za-aš kar-a[š-k]i-ir  
D obv. 7'-8'  
u u MEŠ SIPA.GU.1  
[  ]
[ ]  →

88' A ii 20  
LÜMEŠ SIPA.UDU e-kir ḫa'-a-li-ia a-ša-a-[u]-wa-a[r]  
D obv. 8'-9'  
[  ]  →

89' A ii 21  
uu ú-iz-zì A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.'GUR.,RA.HI.A  
D obv. 9'-10'  
[uu ú-iz-zì] A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ / [  ]
A ctd.  
[DUG]iš-pa-[an-du-zi]  
D obv. 10'  
[DUG]iš-pa-an-du-z[i] →

90' A ii 22  
a-ú-li-uš-ša  kar'-ša'-an-da-ri nu-un'-na3-[aš]
D obv. 12' [wa-aš-d]u-'li ḫar-te-ni

(D obv. breaks)

93 Aii 25 ḫa-at-tar-šum-mi-it ḫar-ak-ta nu ZAG-an ku-'it [i-ia-<u>-e-ni]
94 Aii 26 na-at NU.GÁL nu DINGIR.MEŠ ku-it wa-aš-tūl uš-kat-te-ni
95 Aii 27 nu na-aš-šu DINGIR.MEŠ-ni-ia-an-za ú-id-du na-at me-'ma'-ú
96 Aii 28 na-aš-ma-at MUNUS.MEŠŠU.GI LÚ.MEŠAZU LÚ.MEŠMUŠEN.DÙ me-mi-ia-an-'du'
97 Aii 29 na-aš-ma-at za-aš-ḥi-ia-až DUMU.LÚ.U₄₄.[L]U a-uš-du
98 Aii 30 na-aš-ta URUDU ZI.KIN.BAR-āš ṣar-pa-až ku-un-ku-u-e-en
99 Aii 31 nu DINGIR.MEŠ A-NA KUR URU.KU.BABBAR-TI ge-en-'zu nam-ma

100 Aii 32 ke-e-ez-za-at ḫi-in-ga-na-an-za ta-ma-aš-ta ke-e-ez-za-at-ta (at)
101 Aii 33 ku-ru-ra-an-za ta-ma-aš-ta nu ku-ri-wa-na-aš KUR.KUR.MEŠ ku-e
102 Aii 34 a-ra-aḫ-za'[ḥa]-an-da KUR URU MI-IT-TA-AN NI KUR URU AR-ZA-U-WA
103 Aii 35 nu ḫu-u-ma-an-za šu-ul-li-e-et nu-za-kán DINGIR.MEŠ ša-ra-a
104 Aii 36 Ū-UL i-ia-an-zi na-aš-ta NI-EŠ DINGIR.MEŠ šar-ri-'e'-eš-kán-zi
105 Aii 37 'Ē.ḪI.A DINGIR.MEŠ-ma la-u-wa-ar-ru-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi
106 Aii 38 [n]a-at A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ kat-ta-wa-a-tar nam-ma ki-ša-ru
108 Aii 40 ta-pa-aš-ša-an A-NA KUR URU MI-IT-TA-AN NI Ū A-NA 'KUR'
109 Aii 41 tar-na-at-tén wa-ar-ša-an-da šu-ul-la-an-da KUR.KUR.HI.A
110 Aii 42 {A-NA} KUR URU KU.BABBAR-TI ma ta-ri-ia-an KUR-e
111 Aii 43 nu ta-ri-ia-an-da-an la-a-at-tén wa-ar-ši-ia-an-da-an-ma
112 Aii 44 tu-u-ri-ia-at-tén

113 Aii 45 ke-e-ma nam-ma ŠA KUR URU ḤA-AT-TI-pār KUR.KUR.HI.A-TIM KUR

114 Aii 46 GA-ĂŠ-GA
114’ A ii 46  [n]a-at LÚ.MES SIPA.ŠAH Ü LÚ.MES E-PIŠ GADA e-eš-šir
D rev. 1’  →

115’ A ii 47  ’Ü n KUR URU A-RA-U-WA-AN-NA KUR URU KA-LA-AS-MA KUR
D rev. 1’-2’  →
A ctd.  URU LÚ-UQ-QA
D rev.2’  →

D rev. 2’-3’  →
A ctd.  GUL-ḫa-an-ni-ia-u-wa-an d[a-a-ir] 78
D rev. 6’  →

D rev. 4’  →
A ctd.  šar-ḫi-iš-ški-it
D rev. 9’  →

D rev. 7’  →
A ctd.  DINGIR.MEŠ-ia  [da-a-ir]
D rev. 11’  →

121’ A ii 53  nu pa-ra-a URU Ḥal-pa-an URU KÁ.DINGIR.RA’a-an ku-i-uš
D rev. 10’  →
A ctd.  DINGIR.MEŠ-ia  [da-a-ir]
D ctd.  →

122’ A ii 54  nu KUR-e-aš þu-u-ma-an-da-a[š a-aš-š]u ’KÙ.BABBAR’ KÙ.SI 22
D rev. 11’-12’  →
A ctd.  →

123’ A ii 55  na-at PA-NI d UTU URU A-RI-IN-N[A zi-ik-ki]-ir

78  da-a-ir is restored here from a similar sentence in line 125’.
124' Aii 56

ki-nu-na a-ra-aḫ-zi-na-an-te-ēš³ [ud-ne-(e)-an-te]-ēš

125' Aii 57

ḫu-um-a-an-te-ēš KUR⁴ URU KÙ³. BABBAR-TI [wa-al-ḫa-an-ni-eš-ki-ur-

wa-an d-a-ir

126' Aii 58

na-at A-NA⁴ UTU URU A-RI-IN-NA i'kat-ta³-wa-a-tar

127' Aii 59

nam-ma ki-ša-a-ru nu-za DINGIR-LUM tu-el ŠUM-KA

128' Aii 60

le-ē⁷⁹ te-ep-ša-nu-ši

129' Aii 61

nu A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ku-iš kar-pī-iš kar-tim-mi-ia-az

130' Aii 62

ku-iš DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš Ú-UL na-aḫ-ḫa-an-za na-aš-ta [e-e]

131' Aii 63

a-aš-ša-u-e-ēš i-da-a-la-u-wa-aš an-da i'har-kān-zi³

132' Aii 64

na-aš ma-a-an I-EN URU.KI na-aš-m[a-at 1-EN É-TUM]

133' Aii 65

na-aš-ma 1-E[N L]Ú nu DINGIR.MEŠ a-pu-u-u[n-pāt]

134' Aii 66

¹*i'ant i'ḫar³-n[i-ik-tēn nu A-NA KUR¹]⁸² KÙ³.BABBAR-TI³-[ma-kān DINGIR.MEŠ]

(Aii breaks. The end of line 134' and lines 135'-138' are restored from lines 42'-45' of 376.1; lines 139'-142' are restored from CTH 377)

135'

[an-da SIG₅-u-it IGLḪI.A-ti a-uš-tēn i-da-a-lu-ma ḫi-in-kān]

136'

[i-da-la-u-aš KUR-e-aš pé-eš-tēn I-NA KUR URU KÙ³.BABBAR-TI-ma]

137'

[ma-a-ū ši-eš-du nu EGR-pa KUR URU KÙ³.BABBAR-TI ka-ru-ū-i-li-at-ta]

138'

ki-ša-ru]

139'

[nu KUR.KURḪI.A L[U] KÙɾ ku-e šu-ul-la-an-ta]

140'

[Ḫar-šal-la-an-ta ku-i-eš-kān tu-uk A-NA⁴ UTU URU A-RI-IN-NA]

141'

[Ú-UL na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-ēš ku-i-eš-ma-aš šu-me-en-za-an]

142'

[ḪI.A DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU ar-Ḫa wa-ar-unu-ma-an-zi]

143' Aiii 1'

‘i-lā³-[i-iš]-³-kān-z[i ku]-³-i-eš-ma³-[aš-za]

144' Aiii 2'

ḪI.BR⁹ [GALḪI.A] URU-TE⁹ MES³ ŠA [KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.SI³]

145' Aiii 3'

da-an-na š[a-a]n³ ši³-iš-kān-zi

146' Aiii 4'

ku-i-eš-ma-aš-za A³SA³ AGARḪI.A KU-NU³ GIS KIRI³.MEŠ-كس[K]U-

N[U]

147' Aiii 5'

GIS TIR.MEŠ KU-NU ta-an-na-at-ta-u-wa-an-zi

⁷⁹ The sign e in le-e is written above the line and was probably added later.
148' A iii 6' ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za
149' A iii 7' LÚ.MEŠ APIN.LÁ LÚ.MEŠ NU. GIŠ KIRI₆ MUNUS.MEŠ NA₄ ARA₃
150' A iii 8' ta-an-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi
151' A iii 9' nu i-da-a-lu-un ta-pa-aš-ša-an ḫi-in-kán
152' A iii 10' ga-aš-ta-an UTU URU A-RI-IN-NA GAŠAN-IA
153' A iii 11' a-pé-e-da-aš A-NA KUR.KUR.HI A LÚ.KUR pa-a-i
                  LÚ.KUR³ pa³-a³-i³
C 1'  

AC  

154' A iii 12' nu-za UTU A-RI-I[N]-i'NA-i₄ zi-ki-la
C 2' [ ] UTU A₃-[RI-IN-NA-i₄] 'zi³-ki-[la]
155' A iii 13' mu-ke-eš-ki-iḫt-an-[zi-ik-la]-za me-mi
C 3' [mu-ki-iš]-ki-ḫ₄-[zi-ik]-za me-mi
157' A iii 15' na-aš-ta A-NA M[UR-ŠI-LI LUGAL]-i A-NA İR-KA
158' A iii 16' A-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI [an-da] aš-šu-li
C 5' [A-N]A KUR URU KÜ.BABBAR-TI-ia a(n)-da aš-šu-[l]i
159' A iii 17' ne-iš-ḫu-ut nu A-N MUR-ŠI-LI İR-KA
160' A iii 18' TI-tar ḫ₄-at-tu-[a-tar in-na]-ra-u-wa-a-tar
C 7' [T]I-tar ḫ₄-at-tu-la-tar [n-na-r]u-a-wa-'a'[a]-[tar]
161' A iii 19' Ṣ₄ EGIR.UD-MI [ ] la-[l]u-uk-ki-ma-an
C 8' [Ṣ₄] EGIR.UD-MI ZI-a[ş la-[lu-uḵ]-ki³]-[ma-an]
162' A iii 20' [MU.KAM] ḠID₄.DA-ia [ ] nu³-'uš³-ši-kán
C 9' [M]U.KAM ḠID₄.DA-ia pé-eš-ki [nu-uš-ši-kán] →
163' A iii 21' A-NA ZI-ŠU a[n-da la]-lu-u[k]-ki-ma-an
C 9'-10' [A-NA ZI-ŠU] / [a]n-da la-[lu-uk]-ki-ma-an →
164' A iii 22' [du-uš-ga-ra-a]t-[a-an-na] zi-ik-ki
C 10'-11' [du-uš-ga-ra-at-ta-an-na(?)] / zi-ik-ki
165' A iii 23' [nu-uš-ši ḫ₄-aš-š]-a-tar [DUMU.MEŠ] DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ
C 11' nu-uš-ši -------------- D[UMU.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ]
166' A iii 24' ḫ₄-aš-šu-[u] / ḫ₄-an-[za-aš-š][u]-uš³ pé-eš-ki
C 12' ḫ₄-aš-šu-uš ḫ₄-an-za-aš-[u]-uš pé-eš-ki
C 13’ ‘nu³-uš-ši nu-ú-un tu-[um-ma-an-ti-ia-an]

168’ A iii 26’ [ ] nu-uš-ši [hal]-ki-ia-aš [ GEŠ]TIN-aš
C 14’ [pē-eš-ši nu-uš-ši  ḫal-[i-ia-aš ]]

169’ A iii 27’ [UZ₆]-aš GU₄-aš UD₄-aš ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš
C 15’ [ ] ‘ANŠE.KUR.RA-aš[š]

(C breaks)

170’ A iii 28’ [DUMUL]Ü.[U₉₅]LU-aš-[ša(?)] m-[i]-ia-tar pé-eš-[k]i

171’ A iii 29’ [nu-uš-ši x x x x] x-tar tar-[ḫu-u]-i³-[l]a-a-tar

172’ A iii 30’ [ x x x x x (x)] x pa-ra-a 'ne³-ia-an-da-an


174’ A iii 32’ [ŠA-PAL(?)] GİR.MEŠ(?)-š]U ‘zi³-ik-ki

175’ A iii 33’ [ ... ] x i-id-du

176’ A iii 34’ [ ... ] x-i³-ši³ pí-ra-an

177’ A iii 35’ [ ... ]-ru² nu [U₄₉]URU A-RI-IN-N[A]


179’ A iii 37’ [nam-ma da-a-n]a-at-za EḠIR-an x[x(x)]

180’ A iii 38’ [x x x ša-k]u-wa-an-du-uš [ḫ(e²)-e]-’mu³-[uš]

181’ A iii 39’ ‘u³-[wa-an-d]u nu še-iš-du-wa-a[š]

182’ A iii 40’ IM-an³-ta-[eš³] i-ia-an-da-ru m[a³-a-i³]

183’ A iii 41’ še-iš-du [n]u šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.M[EŠ]

184’ A iii 42’ [NINDA]GUR₄.RA.[HA-K]U-NU DUGⁱš-pa-an-tu-zi

185’ A iii 43’ ša-ra-[a ki-i]t-ta-ri nu pa-an-ku-[uš]
B iv 1’ [ ... ] x [ ... ]

186’ A iv 44’ a-pa-a-at ’e³-[eš-d]u ḫal-za-i
B iv 2’ [ ... ] x ‘wa-ar³-[- ... ]

A

Colophon A (perhaps one or two lines missing)


188’ A iv 2’ x [x x x am-mu-u][k (?)] tup-pí-ia-aš A-WA-TE₄MEŠ

189’ A iv 3’ a³-pí-ia a-ni-i³-nu-un nu [U₄₉]URU A-RI-IN-NA
190’ A iv 4’ URU KÙ.BABBAR-ši I-NA UD.7.KAM mu-ke-eš-ki-nu-un
191’ A iv 5’ I-NA URU A-RI-IN-NA-ia I-NA UD.7.KAM
192’ A iv 6’ mu-ke-eš-ki-nu-un na-aš-ta ki-i A-WA-TE³
193’ A iv 7’ an-da me-mi-iš-ki-nu-un mu-u-ga-u-wa-aš-ma
194’ A iv 8’ ar-ḫa-ia-an ḫa-an-ti tup-pī

Colophon B

B iv 3’ [DUB.1 QA-TI(?)] ma-a-an ŠÀ KUR URU ḤAT-‘TI [ο]
B iv 4’ [an-da(?) ak-k]i-iš-ki-it-ta-ri [?]
B iv 5’ [ar-ḫa-ia-an(?)] 'a⁻ap-pa {x} ḫa-an-ti-i
B iv 6’ [tup-pī m]a-a-an ḫUTU URU A-RI-IN-N[A]
B iv 7’ [URU KÙ.BABBAR-ši(?) mu]-ga-a-an-zi nu-uš-ša⁻t-an' [ke-e]
B iv 8’ [ud-da-a-ar] an-da me-mi-iš-kán-zi

Translation:

1-14 Manuscript B:

[O Sungoddess of Arinn]a! Murši[i, the king, your servant] sent me (saying): “Go to my l[ady, to the Sungoddess of] Ar inna (and) say: I invoke the Sungoddess of [Arinna], my personal [goddess]. [Whether] you, [O honoure]d Sungoddess of Arinna, are above heav[en among the gods], or you are in the sea, or you are gon[e] to [som]e [mountains] to roam, [or] you are gone for battle, let [the fragrant odo]ur of the oil [summon you]. [I hereby invoke] you [with] the fra[grant odour of the cedar] and of the oil. [Come b]ack [to your] te[mple]!

Manuscript A:

[I hereby invo]ke [you] with the thick bread [and libation]. Be [completely satis]fied [and keep lis]tening [to what I am saying to you]!

15-30 [You, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are an honoured] goddess.

[In the lan]d of Ḥatti alone you, my goddess, possess strongly-built [temples], but [nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) you have] a temple.

[In the land of Ḥatti alone] they provide [holy and pur]e festivals and rituals [for you, but] nowhere [in any other lan]d in addition (to ours) they provide (them) [for you].
In the land of Ḥatti alone you possess lofty temples adorned with silver and gold, but nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) you possess (them).

In the land of Ḥatti alone you possess cups and rhyta of silver and gold as well as precious stones.

In the land of Ḥatti alone they celebrate festivals for you (such as) the monthly festivals, the annual festivals of winter, autumn, spring, the animal sacrifices, and the festivals of invoking, but nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) do they celebrate (them) for you.

In the land of Ḥatti alone, your divinity, O Sungoddess of Arinna, is honoured.

In the land of Ḥatti alone, Muršili, the king, your servant, is respectful to you.

They are setting, your, the Sungoddess of Arinna’s, images in order to perform rituals and festivals. They offer you everything that is pure.

Furthermore, respect is established for silver and gold belonging to your temple. No one steps near (them).

You, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are an honoured goddess.

Your name is honoured among the names.

Your divinity is honoured among the gods.

Furthermore, among the gods, you alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are honoured, and you alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are great; furthermore, no other god is more honoured or greater than you.

You alone are the lady (text: lord) of just [judgment].

You alone control the kingship of heaven and [earth]!

You alone set the borders of [the lands]!

You alone listen to [invocations]!

You alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are a merciful goddess and you alone take pity!

The just man is dear to you alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, and you alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, [let] him to prevail!

In the circumference of heaven and earth, you alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are the (source of) light!

Among the lands, you alone are the (most) celebrated deity.

To all the lands you are father and mother.
You are the rightly guided lady (text: lord) of judgement, and in the place of judgment you never tire (lit. there is no tiring you).

Also among the primeval gods you alone are the (most) celebrated!

You alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, set the gods’ offerings, and you alone, set the primeval gods their share.

For you alone they open back the door of heaven, and you alone, O celebrated Sungoddess of Arinna] pass through the gate [of heaven].

[The gods] of heaven [and earth are bowing down to you] alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna. [And whatever] you, O Sungoddess of Arinna, are saying, [the gods] keep pros[trating themselves before you alone, O Sungoddess of Ar]inna.

(Approximately 3-4 lines missing)

69’-77’ You alone, O Sungoddess of Arinna, have m[ercy] on the [per]son at whom the gods are a[ngry], and (whom) they reject.

And now, O Sungoddess of Arinna, sustain Muršili, the kin[g]!

O Sungoddess of Arinna, ta[ke] Muršili, the just king, your servant by the hand!

O Sungoddess of Arinna turn your ear toward the words, which Muršili, the king, keeps telling you and keep listening to them!

78’-112’ O god[s], [what] (is) [th]is you have [do]ne? You have allow[ed] a plague (into Ḫatti), and the [en]tire land of Ḫatti is dying. No on[e] prepares the thick bread and the [lib]ation for the g[ods] anymore. The [plough]men wh[o] used to work the fields of the gods have died. No o[ne] works (or) harvest the fields of the gods anymore. The women of the mill-stone who used to grind (the flour for) the thick breads of the gods have died. No one grinds (the flour for) the thick bread anymore. Corrals and sheepfolds from which they used to select the sacrificial animals (such as) cattle and sheep, (now when) [the cowherds] and shepherds have died, the corral and the sheepfol[ds are neglected]. So it happens that the thick breads, the liba[tion] and the sacrificial animals for the gods are neglected. And you, O gods, proceed to hold us guilty in that very matter. To (us), to mankind, our wisdom has been lost and we cannot do anything right (lit. whatever right [we do], it does not exist). O gods, whatever sin you perceive, either let a man of gods come and pronounce it, or let the old women, the
diviners or the augurs pronounce it, or let a man see it through a dream. We have been dangling from the point of a needle. O gods, take pity on the land of Ḫatti again! On the one hand the plague has been oppressing it, on the other hand hostility has been oppressing it. The lands of kuriwana, which are around, namely the land of Mitanni and the land of Arzawa, each (of them) quarreled. They do not extol the gods; they keep transgressing the oaths and they continually seek to despoil the temples (lit. houses of the gods). May this become an [additional (cause of) vengeance for the gods. Turn the plague, the hostility, the famine and the evil fever towards the land of Mitanni and the land of Arzawa. Rested are the quarrelsome lands, but the land of Ḫatti is a tired land. Unhitch the tired one, but hitch the rested one.

Furthermore, these lands that belong to the land of Ḫatti itself, (namely) the land of Kaška – they were swineherds and weavers – and the land of Arauwanna, the land of Kalašma, the land of Lukka and the land of Pitašša: also these lands have become free fr[om the Sungoddess] of Arinna. They have [repudia]ted (their) tributes and have begun again to attack the land of Ḫatti. Formerly, also [the land]of Ḫatti with the Sungoddess of Arinna used to maul the foreign lands like a lion. Furthermore, (as to) Aleppo and Babylon, which it (i.e. the land of Ḫatti) used to destroy, [they took] the goods of all the lands, namely silver, gold and the gods, and [they deposit]ed them before the Sungoddess of Arinna.

Now, all the surrounding [land]s began to [at]tack the land of Ḫatti. May this become an additional (reason for) the vengeance for the Sungoddess of Arinna. O Goddess, do not degrade your own name!

Whoever is (a cause of) rage and anger to the gods, whoever is not respectful to the gods, let not the good ones perish together with the evil ones. Whether it is a single city or [it is a single house] or a single person, O gods, destr[oy only] that single one! [O gods, behold] the land of Ḫatti [with favourable eyes. Give the evil plague to the evil lands. But in the land of Ḫatti let everything thrive and prosper, and let the land of Ḫatti become again as (it was) before].

[(As for) the enemy lands which are quarrelsome and wrathful: those who are not respectful to you, O Sungoddess of Arinna; those who] wi[sh to burn down your temples]; those wh[o] seek to take (your) rhy[ta, cups] and
objects [of silver and gold]; those who seek to lay waste your farmlands, your orchards (and) your groves; those who seek to capture (your) farmers, gardeners (and) women of the mill, to those enemy lands, O Sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, give evil fever, plague and famine!

154’-186’ And let you yourself, O Sungoddess of Arinna, be invoked [(and) you yourself] speak (as follows): “May, you the oppressed one, be fit [again]”! Turn [in] favour toward Muršili, the king, your servant and toward the land of Ḫatti! To Muršili, the king, your servant grant life, health, vi[gour, brightness o[f] spirit for the future (lit. of the future), and longevity! Put [in his soul] brightness [and joy]! Give him (A: virility,) [sons], daughters, grandchildren and great-grandchildren! [Give] him contentment(?) and obedience(?)! Give him the [g]rowth of grain, vines, [goats], cattle, sheep, horses [and manki]nd! [Give him … ], valor, [ … ], the battle-ready [divine weapon]! Put [beneath h]is [feet] the enemy lands! […] O Sungoddess of Arinna, [have] pity [on the land of Ḫatti again]! [May] it (i.e. the land of Ḫatti) [ … ] again! May the [soa]king r[ains] come! May the winds of prosperity pass over! [May (everything) thrive] and prosper! To you, O gods, [you]r thick bread[s] and libation will be [pre]sented. And the congregati[on] cries out: “Le[t] that [be]!”

Colophon A

[…] I went] to invoke the [Sungoddess of Arin]na. At that time I recorded the words of the tablet. I invoked the Sungoddess of Arinna in Ḫattuša for seven days. I also invoked (her) for seven days in Arinna, while I spoke these words. There is in addition a separate tablet of the invocation.

Colophon B

[One tablet complete]. When [there has bee]n dying in the land of Ḫatti. [In addition] there is again a separate [tablet. Wh]en they [in]voke the Sungoddess of Arinna [in Ḫatti], they speak to her [these words].

Comments:

1-11 The same amount of lines is missing at the beginning of column i and column ii of manuscript A (KUB 24.3+). Since seven lines have been restored by the join KBo

80 Lines 175’-176’ are too fragmentary for translation.
51.18a at the beginning of column ii, the same amount of lines must be missing at the beginning of column i. The beginning of this composition is preserved in eleven lines of manuscript B (KUB 36.80). However, since the amount of missing lines does not allow for so much text in manuscript A, one has to assume that some of the sentences present in manuscript B must have been absent from manuscript A. Because manuscript B contains more text than manuscript A and because the colophon of manuscript B differs from the colophon of manuscript A, it is possible that manuscript B may have been, in fact, a separate composition modelled on manuscript A rather than a duplicate of manuscript A.

Restorations in lines i 1-11 are based on the similar passage that appears in the hymn and prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu (CTH 377), except for the gaps at the end of lines 9 and 10 and the beginning of lines 10 and 11. Although the text restored in these lacunas fits the context well, it must remain a mere suggestion.

4 For the discussion of the meaning of the verb mugai- see chapter two. Although the verb mugai- may not have been originally a verb of speaking (see Laroche 1964-5, Melchert 2010b), in this context the verb clearly refers to the words of a prayer spoken during the performance of the mukeššar ritual and to the ritual activities. The meaning of the verb mugai- within this context is “to invoke”; the goddess is called back to her temple so that she can hear the hymn and prayer.

4-6 The position of šer “above” in the sentence nu-za-k[ān ma-a-an na-ak-ki]-iš UTU URU A-RI-IN-NA ne-pí-s DINGIR.MES-aš iš-tar-na še-er differs from the position this word occupies in the similar sentence in the prayer to Telipinu (KUB 24.1 i 8 and KUB 24.2 obv. 7). While in this prayer the adverb/postposition is placed at the end of the sentence, in the prayer to Telipinu it stands before the noun nepiši. It is not sure whether this positioning of šer in the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna has any syntactic or semantic reasons. One may suggest that perhaps in the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess, šer can be interpreted as postposition dislocated to the end of the sentence, while in the prayer to Telipinu it can be taken as a free-standing adverb.

9-11 nu=tta [kāša mukiškimi EN-aš?] Ì-ašš=a šlanezzi(?) waršulit(?)]. If all the restorations are correct, the syntax of this sentence mirrors the syntax of the sentence in lines 12-13, restored from lines i 13-14 of the KUB 24.1+ (CTH 377).
Both sentences show the OVO\text{indirect} word order. According to Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 438), such an inversion of the regular word order (S)OV is characteristic of formulaic evocations and direct speech in Hittite.

\textit{kāša} in both restored sentences is employed to reinforce an “immediate present” and indicates that the action of making offerings during the performance of this \textit{mukeššar} ritual coincides with the moment of speech. On this use of \textit{kāša}, see Hoffner and Melchert (2002: 388) and (2008: 324).

M. Weeden (StBoT 54: 225) translates the expression NINDA \textit{ḥarši}-, also written in Hittite texts with the logogram NINDA.GUR\text{RA}, as “thick bread/oven bread”. He refers to the Ortaköy Ura 17\textsuperscript{81}, which indicates that \textit{ḥarši}- may be the Hittite word for “oven” and suggests that the expression NINDA \textit{ḥarši}- could designate either bread that was baked in oven (\textit{ḥarši}-) or that resembled DUG \textit{ḥarši-} in shape.

12-14 The beginning of lines 12-26 are restored from lines i 13- ii 8 of KUB 24.1+.

15-30 The adverb \textit{namma=ma} here means “in addition”. Within this construction it follows a sentence containing the particle \textit{-pat}, is used with negation and is associated with \textit{tamai-} (see CHD L-N: 390 sub 6d and 95f sub b8’). The translation of this adverb in lines 15-30 follows CHD L-N 390 sub 6d.

16-17 lit. “In the land of Ḫatti alone there are strongly-built temples for you, but nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) you have a temple”.

21-25 lit. “In the land of Ḫatti alone there are lofty temples for you adorned with silver and gold, but nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) do they exist for you. In the land of Ḫatti alone, there are cups and ryhta of silver and gold as well as precious stones”.

25-28 \texttt{[EZEN₄.HI.A-it-ta EZEN₄.IT].HI.A < EZEN₄.HI.A> MU-ti mi-i-ia-na-aš}

\textsuperscript{81} According to Weeden (2011: 108) \textit{ur₃,ra} (abbreviated Ḥh, Ura) is a new reading of HAR-ra = \textit{ḫubullu}, “an encyclopaedic list of word-signs denoting objects of the world, … arranged according to type (trees, chairs, etc.’). Weeden further argues that the oldest Hittite Ura series is the Middle Hittite fragment from Ortaköy/Sapinuwa (95/3), which is probably a version of late Ura 17 (Middle Babylonian Ura 10). He observes that this text was published by A. Süel and O. Soysal (2003) and that the tablet has two Sumerian entries and two with Hittite/Luwian correspondences. The relevant lines read: Ú SULLIM \texttt{b³NIGIN.NA :GUB.BA = Ḫar-ši-it-kān ku-iš ša-an-ḫu-wa-an-za ta-’wa-ti-iš\textcircled{3}} Weeden (2011: 108-110 and footnote 545).
A similar passage appears in lines ii 3-6 of manuscript A (KUB 24.1+) of the prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377):

EZEN₃.HI.A-it-ta EZen₃.Itu EZEN₃.HI.A MU-aš me-e-a-na-aš
gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš ḫa-mi-iš-ḫa-an-da-aš
zé-na-an-da-aš a-ú-li-uš mu-ki-iš-na-aš-ša
EZEN₃.MEŠ

The scribe of KUB 24.1+, while incorporating the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) into his composition, amended this passage by adding EZEN₃.HI.A before MU miyani- and changing MU-ti to MU-aš.

Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 440-442) regard these changes as scribal errors. They consider the passage appearing in the hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna as more accurate, emend the passage in the hymn to Telipinu, so that it reads like the passage in the hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna and propose that all the phrases starting with MU-ti and finishing with mukišnaš depend on the Sumerogram EZEN₃.HI.A (EZEN₃.MEŠ in CTH 377) that is employed after mukišnaš. They explain the fact that the noun auli- appears in both passages in the nominative plural case rather than in the expected genitive, by stating that it must be an unusual case attraction, found also in KBo 2.9 i 22’-24’ cited in CHD L-N: 237b.

The phrase auliuš mukišnaš EZEN.MEŠ is rendered in CHD L-N: 231b as “festivals of invoking the auli-”. This interpretation is rejected because the verb mugai- is used in Hittite contexts to summon only deities and the souls of the deceased. Since the noun auli- refers to neither it could not have been summoned.

Puhvel HED vol. 1-2: 230 renders this sentence as “sacrificials (auliuš) of winter, spring, fall and feasts of ritual (mukišnaš). This interpretation would make sense on both the syntactic and semantic level, however, as rightly pointed by Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 442), the Hittite evidence does not support the claim that the auli- had a seasonal character.

There is no obvious interpretation of this passage. One could accept Kassian and Yakubovich’s suggestion that all phrases starting with MU-ti depend on EZEN₃.HI.A, but then, one is left with the unusual case attraction. Another
possibility is to amend the passage in CTH 376.II with EZEN₄.HI.A: then auliuš has to be interpreted as one of the four co-ordinated nominative noun phrases: monthly festivals (EZEN₄.ITU.HI.A), annual festivals of winter, spring and fall (<EZEN₄.HI.A> MU-ti mijišanaš gimmantaš zemandaš ħamiš[andaš]), a.-sacrifices (auliuš) and festivals of invocations (mukišnaš EZEN₄.HI.A). The latter interpretation is adopted here.

33-35 nu tuel ŠA dÜTU URU ARINNA ħimmuš SÍSKUR.HI.A EZEN₄.HI.A iyauwanzi šarā tittanuškanzi. The proper understanding of this sentence depends on the correct interpretation of three words: the noun ħimma-, the infinitive iyauwanzi and the verb šarā tittanu-.

ħimma-

Friedrich HW: 69, following Gurney (1940: 21), proposed that this noun denoted either a kind of cultic celebration or feast. Recent scholarship shows that there is enough compelling evidence to suggest that this noun carries the meaning “replica, image” (see Puhvel HED vol. 3: 314). Since some of the substitute rituals included the presentation of images to a deity in place of an actual person, one could propose that at a certain point the noun ħimma- expanded its sphere of reference and began to denote a substitute ritual. Hence the interpretation of Ünal (1991: 804), Puhvel HED vol. 3: 315 and Singer (2002a: 51), who suggested that the noun here carries the meaning “substitute rite” (lit. “offering images”).

iyauwanzi

The infinitive iyauwanzi has been interpreted in this context as the complement of the main verb šarā tittanu- by Gurney (1940: 62-70), Singer (2002a: 51), Ünal (1991: 804), Puhvel HED vol. 3: 315 and CHD Š: 227b. Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 444) interpret this form as a supine and understand it as an adjunct. They follow Ose (1944: 44-45) and argue that, although this use of the supine is rare, it is nonetheless found in Hittite texts.

šarā tittanu-

This verb carries both the literal meaning “to erect, to put up on” (CHD Š: 220 sub 53’ a’ and c’ ) and the metaphorical meaning “to finish, to do something completely” when appearing with the infinitive (see CHD Š: 227 sub j1’b’).
All of the above interpretations of these three words have been taken into consideration by scholars who either edited or translated the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) or the hymn and prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377). This sentence has been rendered as:

(i) Gurney (1940: 21): “And the celebration of thy feasts (?) sacrifices (and) festivals, Telipinu, they continually carry out (?)”

(ii) Puhvel HED vol. 3: 15: “they keep undertaking to perform substitute rites, [genuine] rituals, and feasts for thee, Sungoddess of Arinna”


(iv) Singer (2002a: 51): “They perform fully substitute rites, rituals, and festivals for you, O Sungoddess of Arinna”

(v) CHD Š: 227b: “They finish worshipping your images, performing/celebrating your rituals and festivals, O Sungoddess of Arinna”.

(vi) Yakubovich and Kassian (2007: 433): “They set up your, Telipinu’s, replicas in order to perform festivals and rituals”

This edition follows the translation of Kassian and Yakubovitch. Setting up images and statues to the goddess in order to present her with offerings and festivals fits the context best and makes most sense on the contextual and syntactic levels.

With the sentence *hantandaša=z [ŋa]niešnaš EN-aš zik=pát* begins the part of the hymn that is modelled closely on the hymn to the Sungod attached to the ‘prayer of a mortal’ (CTH 372). The hymn is not copied verbatim; while some lines are omitted, particularly those that describe the physical attributes of the Sungod and his filial connections to Ningal and Enlil, some sentences are changed either in wording or in structure. For the line-by-line comparison of these hymns see Güterbock (1980: 43-49).

The Sumerogram EN-aš “lord” has been erroneously copied here by the scribe instead of the logogram GAŠAN “lady” that is required by the context. The same mistake occurs in line 57.
The noun [mu-ga-u-w]a-ar-ra is restored from the same sentence in the hymn to the Sungod (CTH 372.A = KUB 31.127). The same reading is proposed here by Gurney (1940: 22) and Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179.

[z]i[k]=pat=za dUTU ARINNA gi[n]zuwaš DINGIR-LUM {zik}. This line is interpreted as a nominal sentence with the subject zik dUTU ARINNA and the predicates ginzuwaš DINGIR-LUM. The personal pronoun zik at the end of the line must be considered redundant and must have been repeated by mistake.

lit. “rightly guided man”

The beginning of the line is restored from line i 30 of KUB 31.127+.

Since the scribe of manuscript A (KUB 24.3+) of the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna followed the hymnic part of CTH 372 more or less faithfully, it is reasonable to assume that the beginnings of lines 65-68 partially missing from the manuscript A can be restored from manuscript A (KUB 31.127+) of CTH 372. The lines i 32-33 of KUB 31.127+ read as follows:

   nu ne-pí-ša-aš DINGIR.MES -eš tu-uk-pát kat-ta-an ka-ni-na-an-te-eš
ták-na-aš-ša DINGIR.MES-eš [tu]-uk-pát kat-ta-[an] ka-ni-na-an-te-eš

There is not enough space in the lacunas at beginning of lines i 56’-58’ of KUB 24.3+ (here lines 65-68 of CTH 376.II) to accommodate all the text that appears in KUB 31.127+. The scribe of KUB 24.3+ must have merged two sentences into one. The next sentence he wrote starting with kuitta (lines 67-68 of CTH 376.II) corresponds to lines 33-34 of KUB 31.127+.

The reading AŠÀ A.GÀR follows Hoffner (1997: 191) and Weeden (2011: 160-161). Hoffner’s understanding of this logogram as idle land/fallow land that has been cleared but not yet sown with a crop, is followed here.

According to Puhvel HED vol. 1: 229, 231 the noun UZUauli- denotes “a fleshy internal body parts of animals and humans, which are squeezable and yield liquid”. He translates it as “milt, spleen” and as “sacrificial (feast or contingent); some kind of emotion” when the noun appears in the plural. Puhvel also suggests that the usage of the determinative UDU in the instances in which the noun means
“sacrificial contingents” is due to the fact that sheep were typically used for sacrifices.

Kloekhorst (2008: 229-230) argues that the noun denotes a tube-shaped organ in the neck, translates it as “throat, windpipe, carotid artery” and compares this noun to Greek αὐλῶν “reed, flute” and other words referring to hollow tube-like objects. For these translations Kloekhorst refers to Kühne (1986: 85-117), who proposes three meanings for this noun “throat; sacrificial animal; animal sacrifice” and argues that the noun auli- underwent a metonymic shift from the literal sense “throat” to “sacrificial animal” and then to “animal sacrifice”.

The translation of UDUauliuš adopted in this edition is “sacrificial animals”, which are then specified as GU..HI.A and UDU.HI.A. Such translation has been already suggested by Gurney (1940: 27).

The Sumerogram UDU is written separately from the noun auli- in line 86’ and 90’ of CTH 376.II, which might indicate that it represents a separate word rather than a determinative of auli-.

86’-88’

[UDUauliūš=kán GU..HI.A UDU.HI.A ḫāl[iyaz āšauša kuēzz=āš karāškir nu SIPA.GU. LÜ.MEŠ] SIPA.UDU akir ḫāli[a ašauwarr kar-ša-an-da-ri(?)]) (CTH 376.I lines 3’-4’)

UDUauliuš=kán GU..HI.A UDU.HI.A ḫāl[iyaz āšauša kuēzz=āš karāškir nu [SIPA.GU.] LÜ.MEŠ SIPA.UDU ekir ḫāli[a ašauwara kar-ša-an-da-ri(?)]) (CTH 376.II lines 86’-88’)

Because the scribe of KUB 24.3+ copied the Middle Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.I.) almost verbatim, it is assumed that the Middle Hittite manuscript also included in this sentence the ablative of the relative pronoun kui- with the accusative plural of the personal pronoun -aš. In the Middle Hittite manuscript this pronoun could have been written as either -uš or -aš, since both forms were used in the Middle Hittite texts.

Two main interpretations of this sentence have been proposed. According to the first, this entire sentence focuses on the corrals and sheepfolds (Singer, Lebrun), according to the other, the sentence concentrates on the shepherds and cowherds (Gurney, Goetze, Trabazo, Ünal).
(i) Gurney (1940: 27) rendered the sentence as “From whatever corral (or) sheepfold [they used to] select (?) the sacrificial animals(?) oxen and sheep, [now the cowherds] (and) shepherds are dead, and the corral [(and) sheepfold …].

(ii) Goetze (1950: 396) translated it as: “From whatever corral (or) sheepfold they used to select the sacrifices of sheep and cattle, the cowherds and shepherds are dead and the corral [and the sheepfolds are empty].”


(v) Singer (2002a: 52) translates this sentence as “The cowherds and shepherds of the corrals and sheepfolds from which they used to select sacrificial cattle and sheep are dead, so that the corrals and sheepfolds are neglected”.

(vi) Trabazo (2002: 295) reads this sentence as: “De cualquier establo (o) aprisco de los que se seleccion[aban] los animals de sacrificio, las vacas (y) las ovejas, [ahora los pastores de vacas] (y) los pastores de ovejas han muerto: los establos (y) aprisc[os se han abandonado].”

The syntax of this relative clause is unusual. It begins with a nominativus pendens, the noun phrase UDU auli DispatchQueue₂ GU₂ HI₂ A UDU₂ HI₂ A, which is dislocated to the beginning of the sentence and is referred to by the accusative plural pronoun -aš attached enclitically to the relative pronoun kui-.

This noun phrase (i.e. UDU auliDispatchQueue₂ GU₂ HI₂ A UDU₂ HI₂ A) together with ğaliyaz ašaunaz precede the determinate relative pronoun kui-, which is an exception to
the rule according to which the relative pronoun is preceded by only one syntactic constituent (Hale 1987: 49; Garrett 1994: 46). The real antecedent of this relative clause is ȷāliyaz ašaunaz, which is resumed in the main clause by repetition of the antecedent ȷālia ašaunwarā.

This relative sentence is interrupted by a simple sentence nu Lū.MES SIPA.GU, Lū.MES SIPA.UDU ekir which serves two functions. On the one hand it explains who “they” who selected the sacrificial animals are and on the other hand it explains why the corrals and sheepfolds are neglected. Although syntactically the Lū.MES SIPA.GU, Lū.MES SIPA.UDU are not the focus of this relative clause, contextually they carry the same weight as the ploughmen and women of the millstone in the previous paragraphs; the ploughmen who used to work the fields of the gods and the women who used to prepare the flour for the breads of the gods are dead and so offerings are no longer made, also the cowherds and shepherds who took care of the animals are dead, so the sacrifices for the gods have ceased.

91’-92’The sentence nu=nnaš uwāteni … [wašduli] ḫarteni is read here as a serial or phrasal construction. Since the form uddaniya is not attested in Hittite texts as the dative of the noun uttar, its only possible interpretation is the dative of the noun uttar with the enclitic -ya (uddani=ya). This enclitic -ya must be understood here as a particle that places emphasis on the fact that the offerings, libation and sacrifice of animals ceased to be made to the gods and together with the demonstrative apā- is translated as “in that very matter”.

92’-93’n=[ašt]a ANA DUMU.LŪ.UM.LU ḫattatar=šummit [ḵarakta]. While in CTH 376.II the final r of the noun ḫattatar is protected by the suffix -šummit (the possessive pronoun), in CTH 376.I. the consonant r is lost in exactly the same environment, that is, in the final position and after the unaccented vowel (see HG: 46: 1.133.), resulting in the spelling ḫa-at-ta-ta-šum-mi-ii. This phenomenon was listed by Carruba (1983: 5) among the features that safely date manuscript A of CTH 376.I (i.e. KUB 24.4+) to the Middle Hittite period.

Grammatically, the most logical interpretation of this sentence would be the assumption that the dative plural of the first person enclitic personal pronoun -naš is omitted from the text but should be understood here. Since the form -šummit is the nominative-accusative plural of either the 1st or the 3rd person possessive pronoun, this edition follows Catsanicos (1991: 3 n. 5) and Singer
(2002a: 52 and 68 n.4) in translating the enclitic -šummit as “our” rather than “your” adopted in most translations (Gurney 1940: 27; Archi 1978: 83; Carruba 1983: 5; Lebrun 1980: 169; Beckman 1986: 28; Ünal 1991: 805; Trabazo 2002: 295). Although Beckman’s (1986: 27-28) understanding of this sentence according to which the human incompetence is a consequence of the absence of divine ḫattatar (“advice” or “guidance”), is very tempting, it is not supported by either the syntax or the grammar of this sentence.

In the context of these two prayers (CTH 376.I and CTH 376.II), the noun ḫattatar refers to the wisdom and understanding of people. The sentence is translated here as “to (us), mankind, our wisdom has been lost” and its general sense is that people have lost confidence in their own wisdom and cannot think of any reasons or transgressions committed that would have caused the plague.

97' Lines obv. 11'-12’ of manuscript A of CTH 376.I read našma=at zašheaz DUMU.LÚ.U₁₁.LU ú-wa-an-du. The employment of the plural verb with the logogram that does not bear the plural marker can be considered as a scribal error. This error has been corrected by the scribe of manuscript A (KUB 24.3+) of CTH 376.II, who instead of the plural uwandu used the third singular imperative of the verb auš-.

98' n=ašta URUDU šepikkuštaš GIS šarpaz kunkū[en] (CTH 376.I) n=ašta URUDU ZI.KIN.BAR-aš GIS šarpaz kunkūen (CTH 376.II)

The exact meaning of some of the words in these lines as well as the precise significance of the entire expression is unclear.

kunk-

Puhvel HED vol. 4: 248 provides five meanings for the verb kunk- “to shake, to sway, to swing, to rock, to dandle” which reflect several earlier proposals (Gurney 1940: 90, Friedrich HW: 116 followed by Lebrun 1980: 175, Kühne 1978: 174).

GIS šarpa-

CHD Š: 288-289 translates the noun GIS šarpa- as “(sharp) point”, provides compelling evidence for interpreting this noun as a Hittite designation for an agricultural implement (already suggested by Gurney 1940: 90), perhaps a harrow, and gives a long list of translations that have been suggested for this noun in
various studies. Puhvel gives the cognates of this noun as Lat. *sarpō* ‘I prune’, OHG *sarf* ‘sharp, rough’, Russ. *serp* ‘sickle’ and translates the Hittite *šarpa*- as “sickle” (Puhvel *HED* vol. 4: 249).

*šepikkûšta*-  

Gurney (1940: 90) argued that in KUB 27.49 (fragment of a *witašš(i)jaš* festival), this noun designates “a small copper object of little value, several of which may be worn by a bride on the head together with a head-band”; in two other texts (KUB 17.20 and KUB 17.28) *šepikkûšta*- seems to denote a ‘stylus’. Beckman (1983: 63-4) suggests that *šepikkûšta*- designates a long pointed metal object with a single shaft and translates it as either “point” or “needle”. Kloekhorst (2008: 744) renders the noun *šepikkûšta*- as “pin; hairpin; stylus”, drawing on the previous two suggestions.

Several scholars have translated and commented on the sentence *n=ašta URUDU ZI.KIN.BAR-aš GIS šarpaz kunkûen* that employes all of the above words.

(i) Forrer (*Forsch. II*) suggested that this line should be read as “we will pull the nails out of the tally” and should be understood as reflecting the practice of pulling nails out of the debtor’s stick by the creditor upon the payment of the debt by the latter.

(ii) Goetze (1930: 235), commenting of the same expression employed in the second plague prayer (CTH 378.II), proposed that it denotes religious activity that involved a sacred symbol but he did not venture a translation of this sentence.

(iii) Bechtel - Sturtevant (1935: 123) rendered the sentence as “we shall decorate(?) the statues(?) with *verbenae*”

(iv) Gurney (1940: 90-92) suggested that this line expresses the general thought “we will make amends” and proposed that the approximate sense of this metaphorical sentence must be “we will prepare (adorn, decorate?) (the?) pins (amulets?) with (a?)…”

(v) Kühne (1978: 174) translates this expression in the second plague prayer (CTH 378.II) as “we will hang the bronze clasp(?) from the
sarpa-wood”, suggesting that the noun šarpa- may be a Hittite designation for a pendulum oracle and that this expression reflects an otherwise obscure religious practice.

(vi) Lebrun (1980: 161) translates the sentence as “Alors, [nous] suspendrons des bracelets en bois šarpa” and comments that the noun GIS šarpa- designates an object made of wood.

(vii) Bernabé (1987: 269) renders this sentence as “luego colgaremos prendedores de madera de sarpa”

(viii) Singer (2002a: 52 and 68 n. 5) translates the sentence as “We shall stroke(?) by means of thorns(?)/pins(?) of sarpa” and comments that the exact significance of this idiom remains unknown.

(ix) Trabazo (2002: 295) translates the sentence as “Entonces colgar[emos] prendedores (de cobre) de los sarpa”.

(x) Puhvel HED vol. 4: 248 renders the sentence as “we shake [copper] spikes from the [wooden] harrow” and suggests that this idiom may represent a symbolic manner of counteracting the plague and may be a metaphor for defanging death.

(xi) Ünal (1991: 806) renders the sentence as “wir es mit dem Kratzer der Spange putzen können” and interprets the noun šarpa- in this context as a comb-like spatula with teeth, which would be used metaphorically to scrape away the plague.

(xii) The authors of CHD Š: 289 translate the sentence as “we are dangling /swaying from the point of a needle”.

In order to interpret properly and understand this sentence one has to read it in the context of this prayer. In the first lines, the author blames the gods for sending the plague into Hatti and killing people responsible for providing the gods with offerings and sacrifices. All the offerings ceased and the gods hold people responsible. The Hittites have done all they could to appease the gods and to find any transgressions and sins that would have caused the anger of the gods and by extension the plague. All their efforts were in vain. The author asks for the divine
guidance to find and determine the sin that has caused the plague. Now the author states that people have run out of options; they do not know what to do and they do not know how to act. This sentence ends the plague topic and stands at the beginning of another part of the prayer, in which the author describes how the “land of Ḫatti” is attacked by enemies. This sentence thus links these two parts of prayer and refers to both parts equally; the Hittites are overwhelmed with both the plague and the enemy invasion and they cannot cope with these disasters anymore.

It is therefore argued here that this expression reflects the state of great despair in which the humans find themselves, rather than a religious practice that would involve either shaking, stroking, scraping, suspending or decorating any objects. The image evoked by this expression is that of a person hanging from a cliff, a tip of a tree or the like just by a collar. The immediate danger is the fall and death.

In that context the translation suggested in CHD makes the most sense in this context and is adopted in this edition with one change. The form kunkuwen that appears in line 98 of CTH 376.II and that is restored in the same sentence in CTH 376.I, is a first person plural preterite rather than the first person plural present of the verb unk-. Hence the translation of this sentence in this edition reads: “we have been dangling from the point of a needle”.

101’-102’

nu ku-ri-wa-na-aš KUR.KUR-TIM k[u]-e’ a-ra-ab-za-an-d[a] (CTH 376.I)
nu ku-ri-wa-na-aš KUR.KUR.MEŠ ku-e a-ra-ab-za'-an-da (CTH 376.II)

The syntax of this sentence presents several interpretative problems:

(i) It is uncertain what Hittite word hides behind the Sumerogram KUR.KUR-TIM. Two possibilities present themselves, either the nominative plural common gender udneyantes or the nominative plural neuter utne.

(ii) If kuriwanaš is understood here as a predicate of KUR.KUR-TIM, one has to account for the lack of grammatical agreement in this sentence. If KUR.KUR-TIM is a logographic writing for the Hittite udneyantes, then the phrase kuriwanaš KUR.KUR-TIM does not agree in gender with the neuter relative pronoun kue. If, on the other hand, KUR.KUR-
TIM represents the Hittite noun utnē, then the neuter KUR.KUR-TIM kue does not agree with the common gender adjective kuriwanaš.

(iii) If one interprets kuriwanaš as the predicate of KUR.KUR-TIM, one has to also account for the inverted word order, which normally is subject-predicate.

(iv) A fragment of a treaty between Muršili II and Tuppi-Tešub of Amurru (KBo 22.39 ii 12’) employs a similar phrase: kui-e KUR.KUR.MEŠ kuri-wa-na, which shows the indeterminate relative clause with the regular word order and the grammatical agreement.

One possible solution to these problems has been proposed by Gurney (1940: 29, 94). He translated this sentence as “the independent countries which are round about” and suggested that the Sumerogram KUR.KUR-TIM in this sentence is a logographic writing for the Hittite noun udneyanteš, in which he follows Sommer (1932: 342). He explained the lack of grammatical agreement between the kuriwanaš KUR.KUR-TIM (udneyanteš) and the neuter relative pronoun kue by comparing it to the irregular use of the demonstrative neuter kē with the noun in the common gender, for which he gave the example ke-e a-ra-alp-ze-na-aš KUR.KUR.MEŠ LŪKÚR (KBo 3.4 i 28f. cf. Friedrich 1926: 38; Goetze 1928: 203ff and Sturtevant 1933: 258).

Gurney’s explanation and interpretation of this sentence have been widely accepted by the translators of this text: Goetze (1950: 396) translated this sentence as “the protectorates beyond the frontier”; Lebrun (1980: 169) as “les pays indépendants q[u]ji (sont) ses voisins…”, Ünal (1991: 806) as “(Auch) unabhängige Länder ringsum, …”, Trabazo (2002: 297) as “los países independientes que la rodean.” and Singer (2002a: 52) as “the protectorates which are round about…”

However, since the form kuriwanaš can also be interpreted as the genitive singular as well as the genitive or dative plural, it is possible to advocate another interpretation of the syntax of this relative clause. The word kuriwanaš could be taken here as a noun in the genitive case (already Forrer 1929: 266f), that describes the ‘state of being in a kuriwana- relationship with the Hittite king’. On the semantic level, this interpretation is not that much different from the
interpretation according to which kuriwanaš is an adjective that refers to the KUR.KUR-TIM, but on the syntactic level it resolves the grammatical awkwardness of this sentence. This edition adopts the new interpretation of the relative clause nu kuriwanaš KUR.KUR-MEŠ/KUR.KUR-TIM kue aražcanda and translates it as “the lands (with the status) of kuriwana-, which are around”.

The meaning of kuriwana- is not well understood. Some of the suggested interpretations of this word include:

(i) Lebrun (1980: 175) suggests that the kuriwana- describes the lands/kingdoms that were bound to the land of Ḥatti by treaties. The people who inhabited these kingdoms enjoyed rights equal to those enjoyed by the population of Ḥatti, but could not conduct independent foreign relations. The nobles of those lands had to pay an annual tribute to the Hittite king.

(ii) Similarly, Puhvel HED vol. 4: 265 considers kuriwana- as “an adjective that describes a foreign person, people or a country in relation to a superior potentate or power. It expresses the status of dependency without a formal subjection or incorporation, a position between an ally and a subject. These lands or people were internally self-governing but were barred from independent foreign relations”.

(iii) According to Kloekhorst (2008: 494-5), kurewana- is an adjective that describes a foreign person or country in relation to a superior potentate.

The above interpretations of this word seem to be supported by the textual evidence. The adjective kuriwana- is employed in four well-preserved texts, the so-called “Indictment of Madduwatta” (KUB 14.1+), two treaties of Muršili II, one with Kupanta-Kurrunta of Mira and another with Targašnalli of Ḥapalla as well as a treaty of Muwatalli with Alakšandu of Wiluša.

In lines rev. 84-90 of KUB 14.1+, Madduwatta justifies his participation in raiding the land of Alašiya together with Attarašiya the man of Ḥḫṣiyawa and the man of Piggaya. While Attarašiya and the ruler of Piggaya are described as LÚ.MEŠ ku-re-e-wa-ni-eš of the Hittite king, Madduwatta is called ḪR UTU-ŠI ‘servant of His Majesty’ (KUB 14.1 rev. 89’).
In the treaty between Muršili II and Kupanta-Kurrunta of Mira, the latter is warned that if he learns about any revolt being planned by either a Hittite man or man of one of the Arzawan kingdoms, he should inform the Hittite king immediately. The men of the Arzawa kingdoms are described as LÚ.MEŠ ku-ri-wa-na-aš in their relationship to Kupanta-Kurrunta (ki-nu-un-ta ku-i-e-eš ku-u-uš LÚ.MES ku-ri-wa-na-aš “those who are now kuriwana-men in relations to you”; KBo 5.13 iii 26).

The same phrase is used in the same context in the treaty of Muršili II and Targašnalli of Ḥapalla (ki-nu-un-ta ku-u-[uš ku-e-eš LÚ.MEŠ ku]-ri-u-wa-nu-uš KBo 5.4 obv. 15-16) and in the treaty of Muwatalli and Alakšandu of Wiluša ([ki]-nu-un-ta ku-i-e-eš ku-e-uš LÚ.MEŠ ku-ri-wa-[nu-uš] KUB 21.1 ii 77).

It appears that the adjective kuriwana- indeed describes the relationship between a foreign kingdom or a person towards a superior potentate. This relationship is not a state of servitude, but rather a state of dependence of some kind (Aḫḫiyawa and Piggaya towards the Hittite king and the other Arzawa kingdoms towards the ruler of Mira, the ruler of Ḥapalla and the ruler of Wiluša). This interpretation of kuriwana- also fits well in the present context, where a clear division is made between lands that held the status of kuriwana- and the lands that belonged to Ḥatti.

103’-104’
For the interpretation of šara iya- as the semantic equivalent of šer iya- meaning “to exalt, celebrate” see Gurney 1940: 96.

104’ našta NIŠ [DINGIR].MEŠ šarrantati (CTH 376.I)
našta NI-EŠ DINGIR.MEŠ šarriēškanzi (CTH 376.II)

Note the slight semantic/stylistic change that the scribe of the New Hittite prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II) made in this sentence. The scribe of the Middle Hittite prayer employed the verb šarra- in the third plural preterite, probably to emphasize the fact that the rulers of Hurrian lands, of Kizzuwatna and of Arzawa had broken the oaths in the past; the scribe of the New Hittite prayer employed the same verb in the third plural present iterative and thus drew attention to the fact that the breaking of oaths by these countries continues.

105’ The scribe of manuscript A (KUB 24.3+) of CTH 376.II omitted the sentence nu KUR URU ḪATTI idālauwanni šanhiškanzi “They continually seek to harm the land
of Ḥatti (lit. they continually seek the land of Ḥatti in malice)”, which is employed in the Middle Hittite prayer (CTH 376.I).

The enclitic conjunction -ma attached to DINGIR.MEŠ in line 105’ of CTH 376.II and in line 19’ of CTH 376.I, marks the change of topic from transgressing the oaths to despoiling the temples. This conjunction is rendered here and in CTH 376.I as “and”.

106’ \( n=at \) DINGIR.MEŠ-aš kattawatar [nam]ma kīšaru (CTH 376.I)
\( [n]=at \) ANA DINGIR.MEŠ kattawātar namma kīšaru (CTH 376.II)

The preferred translation of the noun kattawatar in this sentence and in lines 126’-127’ is “vengeance” particularly in view of the next sentence in which the gods are asked to turn the plague and all the evils into the lands that do not respect the gods. The enclitic pronoun -at refers to the atrocities that have been described above and that include disrespecting the gods and despoiling the temples (cf. Gurney 1940: 98-99).

This sentence is a rare exception to the rule that operates in the post-Old Hittite period, according to which the verb kiš- occurs with the particle -za when it links two nominatives and means “to become” (HG: 361-362).

109’-110’
[war]šiy[a]nda šullanda KUR.KUR-TIM KUR\(^{URU}\) ḤATTI=ma tariea[n KUR-e] (CTH 376.I)

waršanda šullanda KUR.KUR.ḪI.A A-NA KUR\(^{URU}\) KÛ.BABBAR-TI=ma tariyan KUR-e (CTH 376.II)

The inverted word order šullanda KUR.KUR-TIM / KUR.KUR.ḪI.A instead of the regular KUR.KUR-TIM / KUR.KUR.ḪI.A šullanda places the adjectives waršanda and šullanda side by side to emphasize the fact that the lands which do not show respect to gods are the lands that are free from the plague and/or from the enemy invasion.

The scribe of the manuscript A of CTH 376.II writes the phrase A-NA KUR\(^{URU}\) KÛ.BABBAR-TI=ma in the dative case. Because the syntax of this sentence does not require the dative case of the phrase “the land of Ḥatti” and because the Middle Hittite prayer does not employ the dative case here, it is
assumed that the scribe of ms A of CTH 376.II made a mistake while copying this sentence (cf. already Sommer 1974: 156, who explained it as a dictation mistake due to misunderstanding of the Hittite word *utne*, and Gurney 1940: 101).

111'-112'
\[
\begin{align*}
[nu] & \text{ ta} \text{[riya]} \text{ndan lätten } \text{war} \text{šiyandan} \text{=a } t\text{ur[iyatt} \text{en]} \quad \text{(CTH 376.I 24')} \\
[nu] & t\text{ar} \text{i} \text{y} \text{an} \text{d} \text{ lätten } \text{war} \text{šiy} \text{and} \text{an} \text{=ma } t\text{ūriyatten} \quad \text{(CTH 376.II 111'-112')}
\end{align*}
\]

This expression is a metaphor taken from the field of horse-training. It follows and concludes the part of the text in which the sins and transgressions of the lands that hold the status of *kuriwana-* are described and follows the request that the plague and all the evils be send to these lands. In the sentence that immediately precedes this saying the author expresses his feeling of injustice; while the lands that do not respect the gods are being awarded by having a prosperous existence, Ḫatti that has been worshipping the gods suffers from terrible disasters. Now, with this expression the authors request the change of fortunes and demands that Ḫatti is relieved from all the oppressions.

Note here the slight stylistic change. While the Middle Hittite prayer (CTH 376.I) employs the conjunctive/additive -a “and, also”, the scribe of the New Hittite prayer uses here the topicalizing/contrastive conjunction -ma. The Middle Hittite text adds and coordinates these two sentences, the New Hittite text contrasts them.

114’ [n=at $^{\text{1}}$ $^{\text{L.U.M.EŠ}}$ SIPA.ŠA$^{\text{H}}$ $^{\text{ešer}}$ $^{\text{L.U.M.EŠ}}$ $^{\text{EPIS}}$ GADA.HI.A $^{\text{ešer}}$ (CTH 376.I 26’)]
[n]=at $^{\text{L.U.M.EŠ}}$ SIPA.ŠAH $^{\text{U}}$ $^{\text{L.U.M.EŠ}}$ $^{\text{EPIS}}$ GADA $^{\text{ešer}}$ (CTH 376.II)

The scribe of manuscript A of CTH 376.II chose to combine the two sentences that appear in the Middle Hittite prayer into one and omitted the plural marker on the Sumerogram GADA, which he probably found superfluous because of the plural $^{\text{L.U.M.EŠ}}$ $^{\text{EPIS}}$.

116'-117’
\[
\begin{align*}
[n=\text{ašta } kē=i] & \text{ KUR.KUR-}T\text{IM} \quad \text{ANA }^{\text{d}} \text{UTU }^{\text{URU}} \text{ ARINNA } \text{ ara} \text{uēš[er]} \quad \text{(CTH 376.I 28’)} \\
[n=\text{ašta } kē=i] & \text{ KUR.KUR.HI.A-}T\text{IM AN[}^{\text{A}} \text{d} \text{UTU }^{\text{URU}} \text{]} \text{ ARINNA } \text{ ara} \text{uēšta} \quad \text{(CTH 376.II)}
\end{align*}
\]

The local particle -ašta marks the separation and relates to the dative of disadvantage ANA $^{\text{d}}$ UTU $^{\text{URU}}$ ARINNA.
The conjunction -ya attached to the demonstrative pronoun kē is rendered here as ‘also’ and emphasises the fact that not only the lands that hold the status of kuriwana- do not respect the gods, but also the people who belong to Ḫatti do not revere the goddess of Arinna.

Note the change of the number of the verb araueš-. In the Middle Hittite prayer the Sumerogram KUR.KUR.MEŠ must be a logographic writing for the Hittite noun udneanteš reflected in the plural verb; in the New Hittite prayer this logogram must represent the neuter collective utnē, hence the singular verb.

119'-120'

\[\text{n}u \text{ karū KUR}^{\text{URU}} \text{HATTI}^{\text{URU}} \text{Arinn[aš d]}^{\text{UTU-it za]ḥkait araḫzena KUR-e UR.MAḤ mān ā[...škit]} (CTH 376.I 30'-31')\]

\[\text{karū=ia [KUR]}^{\text{URU}} \text{KÙ.BABBAR-TI İSTU}^{\text{d}}^{\text{UTU}}^{\text{URU}} \text{ARINNA araḫzena[š AN]A KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-TIM UR.MAḤ mān šarḫškit (CTH 376.II)}\]

While incorporating the Middle Hittite prayer, the scribe of Muršili made a few changes to the structure of this sentence:

(i) he replaced the sentence-introductory particle \text{nu} with the enclitic additive -ya, perhaps to emphasise the fact that the surrounding lands attack Ḫatti, just as in the past Ḫatti attacked the foreign lands.

(ii) he replaced the nominative-accusative neuter plural araḫzena KUR-e with the dative plural common araḫzenaš ANA KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-TIM, which reflects the employment of two different grammatical constructions. Also while in the Middle Hittite prayer the Sumerogram KUR-e represents the neuter plural utnē, in the New Hittite prayer KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-TIM is a logographic writing for Hittite udneanteš.

(iii) he replaced the verb that begins with ar-[…] with the verb šarḫ- meaning “to maul, to press upon”

Our understanding of the Middle Hittite sentence is obscured by the fact that the verb is missing. Kammenhuber HW²: 217 restores here the verb \text{ar-} “to come (to), to arrive (at)”, observes that in this context the action expressed by the verb is done by an invading enemy and translates the sentence as: “[Früher] pflegte [Ḫatti […] mit [Ka]mpf wie ein Löwe in einem umliegenden (Feindes-)Land
anzu[kommen]”. Following Kammenhuber, the authors of CHD Š: 252 also restore here a finite form of the verb ar- (i.e. a[raškit]) and translate it as “to invade”. Because this sentence uses analogy and compares Ḫatti to a lion, one could also argue that, a verb that begins with the syllable ar and that would mean either “attack” or perhaps “overpower” could be restored in the present context. The latter meaning has been assigned by Kloekhorst (2008: 199) to the verb arai-. However, in most instances this verb carries the meanings “to stop, to check; hold in check”.

Since, no well-known Hittite verb that begins with the syllable ar carries the meaning “to overpower; to attack”, the restoration of the verb ar- “to come (to), to arrive (at)” is followed here. The literal translation of the sentence in the Middle Hittite prayer is “Formerly, the land of Ḫatti [with the (help of) the Sungoddess of] Arinna [used to] come to the foreign lands with [a battle] like a lion”.

The relative pronoun kuiuš is employed in the Middle Hittite prayer twice, after URU Ḥalpan and then after URU KÁ.DINGIR.RA-an. This repetition of the pronoun was considered unnecessary by the scribe of the New Hittite prayer, who wrote it only once at the end of URU Ḥalpan URU KÁ.DINGIR.RA-an. The scribe also added the Hittite phonetic complement -an to the Sumerogram URU KÁ.DINGIR.RA, which is not present in the Middle Hittite text. Manuscript D of CTH 376.II employs here either the accusative singular neuter relative pronoun kuit or the conjunction kuit “since” instead of the accusative plural common relative pronoun kuiuš. The text of manuscript D is too fragmentary for interpretation.

The Middle Hittite prayer employs here the possessive enclitic pronoun -šmit attached to the noun aššu. The scribe of the New Hittite prayer omitted this, by then, archaic construction but did not feel the need to replace it with the New Hittite possessive construction. The scribe of the New Hittite prayer also changed
the singular forms of the verb da- “take” and zikk- “to set, deposit” with the plural forms daier and zikkir (CTH 376.II 122’, 123’).

124’ While the scribe of the Middle Hittite prayer used the adjective of the base stem in a-, that is, aralţena-, the scribe of manuscript A of CTH 376.II employed in the same sentence the adjective with the derived stem aralţenanant-. Since there is no discernible difference in meaning between these two adjectives, the choice may have been stylistic.

127’-128’

nu=za tuēl(!) ŠUM-KA tepnuškiši (CTH 376.I 37’)
nu=za DINGIR-LUM tuel ŠUM-KA lē tepšanuši (CTH 376.II)

The genitive of the second person pronoun is spelled in Middle Hittite prayer tu-el-e. Sommer (1932: 95) argued that because manuscript A of CTH 376.II employs in the same sentence le-e, this negative was also intended in the Middle Hittite text, but was omitted by mistake. Hoffner (1977: 154 and n.15) and Carruba (1983: 6) interpret this form as a scribal error for tu-e-el assuming that the second and third signs were transposed.

The sentence as it stands can be interpreted as either a rhetorical question or a statement. Sommer argued against the former, because such question would not have a connecting particle, unless preceded by another rhetorical question or by a subordinate clause. Neither of those is employed here. Gurney (1940: 107) and Hoffner (1977: 154), against Sommer, read this sentence as a positive rather than a negative statement. Hoffner translates the sentence as “You are belittling your own name” arguing that if the goddess fails to protect Hatti against the enemies, she allows her name to fall into disrepute (Hoffner 1977: 154 n.16). The same interpretation of this sentence is followed by Singer (2002: 68 n. 8). This edition follows Sommer and reads this sentence as a negative statement.

With regard to the sentence appearing in CTH 376.II three possible interpretations could be proposed: (i) the scribe copied the text from this particular Middle Hittite manuscript (KUB 24.4+), which contained the error. He might have assumed that the writing tu-el-e was an error for tu-e-el le-e, and hence he included this negative in his text; (ii) the scribe was not sure whether he should interpret this sentence as a rhetorical question or as a statement. To avoid ambiguity he chose to
change this sentence into a request; (iii) the scribe of the New Hittite prayer considered this sentence to be unsuitable. He changed the syntax so that the sentence asked the goddess to stop degrading her name, rather than stating the fact that she fails to protect Ḫatti and thus disgraces her name. Although in both sentences the message is the same, the way of delivering is different. The first interpretation of the sentence in CTH 376.II is followed in this edition.

129’ nu mān DINGIR.MEŠ-naš kardī(di)miyaz kuiš [kuiš] DINGIR.MEŠ UL naḫḫanza (CTH 376.I 38’)

Traces preserved suggest that the scribe of the Middle Hittite prayer wrote in this line the indefinite kuiš kuiš. The double kuiš refers here equally to DINGIR.MEŠ-naš kardī(di)miyaz and to DINGIR.MEŠ UL naḫḫanza, which belong to one conditional clause introduced by mān. This construction is not repeated by the scribe of the New Hittite prayer:

nu ANA DINGIR.MEŠ kuiš karpiš kartimmiyaz kuiš DINGIR.MEŠ-naš UL naḫḫanza (CTH 376.II 129’-130’)

Gurney 1940: 109 was disconcerted by the double use of the relative pronoun kuiš in these lines and put forward three possible explanations. He suggested that either the first kuiš referred to karpiš and the second to kartimmiyaz or that these two relative pronouns are to be taken together in the meaning “whoever”, or that the scribe must have inserted the second kuiš to separate karpiš kartimmiyaz from UL naḫḫanza to avoid the use of these words together.

In a similar vein, one may suggest that the scribe of the New Hittite prayer wished to avoid juxtaposing the conditional and the relative clauses, which he found in the Middle Hittite prayer. He changed these two sentences into the two relative clauses.

139’-150’

These lines bear a close resemblance to lines 4’-11’ of a two-column fragment transliterated and translated by Schwemer 2006 (on this see supra and appendix 3 text CTH 376.V) and to lines 67’-78’ of the prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu (CTH 377).

143’ For interpretation of the clitic chain ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za (also in lines 146’ and 148’) as the relative pronoun kuieš, the conjunction -ma, the enclitic personal
pronoun -aš and the reflexive particle -za (i.e. kuieš=ma=aš=za) rather than the relative pronoun kuieš, the personal pronoun -šmaš and the reflexive particle -za (i.e. kuieš=<š>maš=za; Boley 1993: 175) or the relative pronoun kuieš, the conjunction -ma, the personal pronoun -šmaš and the reflexive particle -za (i.e. kuieš=ma=šmaš=za; Gurney 1940: 112), see CHD Š: 167a. Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 449) argue that the pronoun -aš should be interpreted here as a proleptic accusative plural clitic anticipating the following direct objects. According to both authors, this construction is very rare and is characteristic of direct speech.

167’ The translation of nūt- as “contentment (?)” and tummantiya- as “obedience” follows CHD L-N: 476 and 476a-b. See Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 445-447 and 433-4) for rendering these two nouns as “(power) of hearing (?) and understanding(?)

169’-174’
The restoration of the logogram UZ, at the beginning of line 169’ is based on a similar sentence found in rev. 14’ of KUB 24.2+ (ms. B of CTH 377); DUMU.LÚ.U₉.LU-aš-ša at the beginning of line 170’ is restored after line iii 12’ of KUB 24.1+ (ms. A of CTH 377); d.GIŠ.TUKUL-in pé-eš-ki nu-uš-ši at the beginning of line 173’ and ŠA-PAL(?) GI.R.MEŠ(?)-ŠU in line 174’ are restored from lines iii 14’-15’ of KUB 24.1+ (ms. A of CTH 377).

177’-179’
The sentence is restored from line 99’ of this text.

180’-182’
The restorations in these lines follow Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 450). Note the late New Hittite nominative plural ša-ku-wa-an-du-uš [h-e'-e-mu-uš].

185’ Some type of verb of giving that appears in the middle voice and with the adverb/preverb šara is required in this context. It is suggested that perhaps the verb ki-, the passive of the verb dai- ‘to put’ should be restored here.
4.3. Prayers Concerning the Plague

During the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, an unknown plague broke out in Ḫatti claiming countless victims, among them both Šuppiluliuma himself and his son Arnuwanda. The difficult task of investigating the causes of divine wrath that resulted in this calamity and of appeasing the divine anger fell on Muršili II, Šuppiluliuma’s younger son. In the so-called Plague Prayers (CTH 376.II, 378.I-IV, 379), the king presents to the gods various political and religious offences committed by his father and details the reparations which have been made and which will be made to atone for these transgressions.

The order of the prayers has not been indicated in the texts themselves, however has been established by modern scholars on the basis of the development of the king’s approach to the collective guilt. Accordingly, prayers in which the king insists on his own innocence (CTH 378.I) must have been composed earlier than those in which Muršili accepts his father’s guilt (CTH 378.II) (Güterbock 1960: 61f; 1964: 112; Houwink ten Cate 1969: 97f, Singer 2002a: 62-63). Singer proposed an alternative to such an arrangement of these texts; he observed that the general assembly of gods was addressed only when pleading to individual gods failed (1996: 151-152; 2002a: 49). Consequently, since in CTH 378.I Muršili addresses all of the Hittite gods, this prayer would have to have been composed last.

The plague prayers are explicitly labelled by the Hittite scribes as arkuwar “plea”. Their ultimate goal is the presentation of request and the absolution of the sin through confession and reparations.
THE ‘FIRST’ PLAGUE PRAYER (CTH 378.1)

This prayer addresses the totality of the Hittite pantheon, particularly the oath deities. Muršili II pleads with the gods on behalf of his land and in his own name to stop the plague that has been ravaging the land of Ḫatti for twenty years. The text can be regarded as a classic example for an arkuwar prayer.

The text of the prayer is preserved in two copies: a single column tablet (manuscript A) and three small fragments of manuscript B. Manuscript A, which is written in the New Hittite ductus (note the New Hittite sign shapes of az, du, ik, li, ni, uk, šar, SAG and URU), can be almost completely restored, except for the end of the obverse as well as the beginning and parts of the last paragraph of the reverse. The language of the text exhibits a large number of linguistic and orthographic features that safely date the text to the New Hittite period. The most salient of these include: the nominative plural common and nominative-accusative plural neuter of the personal enclitic pronoun “they, them” -at, the accusative plural common of the personal enclitic pronoun “them” -aš, the employment of the independent personal pronoun ammuk in the position of the subject, the replacement of the suffixed possessive pronouns by the oblique enclitic personal pronouns that were used in possessive function, the spelling of the dative case of the enclitic personal pronoun with -ši instead of -še, a tendency to replace syllabic writings with their logographic variants (Ú-UL instead of natta, EGIR-pa for appa etc.), the use of the verb ak(k)- in the middle voice meaning “to die”. The one instance of the possessive clitic pronoun -mit (nom.-acc.sg.neut.) in line 7 might represent an attempt on the part of the scribe to archaise the text, which is typical for a genre that has its origins in the Old and Middle Hittite literary traditions (CHD L-N 221-222). In view of the many erasures and the still remaining mistakes, one may assume that this is a rough copy, perhaps a work of a junior scribe, or a copy of the text done as a scribal exercise.

Three small fragments of manuscript B, also written in the New Hittite ductus, are duplicates to lines 1-16 of the obverse. Since the line length in manuscript B is similar to that of manuscript A, the two fragments probably also come from a single column tablet.
### Manuscripts:

| A   | KUB 14.14 + | Bo 2801 | T.I  
|-----|-------------|---------|------
|     | KUB 19.1 +  | Bo 4336 |
|     | KUB 19.2 +  | Bo 4369 + Bo 9326 + Bo 4533 + Bo 3038 + Bo 9326 |
|     | KBo 3.47 +  | Bo 9451 |
|     | KBo 50.184 + | 1612/u |
|     | KBo 53.303 + | 1804/u |
|     | KBo 54.6 +  | 1858/u |
|     | KBo 58.8 +  | 1107/v + 1132/v + 1121/z |
|     | unpubl. +   | Bo 4229 |
|     | unpubl.     | Bo 9433 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>KUB 23.3 +</th>
<th>Bo 4795 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | KBo 55.24 + | 970/v  
|     | KBo 51.19   | 1104/z |


Previous Transliterations: Miller 2007b: 135-36 (lines 1-7); Miller 2010: 46-46 (lines 1-11 of ms. A); Groddek 2008: 126-7 (lines 16-23); Groddek 2010: 5 (lines rev. 32’-39’ of ms. A = here lines 84’-91’).

### Transliteration:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A obv. 1</td>
<td>[DINGIR.MEŠ] 'EN.ME.EŠ-IA' DI[NGIR.MEŠ LÚ].M[EN.MEŠ] h[u-]u-[ma-an-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 1’</td>
<td>[EN.MEŠ-IA DINGIR.MEŠ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ctd.</td>
<td>te-eš D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B ctd.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ctd.</td>
<td>MEŠ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

82 A join sketch of ms A is included in Appendix 2.
83 The find spots of KUB 14.14, KUB 19.1, KUB 19.2, KBo 3.47, Bo 4229 and Bo 9433 were determined by joining them to other fragments of manuscript A found in temple 1. The fragment KBo 50.184 was found in “fill” or secondary deposited earth from storeroom 12 and 1121/z in storeroom 11 of temple 1.
84 The fragment KBo 51.19 was found in storeroom 11 of temple 1. The find spot of KUB 23.3 was determined by join.
85 At the time of completion of this edition, the fragment 970/v was unpublished. The photograph of this fragment was sent to me by Prof. J. Miller, when he held a research position at the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz. The fragment is now published as KBo 55.24.
86 The transliteration is based on collation of photographs of all fragments.
A obv. 2 [ŠA KU]R^{URU} HA-AT-TI [DINGIR].ME.ES LŪ'.ME.ES ū-u-ma-an-te-
B 2' [ŠA KJUR^{URU} HA-AT-TI]

B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 3 [l]i-[n]-ki-aš ka-ru-[ú]-i-li-eš DINGIR.ME.Š [LŪ.ME.Š] ū-u-ma-an-te-
B 3' [l]-in-ki-ia-[aš]

A ctd. eš <ka-ru-[ú]-i-li-eš> DINGIR.ME.Š MUNUS.ME.ES ū-u-ma-an-[e-eš]
B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 4 a-pé-da-ni'-za UD-ti ku-i-e-eš DINGIR.ME.Š tu-[l-[i-ia] li-in-ki-i-ia
B 4' [a]-pé-e-da-ni-[z][a]

A ctd. k[u-ur]-t'ra'-wa-an-ni
B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 5 ḫal-[z]-[i]-a-an-te-iš 'e'-eš-tén ḤUR.SAG.ME.Š ÍD.ME.Š TÚ[L.ME.Š]
B 5' [ḫal]-zi-ia-an-[e-eš']

A ctd. 'KASKAL.KUR.ME.ES-ia k[a'-a]-ša'(ta)-aš-ma-aš am-mu-u[k]
B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 6 {m}Mur-ši-li-iš LŪ SANGA-KU-NU ÍR-KU-NU ar-ku-wa-[mí] {x-x}
B 6' [[m]Mur-ši-li-[iš]

A ctd. nu-uš-ma-aš'-za' ar-ku-wa-ar
B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 7 ku-e-da-ni 'me'-m[i-i]a-an-ni še-er e-eš-ša-aḫ-ḫi[n]u-mu DINGIR.ME.Š
B 7' [ku]-t'e-da'-n[i

A ctd. EN.ME.ES-JA me-[m[i-i]a-an-mi-[i t iš-ta-ma-aš-tén]
B ctd. [ ]

(KBo 55.24 breaks)

8

A obv. 8 DINGIR.ME.Š 'EN'.ME.ES-JA 'ŠA' KUR^{URU} HA-AT-TI-kán ŪŠ-an
B 8' [ ]

A ctd. 'ki-ša'-at nu KUR^{URU} HA-AT-TI ħi-in-<ga>-na-az
B ctd. [ ]

A obv. 9 ta-ma-aš-[a]-t' na'-at me-ek-ki dam-m[e-eš-ḫa-it-ta-a]r' nu ka-a-aš
B 9' [ ]

A ctd. MU.20.KAM me-ek-ki-ia
10 A obv. 10  

ku-it K[UR URU] HA[T-TI] ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta³-[ri nu am-mu-u]k še-er
[k]u-it KUR URU HA-A[T-TI]

A ctd.  
A-WA-AT

B 11´  
[ ] →

11 A obv. 11  

mDU-UT HA-[LI-IA DUMU]UR U ru SA DUMU mDU-UT HA-LI-IA¹

A ctd.  
'na'[a]k-ke-e-eš-ta IŠ-TU DINGIR⁵ ia

B 11´-12´  
[ ] / [ ] -i[a] →

12 A obv. 12  


A ctd.  
DINGIR⁵ ia Ša-an-da-a-it-ta³-at

B 12´-13´  
[ ] / [ ] -i[a] →

13 A obv. 13  

mDU-U[T-HE-LI-IA] ku-it DUMU⁸ A-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI

A ctd.  
BE-[E]L-ŠU-NU e-eš-ta

B 14´  
[ 'e³-eš-ta →

14 A obv. 14  

'nu'[a]šši URU HA-at]-tu-ša-aš DUMU ME.EŠ.LUGAL BE-LU⁹ UL A-BA-IA-aš šši še-er li-in-ki-[eš-ta]

A ctd.  
UGULA LÜ,ME.EŠ LI-IM-TUM LÜ,ME.EŠ DUGUD

B ctd.

15 A obv. 15  

ERÍN.'ME',[EŠ-ia ANŠE.KUR.]RA.HI.A [h₃u-u-ma-an-za še-er]

B 15´  
[ ]-ia ANŠE.KUR.RA.HI.A [h₃u-u-]

A ctd.  

B 15´-16´  
[ ] / [ ] -šši [še³]-er [ ]

16 A obv. 16  

ú-it-ma A-B[U-I]A mTu-ut-[š₃]-li-ia-an dam-mi-eš-[š₃]-a-it

A ctd.  
'URU]š₃-at-tu-š₃-aš (š₃a)-za-kán

B ctd.

(B breaks)

17 A obv. 17  

DU[M]E.EŠ. 'LUGAL' BE-LU⁶ EŠ UGULA LÜ,ME.EŠ LI-IM

LÜ,ME.EŠ DUGUD h₃u-u-ma-an-za A-BA-IA 'an'-d[a]

18 A obv. 18  

ki-š₃-a-an-da-at nu mDu-ut-[š₃]-li-ia-an li-in-ki-ia-aš (an) EN-ŠU⁷ (ku)-NU
wa-ag-ga-rī(ḫu)-e-ter³

19 A obv. 19 na-an-kān ku'-en³-ni-ir nam-ma-aš-šī Ṿu-e-eš ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ŠU {'-NU'}

20 A obv. 20 na-aš e-ep-pir na-aš 'T-[N]A KUR URU A-la-ši-ia up-<spit>-eš n[u-uš-m]a-aš⁴ Du-ut-ḫa-li-ia-aš

21 A obv. 21 ku-it BE-EL'-ŠU'-NU 'e'-eš-ta a-pu-ú-uš-ma-aš-šī³ [i-in-ki-i]a-aš İR.MEŠ-ŠU 'e³-[š]ir]

22 A obv. 22 nu-kān šu-me-e'[e]/l EN.ME.EŠ-IA NI-EŠ DINGIR⁵ šar-ri-e-e[r nu-kān]³ Du-ut-ḫa-li-[i]-ia-[an ku]-en-nir

A


24 A obv. 24 ar-tum-ma-i³ nu [URU]Ḫa-at-tu-ša-aš ku-it İŠ-TU [KûR x x x x x x x x w]{a-[š]a} n[u-uš-

25 A obv. 25 'ZAG.HI.A'(za) ŠA³ KUR URUḪAT'-TI LÜ KûR da-a-an ḫar-ta n[u(?) A-BU-IA ŠA LÜ KûR KUR.KUR.ME][Ś(?)]


27 A obv. 27 [da?-aš?] ki-it ZAG.HI.A-ma-aš-ma-aš-kān ār-ḫa da-a-aš na-aš EGIR-p[a a-ša-a-ša-aš-ta]

28 A obv. 28 'nam-ma-ia³-za da-ma-a-i q-ra-aḫ-zé-na KUR.KUR.ME.EŠ LUGAL-u-e-ez³-nu-an³-[ni a-da t-ar-aḫ-ta]


30 A obv. 30 nu-uš-šī KUR URUḪAT-TI ḫu-u-ma-an pí-ra-an SIG5-in i-ia-an-ni-eš nu-ušš[í a-an-tu-uš-ša-aš-ta]


32 A obv. 32 na-at lu-lu-wa-an-da-at Ú-UL ku-it-ki ḫar³-aḫ³-ta nu-kān ú-wa-at-tēn DINGIR.M[EŠ EN.ME.EŠ-IA]

33 A obv. 33 a-pu-un A-WA-AT "DU-UT-ḪA-LI-IA DUMU₅ R A'-NA³ A-BI-IA ki-nu-un ap-pé-ez-z[i-ia-až x x]-³-e³-[i]-a-za

35 A obv. 35 ku-e-ēš DUMU.ME.ES LUGAL BE-LU ME.ES UGULA LI-IM DUGUD an-da ki-ša-an-da-at nu 'a'[pu-ū-iš-ša a-pē-e-ez]

36 A obv. 36 me-mi-ia-na-az e-kir A-NA KUR HAT-TI ia-ká[na] a-pa-a-āš-pāt me-mi-āš a-ar-āš nu KUR LI[HAT-TI a-pē-e-ez]

37 A obv. 37 me-mi-ia-na-az ak-ki-īš-ki-u-an ti-i'[ia-āt] nu KUR HAT-TI du-wa-a-an pa-[r[ā a x x x x]

38 A obv. 38 ki-nu-na ḫi-in-kān pa-ra-a nam-ma d[a-āš-šē-e-eš-t]a KUR HAT'[bar]-TI ḫi-in-ga-na-a[z me-ek-ki]

39 A obv. 39 dam-me-ēš-Ḫa-it-ta-at na-at te-'pa-u'[e-e-eš-ta am]'mu-uk-ma'-za 'Mur-ši-li-īš LI SANGA-KU-NU (ĪR-KU-NU) ṢA-az]

40 A obv. 40 la-aḥ-la-aḥ-Ḫi-ma'-an Ū-UL'[tar]-a-[H-mi [NĪ.T]E'-az-ma-za' pī'-tu-li-ia-an Ū-UL'[tar-a-ḥ-mi]
203

(A obv. breaks)

break of uncertain length

53' A rev. 1' [x x x x] x [KUR^URU ḤA-AT]-TI-[a x x x x x ak-k]i-īš-ki-it-ta-[ri x x x x x]

54' A rev. 2' [KUR^URU ḤA-AT]-TI-i[a x x x x x ak-k]i-īš-ki-it-ta-[ri x x x x x]

55' A rev. 3' [x x x (x)] e-eš-[x x x x x x w]a-aš-ta-i KAT-[a x x x x x]

56' A rev. 4' [ki-nu-n]a-kān an/DINGIR [x x x x x x a]-pē-el A-NA [x x x x x x]

57' A rev. 5' [x x x] A-BI-IA ku-[i-t x x x x x m]a-an i-ia-m[i x x x x x x x]

58' A rev. 6' [ma]-an-qa šu-'u1-[x x x x x x x]-x ŚA 'A1-BI-[A x x-e]š x x x x x x x

59' A rev. 7' [ki-nu-na]-za-kān šu-m[a-a-aš ŚA A-BI-IA wa-aš-tul ta]-r-na-an [ḥar-m[i n]u A-BI-IA ku-[i-una]

60' A rev. 8' [mDu]-ut-ẖa-li-i-a-an [ku-it x x x x x] x nu-za A-BI-[I[A a-pad-da-an i-ia-um]

61' A rev. 9' [e]-eš(šē)-ẖa-na-aš SĪSK[UR i-ia-at KUR^URU Ḥa-ad-du-ša-aš-ma-zā Ú-UL ku-it-k[i i-ia-at]

62' A rev. 10' [ú-w]a-nu-un-ma-[za 'e]-[eš-ẖa-na-aš SĪSKUR a]m-mu-uq-qa i-ia-nu-un KUR-e-an-za-[m[a]

63' A rev. 11' [Ú-U]L ku-it-ki i-[i[a-at Ú-UL-ma-za A-NA] KUR^TI ku-it-'ki' še-er i-e-[e[r]

A

64' A rev. 12' ki-nu-na KUR^URU ḤAT-'TI' ku-it ẖi-i[n-ga]-'na-za me-ek-ki ta-ma-aš-[ta-al]

65' A rev. 13' nu KUR^URU ḤAT-TI ak-ki-īš-ki-it-t' ta]1-[ri nu] 'A1-WA-AT mDU-UT-ḤA-

66' A rev. 14' še-er na-ak-ki-īš-ta IŠ-TU [DINGIR^LM]-ia-aš-mu ḫa-an-ta-it-ta-at nu-1 uš3-[šī še-er]

67' A rev. 15' a-ri-ia-nu-un nu šu-ma-a-aš A-NA' [DINGIR Meš B]-E-LU^ME.ES-IA A-NA É. ME.EŠ DINGIR.' Meš^1-[KU-NU SĪSKUR]

68' A rev. 16' MA-MI-TI A-NA KUR^TI ḫi-in-ga-[ni še]-er ḫa-an-ta-it-ta-at nu 'šu-ma'-[a-aš A-NA DINGIR Меš]

69' A rev. 17' EN'ME.EŠ-IA ŚA MA-MI-TI SĪSKUR [pIl]-ra-an ar-ẖa i-ia-an-zi nu-1 uš3-[ma-aš-at pl-ra-an]

70' A rev. 18' erasure pár-ku-wa-an-zi am-mu-u[k-m]a šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR Meš 'EN.' MEŠ-[I[A]
A rev. 19' šar-ni-ik-że-el maš-kán-na KUR-e-t še-er šar-ni-in-ki-iš-ki-mi


A rev. 22' nu KUR^URU-AT-TI-ia a-pa-a-aš iš-t Ḫa'-na-an-za ar-Ḫa nam-ma 'zi-in-ni-e[š-ta]

A rev. 23' na-at KUR^URU-ḪA-TI-ia ka-ru-ū šar-ni-ik-ta ki-nu-na-ia-at-kán ku-it am-mu-u[k]

A rev. 24' a-ar-aš na-at am-mu-uq-qa IŠ-TU ḪA šar-ni-ik-zi-la-az maš-kán-na-[az]


A rev. 26' nu-mu DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-IA gi-[n-z]u nam-ma da-at-tén nu-uš-m[a-aš-k]ān u-wa-aḫ-Ḫa-ru^a

A rev. 27' nu-uš-ma-aš ku-it me'(ku)-mi-iš-ki-mi n[u]-mu iš-ta-ma-aš-tén i-da-a-lu [Ŭ-UL] ku-it-ki ku-it

A rev. 28' am-mu-uk i-ia-nu-un wa-aš-te-er 'ku'-i-e-eš nu {nu} i-da-a-lu i-e-er nu a-pé-el UD.KAM-aš nam-ma Ū-UL

A rev. 29' [k]u-e-iš-ki e-eš-zi ka-ru-ū wa'-at ar-Ḫa e-kir a[m-m]u-uk-ma-kán ŠA A-BI-IA me-mi-aš

A rev. 30' 'a'-ar-aš ku-it nu-za ka-a-ša 'A'-NA KUR^Ḫi-in-ga-ni še-er Šu'-me-e-eš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ


A rev. 32' šar-[n-i]k-ze-el-ia šar-ni-il-[n-k]e-eš-ki-mi nu-mu DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^MEŠ-IA^a gi-in-zu erase nam-ma

A obv. 33' da-at-tē[n] 'nu-uš-ma'-<šaš>-kán u-wa-aḫ-Ḫa-ru nu KUR^URU-ḪA-TI ku-it Ḫi-in-ga-na-[z]a dam-me-iš-Ḫa-a-it-<ta>

A rev. 34' na-at [te]-pa-u-i-eš-ta nu šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-IA NINDA Ḫ[ar]-ši-in DUG iš-pa-an-du-uz-zi-[i]a

A rev. 35' ku-e-eš [e-eš]-šir na-aš Ḫi-in-ga-na-[az]-za me-ek-ki ta-ma-aš-ta na-at Ḫi-in-ga-na-az


91 A rev. 39' Ú-[UL] ku-iš-ši ku-it-ki pa-[a]-š-[i]-i

92 A rev. 40' nu-[x] x x x x x x x x x x A-N[A NINDA.GUR,RA ši-pa-an-tu-úš-zi-ia še-er ku-in [x]

93 A rev. 41' e-[š-ša-an-zi?] nu-mu DINGIR.MEŠ EN.M.EŠ-IA nā-[ma?] gi-in-[z]u da-at-tén nu-uš-ma-aš-kán ú-wa-aḫ-ḫu-ru nu-kā[n]


95 A rev. 43' te-e-[p][u-e-e-e a-ša-an-te-eš na]-š-at-tén na-at le-e ak-[i]-iš-kán-ta-rí]

96 A rev. 44' nu-uš-m[a-aš NINDA.GUR,RA iš-pa-an-tu-úš-zi-ia]-eš LÚ.M.EŠ BE-LU.M.EŠ-IA ši-pa-an-tu-úš-zi-ia-la-aš

97 A rev. 45' ši-in-g[a-a]n [a[r-ḫu ú]-š]-iš-a-at-tén ku-e-e-kán ku-e-eš i-da-q-la-wa A-NA x x u-x x x


100 A rev. 48' da-at-tén nu-kán KUR-[e]-š-an-da SIG₅-ru nā-[ma]-a-mu-uq-qa-aš-ma-aš-kán LÚ.SANGA-KU-NU IR-KU-N[U]

101 A rev. 49' u-wa-aḫ-ḫu-ru nu-mu gi-in-[z]u da-at-t-e-en nu-mu-kán ŠÀ-az la-aḫ-la-[š]-a-[h]-ši-[ma]-an ar-ḫu

102 A rev. 50' u-e-ia-at-t-e-en NİTE-aš-ma-[š]-mu-kán pî-[š]-tu-li-ia-an da-a-at-tén

____________________________________________________ _________

____________________________________________________ _________
Translation:

1-7 [O gods], my lords, [all male deities], all female deities, gods [of the land] of Ḫatti, [all] male [deities] of the oath, all female deities of the oath, all primeval [male] deities, all <primeval> female deities, you gods, who, on that day, had been summoned to the assembly for witnessing the oath! O mountains, rivers, springs and underground watercourses! I Muršili, your priest, your servant, hereby pleaded with you. O gods, my lords, [hear] my word, regarding the matter in which I am making a plea to you!

8-15 O gods, my lords, a plague broke out within the land of Ḫatti, and the land of Ḫatti has been oppressed by the plague. It has been very much harmed. And since the land of Ḫatti continues to die this twentieth year in large numbers, the affair of Tudḫaliya the Younger, the son of Tudḫaliya began to haunt [me]. I inquired (about it) from a deity through an oracle, and the affair of Tudḫaliya the Younger was confirmed by the deity. Since to the land of Ḫatti Tudḫaliya the Younger was their lord, the princes, the lords, the overseers of a “thousand”, the officers, [as well as] the entire infantry (and) horse-troops of Ḫattuša swore an oath to him. My father also swore an oath to him.

16-22 But it happened that my father harmed Tudḫaliya. All the princes, the lords, the overseers of a “thousand”, (and) the officers of Ḫattuša joined in with my father, they rebelled against Tudḫaliya, their lord of the oath and they killed him. Furthermore, those of his brothers, (namely) Piquauda and Pirwa, whom they [found], they seized and sent to Alašiya (Cyprus). Since Tudḫaliya was their lord and they were his subjects bound by oath, they transgressed your, my lords’, oath; they [killed] Tudḫaliya.

23-40 You, gods my lord[s], have protected my father, [and] during [his reign] you stood [by him]. Since Ḫattuša [was destroyed] by the enemy, and the enemy had taken the border regions as well as […] of the land of Ḫatti, [my father] repeatedly attacked the enemy lands and repeatedly defeated them. He [to]ok [back the border regions] of the land of Ḫatti, but (also) he took away from them (their) border regions and [resettled] them. And [furthermore, during] his reign, [he
conquered] other foreign lands. He sustained the land of Ḫatti and for it [he established] the borders on this side and that. All the land of Ḫatti prospered in his time (lit. walked in well-being). [Humans], cattle and sheep became numerous in his time. Also, the civilian captives who [were brought] from the ene[my] land survived; none of them perished. You god[s, my lords], now finally [ … ] … avenged that affair of Tudḫaliya the Younger on my father. And so my father [died] because of the blo[od] of Tudḫaliya. The princes, the lords, the overseers of a “thousand” (and) the officers who joined in [with my father, they too] died because of [that] matter. The aforementioned matter came also upon the land of Ḫatti and the land of [Ḥatti] began to perish [because of that] affair. Until no[w] the land of Ḫatti […]. Now the plague has become even ha[rsher]. The land of Ḫatti has been [very much] harmed by the plague and it has been dimin[ished]. I, Muršili, [your] pr[iest, (your servant)] cannot [over]come the worry [with my heart]. I cannot [overcome] the anxiety with my body.

41-47 […] o gods, my lords, you who ištarāizzi to/for […], since you [were summoned] by/to the assembly for witnessing the oath. When the whole of [Ha]ttuša was swearing the oath, they repeatedly [sum]moned [you the gods, my lords] as witnesses. But since it came to pass that they [harmed their] lord of the oath, had/would you the gods, my lords no[t] … in that case? [Ha]d/would you in no way avenge that blood [on them]? […] O you yourselves, [gods], upperworld lords […!]

48-52 […] they continue to transgress. […] gods, my lords, those who […] the oath, […] they killed their [lor]d [of the oath]. [No one] of that da[y is still (alive)]. They have already died. They […]have made res[titution. But whoever already […].

break


64’-71’ Now because the land of Ḫatti has been oppressed very much by the plague, and the land of Ḫatti continues to die, the affair of Tudḫaliya began to haunt the land. It (the affair of Tudḫaliya) has been confirmed for me by [a deity], and I have consulted the oracle [about it]. The [ritual] of the oath concerning the plague has been confirmed for you [the gods], my lords, and for your temples on behalf of the land. They are performing the ritual of the oath before you, the gods, my lords, and they are clearing it before you. But I myself am making restitution to you, the gods, [my] lords, with compensation and propitiatory gift on behalf of the land.

72’-91’ O gods, my lords, because [you have] sought (revenge for) the blood of Tudḫaliya, those who killed Tudḫaliya have made restitution for the blood. In addition, that blood has finished off the land of Ḫatti as well, and the land of Ḫatti has already made restitution for it. Because now it (the blood of Tudḫaliya) fell on me too, I, from my estate, am also making restitution for it through compensation and propitiatory gift. To the gods, my lords may the soul again be appeased! O gods, my lords, have pity on me again! Let me appear before you! Listen to me, to what I continue to say to you, since I have done no evil! Of those who sinned and who did evil, no one of that day is still (alive). They have already died off. But because the deed of my father has fallen upon me, I am hereby giving to you, the gods, my [lord]s, on behalf of the land, a propitiatory gift concerning the plague. I am making restitution. To you I am making restitution with a propitiatory gift and compensation. O gods, my lords, have pity on me again! Let me appear before you! Because the land of Ḫatti has been harmed by the plague, it (the land of Ḫatti) has been diminished. Those who prepared for you, the gods, my lords, the thick bread and libation have been also oppressed by the plague very much and by the plague they have been diminished. But furthermore, does not the plague take them away again? They continue to die (lit. there is continual dying). If those few makers of the thick bread and libation bearers who remain perish, no one will give you ever again anything (whether) thick bread or libation.

92’-102’[ … O gods, my lords] on account of the thick bread and libation which [they prepare for you, have pity] on me again! Let me appear before you! [Send the plague from the land of Ḫatti!] Let those few makers of the thick bread [(and) the libation pourers] who [remain] for you not be harmed again, let them not go on dying! Let them [prepare] for you thick bread and libation. O gods, my
lords, send the plague [away from the land of Ḫatti]! Whatever evils happened within the land of Ḫatti [on account of] … of Tudḫaliya, O up[erworld] gods […] them, send them [away]! Send them to the enemy land! Have pity on the land of Ḫatti [again]! Let the land be well again! Let me, your priest, your servant, appear before you! Have pity on me! Send away the worry from my heart! Take the anxiety from my body!

Colophon:

[One tablet]; (text) complete. When Muršili ma[de] a plea [to the god]s because of the plague.

Comments:

1 The reading DINGIR.MEŠ at the end of line 1 and the restoration <ka-ru-ú-i-li-eš> in line 3 follow Miller (2007: 136).

6 ar-ku-wa-[mi]{x x}. The spacing, as shown on the photograph of manuscript A, would suggest that the traces preserved after the break are part of the verb. This verbal form, however, is difficult to interpret. The gap is both too small to accommodate nu and un, and too large to contain only the beginning or the entire nu, therefore, the suggested readings ar-ku-wa-[nu-un] (Lebrun 1980: 193) and ar-ku-wa-[n]u-un (Miller 2007b: 136), ar-ku-wa-[n]u-un!-un! (Groddek 2009: 96) as well as an alternative ar-ku-wa-[nu]-un must be excluded. The first singular preterite of the verb arkuwai- also does not seem to fit into the present context; it follows directly the address to the gods and therefore would have to carry a meaning “to address.” This, however, does not agree with the use of this verb in or outside of prayer contexts (see discussion in chapter two). On the other hand, if not part of the verb, these two sings would have to belong to the next clause/sentence, so perhaps nu-za (Lebrun 1980: 193). This reading, however, is excluded by the fact that the sentence beginning after the gap has already a sentence initial clitic chain nu-uš-ma-aš-za. Because of these considerations it is proposed here that the verb is to be read ar-ku-wa-[mi] (first singular present) and the two signs {x x} are left over from an erasure (so Goetze 1930: 164 and footnote 6).

9 The nominal sentence nu ka-a-aš MU.20.KAM is interpreted here as syntactically belonging to the causal kuit clause. The general sense is that because the Hittite
population has been dying for twenty years, Muršili seeks the causes that underlie this disaster; in this prayer the reason or the sin that triggered the plague is the murder of Tudhaliya the Younger by Muršili’s father Šuppiluliuma I.

16. URU Ḥa-at-tu-ša-ša-za-kán. A scribal error must be postulated here: the second ša is a mistake for aš. Against an interpretation URU Ḫattušaš=a=za=kán is the fact that the contrastive enclitic conjunction -a is no longer employed in New Hittite compositions; isolated examples are used after personal independent pronouns (see for instance KUB 6.45 iii 60; HG: 395-399).

18. linkiyaš. A recently joined fragment (1612/u) completes the context and excludes restoration linkiyanteš suggested by Goetze (1930: 166) and followed by Singer (2002a: 62) as well as by CHD L-N 64. The present context requires the noun lingai-“oath” to appear in the genitive. Although linkiyaš, not attested elsewhere in Hittite texts, may be analysed as an Old Hittite genitive plural, it is more likely that this form is a scribal error and should be read linkiyaš (a genitive singular). linkiyaš is employed in Hittite texts to identify various aspects of the oath and its ceremony. It describes the place where the oath was taken, or a tablet containing the oath, the seal of the oath or persons bound by the oath (CHD L-N 65-66). linkiyaš EN/BE-EL would be another variant of this standard phrase and would denote a person to whom others are bound by the oath: “lord of the oath.” The same expression is also attested in line 44 of this text li-i[n]-ki-ia-aš … BE-E[L-ŠU-NU].

19. Of the two personal names, Pirwa is well attested in Hittite texts; however, the reading of the first name is problematic. Two signs ú and da are preceded by a sign that is most likely to be read qa though it does not have exactly the same form as other qa signs in this manuscript. The traces of the sign that precede qa seem to be consistent with pí but other readings are not excluded. Since the break that contains the beginning of the name allows only for one or two signs the name could be read Piauda, a name that is, however, not attested otherwise.

22. Most probably -en-nir inscribed below line 86’ of the reverse belongs to the verb ku-en-nir that is restored at the end of line 22 of the obverse side.
Although the traces of the last three signs following *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš*-., as shown in Goetze’s copy of KUB 14.14, are difficult to interpret, the photograph confirms that *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-te-en* is to be read here (so Goetze 1930: 166). The third sign is probably left over from an erasure. Groddek reads here *pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ta’-x-ni* (2008: 127).

Because the present context requires that the verb *ar-* carries a meaning “to stand by, take care of”, a restoration of [appan] at the end of line 23 is fairly certain. *anda* is interpreted here as a postposition governing restored [LUGAL-]*u-e-ez-na-an-ni*. This restoration seems very plausible, particularly because what follows is the description of the reign of Šuppiluliuma. The same phrase seems to be also employed at the end of line 28.

Goetze (1930: 167) and Lebrun (1980: 194) read *-wa-nu-uš* at the end of the line 23. The photograph of manuscript A shows that these signs are written two or three lines below *ku-en-nir*. Since that verb is restored in line 22, it is suggested that *-wa-nu-uš* is to be read at the end of line 24 and possibly is to be interpreted as an accusative plural ending of a common gender noun which together with ZAG.ḪI.A in line 25 would be the direct object of the verb *da-* “to take.”

Since *-wa-nu-uš* in line 24 is understood here as the ending of a noun in an accusative case, ZAG.ḪI-za appearing on the fragment 1132/v does not stand at the beginning of a sentence and therefore cannot host any clitics. For that reason this form must be a scribal error and is read here as ZAG.ḪI.A.

The restoration *[da-aš]-ki-it* (Goetze 1930: 168) at the beginning of the line is problematic, although contextually plausible; the present context requires a verb of holding or taking. The break at the beginning of this line is too large to accommodate only *da-aš*. Another possibility would be to restore a form of *ḫark-* “to have, hold”; since, however, the usage of this verb in the iterative has not been attested otherwise its restoration here seems uncertain.

The interpretation of *-e-ia-za* at the end of the line is difficult. Perhaps it represents the end of another adverb following *kinun* and *appezziyaz.*
36 *e-kir* occurs twice in this text in line 36 and 81’. Goetze (1930: 168, 174) followed by Otten (1973: 46) transliterated this verb as *a'-kir* in line 36 and *a-kir* in line 81.’ While Goetze’s copy of KUB 14.14 shows *e-kir* in both lines, the photograph is unclear. In line 36 the vowel sign is damaged, in 81’ it shows two small horizontals. Because the traces are more consistent with *e-kir* than *a-kir* and because this text is a New Hittite composition, the New Hittite spelling *e-kir* is adopted here.

39 The reading İR before the break at the end of the line (so all previous editors and translators of the text) cannot be reconciled with the traces as shown in Goetze’s copy. The end of the line is not clearly visible on the photograph. Because the phrase \(^{LÖ}\)SANGA-KU-NU İR-KU-NU, is also employed in obv. 6 of this text and because the traces visible in Goetze’s copy are consistent with the logogram LÛ, the restoration of \(^{LÖ}\)SANGA-KU-NU İR-KU-NU] is suggested here. However, the lacuna at the end of the line is not large enough to accommodate that phrase and ŠÀ-az, which belongs to the next sentence. It is therefore suggested that the phrase was either shortened to \(^{LÖ}\)SANGA-KU-NU or the writing in this line continued to the edge and the reverse of the tablet.

41 *ištarāizzi*. This verb is found nowhere else in Hittite texts. Because of the plural relative pronoun kuēš one would expect the plural verbal form, instead of the third singular present that appears here. Due to the very fragmentary context, no ready explanation can be offered for the singular form of the verb. One could propose that *ištarāizzi* is a scribal error for *išgarāizzi*. The verb *iškar-* covers a broad semasiological spectrum “to sting, prick, stab, pierce; stick, fasten, attach, set, post; (intransitive) cleave, cling” (Puhvel *HED* vol. 1: 416). However, none of these meanings seems to make sense within the present context.

43 Even though the spacing would suggest that in is part of *ḥumanza*, the form *ḥumanzain* has never been attested and is not part of the paradigm of this adjective. The sign in must therefore be interpreted as a scribal error.

44 The present context seems to call for the verb *kuen-* “to kill” (so Goetze 1930, Singer 2002a: 62). However, because of the lack of the particle -kan a restoration of this verb is not possible.
47 'ša-ra-az-zi-e-es'. This spelling of the nominative plural common gender of the adjective šaraz(zi(ya))- ‘upper, superior, upperworld’ is attested here for the first time. The nominative plural of this adjective is usually written phonetically as ša-ra-az-zi-iš, or, more commonly, as the logogram UGU-(az)-zi-iš/UGU-(az)-zi-uš (see CHD Š: 247ff).

48 The translation of wa-aš-ku-iš-kán-zi as “transgress” assumes some connection of this verb with a noun wašku-/waškui- “transgression, offence”. The verb waškui- is attested here for the first time.

49 The form li-in-ki-en is unusual. A scribal error must be postulated here: li-in-ki-en is probably a mistake for li-in-ga-en, the accusative singular of the common gender noun lingai- ‘oath’.

50-51 The sentence that begins with nu a-pé-el and the sentence in line 51 are restored from the parallel sentences in lines 80’-81’.

52 The restoration of šar-ni-in-kir is confirmed by the traces preserved on the tablet and by the present context.

70' This edition follows CHD P 161-162 and Singer 2002a: 63 in translating the verb parkuwa- as “clear” rather than “purify” (so Beckman 1997: 157, Goetze 1930: 173 and Lebrun 1980: 201). The purpose of the ritual was to clear and free the land of Hatti from the consequences of breaking the oath taken by Muršili’s father and the Hittite nobility.

71’ Although the spacing, as shown on the photograph of KUB 14.14, would indicate that whatever sign has been lost in the break was not part of KUR-e, the postposition šer requires a noun in the dative. Therefore, the reading KUR-e-‘i’ is suggested here.

The construction šarnink– with nouns in the dative and the accusative, also appearing in lines 83’-84’, is usually translated as “to compensate someone for something” (CHD Š: 285). However, the present context requires the meaning “to compensate someone with something”, which is typically expressed with the verb and the nouns in the dative and the ablative (employed here in lines 76’-77’). The construction
šarnink- with nouns in the dative and the accusative in the meaning “to compensate someone with something” appears only in this text.

The noun maškan is included in the figura etymologica šarnikzel šarnink-. The literal meaning of this expression is “to compensate (with) compensation and a propitiatory gift”.

74' The ending of the verb zinni- employed at the end of the line is broken. Since the subject of the sentence is the ergative išḫananza, the verb must have been used here in the third person singular. The possible restoration include the third singular present active zi-in-ni-zi, the third singular preterite active zi-in-ni-it or the third singular imperative active zi-in-ni-eš-du. If one restores here zinnizi or zinnit, one has to assume that zinni- is the transitive verb and the sentence should be understood as: “In addition, that blood also destroyed/destroys completely the land of Ḫatti”. If one restores zinniešdu, one would also have to restore the Akkadogram INA or ŠÀ before the KUR URU HA-AT-TI-ia and the sentence would read as: “And in addition let that blood(shed) stop completely <in> the land of Ḫatti”. The first interpretation is adopted here. The general sense conveyed in these lines is that those guilty of the murder of Tudḫaliya already paid their restitutions. Now they are dead. The consequences of that sin fell on the land of Ḫatti. The Hittite population has been dying and thus has also been paying restitution for the murder of Tudḫaliya. Since the gods are still not appeased, the king himself must now atone for the sin and pay restitution. The blood(shed) destroyed those guilty of the crime and those innocent, namely the population of Ḫatti.

79' Since the verbal form ku-mi-iš-ki-mi is not attested otherwise, and cannot be derived from or connected to any Hittite verb or noun, it may be regarded as corrupt. Goetze (1930: 198) emended the form to <ar>-ku-mi-iš-ki-mi. Lebrun (1980: 197) read here me-mi-iš-ki-mi. The fact that the regular iterative of the verb arkuwai- is arkušk/-arkuešk-, spelled with the sign wi, rather than with mi is not in favour of the emendation <ar>-ku-mi-iš-ki-mi. The form me'̄-mi-iš-ki-mi seems more likely and is adopted here.

With an asyndetic causative sentence at the end of the line (contrary to Singer 2002a: 63 and Beckman 1997: 157) Muršili emphasizes his innocence and
suggests that his request should be granted because of his blamelessness, but not ignorance, in the matter of the murder of Tūdḥaliya.

82’ This edition follows Lebrun (1980: 203) in interpreting šumēš as a scribal error for šumāš dative plural common.

83’ For the reading šar-ni-ik-zi-le-e-eš-ki-mi as a denominative verb from šarnikzel- “restitution, reparation” see Goetze (1930: 198-199) and recently Kloekhorst (2008: 737).

86’-88’

Because of kuēš that appears on the fragment KBo 58.8 (1132/v) at the beginning of line 87’, the sentence in lines 86’-88’ is read here as a relative clause, contrary to earlier restorations/interpretations (see Beckman 1997: 157, Singer 2002a: 63, and Goetze 1930: 175). The pronoun -aš of the first resumptive clause is understood here as a collective singular referring back to kuēš. This is supported by the fact that the singular verbal forms occur in both resumptive clauses. See also line 41, where the plural relative pronoun kuēš occurs with a verb in the third singular present (ištaraizzi).

88’

-at attached enclitically to the adverb anda must have the same grammatical referent as -at in the second resumptive clause in line 87’. The sentence that begins with anda=at is interpreted here as a question: “But furthermore (anda … -ma), does not the plague take them away again (and again)? They continue to die (lit. there is continual dying).”

Singer (2002a: 63) translated “they have died” in the break at the beginning of the line. Goetze (1930: 174) restored here ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-at. KBo 58.8 (1132/v) shows possibly broken te and pa before the break in the tablet; 1858/u shows two Winkelhaken that can be read as eš and a clear ta. Therefore, the reading suggested here is [†]e-’pa-[u-e-eš]-ta.

89’ [nu-kán ke-e-u]š and a[š-ša-an-te-eš] has been restored in line 90’ through comparison with the parallel relative clause in lines 94’-95’ as well as in KUB 14.8 rev. 18-19.
92’ *kuin* {x}. Because the present context seems to require the accusative singular relative pronoun, which would refer to NINDA.GUR₄.RA *iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ia*, the traces, as shown on Goetze’s copy and the photograph of KUB 14.14, cannot be part of *kuin* despite the spacing that would indicate otherwise. It also seems that nothing has been lost in the break at the end of this line since the verb *ešša-* appears at the beginning of the next line. The traces must be then regarded as a scribal error.

93’ The restoration of [*nu=mu DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-IA namma ginz]* u in the break at the beginning of the line is based on the parallel sentence in lines 84’-85’. The sign *zu* at the end of the break, although not suggested by Goetze’s copy, is confirmed by the photograph.

94’ [*IŠ-TU KUR URU ḤAT-TI ar-ḫa ú-i-i|a-‘at-tén* is restored based on the comparison with a similar phrase in lines 96’-97’.

97’.98’ It is not certain whether the phrase *KUR LÚ KUR* really occurs here (so the previous editors and translators of the text). The traces, as shown in Goetze’s copy and on the photograph of KUB 14.14, are unclear. It is more probable that because of the context, with the postposition *šer* in line 98’, another noun in a dative case indicated by *A-NA* occurs here. This noun has been written after the erasure and has been lost in the break at the end of line 97’.

98’ *kišan*. It is not certain whether *kišan* is to be read here as defective writing for the third plural present (i.e. *kišanta*) or for the third plural preterite (i.e. *kišantat*) of the verb *kiš-* agreeing with *idālawa* in line 97’, or whether *kišan* should be treated here as nominative-accusative neuter singular participle and *idālawa* as collective singular.
THE ‘SECOND’ PLAGUE PRAYER (378.II)

This prayer is preserved in four manuscripts. Although all manuscripts are incomplete, the text of nearly the entire prayer can be restored. The middle part of the prayer is preserved in manuscript A and partially in manuscripts B and C; the first 29 lines of the text are extant in manuscripts B and C and the end of the text together with the colophon is preserved in manuscript C.

All manuscripts are written in the New Script characteristic of the reign of Muršili II. Manuscript A (KUB 14.8) is a one-column tablet that lacks the beginning and the end of the obverse as well as the beginning and the end of the reverse. The scribe employs exclusively older sign shapes of ak, al, gi, ik, li, nam, ni, tar and URU. He uses newer variants of the signs az, šar, uk, Ū and the older and newer forms of du and zu.

Manuscript B (KUB 14.11+) is a four-column tablet. Column i and column iv both preserve twelve lines. The first twelve lines of column ii and the last seven lines of column iii are completed by the recently joined fragment KBo 55.25 (650/u). Column ii is missing the end, column iii the beginning. The scribe of manuscript B uses the older variants of al, li, ni, šar, zu, the new shapes of az, du, gi, šar, tar, uk, Ū and both the old and the new forms of ak, ik, URU. Many erasures and errors in this text may indicate that this manuscript was a draft, perhaps written by an inexperienced scribe.

Manuscript C (KUB 14.10 + KUB 26.80 + ABoT 2.22) is a four-column tablet. Only the first 26 lines of column i, 31 fragmentary lines of column ii, approximately 50 fragmentary lines of column iii and 26 lines of column iv are preserved. The scribe of this manuscript uses the older shapes of ak, al, ik, gi, nam, ni, tar, URU and the new variants of az, li, šar, uk, Ū and the old and new variants of du and li.

Manuscript D (KBo 57.21) contains fragments of seven lines which duplicate rev. 25’-28’ of manuscript A. Not enough is left of this manuscript to allow comments on either its palaeography or language.

The language of manuscripts A, B, and C exhibits a large number of linguistic and orthographic features that safely date the text to the New Hittite period. The most salient of these include: the nominative plural common and nominative-accusative plural neuter of the personal enclitic pronoun “they, them” -at; the accusative plural common of the personal enclitic pronoun “them” -aš; the use of the independent personal pronoun ammuk in the position of the subject; the use of the plural determinative MEŠ not only with the Sumerograms that designate people and deities but also with the Sumerograms that denote other concepts; the tendency to replace syllabic writings with their
logographic variants (Ú-UL instead of natta, EGIR-pa for appa etc.) and the use of the verb ak(k)- in the middle voice in the meaning “to die”.
Manuscripts:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 14.8</td>
<td>Bo 2803</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>KUB 14.11+</td>
<td>Bo 2029+</td>
<td>T.I 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KUB 14.11+</td>
<td>Bo 3713+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KUB 14.11+</td>
<td>Bo 4692+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBo 55.25</td>
<td>650/u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>KUB 14.10+</td>
<td>Bo 2067+</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KUB 26.86+</td>
<td>Bo 3144+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABoT 2.22</td>
<td>AnAr 11398</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>KBo 57.21</td>
<td>513/v</td>
<td>T.I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Editions: Goetze 1930: 204-235; Lebrun 1980: 203-216


Previous Transliterations: Grodek 2011: 13 and the footnote 48 (lines 1'-7' of ms. D).

Transliteration:

1  Ci 1  $[\text{d}]M\text{ URU} \text{ HA-AT-TI} \text{ BE-LÍIA} [\text{DINGIR.MEŠ URU} \text{ HA-AT-TI(?)}]$
2  Ci 2  $[\text{BE-L}]\text{UMES-IA} u-i-ia-at-mu u[M]\text{-ur-} (i\text{-li-iš} \text{ LUGAL?}) x$
3  Ci 3  $[\text{i}]\text{mu-me-e-el ĪR-KU-NU} i-it-wa A-NA \text{ d}^\prime [\text{I}]\text{M} \text{ URU} \text{ HA-AT-TI}$
4  Ci 4  $\text{BE-LÍ-IA Ê A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LÚ MES-IA} k[i]\text{-iš-}ša-an$
5  Ci 5  $\text{me-mi ki-i-wa ku-it i-ia-at-tén}$
6  Ci 6  $\text{nu-wa-kán I-NA ŠÅ Bl KUR URU HA-AT-TI ḫi-in-kán}$
7  Bi 1'  $n[u-wa] \rightarrow$
8  Ci 7  $\text{tar-na-at-te-en nu-wa KUR URU HA-AT-TI}$

---

88 All manuscripts were collated with the photograph. The join sketches of ms B and ms C are included in Appendix 2.
89 The fragment KBo 55.25 was found in temple 1. The find spots of three fragments of KUB 14.11 were determined by joining them to KBo 55.25.
90 At the time of completion of this edition the fragment 650/u was unpublished. The photograph of this fragment was sent to me by Prof. J. Miller, then holding a research position in the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. The fragment has been recently published as KBo 55.25.
91 ABoT 2.22 was joined to manuscript C by Grodek after the author of this dissertation completed her edition.
8 B i 2' | [ ] a-ru'=um-ma [ ] C i 8
| ḫi-in-ga-na-az a-ru-um-ma  me-ek-ki ta-ma-aš-ta-at

9 B i 3' | nu-wa PA-AN [ ] C i 9
| nu-wa PA-AN  A-BI-IA PA-AN ŠEŠ-IA ak-ki-iš-ki-ta-at

10 B i 4' | ku-it-ta-[ia-wa-az] C i 10
| ku-it-ta-ia-wa-az  am-mu-uk  A-[N]A DINGIR.MEŠ

11 B i 5' | LŪ SANGA ki-[iš-ḫa-at] C i 11
| LŪ SANGA ki-iš-ḫa-at  nu-wa  ki-nu-un-'na' am-mu-uk

12 B i 6' | pī-ra-an  a[k-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri  ka]-'a'-aš→ C i 12
| pī-ra-an  ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri  ka-'a'-aš

13 B i 7' | MU.20.KAM  ku-[t] URU [HA-AT-T] C i 12-13
| MU.20.KAM  ku-it-kān  I-NA ŠÀ KUR URU [HA-AT-T] →

14 B i 8' | ak-ki-iš-[ki-it-ta-ri  nu-kān] IŠ-TU KUR URU [HA-AT-T] C i 13-14
| ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri  / nu-kān  IŠ-TU KUR URU [HA-AT-T] →

15 B i 9' | ḫi-in-kā[n Ú-UL-pā]t  ta-ru-up-ta-ri C i 14-15
| ḫi-in-kān  / ar-ḫa  Ú-UL-pāt  ta-ru-up-ta-'a'-ri

16 B i 10' | [am-m]u-[k-ma-az  l]a-aḫ-la-aḫ-ḫi-ma-an C i 16
| 'am'-mu-uk-ma-az  ŠÀ-az  la-aḫ'-la'-aḫ-ḫi-ma-an

17 B i 11' | [ ] NÍ.T[E]-az-ma-Za pīt-tu-li-ia-an C i 17-18
| 'Ú'-UL  tar-aḫ-mi  NÍ.TE-az-ma- [s] za  / [p]t-tu-li-ia-an →

18 B i 12' | [ ] tar-aḫ-mi C i 18
| nam-ma  Ú-UL[|] tar-aḫ-mi

BC

19 B i 13' | [ ] ku-wa-pī e-eš-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-un C i 19
| 'nam'-ma-za  EZEN.ḪI.A-ia  ku-wa-pī e-eš-ḫa-aḫ-ḫu-un

20 B i 14' | [ ] ḫu-u-ma-an-d[a]-aš  pī-ra-an  EGIR-pa C i 20-21
| nu  A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš  p[i-r]a-an  / [EGI]R-pa →

21 B i 15' | [ ] DINGIR[R-LIM]-kān  Ú-UL te-ēḫ-ḫu-un C i 21-22
| i-ia-aḫ-ḫa-at  1-EN  É DINGIR-[R-LIM]-kān  / 'Ú'-UL te-ēḫ-ḫu-un →

22 B i 16' | [ ] 'A'-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš C i 22-23
| nu-za ḫi-in-g[a]-ni  še-er  / A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš

23 B i 17' | [ ] e-eš-ša-aḫ]-ḫu-un C i 23-24
| 'a'-a[r]-'[k]u'-u-wa-ar  / [e-eš]-'[ša]-aḫ-ḫu-un →
24 B i 18'  
C i 24-25  
\[ 'IK'\cdot[Rl-Bt^{[A]}-aš-m\|a-[aš-kä]\|n / [m]a\|^3\cdot-Za-aš-ki-nu-\'] \rightarrow

25 B i 19'  
C i 25-26  
\[ nu-(wa)-mu(?) DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^{[A]}-\] IA / [i]š\cdot \{ta\|^4\cdot-ma-aš-[tén] \rightarrow

26 B i 20'  
C i 26-27  
\[ nu-(wa)-kán(?) IŠ-TU(?) KUR \] URU \{HA-AT-T\} I(?) / [i]š\cdot \{ta\|^4\cdot-ka

27 B i 21'  
C i 27  
\[ ar-\{ku\}(?) ú-ia-at-tén(?) \] URU \{HA-AT-T\} a-š-wa

28 B i 22'  
C i 28  
\[ [\{ši\}-\{in\}-\{kán\}(?) nam-ma \} Ú-UL \] tar-\{a\}-\{ži\}

(C i breaks)

29 A obv. 1'  
B i 23'  
\[ nu-wa(?) ku-e-ez\} qa(?) INIM(?) a[k-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri] \] ak-ki-i][ši-ki-it-ta-ri

A ctd.  
\[ nu-wa-ra-at na-aš-šu a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-az] \]

B i 24'  
\[ ] \rightarrow

30 A obv. 2'  
B i 24'  
\[ \{ku-an-da-it\} \} ta-ru\} na-aš-ma-wa-at-za-ká[n te-eš-\{ži\}-it \} ú-wa-al-\{lu\}\] \[ \}

A ctd.  
\[ na-aš-ma-at\]

(B i breaks)

31 A obv. 3'  
\[ \{LU\} DINGIR-LIM-ni\} an-za-ma me-ma-a-ú DINGIR.MEŠ-ma-\} mu\} [Ú-UL iš-ta-ma-aš-šir nu-kán I-NA]\n
32 A obv. 4'  
\[ \{KUR \} HA-AT-TI \{ži\}-\{in\}-\{kán\} Ú-UL SIG_{S-i}[a-at-ta-at nu \] KUR \{URU \} HA-AT-TI \{ži\}-\{in\}-\{ga-na\}-az me-ek-\{ki\}\]

33 A obv. 5'  
\[ ta-ma-aš-t\} a-at\]

A

34 A obv. 6'  
\[ nu-kán \} Š\} A DINGIR.MEŠ-ia ku-i-e-eš LÚ^{[A]}-NINDA.GUR_{4,RA} \] \{LU,MEŠ\} iš-pa-an-tu-uz-\{zi\}-ia-la-aš-ša\]

35 A obv. 7'  
\[ a-aš-ša-a\} n-te-eš e-še-er na-at ak-ki-i][š-\{kán-ta-ri \} x x x x x x x x x x x\]

36 A obv. 8'  
\[ \{ži\}-\{in\}-\{ga-na\}-a\} \} š(?) nam-ma na-ak-ki-iš-ta nu \} ŠA DING[IR.MEŠ x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x]

37 A obv. 9'  
\[ nu-zā(?) ka\} \} a-1\}-ru-ú-i-la DUB.2.KAM.HL.A pí-ra-an \} u\} \} e-mi-ia-nu-u\} n \] 1 TUP \} PU \} Š[\{A SISKUR \} ID \} MA-A-LA(?)\]

38 A obv. 10'  
\[ ma-aš-[ku-an(?)\} \} ma\} 3\}-wa SISKUR \} ŠA \} ID \} MA-A-LA ka-ru-ú-[i-\}li-i\} \} e\}3\}-eš\]
LUGAL.MEŠ $hi^1$-\textit{in}^2$-<ga>$^3$-$n[i(?)]$

39 A obv. 11' [\textit{še-er i-e}r(?)] ku-it-ma-an-ma IŠ-TU UD.KAM-U[M] 'A'$^1$-BI-IA I-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI $a[k$-ki-$iš$-ki-it-ta-ri(?)]$

40 A obv. 12' [\textit{nu SISKUR}] ŠA r$^\text{f}DMA'$-A-LA Ú-UL k[u]-wa-pî-ik-ki i-ia-u-e-e$[n]$

\begin{center}
\textit{A obv. 13'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{TUP-P[U}U-ma ŠA URU KU-RU-UŠ-TA-AM-'MA'
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 1'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{šA'[NU].'-Ú'} TUP-PU
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.MEŠ URU KU-RU-UŠ-TA-AM-MA $ma$-$aβ$-$ša$-\textit{an}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 2'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.MEŠ URU KU-RU-UŠ-TA-AM-MA
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}

42 A obv. 14' [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{dU URU HA-A[T-TI I-NA KUR URU MI-IZ-RI pê}$^1$-$[d]$a-aš
\end{tabular}]
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 3'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{dU URU HA-AT-TI}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
nu$-uš$-$ma-aš$ IM URU HA-AT-TI $ma$-$aβ$-$ša$-\textit{an}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 4'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
nu$-uš$-$ma-aš$ $dU$
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}

43 A obv. 15' [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{iš}$^1$-$[β]$-ú-u$^1$ A-NA LÚ.MEŠ URU HA-AT-TI 'me-na$-aβ$-$ša$-\textit{an-}da$ i$-ia$-at$
\end{tabular}]
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 5'-6'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
iš$^1$-$[β]$-ú-ul$^1$ A-NA[ / me-na$-aβ$-$ša$-\textit{an-d[a}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
nam$-ma$-at IŠ-TU $dU$ URU HA-AT-TI
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 6'-7'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
IŠ-TU $dU$ URU HA-AT-TI →
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}

44 A obv. 16' [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{\textit{li}$^1$-[in]-ga$-nu$-wa$-an$-te$-es$ nu LÚ.MEŠ URU HA-AT-TI ku-it
\end{tabular}]
\begin{center}
\textit{B ii 1} [\begin{tabular}{l}
nu LÚ.MEŠ URU HA-AT-TI ku-it
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 7'-8'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
/ nu LÚ.MEŠ URU HA-AT-TI
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.MEŠ URU MI-IZ-RI-ia
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{B ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.MEŠ URU MI-IZ-RI-ia
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}

\end{tabular}]
\end{center}

45 A obv. 17' [\begin{tabular}{l}
\end{tabular}]
\begin{center}
\textit{B ii 2-3} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{li-in-ga$-nu$-wa$-an$-te$-es$ / e$-șe$-er nu ú-e-er}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 9'-10'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{IŠ-TU$^1$ IM [ / e$-șe$-er nu ú$-\textit{te}^1$-er}
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.MEŠ URU HA-AT-TI
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{B ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
LÚ.ME.ES URU HA-AT-TI
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}

\end{tabular}]
\end{center}

46 A obv. 18' [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{pi$-ra$-an wa$-aβ$-nu-e-er nu-kán NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM LÚ.MEŠ
\end{tabular}]
\begin{center}
\textit{B ii 4-5} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{pi$-ra$-an wa$-aβ$-nu-ir / nu-kán NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM LÚ.ME.ES
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{C ii 11'-12'} [\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{pi$-ra$-an wa$-aβ$-[ / LÚ.MEŠ
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{A ctd.} [\begin{tabular}{l}
URU HA-AT-TI šu-u-da-a-ak
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\textit{B ii 5-6} [\begin{tabular}{l}
URU HA-AT-TI / šu-u-da-a-ak →
\end{tabular}]
\end{center}
47 A obv. 19’ šar-ri-e-er nu A-BU-IA ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
   B ii 6-7 šar-ri-e’-er / nu A-BU-IA ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
   C ii 12’-13’ [ ] / nu A-BU-IA ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
A ctd. u-i-a-at nu ZAG KUR MI-IZ-RI KUR A-AM-GA
   B ii 7-8 u-i-a-at / nu ZAG KUR MI-IZ-RI KUR A-AM-GA
   C ii 14’ [ ] nu ZAG KUR MI-IZ-R|I
A ctd. wa-al-aḫ-ḫi-ir nam-ma-ia u-i-ia-at
   B ii 9 wa-al-aḫ-ḫi-ir [ ] →
C ctd. [ ] →

48 A obv. 20’ nu nam-ma wa-al-aḫ-ḫi-ir LÚ.MEŠ MI-IZ-RI-ma / ma-ah-ḫa-an
   B ii 9-10 [ ] →
   C ii 15’ [ ] →
A ctd. na-ah-ša-ria-an-ta-at
   B ctd. [ ] →
C ctd. [ ] →

49 A obv. 21’ ————————— na-at ú-e-er nu A-NA A-BI-IA DUMU-ŠÚ
   B ii 11-12 ‘nam-ma u-i-e-er na-at ú-e-er / nu ‘A-NA A‘-BI-IA’ DUMU-ŠU
   C ii 16’ ————————— [ ] →
A ctd. [LUGAL]-u‘-iz-na-an-ni an-ku ú-e-ki-ir
   B ii 12-13 LUGAL-u‘-iz-na-ni / an-ku ú-e-ki-[i]r →
   C ii 16’-17’ [ ] →
A ctd. [ ] →

50 A obv. 22’ nu-us-ḫa-ḫa-an A-BU-IA a-pé-e-el [DUMU-Š]Ù
   B ii 13-14 nu-us-ḫa-ḫa-an / A-BU-IA a-pé-e-el DUMU-ŠU
   C ii 17’-18’ [ ] / a-pé-e-el DUMU-ŠU
A ctd. pé-e-š-ta na-an ma-ah-ḫa-an pé-e-ḫu-te-er
   C ii 18’ pé-e-š-t[a]

51 A obv. 23’ na-an-kán ku-e-en-ni-ir A-BU-IA-ma ‘kap-pi-la-az-za-at-ta
   B ii 16-17 na-an-kán ku-e-en-ni-ir A-BU-IA-ma / kap-pi-la-az-za-at-ta
   C ii 19’-20’ na-an-kán ku-e-en-ni-ir [ ] / kap-pi-la-az-za-at-t[a]
A ctd. na-åš I-NA KUR MI-IZ-RI
   B ii 18 na-åš I-NA KUR MI-IZ-RI →
C ctd. [ ] →

52 A obv. 24’ pa-it nu KUR MI-IZ-RI wa-āḫ-ta
   B ii 18-19 pa-it / nu KUR MI-IZ-RI wa-āḫ-ta
   C ii 21’ pa-it nu KUR MI-IZ-R|I
A ctd. ÉRIN.MEŠ-ia-kán ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ŠA KUR MI-IZ-RI
   B ii 20 ÉRIN.MEŠ-ia-kán ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ŠA KUR MI-IZ-R|I
C ii 22'  ÉRIN.MEŠ-ia-kán ANŠE.KUR.[RA.MEŠ]  

A ctd.  ku-en-‘ta'  
B ctd.  [ku-en-ta]  
C ctd.  [ ]  

A  

B ii 21-22  nu a-pí-ia-ia [IM URÜ HA-AT-TI [BE-LÍA]] / at-ta-aš-mi-in  
C ii 23'  nu a-pí-ia-ia [IM URÜ]  

A ctd.  ša-an-ne-eš-ni-it šar-la-a-[it]  
B ii 22-23  ša-an-ni-iš-ni-it / šar-la-a-it →  
C ii 24'  ša-an-ne-eš-ni-it [ ] →  

54 A obv. 26'  nu-za ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ŠA KUR URÜ MI-IZ-RI  
B ii 23-24  nu-za ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ME.ES / ŠA KUR URÜ MI-IZ-RI  
C ii 24'-25'  [ ] / ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ŠA [ ]  

A ctd.  tar-a [na-a]t-kán ku-en-ta nu  
B ii 24-25  tar-a [na-a]t / na-at-kán ku-en-ta nu ap-pa-a[n-te-eš]  
C ii 25'-26'  [ ] / na-at-kán ku-en-[ta]  

55 A obv. 27'  ku-in e-ep-pir na-an ma-a [HA-AT-TI]  
C ii 27'  ku-in e-ep-pir na-an [ ]  

A ctd.  EGIR-pa ú-wa-te-e-[er]  
B ctd.  EGIR-pa ú-wa-'te'[er]  
C ii 28'  EGIR-pa ú-wa-te-er →  

56 A obv. 28'  nu-kán I-NA ŠA[SA] LÜ.MEŠ SU.DAB.BI.HI.A  
B ii 28-29  nu-kán I-NA ŠA LÜ.MEŠ SU-AB-TU-TI / ši-in-kán ki-ša-at  
C ii 28'-29'  nu-[ša-an’] [ ] / ši-in-kán ki-ša-at  

A ctd.  na-aš ’ak-ki-iš’-ki-u-‘an’ d[a-a-iš]  
B ii 30  na-aš ak-ki-iš-ki-it  
C ctd.  na-a[š]  

CB  

57 A obv. 29'  ma-aḫḫa-an-ma-[kán] > LÜ.MEŠ SU.DAB.BI.'HI.A'  
B ii 31  ma-aḫḫa-an-ma-[kán] LÜ.MEŠ ŠA-AB-TU-TI  
C ii 30'-31'  [ma-a]ḫḫa-an-ma-[kán'] LÜ.MEŠ ŠA-[B-TU-TI]  

B ii 32-33  I-NA ŠA KUR URÜ HA-AT-TI ar-nu-ir / nu-kán ši-in-kán [X]  
C ii 31'-32'  [I-NA ŠA] KUR HA-[A]-TI ar-nu-[i[r] / [ ] →  

92 The traces show the sign aš written after ši-in-kán, which was left over erasing the preceding signs.
The scribe first wrote the sign ta but then corrected it to it.

The scribe wrote this sign with three verticals instead of one.
64 A obv. 36'  me-mi-ia-an-ma-kán LÚ.MEŠ  URU HA-AT-TI-pát ṭu-u-da-a-ak
   B ii 43-44  [ -a]n-ma-kán LÚ.ME.EŠ  URU HA-AT-TI — / [ ]
   C ii 41'-42'  [ -a]n-ma-kán LÚ.MEŠ  URU HA-[AT-TI ] / [ ]

A ctd.  šar-ri-i-e-er
B ctd.  [šar-ri]i-e-er →
C ctd.

65 A obv. 37'  'nu-wa-ra-aš ma-a-an A-NA dIM  URU HA-AT-TI BE'-LÍ'-IA
   B ii 45  [ ] i' URU HAT-TI EN-JA
   C ii 42'-43'  nu-wa-[a-aš ] / [ ]

A ctd.  [k]ar-dim-mi-ia-az   ki-ša-at
B ii 45-46  kar-dim-mi-ia-za / [ ] →
C ii 43'-44'  kar-d[im- ] / [ ] →

66 A obv. 38'  na-at ḫa-an-da-a-it-ta-at
   B ii 46  [ ḫ]a-an-ta-it-ta-at
   C ii 44'  [ ] ḫa-an-da-a-it-[a-at]

( C ii breaks)

67 A obv. 39'  a-ri-ia-nu-un  nu-mu-kán a-pí-ia-ia d[IM  URU HA-AT-TI ]
   B ii 47-48  a-ri-ia-nu-un / [ ]
   C ii 46'  [ nu-mu-ká]n a-pí-[a-ia]

A ctd.  EN-JA pí-ra-an ti-ia-u-an-zi
B ii 49  [ ] →

(C ii breaks)

68 A obv. 40'  ḫa-an-da-a-ıt-ta-at nu-za-kán k[a]-t-a-ša3 [A-NA PA-NI dIM wa-aš]-tıul
   B ii 49-50  [ ḫa-an-ta-it-ta-a]t / [ ] x x a3-[

A ctd.  tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un

(B ii breaks)

69 A obv. 41'  e-eš-zi-ia-at i-ia-u-e-en[n[a-ät nu(?) wa-aš-tuíl Ḫ-U[L] am-mu-uk pí-ra-an
70 A obv. 42'  ki-ša-an-za A-NA PA-AN A-BI-IA-m[a'-at]  ki-ša-an-za x x x x x a' an-da'
71 A obv. 43'  im-ma ša-a-ag-ga-aḫ-ḫi x [ x x x x x x x x (x) ] x
72 A obv. 44'  me-mi-ia-aš nu-za d[IM  URU HA-AT-TI BE-LÍ-IA ku-it(?) ke-e-da-ni(?) me

95 Traces of the sign a are preserved only in Goetze’s hand-copy of this manuscript.
-mi-ia-n]i(?)

73 A obv. 45' še-er kar-dim-mi-ia-u-wa-[an³-{za nu-kán I-NA ŠÀ KUR URU HA-AT-TI

74 A obv. 46' [a][k-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-r[i]

(A obv. breaks)

75' C iii 1' [nu-kán] 'ma-a-an I-NA ŠÀ KUR URU HA₁-A[T-TI

76' C iii 2' [ak-k[i]-iš-ki-it-ta-ri nu-za k[a-a-ša(?)]

77' C iii 3' [A-N][A d³IM URU HA-AT-TI EN-IA [ar-ku-wa-ar(?)]

78' C iii 4' [a-pâ][da še-er e-eš-ša-â]-hi nu-ut-ta³

79' C iii 5' [ḥ][a-li-iš-ki-mi nu du-ud-du ḫ[al-zi-â]-hî]

80' B iii 1' [ … ] x [ø]
B iii 2' [ ] iš-da-ma-aš
C iii 6' [n]u-mu d⁴U URU HA-AT-TI EN-IA iš-ta-[m[a-aš]

81' B iii 3' [ ] [ḥ]-i-in-kán [da-ru³]-ul[p-ta-ru]
C iii 7' [n]u-kán I-NA ŠÀ KUR HA-AT-TI [ḥ]-i-in-kán [da-ru-up-ta-ru]

CB

82' B iii 4' [ ] [a]-¹-ri¹-ia-nu-un
C iii 8' [νu]-za ut-tar ku-it ar-[ḥa a-ri-ia-nu-un [ø]

83' B iii 5' [ ] ku-e INIM.MEȘ [ḥa-an-da-it-ta-at

B iii 6' [ ] -iš-ki-mi erasure
C iii 10 [na-a]t EGIR-pa la-a-iš-ki-mi →

84' B iii 7' [ ] ša]r-ni-in-ki-iš-ki-mi
C iii 10'-11' na-at [ø] / [šar-ni]-³-ki-iš-ki-mi →

85' A rev. 1' [ ] →
B iii 8' [ ] DINGI[R-LIM ku-it ḫi-in-ga-ni
C iii 11'-12' [nu A-WA-AT NI-[IŠ DINGIR-LIM] / [ku-it ḫi]-³n-ga-ni

A ctd.
B iii 9'-10' [ ] [n]u 'SISKUR³ [ø]
C iii 12'-13' še-er ḫa-an-da-a³-it³-[ta-at] / [nu SISKUR] →

86' A rev. 2' [ ] →
B iii 10' [ ] A-NA d³⁴U URU HA-AT-TI
C iii 13' [N]I-IŠ DINGIR⁵LM A-NA d⁴U URU HA-A[T-TI]

A ctd.
B iii 11' [ ] ši-pa-an-t(e-er)
B iii 12' [ ] 'ar³-[ḥa ši]-³-pa³-an-ta-[â]-hu-un
C iii 14'  

\( \text{[BE-LÍ]} \)A(?) \( \text{pi-ra-an} \) ar-\( 
\text{ḫa} \) ši-\( 
\text{pa-a[n-ta-aḫ-ḫu-un]} \)

87'  

A rev. 3'  

B iii 12'  [na-at A-NA x x] x \( 
\text{pi-ra-an} \) erasure ar-\( 
\text{ḫa} \) ši-p(a-an-ta-aḫ-ḫu-un)

C iii 15' [\( 
\text{89'} \)  

A ctd. [\( 
\text{t} \)u-\( 
\text{uk} \)  

B iii 13'  [\( 
\text{i-in-ga-ni} \) / [\( 
\text{sše-er} \) / [\( 
\text{na-at-kán} \)

C iii 16' [\( 
\text{x x x SISKUR}\) 'tu\( 
\text{a-ša} \)

88' A rev. 4'  

B iii 13'-14' \( \text{[A]} \)\( \text{[NA]} \) \( \text{dU} \) \( \text{URU} \) \( \text{HA-T-TI} \) / [SISKUR]-\( \text{tia-aš\text{š}a} \)-\( \text{ma-aš} \)

C iii 16'-17' A-NA \( \text{dU} \) \( \text{URU} \) \( \text{TI-A[T-TI]} \) / [EN-IA i]-er SISKUR-\( \text{ia-aš} \)-\( \text{ma-aš} \)

A ctd. [\( 
\text{š} \)A \( \text{id} \)MA-\( \text{A-LA} \)-\( \text{ma-mu} \)

B iii 15' [\( 
\text{SISKUR} \) \( \text{š} \)A \( \text{id} \)MA-\( \text{A-LA} \)-\( \text{ma-mu} \)

C iii 17'-18' D[\( 
\text{INGIR.MEŠ} \) BE-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \)-\( \text{i-er} \)] / [SISKUR \( \text{š} \)A \( \text{id} \)MA]-\( \text{A-LA} \)-\( \text{ma-mu} \)

89' A rev. 5'  

B iii 16'-17' \[\( 
\text{k} \)u-\( 
\text{t} \) / \( 
\text{š} \)e\( \text{š} \)e-\( \text{r} \) ḫa\( \text{š} \)-\( \text{a} \)-\( \text{an} \)-\( \text{da-it} \)-\( \text{ta-at} \) / nu ka\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)

C iii 18'-19' \( \text{k} \)u\( \text{š} \)i \( \text{ḫi} \)-\( \text{in-ga-ni} \) / [\( 
\text{sše-er} \) \( \text{ḫa-an-da-i} \)-\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{a} \)-\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a]

A ctd. [\( 
\text{id} \)MA]-\( \text{A-LA} \) \( \text{ku-it} \)

B iii 17' [\( 
\text{A-NA} \) \( \text{id} \)MA-\( \text{A-LA} \)-\( \text{la} \)-\( \text{ku-it} \) →

C iii 20' [\( 
\text{ku-it} \)\( 
\text{t} \)

90' A rev. 6'  

B iii 17'-18' \( \text{i-ia-aḫ-ḥa-ri} \) / nu-mu \( \text{dU} \) \( \text{URU} \) \( \text{HA-T-TIE} \)EN-IA DIN GIR.ME ES

C iii 21' \( \text{i-ia-a[ḫ-ḥa-ri]} \) / [\( 
\text{EN-IA} \) DIN GIR.ME ES

A ctd. \( \text{[B]} \)E-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \) SISKUR \( \text{id} \)MA]-\( \text{A-LA} \) EGIR-an tar-na-at-tén

B iii 18'-19' BE-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \) / SISKUR \( \text{š} \)A \( \text{id} \)MA-\( \text{A-LA} \) EGIR-an tar-na-at-tén

C iii 21'-22' \( \text{BE-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \)} \) / [\( 
\text{id} \)MA]-\( \text{A-LA} \) EGIR-\( \text{an} \)\( \text{t} \)ar-[\( 
\text{na-at-tén} \)

91' A rev. 7'  

B iii 20'-21' nu SISKUR \( \text{š} \)A \( \text{id} \)MA-\( \text{A-LA} \)-\( \text{A} \)-i-ia-al-lu / na-at-kán

C iii 23' [\( 
\text{id} \)MA]-\( \text{A-LA} \) i-ia-\( \text{š} \)a-l[l(u)

A ctd. \( \text{aš-nu-śu-lu} \)\( \text{i-ia-mi-ia-at-az} \)

B iii 21' \( \text{a-ś} \)ša\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)u-\( \text{u} \)lu i-ia-mi\( \text{i-ia-at-az} \)

C iii 24' \( \text{a-ś} \)ša\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)u-\( \text{u} \)lu i-ia-mi\( \text{i-ia-at-az} \)

92' A rev. 8'  

B iii 22'-23' \( \text{ku-e-da-aś-aš} \)\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)a\( \text{š} \)u-\( \text{u} \)lu i-ia-mi\( \text{i-ia-at-az} \)

C iii 25' [\( 
\text{ku-e-da-ni u} \)d-da-n[\( \text{i-li}] i-ia-mi\( \text{i-ia-at-az} \)

A ctd. DIN GIR.ME ES BE-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \) ge-en-z[\( \text{u} \) da-at-tén]

B iii 23'-24' DIN GIR.ME ES BE-\( \text{LU} \)-\( \text{MEŠ} \)-\( \text{IA} \) gi-in-zu / da-at-tén →

C iii 26' [\( 
\text{gi-en-zu} \)\( \text{t} \)ta-ru

93' A rev. 9'  

nu-kán I-\( \text{NA} \)\( \text{š} \)i-\( \text{in-ga-an} \) la-az-z[\( \text{i-ia-a}]t-ta-ru
B ii 24'-25' nu-kán I-NA ŠÀ KUR URU HAT-TI ūṭ-'in-kán-an³ / SIG₃-ia-at-ta-ru
C iii 27' [ ] KU|R 'H₃₁-[A]₃'-TI ūṭ-'in-ga-an

ABC

94' A rev. 10' dIM URU HA-A[T-TI] BE-LU^{MEŠ} IA
B iii 26' dU URU HA-AT-TI BE-LÍ-IA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^{MEŠ} IA
C iii 28'-29' [ ] [ ]

A ctd. ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-a-r[i QA-TAM-M]A wa-aš-te-eš-kán-zi
B iii 27' ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-ri QA-TAM-MA wa-aš-te-eš-kán-zi
C iii 29' [ki-ik-k]i-iš-ta-a-r[i]

B iii 28' nu A-BU-IA-ia wa-aš-ta-aš nu-kán ŠÀ [ ]
C iii 30' [nu A-B]U-IA-ia wa-aš-t[a-aš]

A ctd. EN-[A me-m]j-ia-an za-a-i-iš
B iii 28'-29' [ ] / me-mi-an za-a-iš →
C iii 31' 'EN-[IA me-mi-an za-a-iš →

96' A rev. 12' am-mu-uk-ma 'Ū-UL ku-it-ki³ [wa]-aš-da-ab-[t]u-un
B iii 29'-30'am-mu-uk-ma Ü-'UL³ [ ] / wa-aš-ta-ab-[t]u-un
C iii 31'-32' [ ] / Ü-UL ku-it-ki wa-aš-t[a-aš-tu-un]

A ctd. nu ki-ik-ki-[š-t]a-a-ri QA-TAM-MA
B iii 30' nu ki-ik-ki-iš-[t[a-]
C iii 33' nu ki-ik-ki-iš-ta-a-r[i] →

97' A rev. 13' ŠÀ A-BU-ŠU-kán wa-aš-túl A-NA DUMU-ŠU a-ri
B iii 31' ŠÀ A-BU-ŠU-kán wa-aš-túl A-NA DUMU-ŠU 'a³-ri]
C iii 33'-34' [ ] / 'wa-aš-túl A-NA DUMU-ŠU a-[ri]

A ctd. n[u-ká]n a-mu-uq-qa ŠÀ A-BI-IA wa-aš-túl
B iii 32' nu-kán a[m-mu-uq-qa ŠÀ A-BI-IA wa-[aš-túl] →
C iii 34'-35' [ ] / ŠÀ A-BI-IA wa-aš-túl →

B iii 32'-33' [a-a]r-aš na-at-za-kán ka-a-ša A-NA dU URU HA-A[T-TI]
C iii 35'-36' a-[a]r-aš [ ] / ka-a-ša A-NA dU URU HA-AT-TI

A ctd. EN-IA Ü 'A⁴-[N]A DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^{MEŠ} IA
B iii 34' EN-IA A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^{MEŠ} IA →
C iii 36'-37' [ ] / A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU^{MEŠ} IA³

99' A rev. 15' pi-ra-an 'tar³-na-an 'har³-mi e-eš-zi-ia-at 'iš[i]a-u-e-na-at
B iii 34'-35' [p]i[r]a-an / tar-na-an t̜ar-mi e-eš³-z[i]³-[i-a]t i-a-[u-e-na-at
C iii 37'-38' [ ] / e-eš-zi-ia-at 'iš[i]

A ctd. n[u-z]a-kán ŠÀ A-BI-IA ku-it wa-aš-túl
B iii 36' nu-z[a-kán ŠÀ A-BI-IA'[ ku-i]t wa-aš-túl →
C iii 39' nu-z[a-kán ŠÀ A-BI-IA ]
100' A rev. 16' tar-na-an...ňar-mi nu A-NA dUrU HA-AT-TI EN-IA
B iii 36'-37' tar-na-an / ňar-mi nu A-NA dUrU [H]A-AT-TI EN-IA
C iii 40'-41' tar-na-an ňar-mi [ ] / EN-IA
A ctd. ŠÜ A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU MEŠ-IA ZI-an-za
B iii 38' ŠU A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU MEŠ-IA ZI-an-za →
C iii 41'-42' ŠU A-N[ ] / ZI-an-za →

101' A rev. 17' nam-ma wa-ar-ši-ia-ad-du nu-mu ge-en-zu nam-ma
B iii 38'-39' nam-ma / wa-ar-ši-ia-ad-du nu-mu ge-en-zu nam-ma
C iii 42'-43' na[ ] / nu-mu ge-e[n-zu ]
A ctd. da-a-at-tén nu-kán IŠ-TU KUR URU V A-AT-TI
B iii 40' da-at-tén nu-kán IŠ-TU KUR URU V A-AT-TI
C iii 43'-44' [ ] / nu-kán IŠ-T[U ] [ ] →

102' A rev. 18' [h]i-in-kán ar-ňa nam-ma u-i-ia-at-tén
B iii 41' [h]i-in-u gm[ ] aš nam-ma u-i-ia-at-tén
C iii 44'-45' [ ] / 'ar-ňa nam-[ma ]
A ctd. nu-kán ke-e-uš ku-i-e-eš LU MEŠ NINDA.GUR,[RA-]uš
B iii 42' [n]u-kán ku-u-uš ku-i-e-eš[ ] LU MEŠ NINDA,<GUR>[,RA-]uš
C iii 45'-46' [ ] / [LU ] MEŠ NIND[ A,]<GUR>[,][RA-]uš
(C iii breaks)

103' A rev. 19' LÜ MEŠ iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ia'-li'-uš te-e-pa-u-e-eš
B iii 43' LÜ MEŠ iš-pa-an-tu-zi-ia-li-e-eš te-e-pa-u-e-eš
A ctd. a-aš-ša-an-te-eš na-at'-mu [le-e ak-ka] an-zi
B iii 44' 'a'-<aš>-ša-an-te-eš na-at — 'le-e ak-kán-zi

AB

104' A rev. 20' nu-za ka-a-ša A-NA dIM EN-IA Šh-[i[ng]a-ní še-er
A ctd. ar-ku-u-wa-ar e-eš-ša-ab-[t]i
B iii 46' [a]r-ku-u-wa-ar e-eš-ša-ab-[t]i →

105' A rev. 21' nu-μu dUrU HA-AT-TI EN-IA iš-ta'-ma'-aš nu-mu
B iii 46'-47' nu-μu dUrU HA-AT-TI / [EN-I]A iš-da-ma-aš nu-mu
A ctd. Šh-iš-nu-ut nu-ut'-tá-kán k[i-iš-ša-an me-ma-ab-[t]i
B iii 47' 'TT-nu-ut
(B iii ends)

106' A rev. 22' MUŠEN-iš-za-kán GIS tap-ta-ap-pa-an EGIR-pa e-ep-zi na-an GIS
    tap-ta-[a]p-pa-aš Šh-u-[iš-nu-zi]
107' A rev. 23' na-aš-ma ma-a-an A-NA ÏR-TI ku-e-da-₃ ni-ik-ki ku-it-ki na-a[k]-ki
ia-aḫ-ḫu-a[n]


109' A rev. 25' ku-it na-ak-ki-aḫ-ḫu-an na-at-ši 'SIG₃-aḫ-zi na-aš-ma ma-a-an
ku-it n[a-
A ctd. A-NA ÏR-TI ku-e-da-₃ ni-ik-ki
D 2' Ï[ ]R-TI ku-e-[da-ni-ik-ki

D 3' [ A ctd. na-an EN-ŠU ku-it a-pi-ia
D 4' ku-it a-pi-ia

111' A rev. 27' i-e-ez-zi na-an i-e-ez-zi wa-aš-tūl-ma-az-k[ān] 'A-NA' PA-NI
D 4' i-e-ez-zi [wa-aš-tūl-ma-az-kā[n]
A ctd. EN-ŠU ku-it tar-na-a-i
D 5' [ A ctd.

112' A rev. 28' nu A-NA EN-ŠU ZI-an-za wa-ar-ši-ia-az-[i nu EN]-ŠU a-pu-u-un
D 6' [ A ctd.

113' A rev. 29' [a]m-mu-uk-za-kān ŠA A-BI-IÅ wa-aš-tūl tar-₃ na-[a]-ša-a na-at i-ia-nu-na-at

114' A rev. 30' [ma-a]n šar-ni-ik-ze-el ku-iš nu a-pé-[e-ez ḫi-in-ga]-na-az ka-ra-ú-ia ku-it me-ek-ki

DAB ú-wa-te-er [A ctd.


121 A rev. 37' [nu-ut-t]a ka-a-ša am-mu-uq-qa A-NA 4UR HA-AT-TI EN-IA
B iv 4' [ ] [ ]
C iv 1'-2' [ ] ] ka-a-šj a[m-] ] /
A ctd. ar-ku-eš-ki-mi nu-mu TI-nu-ut
B iv 5' [ ] ]
C iv 2' 'ar'1-ku-eš-k[i-mi ]

122 A rev. 38' [nu ma-a]-an ke-e-ez-za ku-wa-at-qa ud-da-a-na-az
B iv 6' [ ] [ ] ud-da-a-na-az
C iv 3' [ ] [ ] -a)n ke-e-ez-za ku-w[a- ]
A ctd. ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri na-at ku-it-ma-an
B iv 7' [ ] [ ] k]u-it-ma-an
C iv 4' [ak-ki-i-š-k]i-ti-ta-r]i n[a-at ]

123 A rev. 39' [EGIR-p]a SIG5-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-mi nu-kán ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ
B iv 8' [ ] [ ] 'nu'-kán ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ
C iv 5' [ ] SIG5-aḫ-hi-iš-k]i-mi nu-kán ŠA ]
A ctd. ku-i-e-es LÜ.MEŠ NINDA.GUR4.RA LÜ.MEŠ.iš-pa-an-tu-uz-z[i-la-aš-ša
B iv 9' [ ] [ ] LÜ.MEŠ.HE-iš-pa-<an>-tu-uz-ze-e-la-aš-ša
C iv 5'-6' [ ] [ ] LÜ.MEŠ.NINDA.GUR4.]RA LÜ.MEŠ.DUG.iš-pa-an-[u ]

124 A rev. 40' [a-aš-š]a-an-te-eš na-at le-e nam-ma ak-kán- erasure zi
B iv 10' [ ] [ ] l[e-e nam-ma ak-kán-zi
C iv 7' [ ] [ ] -an]te-eš na-at le-e nam-[ma ]
A

125 A rev. 41' [na-aš-m]a ma-a-an ta-me-e-ta-az-i-a ku-e-ez-qa
B iv 11' [ ] [ ] ta-me]-e3-da-z[i-i-a ku-e-ez-qa
C iv 8' [ ] [ ] ma]-a'a-an ta-me-ta-zi-ia ]'ku'[-e-ez-qa
A ctd. ud-da-a-na-az ak-ki-iš-ki-it-t[a-r]i
B iv 12' [ ] [ ] -t[a-r]i →
C 8'-9' [ ] [ ] [ak-ki-i-š-k]i-ti-ta-r]i

126 A rev. 42' [na-at-za-ká]n na-aš-šu te-eš-ḫi-it ú-wa-al-lu na-aš-ma-at
B iv 12'-13' [ ] [ ] na-at-za-kán na-aš-šu ] [ ] [ ] na-aš-ma-at
C iv 9'-10' na-at-za-kán n[a-aš-šu ] [ ] [te-eš-ḫi-i]t ú-wa-al-lu na-aš-ma-at
A ctd. a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-až
233

B iv 13’  a-ri-ia-še-es-na-za-ma
C iv 10’  a-ri-ia-še-es-na-a

127’ A rev. 43’  [ḫa-an-da-i-a]-a-ta-ru na-aš-ma-at LÛ.DINGIR-LIM-ni-an-za-ma
B iv 14’  [ ] -t[a]-ru na-aš-ma-at LÛ.DINGIR-LIM-ni-an-za-ma
C iv 11’  [ḫa-an-da]-i[a]-at-ru na-aš-ma-at LÛ.DINGIR-L[I][M]-ni-an-za-ma

A ctd.  me-ma-a-ú na-aš-ma 'A-NA' [LÛ.MEŠ SANGA]
B iv 15’  [me-ma-a]-ú [na-aš-ma]96 A-NA LÛ.MEŠ SANGA erasure
C iv 12’  [me-ma-a]-ú na-aš-ma A-NA LÛ.MEŠ SANGA

128’ A rev. 44’  [ku-it ū-u-ma-an] a-a-aš wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un
B iv 16’  [ku-it] da-[pí-ia-aš?] wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un
C iv 12’-13’ ku-it / [ū]-u-ma-an-da-aš wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un

A ctd.  na-at-ša-ma-aš šu-up-pa-ia še-es-k[i-iš-kán-zi]
B iv 17’  'na-at-za š[u-up-pa] a še-es-k[i-iš-kán-zi]
C 13’-14’ na-at-za šu-up-pa / [še-es-k][i-iš-kán-zi] →

129’ A rev. 45’  [ ] URU HA-AT-TI EN-IA ū-u-iš-nu-ut
B iv 18’  nu-mu erasure d[U] RU HA-AT-TI EN-IA TI-nu-ut
C iv 14’-15’ nu-mu d[U] URU HA-AT-TI EN-IA / [TI]-nu-ut

A ctd.  nu-za DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU.MEŠ erasure 'IA'
B iv 19’  nu-za DINGIR.MEŠ B[E-LU.MEŠ IA] →
C iv 15’  nu-za DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU.MEŠ IA →

130’ A rev. 46’  [ ] 'ti-ik'-ku-uš-nu-wa-an-du
B iv 19’-20’ pa-ra-a ū-an-da-an-da-a-tar / ti-ik-ku-uš-n[u]-wa-a]n'-du
C iv 15’-16’ pa-ra-a ū-an-da-an-ta-tar / 'ti'-ik-ku-uš-nu-wa-an-du

A ctd.  na-at-za-kán a-p[i-ia] →
B iv 21’  na-at-za-kán a-p[i-ia] ku-iš-ki →
C 16’-17’ na-at-za-kán a-p[i-ia] / ku-iš-ki →

131’ A rev. 47’  [ ] 'ud-da'-a-na-az
C iv 17’-18’ te-es-ḫi-it / a-uš-du nu ku-e-ez-za / ud-da-na-az

A ctd.  ak-ki-iš-ki-it[ta-ri] →
B iv 23’  'ak-ki-iš-ki-it[ia-ta-ri] na-at
C iv 18’-19’ ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri / na-at

132’ A rev. 48’  [ ] URUDU ZI.KIN.BA]R-aš
B iv 23-24’ ū-e-mi-ia-at-ta-ru / [ ]
C iv 19’  ū-e-mi-ia-at-ta-ru nu-kán URUDU ZI.KIN3.BAR-aš

A ctd.  GIS š[ar-pa-az]
B ctd.  GIS š[ar-pa-az] ku-un-ku-u-e-ni
C iv 20’  GIS š[ar-pa-az] ku-un-ku-u-e-ni →

96 Traces of the sign ma are visible on the photograph of the tablet.
Translation

1-18 [O Sto]rmgod of Ḫatti, my lord, [and gods of Ḫatti], my [l]ords! Murš[ili], [the king], your servant, has sent me (saying): “Go speak to the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord, and to the gods, my lords, as follows: What is this you have done? You have allowed a plague into the land of Ḫatti and the land of Ḫatti has been very greatly oppressed by the plague. During the reign of my father and during the reign of my brother there was continual dying, and since I have become a priest to the gods, also now, during my reign, there is continual dying. This is the twentieth year since there is continual dying within the land of Ḫatti and the plague is not at all removed from the land of Ḫatti. I myself cannot overcome the wo[r]ry with my heart, I can no longer overcome the anguish with my body.

19-33 [Further]more, also when I performed the festivals, I went [bac]k and forth to all the gods. I did not prefer one temple. I have repeatedly made a plea to all the gods concerning the plague and I have repeatedly [vow]ed vos to you]: “Hear [me, O gods], my [lords, and send away] the plague [from the land of Ḫatti]. [Ḫattuša [can no longer] overcome [the plague]. Let [the matter because of which there is continual dy]ing be [deter]mined [either through an oracle, or let me see it in a dream, or] let a [man of go]d pronounce it.” But the gods [did not hear] me, and the plague has not
subsid[ed in the land] of Ḫatti. [The land of Ḫatti continues to be very greatly oppressed]sed [by the plague].

34-40

The makers of thick bread [and libation pourers] of the gods who remained also die[d. The matter of [the plague] continued to trouble [me] and [I …] of god/s …]. I have f[oun]d two old tablets. One tablet (deals) [with the ritual of Mala river97: how the previous kings [perform]ed the ritual of the Mala river [on account of] a plague. Meanwhile, from the days of my father, [there has been continual death] in the land of Ḫatti, [(but)] we never performed [the ritual] of the Mala river.

41-56

The second tablet (deals with) the city of Kuruštama: how the Stormgod of Ḫatti carried the men of Kuruštama to the land of Egypt and how the Stormgod of Ḫatti made a treaty concerning them (i.e. the men of Kuruštama) and the men of Ḫatti. Furthermore, they were put under oath by the Stormgod of Ḫatti. Since the men of Ḫatti and the men of Egypt were bound by the oath by the Stormgod of Ḫatti, and the men of Ḫatti proceeded to turn about; the men of Ḫatti suddenly transgressed the oath of the gods. My father sent infantry and chariotry and they attacked the border region of the land of Egypt, the land of Amka, [manuscript A: And again he sent (them), and again they attacked]. When the men of Egypt became afraid, [B: they sent again], they came and they asked my father outright for his son for kinship. When my father gave them his son, as they led him off, they killed him. My father became angry, he went to the land of Egypt, attacked the land of Egypt and destroyed infantry and chariotry of the land of Egypt. Even then, the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord let my father prevail by (his) judgement, and so he defeated the infantry and chariotry of the land of Egypt, and he destroyed them. When they brought back to Ḫatti the prisoners of war whom they captured a plague broke out among the prisoners of war and they began to die [B: kept dying].

57-62

When they transported the prisoners of war into the land of Ḫatti, the prisoners of war brought the plague into the land of Ḫatti. And from that day on there has been continual dying in the land of Ḫatti. When I found the aforementioned tablet dealing with the land of Egypt, I inquired from

97 lit. the first tablet (was) of the ritual of the Mala river.
the god by an oracle (saying)\textsuperscript{98}: “Concerning that thing mentioned earlier (i.e. the oath) which was done by the Stormgod of Ḫatti; because the men of Egypt and the men of Ḫatti were bound by the oath by the Stormgod of Ḫatti (and)

because the damnaššara-deities (were) inside the temple of the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord [B: inside the temple of the god], but the men of Ḫatti on their own suddenly broke the word (lit. transgressed the word). If the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord, is angry on account of it?” This was confirmed.

I have also made an oracular inquiry about the ritual of the Mala River on account of the plague. And at that time it was determined for me that I should stand (in plea) before the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord. I have just confessed the sin to the Stormgod. It is (true), we have done [it. However, the sin did not] happen during my reign, [it happened] during the reign of my father […]. Indeed I know […]. The matter […]. [Because] the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord] is angry about [that matter], there is continual dying [within the land of Ḫatti].

When there is continual dying in the land of Ḫatti. [Because of this I am making [a plea] to the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord. I am kneeling before you and I cry for mercy. Hear me, O Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord! Let the plague be brought to an end within the land of Ḫatti!

I am resolving the matter on account of which I have made an oracular inquiry and the matters which were ascertained (for me) on account of the plague. I am making restitution for them. Because the matter of oath concerning the plague has been confirmed, I have offered before the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord, the ritual of oath [(and)] before [the gods, my lords] I have offered [it] (A: they have offered it). They have celebrated the ritual for you, the Stormgod of Ḫatti, [my lord], and they have celebrated the ritual for you, [the gods, my lords]. Since the festival of the Mala River concerning the plague has been confirmed for me, and since I am on my way (lit. going) to the Mala River, O Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord and gods, my lords remit the festival of the Mala River to me. Let me perform the festival of the Mala River, let me carry it out. In the matter in

\textsuperscript{98} lit. I inquired from a deity through an oracle
which I am performing it, namely the plague, O gods, my lords have pity on me! Let the plague become well (i.e. subside) in the land of Hatti.

O Stormgod of Ḥatti, my lord! O gods, my lords! It always happens so – people sin (lit. they sin). Also my father sinned. He transgressed the word of the Stormgod of Ḥatti, my lord. But as for me, I did not sin in any way. It always happens so – the sin of a father comes upon his son. And so the sin of my father came upon me too. I have been confessing it to the Stormgod of Ḥatti, my lord, and to the gods, my lords. It is so, we have done it. Because I have been confessing the sin of my father, may the soul of the Stormgod of Ḥatti, my lord, and of the gods, my lords, be appeased again! Have pity on me again! Send the plague away from the land of Ḥatti again! Let those few makers of thick bread and the libation bearers who remain not die! (A: on me)

I am making a plea concerning the plague to the Stormgod, my lord. Hear me, O Stormgod of Ḥatti, my lord! Save me! To you [I say] as follows: ‘The bird takes refuge (lit. takes back the cage) in the cage and the cage saves it. Or if anything is a concern to some servant, he makes a plea to his master. His master hears him and has pity on him; and whatever was a concern, he sets it right for him. Or if some servant commits an offence, but he confesses the offence before his master, as his master treats him there he may treat him but since he confesses his offence before his master, the soul of his master is appeased and his master will not call that servant to account. I have confessed the sin of my father. It is (true), I have done it. [If there was any reparation (to be made), and because (Ḫatti) has paid already much through that plague and (for) the war prisoners whom they brought from the land of Egypt and civilian captives whom they brought, that (for) which Ḫattuša has made restitution through the plague, [it (i.e. Ḫattuša) has made restitution] for it twentyfold already. It happens so. And yet the soul of the Storm-god of Ḥatti, my lord, and of the gods, my lords, is not at all appeased. Or if you impose on me some special restitution, tell me about it in a dream so that I can give it to you!

99 lit. If an offence is on some servant
I continue to make a plea to you, the Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord. Save me!
If perhaps there has been continual dying because of this matter, let the
makers of the thick bread and libation bearers of the gods who remain not
die anymore, while I am setting it right!

[Or] if there has been continual dying because of some other matter, let me
either see it in a dream, or let it be determined through an oracle, or let a
man of the gods pronounce (it), or the priests will keep sleeping sacredly
(A: for you), with regard to that (matter in) which I instructed all of them.
Save me, O Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord! Let the gods, my lords, show
(their) divine power, and then let someone see it in a dream! Let this
matter because of which there has been continual dying be discovered! We
are dangling from the point of a needle. Save me, O Stor[mgod of Ḫa]tti,
my [lo]rd! Let the plague be aga[in remo]ved from the land of Ḫatti!

Colophon C

Tablet One. (Text) complete. [When] Muršili, [the king, made a p]le[a to
the Stormgod of Ḫatti and the gods] con[cerning] the plague.

Comments

2 Goetze (1930: 206; 1950: 394), followed by Bernabé (1987: 279), Christmann-
restored at the end of the line LUGAL.GAL “the great king”. Beckman (1997a:
157) and Kühne (1978: 170) read here LUGAL. An alternative reading is
proposed here, namely LUGAL-uš. The phrase מMUR-ŠI-LI LUGAL-uš is also
employed in obv. 4 of manuscript B of the hymn and prayer to Telipinu (CTH
377) and is restored in line i 1 of manuscript B of a prayer and hymn to the
Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II).

8 For the translation of aruma mekki as “very greatly” see Puhvel HED: vol.1: 177.

10 ku-it-ta-ia-wa-az is interpreted here as kuitt=a=ia=wa=za with a double writing
of the conjunction (-aya). This writing of the conjunction after words ending in a
consonant is occasionally found in New Hittite texts (see HG: 399-400 § 29.38).

13-14 kāš MU.20.KAM kuit=kan INA ŠÀ KUR ÛRU ḪATTI akkiškittari
The exact function of the particle -kan in this sentence is uncertain. Usually, it does not appear with the verb akk- ‘to die’ unless there is a dative expression indicating person(s) most affected by the death. The translation of this construction is “to die on somebody” (HG: 371 § 28.76). Since this expression is not used here, the particle must have another function; perhaps it conveys the local restriction, since it appears with the phrase INA ŠÀ KUR URU HATTI. The particle -kan with the same phrase and the verb akk- also appears in lines 58-59.


14-15  nu=kan IŠTU KUR URU HATTI Ŧînkan arḫa UL=pat taruptari


The literal meaning of the verb tarupp- in the middle voice is “to be completed; to collect oneself” (HW: 217, Tischler HEG vol. 3: 240, Kloekhorst 2008: 850); however, neither of these meanings fits the present context. Since the verb tarupp- appears here with the adverb/preverb arḫa and the noun in the ablative case (IŠTU KUR URU HATTI), it must mean “to remove from”. A similar translation can be found in all translations and editions of this text (for a discussion of the meaning of this verb see also Goetze 1930: 222-3).

17-18  ammuk=ma=z ŠÀ-az laḫlabbûman UL taraḫmi NÍ.TE-az=ma=z(a) ṭittuliyan namma UL taraḫmi

ŠÀ-az and NÍ.TE-az are read here as ablatives of means depending on the verb tarḫ-. This interpretation follows Stefanini (1983: 147 with a discussion of this expression).
Enclitic -ma attached to ammuk and to NÍTE marks a change of topic in each case; the first -ma indicates the change from the description of the situation in Ḫatti to the description of the emotional state of the king, the second -ma the change from heart (ŠÂ) to body (NÍTE). Neither of these conjunctions is rendered in the English translation of these two sentences.

21 1-EN É DINGIR-LIM=kan UL tehḫun. The literal meaning of this sentence employing the first singular preterite of the verb dai- ‘to lay, to put, to place’ and the particle -kan is “I did not put one/a single temple”. The general sense is that the king did not favour one god while he was pleading and making restitutions on account of the plague. On the contrary, the king emphasises the fact that he went to the temples of all the gods and that he made offerings and vows to all the gods. Consequently, the sentence is rendered in this edition as “I did not prefer one temple”. The same interpretation of this sentence was adopted by other editors or translators of this text, which is reflected in their renderings of this sentence. Thus Goetze (1930: 207) read this sentence as “ein Gotteshaus (allein) pflegte ich nicht”, “I never preferred one temple” (1950: 394); Lebrun (1980: 210) and Christmann-Franck (1989: 53) as “je n’ai pas omis? un seul temple”; Beckman (1997a: 157) as “I did not privilege any single temple”; Singer (2002a: 58) as “I did not pick out any single temple” and finally van den Hout (2006: 263) as “not a single temple did I leave aside.”


The reading \([ma]-l-[a]l\)- at the beginning of line i 25 of manuscript C was suggested by CHD L-N: 134. Since it is consistent with the traces shown in Goetze’s hand-copy and on the photograph it is followed here. The beginning of this word in manuscript B is broken off. The traces of the sign appearing before za seem to be consistent with al, therefore the reading \([ma]-a]l-[za]-\) is restored here. The spelling of the first singular preterite iterative ma-al-za-aš-ki-nu-un is attested only in this text. The other spelling of the same form as ma-al-za-ki-nu-un is found in KBo 23.111 rev. 13’.
The restorations in lines 26-27 are based on a similar sentence in lines 93’-94’ of CTH 378.I. The restorations in lines 29-30, 32 and 33 are based on lines 132’-133’ and 7-8 of the present text.

The sentence in lines 34-35 is restored from lines 123’-124’ of the present text. However, the exact spelling of the restored ĿŪ.MEŠš is-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ia-l- remains uncertain. This noun is spelled as ĿŪ.MEŠš is-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ia-li-uš (manuscript A) and as ĿŪ.MEŠš is-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ia-lie-eš (manuscript B) in lines 108’-109’ and as ĿŪ.MEŠš is-pa-<an>-tu-uz-ze-e-la-aš-ša (manuscript A) and ĿŪ.MEŠš is-pa-<an>-tu-uz-ze-e-la-aš-ša (manuscript B) in line 129’.


Goetze (1930: 208) followed by Lebrun (1980: 204) and by Trabazo (2002: 312) read at the beginning of this line [zi-la-d]u-wa. Although the photograph of manuscript A confirms the reading wa, the sign that precedes it could also be interpreted as ma. The gap at the beginning of the line can accommodate approximately four signs. In view of the above, it is suggested here that the word which is now missing in the lacuna was ma-ḥa-an. The phrase 1 DUP-PU ŠA … maḥḥan, would mirror the construction in lines 41-42.

The traces preserved at the end of obv. 10 of manuscript A (here line 38) could be read as either kan or ni. The first reading was adopted by Goetze, who restored here ḫi-in-kā[n ḫar-kir] thus postulating the construction with the auxiliary verb ḫar(k)- and the neuter nominative-accusative singular participle of the verb ḫink- “to offer”. Goetze also restored at the beginning of the next line ki-nu-na (1930: 208). An alternative restoration proposed here is ḫi-in-<ga>-n[i] at the end of obv. 10 of manuscript A and [še-er i-e]r at the beginning of the next line. The lacuna at the beginning of obv. 11 of manuscript A is large enough to fit three to four signs, therefore the restoration of only [i-e]r would not fill the entire gap. This restoration assumes that the ritual of the Mala river was performed on account of a plague by earlier kings but was neglected by Muršili’s father and by
Muršili himself. The main consequence of this neglect is the continual destruction of the Hittite population by the plague.

A faint line is drawn through ii 4 of manuscript B (KUB 14.11 + 650/u). It appears that either the scribe drew this line first and then decided to write over it or decided to draw here a paragraph line after having written the text. Since the line is drawn in the middle of a sentence, thus dividing it between two paragraphs, the first possibility is more likely.

The authors of CHD Š: 303 (sub k) translate the expression *peran waḫmu* - as “to be or become important, vital, preeminent, to gain pre-eminence, get the upper hand”. This is followed by Beckman (1997a: 158) and by Singer (2002a: 58). The latter renders this expression as “to gain the upper hand”. The other translations of this phrase in the context of this prayer include “schulgen … in den Wind” (Goetze 1930: 209) and “prevail” (1950: 395); “détourner (le serment)” (Lebrun 1980: 211 and Christmann-Franck 1989: 54); “transgredir” by Trabazo (2002: 315 and a footnote 53) and “turn away” by van den Hout (2006: 164).

Although the main meaning of the preverb/postposition *peran* is “in front, before” and *peran waḫmu* - may in some text carry the meaning “to be important, get the upper hand” (see CHD Š: 303), in this context the expression must mean “to turn around/about” and thus implies that the Hittites had a change of heart and breached the treaty with Egypt.

The sentences *namma=ia uiyat* “and again he sent” and *nu namma walaḫḫir* “and again they attacked” appear only in manuscript A. The first sentence is written on the edge and on the reverse of the tablet; the second is written over an erasure. Miller (2007a: 268) surmises that the scribe either added these phrases by mistake or that he began to add details of the Hittite attack but then changed his mind and ‘summarized’ this military event in these two sentences.

Note the use of the conjunction *-ma* in line 48 and in line 51 to mark the change of topic from “the men of Ḫatti”, to “the men of Egypt” and then from “the men of Egypt” to Šuppiluliuma.

The verb *kappilazza* - is taken by Kloekhorst (2008: 439) and Melchert (1987: 198-199) as a Cuneiform Luwian word meaning “become hostile” (Kloekhorst),
“become angry” (Melchert). Melchert suggests that the form *kappilaza* may be the iterative of an ā(i)- stem verb, here *kappilā(i)-*, which he renders as “be angry”. He further argues that this verb is also attested in Hittite *kappilā(i)-*, which he translates as “to incite anger”. This interpretation is followed by Puhvel in *HED* vol. 4: 63, who renders the verb *kappilai*- as “to pick a fight” and the form *kappilazzata* as “initiated conflict”.

The scribe of manuscript B wrote here *attaš=min*, rather than the Akkadogram *A-BA-IA* (ms A). The scribe composed the text in the New Hittite period when the enclitic possessive pronouns had begun to fall out of use. He therefore declined only the final element of the bipartite construction (i.e. noun + possessive pronoun). For this phenomenon in New Hittite texts see Francia (1996: 210-211) and *HG*: 141 § 6.9.

The noun *ḫannešar* has been rendered in this context as “Urteil zum Überlegenen” by Goetze (1930: 211) and “by his decision” (1950: 395); “to win in a dispute” Kühne (1978: 172); “jugement” (Lebrun 1980: 212; Christmann-Franck 1989: 53); “the lawsuit” by Beckman (1997a: 158); “verdict” by Singer (2002a: 58); “decision” Trabazo (2002: 317) and “lawsuit” by van den Hout (2006: 264).

Trabazo rightly argues that Muršili must have thought that by making his decision/judgement about granting victory to Šuppiluliuma, the Stormgod supported and approved the king’s action. One may also suggest that by using this noun the king attempts to justify the action of his father and reminds the Stormgod that attacking Egypt and thus breaching the treaty was initially supported by the god.

Note the singular common relative pronoun *kuin* and enclitic pronoun -*an* in line 55 as well as the singular common pronoun -*aš* in line 65 all referring to the collective plural *LÜ.MEŠ appan [teš?] in manuscript B and *LÜ.MEŠŠU.DAB.BI.HI.A* in manuscript A.

The amount of space at the end of line ii 29’ of manuscript C allows only for the restoration of the third singular preterite *ak-ki-iš-ki-it* also found in manuscript B rather than *ak-ki-iš-ki-u-an d[a-a-iš]* employed in manuscript A.
Because the *damnaššara*-deities were present in the temple when the oath was sworn, they must have been the deities who protected or guaranteed the oath (Beckman 1997: 158). For brief discussions of the nature of these deities see Goetze (1930: 228-229), Trabazo (2002: 319 footnote 100), Tischler HEG III: 85-6 (statues of deities in the shape of animals), van den Hout (1991: 108 n. 34, movable images), Güterbock (1961: 15, sphinxes), Goetze (1953: 169, female deities who were guarding the gate).

The pronoun *-aš* is interpreted here as the nominative singular common that refers back to the phrase *kuiš memiyaš* in line 61, which in turn must refer to the treaty with Egypt created and supported by the Stormgod of Ḫatti and then breached by the Hittites. The verb *kiš-* links here two nominatives, the pronoun *-aš* and the noun *kardimmiyaz* (thus Singer 2002a: 59 and van den Hout 2006: 264). The sentence is translated in this edition “If the Stormgod of Ḫatti is angry on account of it (i.e. the breaking of the oath)”.

Manuscript A employs in obv. 35’ phrase *I-NA ŠÀ BI É IM URU ḤA-AT-TI BE-LÍ IA*. Manuscript B has *I-NA ŠÀ BI DINGIR-LIM*. The lacunae at the end of line ii 40 and at the beginning of line ii 41 of manuscript C are not large enough for a restoration *dIM URU ḤA-AT-TI BE-LÍ-IA/EN-IA*. Therefore it is assumed that manuscript C used the same phrase as manuscript B.

The traces that appear in obv. 40’ of manuscript A immediately before and above the break are consistent with *ka* as written in this manuscript, *a* and *ša*. Since there is no space between these signs they are read here as one word (i.e. *kāša*). This word appears in the sentence together with the expression *ANA PANI dIM waštul tarna* restored partially in the break.

Melchert 1985: 186 proposes here the restoration of the expression *natta anda imma šāggabḫḫi*, which he interprets as a rhetorical question and translates as “Do I not acknowledge …?” Although this restoration is entirely possible in this context, it cannot be ascertained.
Note the unusual syntactic position of the nominative singular common of the word memiya- “word, matter”. It stands at the end of the sentence that is now lost in the gap.

Traces preserved in line iii 2’ of manuscript C before the break are consistent with the sign ka, hence the restoration ka-a-ša. kaša expresses and reinforces here the “immediate present” contemporaneous with the speech act: while the Hittite lands are being ravaged by the plague, the king pleads with the gods to put a stop to this disaster.

The restoration [ar-ku-wa-ar] is supported by the context and by the fact that the sentence uses the particle -za in combination with the verb ešša-. For the expression -za arkuwar ešša- see chapter two.

[nu]=za uttar kuit arḫa ariyanun

HW: 30 translates the verb ariya- with the preverbs anda, arḫa, katta and peran as “durch Orakel bestimmen”. Kammenhuber HW²: 294 § 3a renders arḫa ariya- as “wegorakeln (durch Orakel aus der Welt schaffen)”. Beckman (1997: 158) translates this expression as “research thoroughly (through oracular inquiry)”; while all other scholars who either edited or translated this text render it as “make an oracular enquiry”. Another translation could also be suggested. Puhvel HED vol. 1: 131 and Kloekhorst (2008: 245) translate the adverb arḫa as “off, away (from), out of, on account of”. Since the meaning “on account of” fits the context well, it is adopted in this edition and the sentence is rendered as “the matter on account of which I have consulted the oracle …”

The function of the adverb arḫa in the sequence peran arḫa šipand- is to strengthen the preceding adverb peran (on this function of the adverb arḫa see Puhvel HED vol. 1: 131).

Manuscript B employs at the end of line iii 10’ šipantaḥjun. The traces preserved in rev. 2’ of manuscript A suggest that this verbal form was not used in this manuscript. The traces are consistent with te rather than with the expected talda, therefore the verbal form used in manuscript A must have been šipanter.
87’-88’ All restorations in lines iii 14’-18’ of manuscript C are only based on the context and must consequently remain uncertain (for a similar understanding of these lines see Goetze 1950: 395 and Kühne 1978: 173). Note that the break at the beginning of C iii 15’ is not large enough for the restoration of the expected na-at A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-IA. There also seems not to be enough space for a restoration na-at A-NA 4U EN-IA.

90’ The verb tarna- with the preverb appan was translated in HW: 215 as “überlassen; nachlassen, verziehen, erlassen”. Goetze (1930: 215) and (1950: 395) translated it as “nachlassen” and as “acquit”; Beckman (1997a: 158) rendered it as “leave me alone”, Lebrun (1980: 213) followed by Christmann-Franck (1989: 55) as “accepter”, van den Hout (2006: 265) as “let me off the hook”, Trabazo (2002: 323) as “dispensadme” and Kühne (1978: 173) as well as Singer (2002a: 59) as “forgive me”. The translation adopted in this edition is “to remit”. The king begs the gods to be absolved in the matter of neglecting of the ritual of the Malā river, since he is on his way to perform it.

91’-92’ iyami=ya=at=za kuedani uddani ūngani ūer

This sentence is interpreted here as a relative clause. The verb iya- is fronted in accordance with the rule that the relative pronoun is preceded by one syntactic constituent (Hale 1987: 49, Garrett 1994: 46, HG: 425 § 30.60). A similar interpretation was suggested by Kühne 1978: 173, who renders this sentence as “in the matter because of which I am performing it, namely because of the plague”.

103’ The usual spelling of the participle of the verb āšš- “to remain, to stay, to be left” is a-aš-ša-an-t- (cf. manuscript A a-aš-ša-an-te-eš). The scribe of manuscript B spelled it as a-ša-an-te-eš; probably this is just a scribal mistake.

106’ The noun Gištaptappa- was translated here as “nest” by Beckman (1985: 22) and (1997a: 158), Goetze (1950: 395), Christmann-Franck (1989: 56), Kühne (1978: 173) and Trabazo (2002: 325). The translation “cage” (see Singer 2002a: 60; van den Hout 2006: 265) is also possible in this context particularly because the author evokes here an image of the ‘ideal’ relationship between a servant and his master. When a servant is faced with a problem he seeks the help and assistance of his master; when he commits an offence against his master, but he confesses, the
master forgives his servant. Because the focus seems to be here on the relationship between a servant and his master, the sentence “the bird seeks the refuge in the cage”, could be understood as “the bird seeks refuge with its owner”. For a similar interpretation of this noun and this metaphor see Singer (1996: 66).

114’-117’

The sentences that begin with restored ma-a-an in line 114’ and end with the verb ki-ša-ri in line 117’ are difficult to interpret. The restorations at the beginning of lines 114’, 116’ and 117’ follow Goetze (1930: 216), the restoration in line 115’ is borne by the context and by the translation of Singer (2002a: 60) “has been paid”. Following Singer, the end of the lines 116’ and 117’ are interpreted as two sentences na-at 20-an-ki šar-ni-ik-ta ka-ru-u and a-pé-e-ni-iš-ša-an ki-ša-ri “It has made restitution for it twentyfold already” and “it happens so” rather than “it is thus happening [now] twentyfold already (cf. van den Hout 2006: 265).

These lines emphasise the fact that whatever restitution was required by the gods for breaching the treaty with Egypt, it has already been paid by the Hittite population with death.

127’-128’

šuppa šeškiškanzi “they will keep sleeping sacredly”. This expression refers to the practice of dream incubation; the king instructs the (SANGA) priests to sleep in the temple in order to receive the answer or the solution to the problem from the gods.

While manuscript A and C employ in line 134’ the adjective ḫumandaš, the scribe of manuscript B uses here the adjective dapiyaš. On the semantic level there is no difference between these two adjectives.

132’

The traces indicated by Goetze’s hand-copy are consistent with URUDU ZI.KIN.B]AR-aš ḡiššị[ar-pa-az. These are not visible on the photograph of KUB 14.8. The photograph was probably taken after Goetze made his copy of the tablet. During the time that elapsed between drawing of the copy and taking the photograph the condition of the tablet might have deteriorated. For a discussion of the meaning of this expression see the commentary on CTH 376.II line 98’ (pp. 182-185).
4.4. HYMN AND PRAYER TO TELIPINU (CTH 377)

The hymn and prayer to Telipinu shows similar structural frame as the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddes of Arinna (CTH 376.II).

The end of the hymn and the beginning of the prayer are lost in the lacunae in the two main manuscripts of the text, namely KUB 24.1+ (manuscript A) and KUB 24.2 (Manuscript B). Based on the textual similarities that this hymn and prayer to Telipinu shares with the hymn and the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II), it is generally assumed that the former was modelled on the latter.

The hymn to Telipinu breaks after the sentence [DINGIR\-LIM\-ia-tar=ma=ta=kan] DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ištarna nakki “[Your divinity] is honoured among gods.” The hymn to the Sungoddess of Arinna continues here for additional 36 lines, which is then followed by approximately 22 lines that deal with the plague and approximately the first 40 lines of the prayer section that is concerned with the enemy invasion.

The break in manuscript A of CTH 377 is not large enough to accommodate all this text. Because approximately nine lines are preserved at the end of column i, it is assumed here that 8-9 lines are missing at the end of column ii. Also, because ten lines are partially preserved at the beginning of column iv, approximately 8-10 lines must be missing at the beginning of column iii. In total, manuscript A lacks between 16-19 lines. Assuming that manuscript B is an exact duplicate of manuscript A, the same amount of text must be missing from this manuscript.

It seems likely that the hymn to Telipinu continued for some more lines after the break but was, as a whole, perhaps not as long as the hymnic section of CTH 376.II. The rest of the text that is now lost must have contained the prayer against the enemy. In all probability, the part of the prayer that deals with the plague was not included in the Telipinu text.

The fact that the prayer was composed on behalf of the king, the queen and the royal princes (Carruba 1983:12; Singer 2002: 54) as well as the fact that the prayer does not refer to the plague may suggest that this prayer was composed after the epidemic ceased and thus after the prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and the “plague prayers” (CTH 378).

The prayer is preserved in three manuscripts. Manuscript A (KUB 24.1 + KBo 58.10) is a four-column tablet that lacks large parts of column ii and iii as well as the ends of lines 1-16 of column iv. The beginnings of the first nine lines of column i are partially
completed by KBo 58.10. The scribe of this manuscript uses the older forms of ni, du, nam, gi, the New Script forms of al, az, šar, tar, uk, URU and both the new and the old variants of ak and li. The manuscript contains numerous erasures and errors, which indicates that it was a either a first draft or a scribal exercise.

Manuscript B (KUB 24.2) is a one-column tablet. Only 23 lines of the obverse and 19 lines of the reverse are partially preserved. The scribe uses the older forms of al, li, nam and ni, the New Script variants of gi, az, šar, tar, uk, Ú and URU as well as both the older and newer shapes of ak, ik, and du. The paragraph divisions drawn by the scribe of this manuscript are not straight and the scribe did not manage to fit the colophon on the tablet. This may indicate a scribal apprentice rather than a proficient scribe.

Manuscript C (Bo 8072) is very fragmentary. It contains only the beginnings of ten lines that duplicate lines iii 1’-14’ of manuscript A.

A full edition of this text, which also includes the dating of manuscripts A and B as well as a discussion of their orthographic and linguistic features, has been recently published by Kassian and Yakubovich (2007). Consequently, this dissertation includes only the transliteration and translation of this text as well as brief notes on either the cuneiform or the translation of the text. These are included in the footnotes.
Manuscripts:

A  KUB 24.1\textsuperscript{101} +  Bo 2415 +  T.I\textsuperscript{102}
KBo 58.10  1122/v +
KBo 58.10  217/w

B  KUB 24.2  Bo 2082\textsuperscript{103}  ---

C  Bo 8072\textsuperscript{104}  ---


Previous transliterations: Otten and Rüster: 1972: 232 (lines 1-8 of ms A)

Transliteration:

1  A i 1  [\textit{ke-e}-ma-kán \textit{tup-pi}
B obv. 1  [\textit{ke-e-k}ân  \textit{tup-pi} DUB\textsuperscript{3} SAR A-NA DINGIR-LIM an-{\textit{da}}]
   \rightarrow

A ctd.  \textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{5}\textsuperscript{6}  \textit{wa-al-li-iš-ki}-i[z-\textit{zi}]  \\
B ctd.  \textit{wa-al-li-iš-ki}-i[z-\textit{zi}]

AB

3  A i 3  \textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{6}  \textit{Te-li-pí-nu-uš šar-ku-uš} a-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-LIM-iš zi-ik
B obv. 3  \textsuperscript{4}\textsuperscript{6}  \textit{Te-li-pí-nu-uš šar-ku-uš} na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-uš zi-ik

4  A i 4  u-i-ia-at-mu \textsuperscript{7} \textit{Mur-ši-DINGIR-LIM} [\textit{UGAL-uš} tu]-\textit{e} el \textit{IR-KA}
B obv. 4  u-i-ia-at-mu \textsuperscript{7} \textit{MUR-ŠI-I-LI} LUGAL-uš tu-e-el \textit{IR-KA} \rightarrow

5  A i 5  MUNUS.LUGAL-aš-ša  tu-e-el GÉME-iš [u-i]-\textit{e} \textit{r} i-it-wa
B obv. 4-5  MUNUS.LUGAL-aš-ša / tu-e-el GÉME-KA u-i-e-er i-it-wa \rightarrow

6  A i 6  \textsuperscript{4}\textit{Te-li-pí-nu-un} an-zi-eI DINGIR-LAM
B obv. 5-6  \textsuperscript{4}\textit{Te-li-pí-nu-un} / an-zi-eI DINGIR-LAM \rightarrow

\textsuperscript{100} A join sketch of ms A is included in Appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{101} Text A in Gurney 1940.
\textsuperscript{102} Fragment 1122/v was found in temple 1; fragment 217/w was found in debris from the storerooms 11 and 12 of temple 1. The find spot of KUB 24.1 was determined by join.
\textsuperscript{103} Text B in Gurney 1940.
\textsuperscript{104} I was able to consult a photograph of this unpublished fragment during my stay at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz in February 2009.
7 A i 7 ŠA SAG.DU-NI mu-ga-a-i
B obv. 6 ŠA SAG.DU-NI mu-ga-a-i

AB

B obv. 7

9 A i 9 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na ma-a-an 'a-ru-ni' na-aš-ma A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na ma-a-an a-ru-ni na-aš-ma A-NA
B obv. 8

A ctd. ŪUR.SAG.MEŠ! (eš)
B ctd. ŪUR.SAG.MEŠ' (eš)

10 A i 10 wa-ḫa-an-na [p]a-a-an-za 'na'-aš-ša-[za] I-NA KUR $^l$KUR wa-ḫa-an-na pa(aš)-a-an-za na-aš-ma-za I-NA KUR $^l$KUR
B obv. 9

A ctd. za(ḥa)-aḥ-ḫi-ia pa-a-an-za
B ctd. za-aḥ-ḫi-ia pa-a-an-za

AB

11 A i 11 ki-nu-na-at-ta ša-ne-ez-zi-[iš] wa-ar-šu-la-aš ki-nu-na-at-ta ša-ne-ez-[zi]-iš wa-ar-šu-la-aš
B obv. 10

B obv. 10-11

B obv. 11-12

B obv. 12

B obv. 13

16 A i 16 me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu DINGIR-LUM iš-[iš]-ta'-ma-na-an me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu DINGIR-LUM iš-ta-ma-na-an
B obv. 14

17 A i 17 la-ga-a-an ṣar-ak na-at iš-[a-m]a-aš-ki la-ga-a-an ṣar-ak na-at iš-[a-m]a-aš-ki
B obv. 14

AB

B obv. 15

$^{105}$ The break is not large enough to accommodate $^<DUG>iš-pa-a]n$. It is therefore assumed that the determinative DUG has been omitted from the text.
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19 A i 19  nu-ut-ta DINGIR-LIM-IA Ū Œ.M[EŠ DINGIR.MEŠ] 'T-NA KUR
B obv. 15-16 nu-ut-ta DINGIR-LIM-IA / Ū Œ.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ I-NA KUR
A ctd. URU HA[T-TI-páť]
B obv. 16 URU HA'[AT-TI-páť] →

20 A i 20  da-aš-ša-nu-wa-an nam-ma-ma-ta [ta-me]'e'-da-ni ut-ni-[e]
B obv. 16-17 ta-aš-nu-wa-an nam-ma-ma-at-t[a] / 'ta-me-e'-da-ni KUR-e

B obv. 17-18 Ū-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-eš-zı / [ E]ZEN₄.HI.A →

22 A i 22  SÍSKUR I-NA KUR URU HAT-TI — p[ár-k]u-i šu-up-pí
B obv. 18-19 SÍSKUR.HI.A I-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI-páť pár-ku-i / [ ] →

23 A i 23  pí-iš-kán-zi nam'-ma'-ma-ta dam-me-e-d[a-ni]
B obv. 19 [pí-iš-kán]-zı nam'-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni

24 A i 24  ut-ni-e Ū-UL ku-w[a]-'pí-ik-ki pí-iš-₄-[kán-zı]
B obv. 20 [KUR-e Ū-UL ku-wa-pí-ik]-ki pí-iš-kán-zi

AB

25 A i 25  Œ.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-ta pár-ku IŠ-T[U
B obv. 21 [ ] KÜ.BA]BBAR KÜ.SI₂₂
A ctd. [ ]
B ctd. 'tš-nu-wa-an-ta' →

26 A i 26  I-NA KUR URU HA-AT-'TI-páť' [e-eš-zı nam-ma-ma-ta]
B obv. 21-22 I-NA KUR URU HA-AT-[TI-páť] / [ ] →

27 A i 27  ta-me-e-da-ni u[t-ni-e Ū-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-eš-zı]
B obv. 22 'ta'-[me]'e'-d[a-ni KUR-e] 'Ū'-₁ς'-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-[k]i

A

28 A ii 1  [GAL].HI.A-ta BI-IB-RI HI.A KÜ.BABBAR KÜ.BABBAR.SI₂₂
B obv. 23 [ ]
A ctd. NA₃₄.[HI.A]
B ctd. [ ]

29 A ii 2  'T-NA KUR URU HA-AT-TI-páť e-eš-zı
B ctd. KUR URU HA'-AT-TI-páť e'-e[š-zı]
(B obv. breaks)

A

30 A ii 3  EZEN₄.HI.A-it-ta EZEN₄.ITU EZEN₄.HI.A erasure MU-aš me-e-a-na-
gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš ḫa-mi-iš-ḫa-an-da-aš

zē-na-an-da-aš a-ú-li-uš erasure mu-ki-iš-na-aš-ša

EZEN₄.ME.ES J-NA KUR₄ URU₄ HA-AT-TI-pát e-eš-zì

nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni KUR URU₄ Ú₄-UL₄

ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-eš-ša-an-zì

n[u]₄ 'tu'-el ṭšA₄ dTE-LI-P₄-NU erasure DINGIR.MEŠ-tar ṭI-[NA KUR URU₄ HA-AT-TI-pát]

n[a-a]k-[k-[i-ia-ab-b]]a-an nu-ut-ták-kán ṭM₄-[i-DINGIR-LIM LUGAL-uš ḫR-KA]

[MUNUS.LUGAL-aš GÉME-KA] ṭÚ DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL’ ḫ[R.MEŠ-KA]

[I-NA KUR URU₄ HA-AT-TI-pát na-ḫa-an-te-eš nu tu-e-el]

[i-ia-ut-wa-an-z]i ša-ra-a’ [ti-it-ta-nu-ḫa-ká]n-z[i] erasure

[nu-ut-ta ṭ]u-u-ma-an ṭu-up-p[i pár-ku-i pi]-iš-kán-zi

[nam-ma-aš-ša]-an erasure É.DINGIR-LIM-K[A BI-IB-R] ḫI₄KA


[na-at-za E]GIR-pa kap-pu-wa-an A-NA ṭÚ₄-NU-UT

[DINGIR-LIM(?)] ma-ni-i[n]-ku-wa-an ṭÚ₄-UL₄ ku-iš-ki ‘iš-i-ia-az-zi

A

[zĭ-ik-ză dTe-l]i-pí-nu-uš na-[a]-ka³-ki-iš DINGIR-LIM-iš

[nu-ut-ták-kán ŠUM-a]n ŠUM₄[HA-aš iš-tar-na {aš} na-ak-ki-i

[DINGIR-LIM-ia-tar-ma-ták-kán] ṭDINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na na-ak-

ka³-[i]

(A ii breaks. Approximately 10 lines missing at the end of column ii and the beginning of column iii)

[A-NA LUGAL-ma(?) MUNUS.LUGAL] DUMU.M[E.EŠ.LUGAL ṭÚ]

[A-NA KUR URU₄ HA-T-T]I an-da aš-[šu-li ne³-[iš-ḫu-ut] →

Lines 36-49 are restored from the similar passage in the hymn and prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna (CTH 376.II).

On the edge of the tablet.
52’ A iii 3’ [zi-ik-za Te-]i-pí-nu-uš šar-ku-uš DINIR-[LIM-iš]
C 1’-2’ [ ] / [Te-li-]pí-nu-uš
→

53’ A iii 4’ [LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL Ü DUMU.ME]Š.LUGAL Ti-an
C 2’-3’ [ ] / Ti-an
A ctd. ṭar-ak nu-uš-*ma-aš*
C 3’ ṭar-a[k ]

54’ A iii 5’ [TI-tar EGI]R.¹UD³-MI ṭa-ad-du-la-tar MU.KAM.ḪI.A GIĐ.DA
C 3’-4’ [ ] / EGIR.UD-[MI ]
→

C 4’ [ ]
→

56’ A iii 7’ [mi-ú-mar(?) la-lu-u[k-ki-ma-an du-uš-ga-ra-da-an-na
C 4’-5’ [ ] / la-lu-u[k-ki-ma-an]
→

57’ A iii 8’ [zi-ik-ki]
C 5’ [ ]

AC

58’ A iii 9’ [nu-uš-ma]-*aš DUMU¹.NITA.ME,EŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ
C 6’ nu-uš-ma-[aš]
A ctd. ṭa-aš-šu-uš ṭa-an-za-šu-uš pé-eš-ki
C ctd. [ ]

59’ A iii 10’ [nu-uš³-[ma]-aš nu-u-un erasure tu-um-ma-an-ti-ia-an pé-eš-ki
C 6’-7’ [ ] / tu-um-m[a-an-ti-ia-an]

60’ A iii 11’ [nu-uš³-[ma]-aš ṭal-ki-ia-aš GİŞ GEŠTIN-aš ŠA GU, UDU
C 7’

61’ A iii 12’ DUMU.LÚ.U₉, LU-ia erasure mi-i-ia-ta pé-eš-ki
C 8’ DUMU.LÚ.¹[U₉₃, LU-ia ]
→

62’ A iii 13’ nu-uš-ma-aš LÚ-aš tar-ḥu-u-i-li-in pa-ra-a ‘ne-ia³-a[n-ta]-a[n]
C 8’-9’ [ ] / pa-ra-a [ ]

63’ A iii 14’ d.GİŞ TUKUL-in pé-eš-ki nu-uš-ma-aš KUR.KUR LÚ KŪR
C 9-10’ [ ... ] x x [ ]

(C breaks)

64’ A iii 15’ ŠA-PAL erasure GİR.ME,EŠ-ŠU-NU zi-ik-*ki³ na-at i[n- x x x x ]¹⁰⁸
A

¹⁰⁸ Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 431) restore here in-[na-ra ṭar-ga-nu?]
A iii 16’  Iš-TU Kur  ḪA-AT-TI-ma-kán i-da-lu-un ta-[pa-ša-an]  
B rev. 1’  Iš-TU Kur¹ ḪA-[T-TI]  

65’  A iii 17’  ḫi-in-kán ka-aš-ta-an erasure  ma-a-ša-an-na a[r-ḫa(?)] u-i-ia(?)[109]  
B rev. 2’  ḫi-in-kán ka-aš-‘ta-an’  

AB


67’  A iii 19’  ḫur-sal-la-an-ta ku-e-eš-kán tu-uk A-NA ḪE-LI-Pī-NU’(ni)  
B rev. 3’-4’  [ ] / ku-e-eš-kán tu-uk A-NA ḪE-LI-Pī-NU] →

68’  A iii 20’  Û A-NA Dingir.Meš ḪA-AT-TI UL na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-eš  
B rev. 4’-5’  [ ] / na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-eš →  

70’  A iii 21’  ku-e-da-aš-ma-az šu-me-en-za-an É.Hi.A Dingir.Meš-Ku-NU  
B rev. 5’  ku-i-e-eš-ma-[z]  

71’  A iii 22’  ar-ḫa wa-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zí  i-la-li-iš-kán-zí  
B rev. 5’-6’  [ ] / i-la-li-iš-kán-zí →  

72’  A iv 1  ku-e-eš-ma BI-[I]-[B-RI] הי  
B rev. 6’  ku-e-eš-m[a]’BI-IB-RIהי GAL.Hi.A’ [Û-NU-TE]MEŠ Kū.Babbar]  

73’  A iv 2  Kū.Babbar. Si₂₂ da-a[n-na]  

74’  A iv 3  Aš-A.Gār-Ku-Nu  Gīš’Kīrī’.[Geštin  
B rev. 7’-8’  [ ] / Gīš’Kīrī’.Geštin  GīšMU.SAR Gīš’Tir (ŠAḥ) →  

75’  A iv 4  dan-na-at-ta-āḫ-hu-wa-an-‘zi’ [ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zí]  
B rev. 8’  dan-na-ta-āḫ-hu-wa-an-[zi] ša-an-ḫi-iš-kān-‘zi’  

AB


B rev. 9’-10’  Mū.Sar; Mūnu.Meš’NA Mū.Sar / da-an-na  
A ctd.  ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zí]  
B rev. 10’  erasure ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zí →  

78’  A iv 7  nu i-da-lu-un ta-pa-ša-an  

The Sumerograms DUMU and LUGAL are usually written together to indicate how these logograms were perceived by Hittite scribes. Here these signs DUMU.ME.EŠ. LU[Gal] are written separately.
The scribe reads out [this] tablet daily to the god and he praises the god (saying):

"O Telipinu, you are a powerful and honoured god! Muršili, the king, your servant sent me. Also the queen, your maidservant (sent me). They sent (me saying): Go invoke Telipinu, our lord, our personal god.

Whether you, O honoured Telipinu, are above in heaven among the gods, or you are in the sea, or you are gone to the mountains to roam, or you are gone to an enemy land for battle,

now let the fragrant odour, the cedar (and) the oil summon you. Come back to the (ms. B: your) temple. I am invoking you by means of thick bread and libation. Be pacified! (With regard) to what I am saying to you, turn your ear, O god, towards me and keep listening!

You, Telipinu, are an honoured god. Furthermore, in the land of Ḫatti alone (there are) strongly-built temples (dedicated) to you, my god, but nowhere else, in no other land in addition (to ours) they exist for you. In the land of Ḫatti (ms. B: alone) they perform pure and holy festivals and rituals for you, but nowhere in any other land in addition (to ours) they perform (them) for you.
25-27 In the land of Ḫatti alone [(there are)] lofty temples adorned with [silver] and gold (dedicated) to you, [but nowhere, in any other [land in addition (to ours) do they exist for you].

28-29 In the land of Ḫatti alone you possess [cups] and rhyta of silver, gold (as well as) precious stones.

30-35 In the land of Ḫatti alone there are festivals for you (such as) the monthly festival, the annual festivals (lit. of the course of the year) of winter, spring, autumn, the auliš-sacrifices, and invocation festivals, but nowhere in any other land or town do they celebrate (them) for you.\textsuperscript{115}

36-46 Your divinity, O Telipinu, is honoured [in the land of Ḫatti alone].

[In the land of Ḫatti alone] Muršili, the king, your servant, the queen, your maidservant, and the princes, [your servants, are respectful] to you. [They are setting up your] images, O Telipinu, in order to perform rituals and festivals.\textsuperscript{116}

[They offer] you everything that is holy and pure.

[Furthermore], respect is established for your [rhyta, [your cups] and your objects (belonging) to your temples. [They are] accounted for.

No one steps near the objects [of the god].

47-49 [You, O Telipinu, are an honoured god. [Your name] is honoured among the names. [Your divinity] is honoured among the gods.

(Aproximately 15-20 lines missing)

50’-57’ [Turn] in favour [towards the king, the queen,] the princes and towards the land of Ḫatti)! [You, O Telipinu, are a powerful god]. Keep alive [the king, the queen and the princes]! Give them [life] for the future, health, longevity [and vigour! Put] in their soul [gentleness], brightness and joy!

58’-64’ Give them [sons,] daughters, grandchildren and great-grandchildren! Give them contentment(?) and obedience(?)! Give them the growth of grain, vines, cattle, sheep and people (lit. mankind)! Give them a man’s valiant,

\textsuperscript{115} For this sentence see Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 440-441) and comment to lines 25-28 of CTH 376.II.

\textsuperscript{116} For this translation of this sentence see comment to lines 33-35 of CTH 376.II as well as Kassian and Yakubovich (2007: 433 and 443-4).
battle-ready divine weapon! Put beneath their feet the enemy lands, and […] them!

65’-66’ But from the land of Ḫatti [send] a[way] the evil fe[ver], plague, famine and locust!

67’-71’ (As for) the enemy lands which are quarrelsome and wrathful: those who are not respectful to you, Telipinu, and to the gods of Ḫatti; those who (A: to those who) wish to burn down your temples;

72’-75’ those who seek to take (your) rhyta, cups [(as well as) the objects of silver] and gold; those who [seek] to lay waste your fields, vineyards, gardens (and) groves;

76’-79’ those who seek to capture (your) farmers, vine dressers, gardeners (and) women of the mill, to those enemy lands give evil fever, [plagu]e, famine and locusts!

80’-89’ But to the king, the queen, the princes and to the land of Ḫatti [give] life, health, vigour, longevity for the future, and joy! Give [them] for the future the growth of grain, vines, fruit-trees(?), cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, horses (B: donkeys), together with the beast of the field, and people (lit. mankind)! May (everything) grow! [May] the rains c[ome]! May the winds of prosperity come! May (everything) in the land of Ḫatti thrive and prosper! And the congregation cries out: “Let that be!”

Colophon: One tablet. (Text) Complete. When the scribe presents daily the prayer on behalf of the king before Telipinu.
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APPENDIX 1: CATALOGUE

All the well or relatively well preserved passages that contain terms discussed in chapter two are included below, namely the verbs arkuwai-, mald-, mugai-, talliya-, walla/i, wallu- and the nouns arkuwar, arkuešni; maldwar, malteššar; mugawar, mukeššar, talliyawar, walliyatar and walli. The verbs and the nouns are arranged according to their meanings.

I. ARKUWAR, ARKUWAI, ARKUEŠNI

I.A. arkuwai-, -za arkuwar iya- “to plead” = “to present arguments”, “to make a plea/case”

1. KBo 3.3 (CTH 63.A), the arbitration of Syrian disputes, NH/NS (Muršili II).1

Concerning the fact that they have not, at this time, sealed this tablet of legal disputes: because the king of the land of Karkamiš, Tudjaššu and Ḥašpḫaš were not before My Majesty, therefore they have not at this time sealed this tablet. When, however, the king of the land of Karkamiš, Tudjaššu and Ḥašpḫaš as well as Tuppi-Teššu come before My Majesty, and they will stand together before My Majesty, I, My Majesty will question them about the legal disputes. And whoever will make a plea,2 I, My Majesty will hear it. And then they will seal this tablet of legal disputes.

1 The text has one duplicate KUB 19.44 (63.D).

2 D: m[ut-ḫa-li-ia-aš]

3 D: m[ut-ḫa-li-ia-aš]

4 D: m[Tup-pi-ša]-[10]-aš-ša

5 D: DL[HLA]

6 D: iš-dam-ma-[aš-mi]

7 D: DL[HLA]

8 The sentence with the phrase arkuwar iya has been previously translated as: “Nun wer welche Bitte machen wird, die (ich), Meine Gött Sonne, werde ich hören” Hrozný 1919: 153; “L’arkuwar que chacun fera, je l’écouterai” Laroche 1964-65: 14 (Laroche proposes the following meanings for arkuwar “defense, une justification, une plaidoirie”); “what plea each makes” Puhvel HED vol. 1: 149; “I will listen to the plea which each makes” Melchert 1998: 46; “and whoever makes some argument, I, My Majesty will listen to it” Beckman 1999: 173; “and who makes what plea” CHD vol. Š 1.a p.16; “whoever argues a case, I, My Majesty will listen to it” Miller 2007a: 130.
2. KBo 18.24 (CTH 187), a letter of the Hittite king to Šul-ma-nu-SAG, NH/NS (either Ḫattušili III or Tudḫaliya IV).


But now upaššallai the matters about which I have written to you, and hear them well, because I am a great king not a “second-ranked man”! Since you keep pleading with the gods, when they bring this tablet, read (lit. call) this tablet aloud in front of the great gods! But because they will bring to you the tablet of greeting/friendship, you will interpret it (lit. make it) as ‘ingratiating (yourself)’. Why, on account of that, should I keep clarifying it for you? A great king does not [...].

3. KUB 14.14+ (CTH 378.I.A), the first plague prayer, NH/NS (Muršili II).

(1)

I Muršili, your priest, your servant, hereby plead with you. O gods, my lords, [hear] my word, regarding the matter in which I am making a plea to you!

---


4. KUB 14.8 (CTH 378.II.A), the second plague prayer, NH/NS (Muršili II). The prayer has two duplicates, KUB 14.10 (CTH 378.II.C) and KUB 14.11 (CTH 378.II.B).

(1) KUB 14.10 i: // (19) 'nam'-ma-za EZE.N.HL.a-ia ku-wa-pí e-eš-ša-ačḫ-ḫu-un / (20) nu A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-ua-ma-an-da-a-aš [p]i-[r]a-an / (21) [EGL]-pa13 i-ia-ḫḫ-ḫa-at 1-EN É DINGIR-LIM-kán / (22) 'Ŭ'-UL te-eḫ-ḫu-un nu-za ḫi-in-g[a]-ni še-er / (23) A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-ua-ma-an-da-a-aš (a)r'-k'-u-u-wa-ar / (24) [e-eš]-ša-aḫḫ-ḫu-un (24') [RI]-B'HL.a-[aš]-ki-[aš]-kán / (25) [m]a'-a-l-[aš]-ki-nu'-un15 [nu-]wa-[aš]-nu(?) DINGIR.MEŠ BE-LU(?) / (26) [i]-š-ta-aš-[tēn]16 nu-(wa)-kán(?) IS-TU(?) KUR URU[HA]-AT-T[?] / (27) [Ḫ]-i-n-kán19 [ar-ḫa(?)] u-i-ia-at-tēn(?) URU [Ḫ]-a-tu-š[a]-aš-ša-ša-ša / (28) [Ḫ]-in-kán(?) nam-ma Ū-UL tar-aḫ-[z]j (the same passage also appears in KUB 14.11 i 13'-22'). Manuscript C (KUB 14.10) breaks. The text continues in manuscripts A (KUB 14.8) and B (KUB 14.11). KUB 14.8 obv.: (1') [nu-wa(?) ku-e-ez]-er(?)-qa(?) INIM(?) a[k]-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-[ri(?)aš]20 nu-wa-ra-at na-aš-sû a-r[i-ia]-ša-eš-na-az / (2') [Ḫ]-a-an-da-it]-ta-[ro]21 na-aš-ma-at-ta-kán te-eš-ḫi-it ū-wa-al-lu na-aš-ma-at] / (3') 14[DINGIR-LIM-ni]-an-za-za me-ma-a-ū ... (obv. 1-3 of KUB 14.8 is duplicated by lines i 23'-24' of KUB 14.11).

[Fu]sher][more, also when I performed the festivals, I went [bac]k and forth to all the gods. I did not prefer one temple. I have repeatedly made pleas12

---

to all the gods concerning the plague and I have repeatedly [vow]ed vows to you: “Hear [me, O gods], my [lords, and send away] the plague [from the land of Ḫatti]. [Ḫattuša] [can no longer] overcome [the plague]. Let the matter [because of which the]re is continual dying be [determined] either through an oracle, or let me see it in a dream, or [let a [man of god] pronounce it.”

(2)

KUB 14.8 rev.: // (20’) nu-za  ka-a-ša A-NA ëIM\²\³ EN-IA ḫ-[i-[n-g]-a-ni še-er\²\³ ar-ku-u-wa-ar\²\³ e-eš-ša-a\³\³ [nu-za  A-NA ëIM\²\³ EN-IA]

I am making a plea\²⁹ concerning the plague to the Stormgod, my lord. Hear me, o Stormgod of Ḫatti, my lord! Save me!

(3)

KUB 14.8 rev.: (23’) na-aš-ma ma-a-an A-NA ḪE-TI ku-e-da-\² ni\³-ik-ki ku-it-ki na-a-[k]-i-ia-ê-[a]-n\²/ (24’) nu-za A-NA EN-ŠU ar-ku-wa-ar i-ia-az-zi na-an EN-ŠU iš-ta-ï-[a]-aš-zi nu-uš-\³ \³ e-en-zu da-a-i / (25’) ku-it na-ak-ki-ia-ê-[a]-n\² / (the passage is duplicated by lines iii 45’-46’ of KUB 14.11)

Or if anything is a concern to some servant, he makes a plea\³⁰ to his master. His master hears him and has pity on him and whatever was a concern, he sets it right for him.


\²\³ B: line division

B: [\³]

B: [\³]r-ku-wa-ar

B: [\³]HAT-TI and line division

B: iš-da-ma-aš

B: [\³]u-<iš>-nu-ut


KUB 14.8 rev.: // (37') [nu-at-t]a ka-a-ša am-mu-uq-qa A-NA ֶU ḤA-
AT-TI EN-IA ar-ku-eš-ki-mi ֶU nu-mu TI-nu-at l (38') [nu ma-a] an ke-e-ez-
za ku-wa-at-qa ud-da-a-na-az ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri na-at ku-it ma-an l (39')
[EGIR-p]a SIG-aḫḫi-iš-ki-mi nu-kān ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ ku-e-eš LÜ.MEŠ
NINDA.GUR,RA ṬI-mu-nu-ša an-na-nu-at l (40') [a-aš-ša]-an-
te-eš na-at l (41') (the passage is duplicated by
lines iv 1'-7' of KUB 14.10).

I continue to make a plea ֶU to you, o Stormgod of ֶUatti, my lord. Save me!
If perhaps there has been continual dying because of this matter, let the
makers of the thick bread and libation pourers of the gods who remain not
die anymore, while I am setting it right!

If the restoration of line iv 25' of manuscript C (KUB 14.10) is correct
either arkuzzar iya- or another form of that expression is employed in the
colophon probably as a generic label.

DINGIR.MEŠ(?)] / (25') [ar-ku-w][a-][ar ֶUi-a-at]

Ub: ֶUone. (Text) complete. [When] Muršili, [the king, made a p]le[a ֶUto
the Stormgod of ֶUatti and the gods] con[cerning] the plague.

5. KUB 14.12 (CTH 378.3.A), the third plague prayer, NH/NS (Muršili II).

KUB 14.12 rev.: (2') nu ka-a-ša am-mu-uk ֶUMu-ši-][iš-za LUGAL
(3') nu-mu-uš-ša-an DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-IA [iš-ta-ma-aš-tén … ]

I, Muršили, your priest, your servant have hereby [plead my case]. ֶUHear
me, o gods, my lords!

The verbal form arkueškimi has been translated here as: “I repeatedly plead my case”
Beckman 1997: 159; “te estoy suplicando” Bénahe 1987: 283; “je t’adresse une plaidoirie”
“keep pleading” van den Hout 2006: 266; “я тебе молюсь” (I pray to you) Ivanov 1977:
190; “I address my prayers to you” Kühne 1978: 174; “j’adresse plaidoirie sur plaidoirie”
Lebrun 1980: 214; “I am now continuing to plead” Singer 2002a: 60, “yo te rezo sin cesar!”
Trabazo 2002: 327.

The expression arkuzzar iya- has been translated here as “моляся (prayed) by Ivanov

In the framework of the plague prayer, the restoration of the verb arkuzzar-
meaning “to plead” is very likely; however, it is not certain whether one should restore here the first
person singular present tense (arkuzzami) or the first person singular past tense form
(arkuzzanun) of arkuzzar-.

The sentence that contains arkuzzanun has been previously translated as: “Now, I, Muršili,
have pled my case” Beckman 1997: 159; “moi, Mursili, [j’ai fait mon plaidoyer]”
6. KUB 14.13 (CTH 738.4.A), the fourth plague prayer, NH/NS (Muršili II).

KUB 14.13 iv: (23) [ma-a-an-ma-wa] a-ši me-mi-aš ŠA DINGIR-LIM a-ša-
ū-e-mi-lia-at] Ū-UL-ma-wa-ra-aš am-mu-[uk] / (26) [a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-az]
AK-ŠU-UD nu-wa KUR URU VAT-TI / (27) |a~>| ri-ia-zi ki-nu-n
a-wa-ra-aš a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-az / (28) |ú~> e-mi-ia-az-zi nu-wa-
a-landa / (29) |ú~> e-mi-ia-az-zi nu-wa 37

[If] the aforementioned matter concerning the god is tr[ue], my father [did
not fin]d [it] through an oracle, nor did I find it  [through an oracle]. Should
the land of Ḥatti [enquire an oracle? Will it now] fi[nd] it through an
oracular investigation? 38 I have ple[d ma case] 39

7. KUB 6.45 (CTH 381.A), a “prayer” addressed to the assembly of Hittite gods,
NH/NS (Muwatalli II). The text has one duplicate KUB 6.46 (CTH 381.B).

(1)

KUB 6.45 + KBo 57.18 i: (1) UM-MA Ta-ba-ar-na "NIR.GÁL LUGAL
GAL LUGAL KUR " (2) [DUMU] "MUR-ŠI-I-LI LUGAL
GAL LUGAL KUR "UR.SAG ma-a-an UN-[ši] 40 / (3) [me-
mi]-aš ku-iš-ki na-ak-ki-i-a-aš-zi nu-za A-NA DINGIR.MES ar-ku-
wa-ar / (4) [D]Ù-
zí (The passage is duplicated by KUB 6.46 i 1-4).

Thus (says) Tabarna Muwatalli, great king, the king of the land of Ḥatti,
[so]n of Muršili, great king, the king of the land of Ḥatti, the hero: If some
[matt]er weighs [on] a man, he [mak]es a plea 41 to the gods.

(2)

KUB 6.45 iv: (45) GIM-an-ma NINDA.GUR 4 4.RA.HI.A pár-ši-ia-u-wa-an-
zi zi-in-na-i / (46) nu-kán ku-e A-WA-TE 46 A-NA "UTU-
ŠI ŠÀ-ta / (47) na-

37 The traces preserved on the tablet suggest that some form of the verb arkuwai-
or the expression arkuwar iyā-lāt-/dai-
appears in line iv 28. The previous editors and translators of
this text restored here the verbal form arkuwanum.

38 This sentence was interpreted by Beckman 1997: 159, Goetze 1930: 251 and Lebrun 1980: 227 as a statement “The land of Ḥatti [enquired through an oracle] and [now have found it]
through an oracle.” Singer 2002a: 66 understood this sentence as a question. The latter
interpretation is followed here. The king states that both, his father and himself, failed to
obtain the answer from the god in the matter of the re-establishing the neglected rites.

39 Perhaps if the Hittite people ask the god, he will be more willing to respond.

40 B: an-ta-ab-ši

41 Previous translations of the sentence that employs the expression arkuwar DÛ-zí include:
“Cuando la situación abruma a un hombre y se acerca a sus dioses en plegaria” Bernabé
1987: 285; “When things get too much for a man and he approaches his gods in prayer”
Goetze 1950: 397; “si une parole pèse sur un individu, il fait son excuse aux dieux” Laroche
1964: 18; “Si pour un individu, quelque parole devient pénible, il se justifiera devant les
dieux” Lebrun 1980: 273; “or if something [is] heavy on some servant’s mind, he makes a
clean breast of it to his master” Puhvel HED vol. 1, 149; “If some problem burdens a man(’s
conscience), he [makes] a plea to the gods” Singer 1996: 31 and 2002a: 86, “él realiza una
plegaria” Trabazo 2002: 335.
When he finishes breaking the thick breads, he makes, the matters which are in His Majesty’s heart, into a plea to the gods. When the presentation of the plea (lit. the presenting the plea) is finished, thereafter he breaks three white thick breads within/inside one red, for the male gods of all the lands. He scatters a oily bread (and) groats. He pours out honey (and) fine oil. He libates one pitcher of wine. Thereafter he breaks three white thick breads for the goddesses of all the lands, to whom he presented the plea.

8. KBo 11.1 (CTH 382), a prayer to the Stormgod concerning the cult of Kummanni, NH/NS (Muwatalli II).

I, My Majesty, Muwatalli, lord of the lands, [have] just [invoked] them, [and I am making this] plea. May the Stormgod, my lord, hear it! How I dispel the sins of the lands and make [them] into [this] plea, may the Stormgod, my lord, hear it!
If some god of the land was maltreated and he complained to the Stormgod, [now I, My Majesty], Muwatalli, lord of the land],s will make [that] into a plea, and may the Stormgod, my lord, hear it!

Tablet one of presenting a plea of/to the Stormgod. It was written down [from the] mouth of His Majesty. (Text) complete. (Written) by the hand of Lurma(ziti), junior incantation priest, apprentice [of...], son of Aki-Teššub.

9. KUB 21.19 (CTH 383), a prayer of Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna, NH/NS.

Hattušili, your servant, and Puduḫepa, your maid, have made this plea as follows.

10. KUB 21.27 (CTH 384), a prayer of Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle, NH/NS.

The phrase arku-war ešša in line 18 has been previously translated as:” lo hago motivo de mi alegato” Bernabé 1987: 294; “I make [this] (the subject of) my plea” Houwink ten Cate/Josephson 1967: 115; “mache ich … zum Gebet” Kammenhuber HW²: II 1b 310-311; “je présente ma plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 300; “I make that into a plea” Singer 2002a: 83.

The previous translations of the Sumerogram LÚ as part of Lu-u-ur-ma-LÚ (Lurmaziti) rather than a determinative of A.ZU.TUR see Singer 1996: 162 n. 353.


The previous translations of arku-war iyat in the present context include: “… ont présenté la plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 317; “…have made this plea” Singer 2002a: 97; “…erhoben Einspruch” Sürenhagen 1981: 89.
This matter I, Puduhepa, your maid, made into a plea to the Sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, lady of the Hatti lands, the queen of heaven and earth. O Sungoddess of Arinna, my lady, be gracious towards me and hear me!


These words which [I], Puduhepa, your maid, have made into a plea to the Stormgod, your father, and to the Sungoddess of Arinna, your mother, announce them for me, O Mezulla, my lady; pass them on to the Stormgod, your father, [and] to the Sungoddess of Arinna, your mother. Recommend me (“intercede on my behalf!”) Singer 2002a: 104!


The previous translations of arkuwar iyamus in the present context include: “… yo, Puduhepa, ... he presentado en mi alegato” Bernabé 1987: 302; “… [I], Puduhepa... have laid in [prayer]” Goetze 1950: 394; “...[ich], Puduhepa... als [arkuwar-Rechtfertigungsgebet gesprochen habe]” Haas 2006: 268; “… j’ai présenté en guise [de plaidoirie]” Lebrun 1980: 341; “… I, Puduhepa ... have made into a prayer” Singer 2002a: 103; “... [i]ch, Puduhepa ... als Einspruch erhob” Sürenhagen 1981: 113; “… yo, puduhepa, ... he presentado como plegaria” Trabazo 2002: 373; “… [i]ch, Puduhepa ... als Gebete gesprochen habe” Ünal 1991: 816.

Boley 1984: 91 reads here ku-[i].
This [word] which, I, Puduhepa, your maid, made into a plea, you, O Stormgod of Zippalanda, announce it for me, and pass it on! O god, my lord, be gracious towards me in this matter! Since I am a woman of a birth stool and I have personally made restitution to the god, my lord, intercede on my behalf, O god, my lord, to the Stormgod your father and to the Sungoddess of Arinna! Ḫattušili, your servant made an effort (lit. exerted himself) with regard to the will of the god. He kept committing (lit. he kept risking) his body and his soul until he rebuilt Nerik, the beloved city of the god, my lord. You, O god, my lord, (lit. join up in favour) be favourably inclined towards Ṭattušili, your servant! And these words which I make into a plea to the Stormgod, your father and to the Sungoddess of Arinna, your mother, pass them on for me O Stormgod of Zippalanda, my lord!

11. KUB 36.87 (CTH 386.3), a fragmentary prayer to the Stormgod of Nerik, NH/NS (either Muršili II or Ḫattušili III).62


12. KUB 22.39 (CTH 577), a fragment of the SU, KIN and MUŠEN oracles, NH/NS.

KUB 22.39 iii: (3') ṢA URU Ne-ri-xik1 ku-it ALA[M ...] / (4') ki-nu-un-

ma-at U-šUL; ku-it p[ ...] / (5') UTU-ŠI I-NA URU Ne-ri-iq-qa ši-[pa-an-
ti(?)] nu] / (6') A-NA DINGIR-LIM pī-ra-an ar-ḫa pé-e[n'_na-ii?] / (7')

EGIR-an-da-ma A-NA DINGIR-LIM SIS[KUR i-ia-zi(?)] / (8') ar-ku-wa-

ar-za DŪ-zi du-ud-d[u(ia(?)] ša-la-ii?] / (9') KI.MIN nu SU.MEŠ SIG5-ru

Concerning the fact that the figure/statue of the Stormgod of Nerik [...]. But

since now he/she does/do not […] it, [should] His Majesty [sacrifice] in

Nerik, [and drive away] before the god? Further, [should he perform] a ri[ual] to the god, make a plea66, [and call/cry] for mer[cy]? The same. Let

the SU oracles be favourable.

13. KUB 22.57 (CTH 577), KIN oracles, NH/NS.

KUB 22.57 obv.: (11) 4dHAL ku-it IT-TI 4UTU-ŠI TUKU.TUKU-ti SIsSÁ-

at / (12) nu-uš-ša-an67 I-an mu-u-kiš-šarBLA kar-ap-pu-u-e-ni / (13) 'nu' [x

x e']n-ti' [x x] pa-ra-a erasure 'e':-ep-pu-u-e-ni / (14) nu-uš-ši EGIR-pa

tak-šu-la-u-e1-[ni] nam-ma-āš-ši ar-ku-wa-ar / (15) ti-ia-u-wa-āš še-er

erasure maš-kán za-[an-k]i-la-tar SUM-an-zi / (16) ku-it-ma-an 4UTU-ŠI ú-

iz-zi nu-ut-ta 4UTU-ŠI KASKAL-ši-āp-zi / (17) DINGIR-LUM a-pé-ez-za

ZI-an wa-ar-ši[.]-i1-ši A68 NA 4UTU-ŠI erasure / (18) a-pé-e-da-ni UD-TI

SIG5-ru in [me]-ma'-at-ti SIG5-ru / (19) 4UL-ša-an-za GAL wa-x-x-ia [ME-

Since it has been determined that divine HAL is angry with His Majesty,70

we will ‘lift/cancel one invocation ritual. We will give […] and make peace

with him again. Further, they will give him a gift (and) reparation on

account of presenting a plea71, until His Majesty comes and (until) His

Majesty satisfies you.72 Will you, o god, reconcile your mind with that? Will

---

65 The previous translations of arkuwar iyanum in the present context include: “habe ich … ein

Opfergebet gemacht” Haas 1970: 193; “j'ai présenté une plaidoir” Laroche 1980: 371; “I have made a plea" Singer 2002a: 107; “I have made a prayer from afar” CHD P 137 4b2’.
66 The previous translations of the sentence employing the expression arkuwar DŪ-zi has been

67 This restoration follows CHD vol. L-N: 325.
68 The sign a is written here with two single vertical strokes.
69 The reading [me]-ma'-at-ti in line 18 and 4UL-ša-an-za and [ME-aš] in line 19 was

suggested by Schwemer (6.10.2010).
70 Lit. “Because the divine HAL has been determined to be in anger with His Majesty”
71 The phrase arkuwar tiyanwaš has been rendered here as “presenting a defense” in CHD vol.

L-N: 209 sub 2.
72 Lit. “will put you on the way.”
you, on that day, speak favourably to His Majesty? Let (the oracle) be favourable! GREAT EVIL [too]k ... and (it is) with the G[ODS]. Unfavourable.

14. KBo 41.210 (CTH 581), an oracle text, NH/NS (Hattušili III).\(^{73}\)

KBo 41.210: (4') \textit{nu-za} 'GIM'-an \textit{rå} \textit{UTU-ŠH} 'SISKUR'.MEŠ DŪ-zi / (5') \textit{nu-za} a-pi-e (tak)-da-ni EGIR-pa ti-ia-u-wa-aš 'INIM'-ni(?) / (6') \textit{ar-ku}-\textit{wa-ar} DŪ-zi šar-ni-ik-zi-el I-NA KUR \textit{ màn} \textit{GAM-ÅTI} / (7') \textit{pa-ra-a pa-a-i} 'SîxSÅ-at'.

When His Majesty performs rituals, he makes a plea in that matter of ‘stepping back.’ He gives compensation in the Lower land. It has been established.

15. KUB 58.41 (CTH 678), fragment of a ritual celebrated in Nerik, NH/NS.

KUB 58.41 obv. ii: (2') \textit{nu-kán} \textit{GU} ? < \textit{A-NA} > d \textit{U AN-E} \textit{NIN.É.GAL} / (3') BAL-ti ni[a-aš]-kān GUNNI pa-ra-a / (5') a-ni[i-a-zi] an-da-ma-kān kiš-an me-ma-i / (6') ka-\textit{a}-[\textit{sa}] 'LUGAL' MUNUS.LUGAL \textit{GAS} da-\textit{ḫa-an-qa} / (7') mu-\{ga-u-an-zi(?)\} i-a-an-ta-ri nu-wa ma-a-an / (8') DINGIR \textit{e}-ri-\{ku-it\} TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za / (9') \{nu-wa-ar-\}a-\textit{za} ar-\textit{ku}-\textit{wa-ar} DŪ-zi nu-wa le-\{e\} / (10') iš-dam-ma-aš-zi KASKAL-za-wa-kān ar-\textit{ḫa} ar-r\{ta\}(?)

He sacrifices an ox to the Stormgod of heaven (and) a sh[ee]p to NIN.É.GAL. He prep[are]s [them] on the hearth and speaks as follows: “The king and the queen hereby proceed to the da\textit{ḫang}a to in\textit{voke} (the god). If the god of [Ne]rik is angry about some\textit{thing}, he will make a plea\(^{74}\) about it. (If) he does not hear, \textit{he will stand} away from the road.”

\textbf{I.B.a. arkuwai-, -za arkuwar iya- “to pray”, arkuwar, akuešni “prayer”}

1. KBo 6.1 = KUB 8.53 (CTH 341.III.1.C), a Hittite version of the Epic of Gilgameš, NH/NS.

KBo 6.1 iv: (7) \textit{nu} \textit{GIŠ.GIM.MAŠ-aš A-NA} \textit{ màn} \textit{ŠA-ME-E} [ ... ] / (8) ka-a-aš-wa a-pa-a-aš UD.'KAM'-za I-NA URU-r\{i\} [ ... ] / (9) ku-it URU-r\{i\} EGIR-pa a-še-ša-nu-u\{t\} [ ... ] / (10) am-mu-uk(az)-ma-'za-kān A-NA \textit{ màn} \textit{ŠA-ME-E} 'E' [ ... ] / (11) nu 'KASKAL'-an e-e-pu-'un' x [x] x x x [ ... ] / (12) 'UTU 'ŠA'-ME-E Š[\{A\}] GIŠ'.GIM.MAŠ \textit{ar-ku-wa-[ar]} / (13) iš-ta-ma-aš-[a] 'nu' A-NA \{HU-WA-WA 'IM'\} / (14) GAL.MEŠ-iš a-ra-iz-zi

And Gilgameš [said] to the Sungod of heaven: “Behold! (This is) that very day that in the city [ ... ]. Since she/he resettled [Enkidu(?)]\(^{75}\) in the city,
[...]. But I [...]
the Sungod of heaven, and I have taken the road [...].

The Sungod of heaven hear[d] the prayer[...].

2. VBoT 121+ (CTH 376.I.B), a New Hittite copy of the prayer concerning the plague and enemy invasion and addressed to the Sungoddess of Arinna and a KIN oracle, NH/NS.


[Should] the king make[ke] (this) prayer? in Arinna? [Let the KIN oracle be favourable]. He took [...], and [gave it] to the GOODNESS/RIGHTNESS.

On the second day he took the PRESENTATION OF THE [PRAY]ER and he [gave] it [to ...]. He took the THICK BREAD and BLOOD SACRIFICE(?) and he [gave] them [to ...]

3. KUB 24.1+ (CTH 377.A), a hymn and prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu, NH/NS.


Tablet one. (Text) complete. When the scribe makes daily a prayer on behalf of the king before Telipinu.

4. KUB 6.45 (CTH 381.A), ‘prayer’ of Muwatalli to the Assembly of the Hittite gods, NH/NS.

(1)

“A prayer to all the gods of Hatti” KUB 6.45 i: (20) ki-nu-na-mu DINGIR.MEŠ am-me-el ŠA SANGA-KU-NU IR-KU-NU me-mi-an / (21) ar-ku-wa-ar is-ta-ma-aš-tén šu-u-da-ak-ma-az šu-me-el-pář ŠA

76 Beckman 2001: 161 restores here “prayed” with a question mark.

77 The expression arkuwar iya- in line 8’ was translated by Berman 1982: 98 and 1983: 8 as “if the king will make a prayer.”

78 The phrase arkuwar tiyawwar was translated by Berman 1982: 98 and 1983: 8 as “presenting the [pray]er.”

79 The sentence with the expression arkuwar ešša- has been rendered in the present context as: “Lorsque le scribe, au nom du roi, en face de Telibinu, chaque jour, présente sa défense” Christmann-Franck 1989: 50; “Wenn der Schreiber wegen des Königs vor Telipinu täglich ein Gebet macht (verrichtet)” Kammenhuber HW 7: 1a: 310; “When the scribe daily makes a prayer” Gurney 1940: 37; “When the scribe presents daily a plea” Kassian-Yakubowitch 2007: 434; “Lorsque le scribe présente quotidiennement la plaidoire” Lebrun 1980: 187; “[he] daily makes a plea” Puhvel HED vol.1: 149; “When the scribe presents daily a plea” Singer 2002a: 56.

80 B: DINGIR.ME.EŠ

81 B: ar-ku-wa-ar-ra; a line division.

82 The phrase arkuwar ištamaš- is also employed in lines i 21-22, 27-28 of ms. B (i.e. KUB 6.46).
Now, gods, hear my, your priest’s, your servant’s word (B: and) prayer. First, I will make a prayer about yourselves, the divine lords, about your temples, about your statues; how the gods of Vatti are treated and how they...
are mistreated. Thereafter, I will make the matters of my soul into a plea¹¹¹. Divine lords, lend me (your) ear, and listen to these prayers o mine (lit. to these my prayers)!¹¹² And the words, which I will make into a prayer to the divine lords, these words, divine lords, accept (lit. take) and hear them! And whatever words you do not (wish to) hear from me, and I nevertheless will make them into a prayer¹¹³ to the gods, they merely emerge (lit. come up) from my human mouth. Refrain¹¹⁴ from listening to them, divine lords.

(2)


Šerri, my lord! You are a bull stepping before the Stormgod of the land of Ḥatti. In these words of presenting the prayer,¹²⁶ announce me to the gods!


¹¹² The phrase arkuwarriVI.A ištamašten has been translated here as: “Oíd estas súplicas” Bernabé 1987: 286; “Listen to these my prayers!” Goetze 1950: 398; “prêtez l’oreille à mes plaidoiries” Lebrun 1980: 274; “hear these my pleadings!” Puhvel HED vol. 1 150; “listen to these my pleas!” Singer 1996: 32 and 2002a: 87; “escuchadme estas plegarias!” Trabazo 2002: 339.

¹¹³ The phrase arkuwar iyami employed in lines i 27-28 and 30 has been previously translated as: “… present en mi alegato” Bernabé 1987: 286; “… I lay in prayer,” (the expression arkuwar iyami in line 30 was left untranslated) Goetze 1950: 398; “… ich zum Gebet mache” Kammenhuber HW² 310; “… j’adresse en guise d’excuse”, and “… j’adresse uniquement comme plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 274; “… I will make into a plea…” Singer 1996: 32 and 2002a: 87; “… yo las hago plegaria” Trabazo 2002: 339.

¹¹⁴ The verb tarna with the preverb parā has been translated in the present context as “permit/allow” in CHD P: 125 and Puhvel HED vol. 2: 457. The same verb has been rendered as “refrain” by Goetze 1950: 398. The latter translation of the verb was followed by Singer 1996: 32.

¹¹⁵ B: d.GUD Še-ri-iš-ma
¹¹⁶ B: URU ŠA A-TI
¹¹⁷ B: A-WA-TE ME.ES
¹¹⁸ The phrase arkuwar tiyauwaš also appears in lines i 35, 37 of ms B (KUB 6.46).
¹¹⁹ B: EN.ME.ES
¹²¹ B: ki-i
¹²² B: A-WA-TE ME.ES
¹²³ B: line division
¹²⁴ B: DINGIR.ME.ES EN.ME.ES
¹²⁵ B: da-ga-zi-pa-aš-ša {aš-ša}
¹²⁶ The phrase arkuwar tiyauwaš in lines 34 and 36 was previously translated as: “los asuntos que present en mi alegato” Bernabé 187: 286; “these matters that I present in my prayer”, Goetze 1950: 398; “des paroles que voici à presenter comme plaidoirie”, “les présentes
Let the gods, my lords, (B: all) the gods, my lords of heaven and earth hear these words (and) (B: of presenting) the prayer!

(3)


I, Muwatalli, the king, the priest of the Sungoddes s of Arinna and (B: of) all the gods, am hereby praying 147 to the Sungod of heaven: O Sungod of heaven, my lord, halt the gods on this day! O Sungod of heaven, invoke from heaven (and) earth, from mountains (and) rivers, from their temples and thrones (B: these) gods whom on this day I have invoked with my tongue in whatever arkušišni! 148

paroles comme une plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 274; “In these words of the presentation of the plea”, “Let the divine lords listen to (B: these words of pre[senting]) a plea” Singer 1996: 32 and 2002a: 87; “estas palabras que van como plegaria” and “estas palabras como plegaria” Trabazo 2002: 339, 341.

127 B: line division
128 B: URU A-ri-in-na
129 B has here ŠA DINGIR.ME.ES
130 B: line division
131 B: ne-pi-aš
132 B: ar-ku-ši-iš-ki-mi
133 B: ne-pi-aš
134 B: line division
135 B: UD-ti
136 B: DINGIR.ME.ES
137 B: line division
138 B: ku-uš ki-i-da-ni
139 B: ku-e-da-ni ar-ku-e-eš-ni after which the paragraph ends
140 B: ne-pi-aš
141 B: line division
142 B: tāk-na-az
143 B: line division
144 B: É.ME.ES
145 B: DINGIR-LJM-ŠU-NU
146 B: Gš GU.ZA.ME.ES-ŠU-NU


Now I, Muwatalli, the king raised by you, O Stormgod of lightning, am praying [173]: Recommend me to all the gods, whom I have invoked with my tongue and (to whom) I prayed [174]: Take the words of my tongue, that of

---

149 The verbal form arkuueskimi is also employed in line iv 2 of ms B (KUB 6.46).
150 B: DIN.GÍR.MÉ.EŠ
151 B: line division. The verbal form arkuwanun appears also in line iv 3 of ms B (KUB 6.46).
152 B: d[a]-[p]-[i]- PI-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-un-ut
153 B: line division
154 B: A-WA-TE.MÉ.EŠ
155 B: line division
156 B omits A-NA
157 B: DIN.GÍR.MÉ.EŠ
158 B: DIN.GÍR.MÉ.EŠ
159 B: line division
160 The expression arkuwar iya- also appears in lines iv 7, 11-12 of ms B (KUB 6.46).
161 B: line division
162 B: MUŠEN-Za
163 B: line division
164 B: ḫu-iš-zi
165 B: am-mu-uk-ma-kán
166 B: line division
167 B: DIN.GÍR.MÉ.EŠ
168 B: line division
169 B: A-WA-TE.MÉ.EŠ
170 B: DIN.GÍR.MÉ.EŠ
171 B: line division
172 B: line division


Muwatalli, your servant, and transmit (lit. fulfill) them before the gods! May they not turn back to me the words which I will make into a prayer\(^{175}\) to the gods! The bird takes refuge in the cage and lives. I too, have taken refuge with the Stormgod of lightning, my lord, and he has kept me alive. Transfer to the gods (lit. fulfill) the words, which I will make into the prayer to the gods, and may they hear me! Then, I will constantly exalt the Stormgod of lightning.

5. KUB 54.1 (CTH 389), a fragment of a prayer or a legal text, NH/NS.

(1)


[But] when they were daddawantēš, I [ma]de it/them into a prayer\(^{177}\) to the gods of Liprašša, (the gods) of my mother and my grandfather. I spoke to them this: “He did [lit.] to me in this way. Then you did not prevail [over me].” Although the spacing, as shown on the line below as well as in lines iii 38 and 42, has been translated here as: “presento en mi alegato” Bernabé 1987: 291; “I lay in prayer” Goetzte 1950: 398; “je présente comme plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 281; “prayer which I will present”, “the plea which I make” Singer 1996: 40 and 2002a: 91; “hago plegaria”, “la plegaria que realizare” Trabajo 2002: 347.

(2)

KUB 54.1 i: (33) nam-ma am-ba-aš-ši-in wa-ar-nu-nu-un nam-ma-zA a[m-b]-a-aš-ti / (34) EGIR-an ar-ku-u-wa-ar DÙ-un ma-a-an-wa ka-a-aš [a]-n-tu-aḫḫu-aš / (35) a-ki-ia am-me-el-ma-wa DI-šar UTU AN-E ;zi-[e]-la-an / (36) pu-nu-uš-du in-na-ra-u-wa-mu-kán ku-i-e-ēš ṣar-[a]-n]-u-ir

---

175 The phrase arkuwar iyami in lines iii 38 and 42, has been translated here as: “presento en mi alegato” Bernabé 1987: 291; “I lay in prayer” Goetzte 1950: 398; “je présente comme plaidoirie” Lebrun 1980: 281; “prayer which I will present”, “the plea which I make” Singer 1996: 40 and 2002a: 91; “hago plegaria”, “la plegaria que realizare” Trabajo 2002: 347.

176 The reading [e-eš]-ša-eḫḫu-un is also consistent with the expression -za arkuwar ešša-. Archi and Klengel 1985: 58 translated the noun arkuwar in this text as “prayer.”
Then I set fire to the burnt offering, and again I made a prayer at/for the burnt offering: “If this man dies, may the Sungod of heaven investigate my case, namely who has ruined me purposely.”


I stepped up before [the deity, made] a prayer[er] and I said this: “[…] to/for me the prayer, which I make to the god, [my] lord. […] My lord has treated me badly. […] he harmed me. And to which place he brought me, I, living, became dead to my brothers [and] sisters. I do not see a[t all] my brothers and sisters.

6. KUB 24.5+ (CTH 419.A), a substitute ritual for a Hittite king, NH/NS. The text has two duplicates KUB 36.92 (419.B) and KUB 36.93 (CTH 419.C).

KUB 36.92: (2') [x x -m]a GE₆-za ki-š[a-ri …] / (3') [na]-aš ŠA ḠŠIN ṣar-pī [ … ] / (4') nu kiš-an te-ez[t]i-šu-an-i [ … ] / (5') ar-ku-wa-ar ti-[a]-wa-an-zí / (6') nu-wa-mu ḠŠIN EN-IA A-NA / (7') GISKIM-[aḫ]-ta nu-wa m[a-a-an …] / (8') nu-wa-za ku-u-uš ‘da-ğ’ […] (Lines 2’-8’ of KUB 36.92 duplicate and partially complete obv. 6’-11’ of KUB 24.5)


And [when] the night falls, he takes [(the images of) the ancient] labarnas and goes to the ḫarpa of the Moongod. [He …] and he says as follows: “In the matter on account of which I have come [to present] a prayer\(^{180}\), hear me o Moongod, my lord! [Since the Moongod gave] an omen, when he announced evil (lit. my harm) for me, I have [just] given in (that) place [substitute images]. Take them for yourself [and set me free/spare me!]"
...he goes in. [He offers] a ram to Ereskigal (Lelw ani) and [makes] the following prayer: “[O] Ereskigal (Lelwani), my lady! The Moongod has just given (me) this omen, when he announced an evil (lit. my harm) for me. The upper gods placed me in your hand. Take the substitute (images) which I have placed in your hand, and release me! Let me see the Sungod of heaven with my eyes!”

7. KUB 55.66 + KUB 24.12 (CTH 448), a substitute ritual for Tudḫaliya, NS.

This restoration is based on the duplicate KBo 15.14 line 5’. The restoration is based on the duplicate KUB 36.94 line 3’. Kümmel 1967: 13 translated the expression -za arkual iya- in the present context as “Er betet folgendermaßen.” Taracha 2000: 93 reads here ma-[n]-’ia’-aḫ-[ka-an-du]. The same translation of the phrase arkual iyazi in the present context was offered by Taracha 2000: 94.
KUB 57.37 (CTH 470), a fragment of a ritual text, NH/NS.

KUB 57.37: (2') 3-ŠU ir-ḫa-iz-zi nu-za A-NA ₄AL-LA-TI / (3') Û A-NA ₄UD.KAM.SIG₂₄ ki-iš-ša-an / (₄') ar-ku-wa-ar i-ia-zi // (₅') ₄LE-EL-WA-NI ḍUD.KAM.SIG₂₄ ia-ux-ra₂₄ ITA.KAM.HI.aš-zu / (₆') x x x / (₇') [ ... ] ar-ku-wa-ar i-ia-zi / (₈') x x x x / (₉') [ ... ] ḍUD.KAM.HI.A NA [ ... ] / (₁₀') [ ... ] ₄wa'-x x -nì //

He completes the rounds 3 times. (Then) he makes a prayer to Allatum and to “Favourable Day” as follows: “O Lelwani, O “Favourable Day”, my lords, years, months, days in ful [...]. Years, months, days […] and he speaks the word. [He …] parḫšena back to him, [and] he speaks [the word]. Then [he/they present] kangati-plant to the gods and to the ritual practitioner. They present 9 eagles. [They …] dalaimi-vessels. The ritual practitioner eats and makes a prayer.

KUB 44.50 (CTH 500), a New Hittite fragment of a ritual.

KUB 44.50: (12') [ ... ] me-mi-ia-an-kán an-da me-ma-i / (₁₃') [ ... ] x-nu-zi INIM-an-kán an-da DU₁₁-i EGIS-ši'-m[a pár-ḫu'-e'-na-an / (₁₄') [ ... ] me-mi-ia-an-kán(? an-d][a DU₁₁-i nu A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ Ụ A-NA EN SISKUR kán-qá-ti / (₁₅') [ ... ] x 9 TI₆.MUSEN'(r) HI.A(? ti-ia-an-z[ ... ] ̣da-](a)-mi-ia-an-kán l (₁₆') [ ... ] EN SISKUR-za e-ez-za-i nu-za ar-ku- u-wa-ar i-ia-zi // [...and] he speaks the word / [He …] and he speaks the word. [He …] parḫšena back to him, [and] he speaks [the word]. Then [he/they present] kangati-plant to the gods and to the ritual practitioner. They present 9 eagles. [They …] dalaimi-vessels. The ritual practitioner eats and makes a prayer.

KUB 16.72 (CTH 573), a fragment of MUŠEN oracle, NH/NS.


[... …and] he kneels down before the deity. [He raises] his hands [towards] the deity, and calls for mercy. The singer […] of the string instrument […], he makes a prayer to the deity. Also [he …] to the mother goddess […] and spear. Either the great sons of the great palace or His Majesty […]. They send a man [to] Arinna, [they …] and they give […] to him. And the KING […] RITUAL (and) SOUL. […] Let 2(?) bird (oracles) be favourable.

187 Torri 1999: 56 translated the sentence containing the expression arkuwar iya-as: “poi ad Allatum e al “Giorno Propizio” in tal modo rivolge une preghiera.”

188 anda mema. “speak concurrently with an action” CHD L-N: 261b-262a.

[...] he kneels down [before the deity]. [He raises] his hands [towards] the deity, [he ... and call]ls [for mercy]. The singer [ ... ], [the ...] of the str[ing instrument ...], he makes [an arkular] [to the deity].

11. 354/z + 732/z + KBo 53.107 + KUB 50.72 (CTH 575.7), a New Hittite fragment of a snake oracle.


And [on] the road to the city of Nerik. dahagan […] And they will bring forth the invocation ritual. [They will ...]. They will carry the presentation of prayer, [they will ...] and in the very same way [they will give] the propitiatory gift and reparation […]. If [this] is approved by the deity, let [(the oracle) be favourable]. We named/assigned the ‘snake of the head’ to the Stormgod. [ ... ] He took one HEART, he took […] and he held (it) over the DEITY for/to the FESTIVALS […].

12. KUB 16.78 (CTH 580), a fragment of MUŠEN and KIN oracles, NH/NS?


They deliver a ritual, a word [and ...] to they deity. [They deliver ...] to the deity. And in the temple they deliv[er ...]. They offer a ritual to the deity. [They ... to] the deity(?). They make a prayer to the deity. And with that word the soul of the deity […]. Until Tudhaliya [...] comes back. If we have nothing to fear for him, [let] the S[U oracles be favourable].

13. KUB 15.22 (CTH 590), a fragment of a vow of queen Puduḫepa to the Sungoddess of Arinna, NH/NS.

KUB 15.22: (3’) [ ...] x INA \UR|TUL-na ar-ku-u-wa-ar ti-ia-u-wa-an-’zi’ [ ...] / (4’) [...]kiš]-an IK-RU-UB
In order to present a prayer\(^{189}\) in Arinna [...]. He/she made the following vow:

I.B.b. -za arkuwar iya- “to pray/to vow”

1. **KUB 15.1 (CTH 584), a votive text, NH/NS (Ḫattušili III and Puduḫepe).**

   KUB 15.1 obv.: (45) [z]a-aš-ḫi-ia-za [MUN]US.LUGAL A-NA UD.KAM.HLA EZEN₄ GIS₄ zu-up-pa-ri / (46) [A-N]A ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL <ŠA>\(^{190}\) URU ₆ U-aš-ša ar-ku-wa-ar / (47) [kiš]-an e-eš-še-eš-ta ma-a-an-wa ₆ UTU-ŠI ‘am’[-me]-e-da-₄ a₄z / (48) [U-ṭ]₄L ku-e[-ez]-qa Gǜ₄b-li-iš-ži q[MUNUS.LUGAL Š]₄A URU A-ša-₄wa / (49) [x x x x -a]₄ḫi₄ nu-wa A-NA ir[MUNUS.LUGAL Š]₄A / (50) [U]₄R U-aš-ša MA.N\₄A KŪ.BABBAR I[x x x] KŪ.BABBAR / (51) [x x x x x KŪ.B]ABBAR x [x x x x] x-x-an [x x x x x x x x] x

   In a [d]ream the [qu]een made a vow\(^{191}\) to the goddess (named) “Queen of Tarhuntašša” for the days of the Festival of Torches [as follows]: “If, His Majesty does not become any worse on my account, and the goddess [named] “Queen of Tarhuntašša” will [...], I will give] to the goddess [named “Queen” of [Tarhuntašša] mi]na of silver, one [... of silver [... of silver [... of silver [... of silver [...

2. **KUB 15.19 (CTH 590), a votive text, NH/NS (Ḫattušili III and Puduḫepe).**


   [In a dream] the queen [made a vow] to Šaumatari for the days of the Festival of Torches [as follows]: “If, His Majesty does not [become an]y worse] on my account, I will send [to] Šaumatari 1 golden soul (of) 29 šekels (20 GĪN).”

---

\(^{189}\) The phrase arkuwar tiyauwanzi has been translated in the present context as “ein Gebet zu setzen” by Kammenhuber HW\(^2\): 313; “to present a plea” by Puhvel HED vol. 1: 149 and “to address a prayer” by de Roos 2007: 184.

\(^{190}\) The hand copy of KUB 15.1 indicates that the enclitic -ma follows the Sumerogram MUNUS.LUGAL (see also Ünal 1974: 218). The photograph of this tablet is not clear. Considering the fact, that ma would be problematic in the present context because of the continuing main clause, the reading ŠA is adopted here (already suggested by de Roos 2007: 93 and note 100) and in line 48.

\(^{191}\) The previous translations of the sentence that employs the expression arkuwar iya- include: “the queen made the following plea” Hoffner 2003: 67; “the queen prayed” de Roos 2007: 101; “Die Königin machte ein Bittegebet” Ünal 1974: 218.

\(^{192}\) The restoration of the noun arkuwar, suggested by de Roos 2007: 177, seems very plausible because of the similarities this passage shares with in relevant passages in KUB 15.19 and KUB 15.1.
I.C. arkuwai- “to complain”

1. KBo 11.1 (CTH 382), a prayer to the Stormgod concerning the cult of Kummanni, NH/NS (Muwatalli II).

   (1) Obv.: (18) ma-a1-\[\text{an}\] DINGIR-LIM KUR-TI-ma ku-iš-ki ⇊HUL-ab-\[\text{an}-za nu ⇊U-ni ‘ar\[-\text{ka}-wa-it ki-nu-na-at-za ⇊UTU-ŠI istringstream[NIR,\text{GÁL}] EN.KUR.KUR.JI Ha ar-ku-wa-ar e-eš-ša-ab-\[\text{ḫi} / (19) ‘nā\[-\text{at}1’ (NI EŠ) ⇊U EN-IA iš-ma-aš-du

   If[\text{f}] some god of the land was maltreated and he has complained to the Stormgod, [now I, My Majesty], Muwa[talli, lord of the land]s am making [that] into a plea, and may the Stormgod, my lord, hear it!

   (2) Obv.: (32) ma-a-an-\[\text{ma} HUR.SAG-ma \text{‘ku1-iš-ki na-\[\text{aš-}\text{ma ši-nap-ši šu-\[\text{upp-\text{pa} AŠ-RU ku-it-ki ⇊HUL-ab-\[\text{an nu A-NA 4U ar-ku-wa-it ki-nu-na-at ⇊ka1-[a-\[\text{aš UtU-ŠI istringstream[NIR,\text{GÁL}] / (33) E\[\text{GIR-\text{pa SIG}_{5}ab-mi}}

   If some mountain, or a šinapši-sanctuary, (or) some holy place has been mistreated and has complained to the Stormgod, now I, My Majesty, Muwatalli am hereby setting it right again.

   (3) Rev.: (3’) ‘ma-a-an DUMU.MEŠ ku-ri-im-mu-uš-ma ku-i-e-eš pi-eš-kán\[-\text{zi} / (4’) nu A-NA 4U\text{lUGAL-lasting ma ar-ku-wa-it 4U\text{lUGAL-ma-aš-\text{ma A-NA 4U a[r-ku-wa-it]} / (5’) na-at [\text{E}GIR\text{R-pa SIG}_{5}ab-mi}}

   If some people(?) give orphans (lit. orphaned children) …, and he has complained to Sarruma, and Sarruma has complained to the Stormgod, they will bring it in order again.

I.D.a. -za arkuwar iya- “to make a request”

1. KBo 15.7 (CTH 420), a fragment of a substitute ritual for a Hittite king, NH/NS.

   KBo 15.7: (11’) LUGAL-uš-ma-za ar-\[\text{ḫi} / (12’) [k]at-ta ú-ič-zi nu-za wa-ar-ap-\[\text{zi} / (13’) [w]a-aš-ši-ia-iz-zi na-\[\text{aš-EGIR-pa GISKIM.JI-A ‘MA-ME’-TI pa-ič-zi [nu-za(\text{?})] / (14’) \{x x x\}_{x 194} A-NA NAM.RU ar-ku-wa-ar kiš-an DÜ-\[\text{zi ‘ka1-\[\text{aš-\text{wa-mu-\text{za / (15’) [x x} x 194} E\[\text{GIR-pa ḫa-as-ta ‘nu-mu-\text{za} [\text{NAM.RA EN-JA le-e nam-m[a ...] / (16’) \{x x x x x \} x x x x x u\[-\text{-zi nu kiš-an me-m[a-i ...] / (17’) [ ... zil-i-a IŠ-\[\text{TU} KU.BABBAR GUŞKIN [ ...] / (18’) [ ...] \text{-pa-al-la-za ar-\[\text{ḫu ú-[ ...] / (19’) [ ... ŠI DUMU-ŠU PA-e-t\text{t} NAM.RU-\[\text{š} ...] //

193 The verb arkuwai- appearing in the present context has been previously translated as “to plead,” “to present a plea” by Buis 2007: 182; Lebrun 1980: 300, 301, 302; Houwink ten Cate/Josephson 1967: 116, 117, 118; Puvel HED vol.1: 149 and Singer 2002a: 83, 84; “to pray” by Kammenhuber HW: II 1.b 310-311 or to “explain in prayer” by Haas-Wilhelm 1974: 38 n. 3.

194 The verb arkuwai- appearing in the present context has been previously translated as “to plead,” “to present a plea” by Buis 2007: 182; Lebrun 1980: 300, 301, 302; Houwink ten Cate/Josephson 1967: 116, 117, 118; Puvel HED vol.1: 149 and Singer 2002a: 83, 84; “to pray” by Kammenhuber HW: II 1.b 310-311 or to “explain in prayer” by Haas-Wilhelm 1974: 38 n. 3.

The particle -za is missing from this construction. Garrett (1999: 242) suggested that the clitic chain nu-za appears at the end of line 13’ and that the two signs at the beginning of line 14’ belong to another word.
The king strips. He comes down. He washes and puts on another festival attire. And he makes request\textsuperscript{195} to the deportee as follows: “He has just opened back [...] for me. You [de]portee, my lord, do not [...] me/for me further. [He ...] and says as follows: ‘[...] with silver and gold. [He ...] away. He went [...] with [... with] his and his son.”

The deportee [...]KyDbo 13.161 (CTH 470.1358), a fragment of a ritual, NH/NS.


The sacrificer (lit. lord of the ritual) reque[sts] from the Stormgod: “O Stormgod, my lord! Give them back to me!” Thus says the Stormgod: “You just gave them to me. Are you now asking them back from me?” The sacrificer reque[sts] from the Stormgod: “Give them to me! and they will always await you.” The Stormgod gave them over to him // Afterwards they set up horses, a chariot and a weapon in Arinna for the Stormgod. The sacrificer reque[sts] from the Stormgod: “[O Stormgod, my lord!] Give them back to me! Thus says the Stormgod: “You just gave them to me. Are you now asking them back from me?’ The sacrificer reque[sts]: “[give them to me!], and they will [...] in front of my house.”

I.D.b (-za) arkuwar iya- “to make a petition”

1. KBo 5.9 (CTH 62.II.A), a treaty of Muršili II of Hatti with Duppi-Tešub of Amurru. The relevant lines are duplicated by KBo 50.25 (CTH 62.II.E):

KBo 5.9 ii (49) …na-aš-ma-at-ta ma-a-an 斗志 UTU-[ŠI] / (i) (1) ku-e-qa me-mi-ia-nu-ši šar-wa ši me-ma-i ku-u-šu wa me-mi-ia-aš / (2) na-aš-ma-wa ku-u-šu-me-mi-i-an i-ia ku-u-šu wa me-mi-ia-aš / (3) ku-iš Ū-UL i-ia-uwa-wa-aš na-an-za-an a-pi-ia-pat / (4) pé-di-iš-ši ar-ku-wa-ar DŪ-ia\textsuperscript{196} ku-u-

195 The expression arkuwar DŪ-zi in line 14’ was translated as: “He makes a plea” Garrett 1999: 241; “Er [der König] macht eine Bitte” Friedrich-Kammenhuber HW\textsuperscript{2} 1, 312; “sprechter eine Bitte” Kümmel 1967: 37; “And he (the king) makes a plea/request” Melchert 1998: 47.

196 The expression arkuwar iya- has been translated by Hoffner 1995: 192 as “to make a plea”. Ünal 1996: 55 rendered this expression in lines 1’ and 5’ as “to demand,” but in lines 10’ and 14’ as “to argue.”

197 For the translation of immakku as “just” see Hoffner 1995: 192-193.

198 E: ‘r-[ia]"
un-wa me-mi-ia-an / (5) Ú-UL tar-aḫ-mi nu-wa-ra-an Ú-UL DŪ-mi / (6) na-an-za-an ma-ḫa-an nam-ma LUGAL-us še-esḫ-a-ši
(The passage is duplicated by lines 1'-2' of KBo 50.25)

Or if His Majesty should somehow secretly give you orders: “Do this thing or that thing,”
make a petition
about that one among these things which cannot be done
right on the spot (saying): “I cannot and I won’t do this thing.” As soon as the king decides it further...

2. KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79 (CTH 191), a Letter of Manapa-Tarḫunta, the king of the Seḫa River Land to a Hittite king, NH/NS (Muršili II or Muwatalli).

However, ...-ḫuḫa and the purple-dyers made a petition to Atpas as follows: “We are the purple-dyers [and] we came over the sea. Let us present (our) purple-dyed wool/things! Šiggauna sinned, [but] we have done nothing!” When they have made their purple-dyed wool/things (the subject of) a petition, Atpas [did not] transport them.

199 Lit. “Do these things or this thing”. Beckman 1999: 62 read this sentence as “perform these deeds or that deed”.

200 The phrase arkuwar DŪ-ia has been translated in the present context as either “to make an appeal” Beckman 1999: 62; Singer 2002b: 97, Friedrich 1926: 21 or “to petition” Goetz 1950: 204. Pulver’s translated arkuwar as “explanation” HED vol. 1: 149.

201 The sentence was translated as: “…what you do not want to perform” Beckman 1999: 62; “…(if) that order cannot be executed” Goetz 1950: 204; “which is not possible to perform” Singer 2002b: 97; “…what you do not want to perform” Beckman 1999: 62.


203 For the translation of the Akkadian term LÚ.MEŠ ŠARIPU as “purple-dyers”, its equation with the Hittite argammanliš and for the translation of Hittite argamman as “purple-dyed wool” see Singer 2008: 21-32 and Hoffner 2009: 295. Houwink ten Cate 1983-84: 40, does not translate LÚ.MEŠ ŠARIPU, and interprets the Hittite argammanliš and argamman as “tributaries” and “tribute.”

204 The previous translations of the phrase arkuwar iyer employed in obv. 15 and 19 include: “…addressed a petition” and “made their purple-dyed stuff (the subject of) a petition” Hoffner 2009: 295; “addressed a petition” and “they had [made] their tribute (the subject of) a petition” Houwink ten Cate 1983/4: 40; “ont adressé une pétition” and “et quand ils ont fait du tribut (le sujet de) leur pétition” Freu 2004: 301.


[Have I] n[ot offered] the guarantee to Piyamaradu? In the land of Ḥatti the guarantee is as follows: if they send bread and šiyanta (drink?)210 to someone, they may not harm him (lit. they may not d[o] harm to him). As a guarantee I brought this (message): “Come, make a petition211 before me. Then I will put you on the road. And I will write to my brother when I put you on the road. If your wish is satisfied, let it be (so); but if your wish is not satisfied, then my man will bring you back, just as you came, into the land of Aḫhiyawa.

4. HKM 57 = Mš. 75/60 (CTH 190), a Middle Hittite letter from Ilali and Kašilti to LU BE-EL MADGALTI and to Ḥuilli.


[The son of the priest] will not proceed to [make] a p[etition].213 He will not s[peak] back to you (pl.) (saying): “Will you not j[udge] the c[ase] of m[y] slave (i.e. Kaštanda)?”

---

205 Although most scholars date the text to the reign of Hattušili II, some are still in favour of Muwatalli I. See Smith, 1990: 22-23; Freu, LAMA 10/11; Gurney 2002: 133-141.

206 Line count is that of KUB 14.3 hand-copy.


208 For a discussion of NINDA and šiyanta[n] see Hoffner 2009: 392 note 304.

209 Translation of Friedrich HW 191.

210 Translation of Forrer 1926: 164 (Forschungen 1).


213 The previous translations of the phrase arkuwar iya- in line 26 include: “wird...die Bitte richten” Alp 1991: 229; “to make a plea” Hoffner 2009: 205.
I.E. (-za) appa arkuwar iya-/ešša – “to respond”

1. HKM 52 = Mšt. 75/57 (CTH 190), a Middle Hittite letter of a scribe Ḫattušili to Ḫimüili, BĚL MADGALTI “district governor”, in Maṣat (Tapikka) and a supplementary letter of a scribe Tarjunmiya to Ḫimüili.

HKM 52 obv.: (6) ŠEŠ.DŪG.GA-mu ku-e tu-el ud-da-a-ar / (7) ḫa-at-re-eš-ki-ši na-at I-NA Ř.GAL-LIM / (8) Ú-UL am-nu-uk-pá-t me-mi-iš-ki-mi / (9) nu-ut-ta EĞIR-pa ar-ku-wa-ar iš-ša-a-[gregar]-a[greg]a[greg]a[greg]

My dear brother, as to your matters about which you keep writing to me, do I not, on my part, keep speaking about them in the palace? I keep giving you a reply.\(^{214}\)

2. KBo 32.202 (CTH 215), a letter of a Hittite dignitary, MH/MS.

KBo 32.202 rev.: (7') [A-NA] rīš-UTU-ŠI ku-it ḫa-at-rī-.ešši na-aš tup-pi up-pa-[aš] / (8') [na-aš] PA-NI 4-UTU-ŠI ḫal-zi-.i-li-en1 nu-ut-ta k[a-aš-ma-zu\(^2\)] / (9') [ud-da-ni-l][i(\(2\))] a-ap-pa ar-ku-[ar ili]-eš-ši et nu am-[m(e-\(2\)] / (10') BE-LI-IA ud-da-ni-i EĞIR-an [i-i-l][a(\(2\))]?

Regarding the message (lit. the tablet of writing) which [he] sent [to] His Majesty, we read [it] before His Majesty. He has [just] replied (lit. made a response) to you [in (this) matter]. My lord, [carry on] in (this) matter.

3. KBo 1.30 (CTH 305) is a trilingual lexical list (Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite) commonly referred to as the Old Babylonian “lú-series”, OH/OS.

(1) KBo 1.30 obv.: [lú KI.MIN-šu]-gar-nu-tuku /// lu-KI.MIN-šu-kar-nu-ut-ku /// ša te-er-tám ir-tám la-a i-šu-u /// [u]-ta-ni-i-za ku-iš ar-ku-u-wa-ar na-at-ta i-ia-ži

Sum: “someone who does not have ...” Akk. “someone who does not have a confronting message?”. Hittite “someone who does not respond (lit. make an answer)\(^{215}\)” to the matter/word”.

(2) KBo 1.30 obv.: [lú KI.MIN-šu]-gar-nu-zu /// lu-KI.MIN-šu-kar-nu-zu /// ša te-er-tám ir-tám la-a i-du-u /// u-ta-ni-i-za ku-iš ar-ku-u-wa-ar na-at-ta ša-ak-ki


\(^{215}\) The previous translations of the expressions arkuwar iya- and arkuwar šak(k)- in the above passages include: “who does not make a reply to a word”, “who does not recognize a reply to (his) word” Güterbock 1969: 215: “celui qui dans une chose ne fait pas d’excuse/de defense” Laroche 1964: 16; “who does not make a turned breast” (Akk.), “who does not offer defence in a matter” (Hitt.) Puhvel HED vol.1: 149-150. Hrozny understood the noun arkuwar in these lines as “Abwehren” (1917). The above sentences are cited in the CAD vol T: 367, without the translation and with a note that Akkadian phrase tertam ištaru may reflect the idiom irta turru.
Sum. “someone who does not know...”, Akk. “who does not know a confronting message?” Hitt. “someone who does not recognize an answer to the matter/word.”

4. KUB 5.7 (CTH 574), a Hurri-bird oracle, NH/NS.

KUB 5.7 obv.: (49’) IGI-zi IR-TAM ki-iš-ša-an a-ri-ia-u-e³-en ŠUTU-ŠI I[R-TAM ma-a-an(?) …] / (50’) pa-ra-a-aš-kán SIG₂-in Ši-iz-zí DINGIR-LUM-šī ar-ku-wa-[i]z-zi(?)... [217] /

We posed the first oracle question in the following way: [If ] His Majesty as[ks the oracle question ... ], will it come out well? The deity respon[ds]²¹⁸ to him [...].

5. HKM 64 = Mšt. 75/24 (CTH 190), a Middle Hittite letter from Piyama-Tarḫunta to Kaššū.

HKM 64: // (22) nu ud-da-na-aš ar-ku-wa-ar / (23) ku-it EGIR-pa i-e-er / (24) ne-et-ta ka-a-aš-ma / (25) TUP-PÍ ŠA mš-mu-DINGIR-LIM / (26) LÚ TE₂-MI Ši-da-aš //

And (my) messenger brought to you the response²¹⁹ to the matter, which they have made, (written) on a tablet of Himmuli.

6. HKM 89 = Mšt. 73/78 (CTH 190), a Middle Hittite letter from Maşat-Höyük.

HKM 89 rev.: (26) [nu-m]u ke-e-da-ni <A-NA> TUP-PÍ ar-ku-wa-ar / (27) [x]̱-x Ju-u-da-a-ak J̱J JJ a-at-ra-a-i

Write to [m]e promptly the response²²⁰ to this tablet!²²¹

L.F. arkuwai- “to explain (oneself)”, arkuwar “explanation”

1. KBo 4.8 (CTH 71.A), an exculpation prayer of Muršili II, NH/NS.

KBo 4.8 iii: (20’) [x x x x x x n]u ka-a-ša am-mu-uk mš-Mur-ši-li-iš / (21’) [x x x x x x] pš-ra-an wa-a-bnu-nu-un / (22’) [x x x x x x x x] Šu-

²¹⁶ For the translation of -za ... šak(k)- as “to recognize, acknowledge, accept” see CHD vol. Š 29-30, 31.

²¹⁷ The restoration of Tognon 2004: 68. From the grammatical perspective, the restoration of arkuwaizzi in the present context could be accurate since the Sumerogram DINGIR-LUM, a singular subject, requires a verb in the third person singular. However, it is not entirely certain whether one should restore here the verbal form arkuwaizzi or perhaps the expression arkuwar dai-. One cannot restore the arkuwar iya- because of the lack of the particle -za, which commonly appears with that expression. Trabazo 2002: 614 reads here DINGIR-LUM ši-x-RI-QÚ-wa].

²¹⁸ The verb arkuwai- in the present context has been translated as “respond, reply” by Tognon 2004: 69.

²¹⁹ For the same translation of the expression arkuwar ešša- in the present context see Hoffner 2009: 191. Alp 1991: 243 renders the expression arkuwar iya- in this context as “request.”


²²¹ For the translation of ke-e-da-ni <A-NA> TUP-PÍ as “to this tablet” see Hoffner 2009: 252 note 26.
Hereby, I, Muršili […] have come forward. […] I have promptly explained myself? […] hear [me].


But you [occup]ied the city of [U]pniwuwa on your own authority. Furthermore, the fugitives of the land of Hatti, who [went] to you, you, Madduwatta, kept taking for yourself. [The father] of His Majesty and His Majesty wrote to you after them repeatedly, but you did not give them back. When we [wr]ite [to yo]u, [you do not …] about this matter. Furthermore, you do not make an explanation with regard to the matter. You [write] about other matter. You always write back to us about other matter.

3. HKM 63 = Mšt. 75/49 (CTH 190), a letter from Piyama-Tarḫunta to Ḥimmuili, MH/MS.


---

222 Hoffner 1983: 189 read arkuwanun as ar-wa-nu-un and translated it as “I presented myself.” The same verbal form was translated by Singer 2002a: 78 as “I bowed down.” The beginning of this verbal form is partially broken. The photograph of KUB 14.8 shows that the traces visible before and after the small break in the tablet are consistent with ar-ka and the space available suggests restoration of two rather than only one sign. Consequently, the verb arkuwa is restored here (already suggested by Laroche 1964-65: 17, Kammenhuber HW2: 309; Puhvel HED vol. 1 1984: 149; Kloekhorst 2008: 205 who translated this verbal form here as “to make a plea”).

223 The verb in the sentence that contains arkuwar was restored by Goetze (1928) as istamaš- “to hear” and as dai- “to put, to present” by Beckman (1999). Alternatively, one may restore here the expression arkuwar iya- (see already Puhvel HED vol. 1: 149). The fact that the particle -za is missing, does not make such a restoration invalid. In fact, in some of the Middle Hittite texts (for instance, letters from Maṣat Höyük), the expression arkuwar iya-appears without the particle -za.

224 The noun arkuwar has been translated in the present context as “defence” by Beckman 1999: 258, “request” by Goetze 1928: 29 and “excuse” by Puhvel HED vol.1: 149.
With regard to what you, my dear brother, wrote to me, as follows: “Nobody brings back to me (any) explanation\textsuperscript{225} with regard to the matter about which I keep writing to you.”

\textsuperscript{225} The nonun \textit{arkuwar} has been translated here as “explanation” by Melchert 1998: 46 and Hoffner 2009: 215 and as “request” by Alp 1991: 239.
II. MALD-, MALDUWAR, MALTEŠŠAR

II.A. mald-, “to recite”, “to pray”, malteššar “recitation”, “invocation”

1. KUB 30.42 + KBo 31.3 (CTH 276.1), shelf list of the DUBxKAM type, OH/NS(?).

```
```

One “long tablet”: “When the singer libates in the temple of Inara, breaks a thick bread, (When, at night, the singer breaks a thick bread in the temple of Inara) and recites...” (Composition) finished.

2. KUB 30.68 + KUB 30.52 + KBo 31.1 + KBo 31.2 + KBo 31.14 (CTH 278.1), a lexical list of the DUBUMMA/mān type, MH/NS.

```
KUB 30.68 iii: (4) [... DUB ma-a[1-te-eš-na-aš mTa-a-at-ta LÚ d][M x x x x x x (x)] / (5) [... LÚ] MEŠ NAR ki-i ŠA [URL] Ne-[ni]-r[i]-i-ga x x x x x x x x 228 / (6) [...DUB ma-a[l-te-eš-na-aš Wā, Ŧu-ut-ta-ā-i-li] x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x 229 / (7) [...x LÚ] NAR "Hū-az-zi-ia L[Ú] șIM] / (8) [... URL] ZA-AL-P[U]-WA ma-a-an DUMU-[aš] A-NÁ DINGIR.MEŠ URL ZA-[L-P]-U-WA / (9) [... pa-a-ič-zi-li ki-ma 230 ma-am-ma-al-zi-kán-ta // [... tablet of the recitation(s)231 of Tatta, the man of the [storm]god, [...] those singers of Ner[ik. [... tablet of recitation(s) of Waḥutaili, [...], [...], the singer, Huzziya, the man of the [storm]god, [...] the city of Zalpuwa. When the prince [goes] to [worship]232 the gods of Zalpuwa, they recite these (chants).233]
```

3. KUB 9.28 (CTH 442.A), a festival dedicated to the goddess Heptade ([d]IMIN.IMIN.BI), MH/NS. This texts has one duplicate, KBo 19.132, MH/NS.

---

Laroche (1964) followed by Lebrun (1980) interpret išpanti in the present context as a dative-locative singular of the noun išpant- “night”. The form iš-pa-an-it has been found twice in Old Hititite texts (Kloekhorst 2008: 404-405) as the spelling of the third singular person present active of the verb šipant- “to libate.” Consequently, išpanti in the present context can be translated either as “at night” (Laroche, Lebrun) or as “he libates” (Hoffner 2003: 69). Either translation makes sense in the present context.

The verb mald- has been translated in the present context as “to recite” by Dardano 2006: 29, in CHD L-N: 133, by Hoffner 2003: 69, Laroche 1975: 164 and Lebrun 1980: 444. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32 translates this verb here as “to utter.”


Dardano 2006: 194 restores at the end of line 6 [L thú VI] DUDU;]

Laroche 1975: 174 reads here the Akkadian kiša “when”.

The noun malteššaš has been translated here as: “chants” in CHD L-N: 139; “Rezitation” by Dardano 2006: 195; “hymnes” by Lebrun 1980: 444.

This restoration is suggested in CHD L-N: 139.

The verb mammalt- has been translated in this context as “recite (chants)” in CHD L-N: 138, as “rezitieren (Gesang)” by Dardano 2006: 195 and by Tischler 1990: 111 and as “declaim repeatedly” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 36. Forlanini 1984: 253 does not translate this verb at all, but argues that it expresses the idea of an appeal/calling (Anrufungen). Also Laroche 1975: 174 leaves the verb untranslated but considers it as a title of the chant/song.
Two pitchers: in one pitcher of beer for drinking, a rigid (?) drinking straw full (of?) páršu[il (or: a full páršu[il ?)] is inserted. The diviner takes it, recites to the gods, and breaks it.

4. KUB 41.23 (CTH 458.10.A), incantation ritual, OH/NS. The passage, which contains the verbal form maldi, is partially duplicated by lines 1’-5’ of KBo 22.170.

5. KBo 21.80 + KBo 20.44 (CTH 621.A), the first tablet of the AN.TAH.ŠUMŠAR festival, OH/MS. Lines i 15’-19’ of KBo 21.80+ are

---

234 Translation of CHD vol. P: 191. Catsanicos 1986: 153 translates these sentences as “Deux ‘vases’; dans l’un d’eux (se trouve) de la bière à boire (et) de paršul; (il en est) plein. On (y) laisse un roseau (qui est) bien fixé (bien joint).” Kammenhuber 1974: 78 renders this sentence as “2 K.-Gefäße, davon 1 H.-Gefäß Bier zum Trinken voll.”

235 The verb mald- in the present context has been translated as “il recite (des formules)” by Catsanicos 1986: 153, “recite” in CHD L-N: 133 and as “utter” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32.

236 Reading of CHD Š: 56 b.

237 This restoration was suggested in CHD vol L-N: 118.

238 KBo 22.170 line 1’: ši-ú-na-ša-aš.

239 KBo 22.170 line 2’: ta-ri-ia-an-za.

240 KBo 22.170 line 5’: ša-ša-a-ša-aš.
duplicated by lines 18-22 of KBo 20.71 + KBo 20.76 + KBo 23.99 (CTH 621.B).

(1) KBo 21.80 + KBo 20.44 i: // (15') [UGULA \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) MUHALDIM] KAŠ GEŠTIN-an iš-pa-an-tu-uz Zi-aš-t³šar³ LUGAL-i pi[a-ra-a] / (16') [\( ^{\text{e-ep-z}} \) i \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) MUHALDIM ³š ŠU ši-pa-an-ti[i] / (17') \( x \times x \) x \( ^{\text{LU}} \) ṭi-iš-tu-um-ma-aš ma-a-al-ti \( ^{\text{LU,SILA,ŠU,DUH}} \) LUGAL-i G[AL(?)] pa-a-i \( ^{\text{dUTU}} \) / (18') [\( ^{\text{LU,MES \ ŠU,LI}} \) ywa-an-zi ta-aš-sa-an A-rNA \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) ALAM.ZU₉ / (20') \( ^{\text{wa-a-tar \|a-t³š}} \) wa-an-zi //

The overseer of the cooks [holds out] to the king a beer and wine libation vessel (B: wine libation vessel). The king puts his hand (over it). The overseer of the cooks libates three times. … The ješta-man recites\(^{242}\). The cupbearer [gives a cup] to the king. The king drinks to the Sungoddess, to Mezulla and to the Moon god. The “barbers” come and pour water over the reciters.

6. Various manuscripts of a “Haste festival” (EZEN₄ nuntarrijaš[ḫas]) CTH 626, OH/NS. Lines rev. 11′-14′of KBo 11.30 (CTH 626.6.T.III.1.B) and vi 6-10 of KUB 41.44 (CTH 626.6.T.III.1.H) are duplicates. Although IBoT 2.101 (CTH 626.6.T.III.1.G) and KUB 25.17 (CTH 626.6.T.III.1.J) do not duplicate one another, their context and wording is similar.

(1) KBo 11.30 rev.: // (11′) GAL \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) ME-ŠE-DI te-ez-zi ta-[u-wa-al …] / (12′) ta <A-NA> \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) ALAM.ZU₉ ḥu-[u-up-pār GEŠTIN pt-an-zi] / (13′) ta GEŠTIN ma-al-di ta-a[ž ḥu-u-up-pār GEŠTIN] / (14′) \( ^{\text{LU,MES}} \) ALAM.ZU₉ da-a-i //

\(^{241}\) There is enough space for one sign after the Sumerogram LUGAL-i. To complete the sentence a noun and the verb are needed. Yosida 1992: 126 restores here a-ku-wa-an-na pa-a-i. If his restoration is correct, it would have to be written on the edge and perhaps on the other side of the tablet.

\(^{242}\) The verb *mald* has been translated in the present context as “declaim” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32.
The chief of the bodyguards says: *ta[wal ... They give* a *huppar-vessel of wine* to the performers. He *recites* "wine-formula" and the performer takes for him*[self the huppar-vessel of/with wine].

KUB 41.44 vi.: // (6) [t]a A-NA ḠEŠTIN pí-an-zí / (8) [ta] GEŠTIN ma-al-tí / (9) [ta-a]z ḡu-u-up-pár GEŠTIN / (10) [LÚ] AM.ZU₉ da-a-i //

They give a [h]uppar-vessel of/with wine to the performers. He *recites* "wine-formula" and [the performer] takes [for him]self the huppar-vessel.

KUB 25.17 vi: (4) ... GAL ME-ŠE-DI / (5) 'A-NA[?] ALAM.ZU₉ ḡu-u-up-pár GEŠTIN-aš / (6) [t]ar-ku-mi-ia-iz-zí / (7) ta-aš-ma-aš ALAM.ZU₉ ma-al-di //

The chief of the bodyguards announces for the performers a huppar-vessel of wine and they give them the huppar-vessel of wine. The performer [ ... ] *recites*.

The performer/reciter dips wine from the kalti-vessel and *recites* as follows: (text in Hattic) "līnaia līnaia wa.piš kurkuwa,na ligara-n".

KUB 48.9 (CTH 627.3.b.C), the KILAM festival, NS.

KUB 48.9 ii: (14) ALAM.ZU₉ kal-ti-‘az’ GEŠTIN / (15) ḡu-a-ni nu ki-iš-ša-an ma-al-di // (16) li-i-na-ia li-i-na-ia / (17) wa,pi-šiš kur-kwa,wa-na li-ga-ra-an //

The performer/reciter dips wine from the kalti-vessel and *recites* as follows: (text in Hattic) "līnaia līnaia wa.piš kurkuwa,na ligaran"

KBo 30.31 + KBo 25.51 (CTH 631), the “Thunderstorm” ritual celebrated by the royal couple, OH.

---

243 The same translation of the verb *mald-* in the present context has been offered in CHD L-N: 133, by Oettinger 1979: 444, by Popko 1994: 261 and Nakamura 2002: 227. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33 translates this verb here as “pronounce”.

244 The same translation of the verb *mald-* in the present context has been offered in CHD L-N: 133, by Oettinger 1979: 444, by Popko 1994: 261 and by Nakamura 2002: 227. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33 translates this verb here as “pronounce”.

245 The verb *mald-* in the present context has been translated as “recite” by Nakamura 2002: 211.

246 The same translation of this verb in the present context was offered by Nakamura 2002: 234.

247 The verb *mald-* has been translated in the present context as “recite” in CHD L-N: 133b, by Klinger 1996: 240 and Singer 1984: 151. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32 translates this verb here as “declaim”.

---

[The king] steps towards the throne/Halmašu and drinks twice. He libates [to the Sungoddess and Mezzul]a. They [play] (lit. strike) [the great string instrument]. The performers [are shouting]. [The king] hands over one vessel (with) wine [to the performers … a]nd recites.

9. CTH 647, festivals celebrated by the king or the prince at Nerik.

(1) KUB 25.36 (CTH 647.6), MH/MS.


The king goes and bows to the Stormgod. The GUDU-priest steps behind him and recites [248] in Hattic. When the GUDU-priest finishes the recitation he [ç]leans the king’s hands (lit. he cleans the king, his hands). The king bow[es]s (and) he (i.e. the GUDU-priest) takes his [p]lace. The SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa goes, bows to the Stormgod, ho[lds] out his hands and in Hattic recites. And the SANGA-priest of Ḥalipinu steps behind him. When the SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa finishes the recitation, he bows and takes back his place. The king goes and bows to ZABABA. The GUDU-priest steps behind him and recites in Hattic. When the GUDU-priest finishes the recitation, he cleans the king’s hands. The king bows and he (i.e. the GUDU-priest)

---

248 The verb mald- has been translated in these passages as “recite” and the verbal noun malduwar as “recitation” by Haas (“rezitiert”, “Rezitativ”) 1970: 207, 209, by Taggar-Cohen 2006: 249 and in CHD L-N: 133. Although Lebrun 1980: 446 does not translate this text in its entirety, he describes the ritual activities performed in the relevant passages by the king and the priests and renders the verb mald- as “proclamation solennellement le vœu en hatti” (mald-). Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35 translates the verbal noun malduwar in line v 20 as “declaiming” and indicates that the same translation applies to all the instances of this noun in this passage.
takes his place. The SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa goes, bows to ZABABA, holds out his hands and recites in Hatti[c]. And the SANGA-priest of Halipinu steps behind him. When the SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa finishes the recitation, he takes back his place.

(2) KBo 11.45 (CTH 647.13.A), OH/NS.


The prince goes and bows to ZABABA. The GUDU-priest steps behind him, recites in Hattic and takes his place. The SANGA-priest of the deity Zaaluqqa bows to ZABABA, holds away his hands and recites in Hattic. The SANGA-priest of Valipinu steps behind him, bows and takes his place.

10. VsNF 12.12 (CTH 648.1), a festival celebrated by DU MU-aš, NS.


The prince comes out of the temple of the Stormgod and goes to the temple of ZABABA. The prince, preceded by the performers, comes into the courtyard. The performers call out “aha”. The SANGA-priest of the goddess Inara holds out tuḫ-eššar-cleansing substance to the prince and the prince cleans himself ritually. The prince goes in (i.e. into the temple) and bows to the god. The performer recites.

11. KUB 34.115 + KBo 30.28 (CTH 648.3), a festival celebrated by DUMU-aš, OH.


249 The same translation of the verb mald- in lines iii 15' and 18' has been offered by Haas 1970: 233. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33 translates the verb mald- in line iii 15' as “declaim”.

The prince goes and bows to ZABABA. The GUDU-priest steps behind him, recites in Hattic and takes his place. The SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa goes, bows to ZABABA, holds out his hands and recites in Hatti[c]. And the SANGA-priest of Halipinu steps behind him. When the SANGA-priest of the Stormgod of Zahhaluqqa finishes the recitation, he takes back his place.
The prince asks to drink. The [cup]bearer gives (him) a cup. [The prince] drinks [to] the Sungod. He takes one thick [s]our bread and the cupbearer[s] ... The singer sings (to) the Sungod/the singer of the Sungod sings; the [former recites. The cupbearer] takes the cup. The GUDU-priest gives sour thick bread to the prince. [The prince breaks (it)]. The GUDU-priest takes two thick breads to the prince and ... one. [ ... ] recites. The SANGA-priest bows. They [ ... ] again/back. They give them to drink. The GUDU-priest ... to] the cupbearer of the king.

12. KBo 20.10+ (CTH 669), a ritual celebrated by the king, OH/OS. 250

(1)  

The palace [attendant] carries the marnuant-beer. The king libates twice. The palace attendant brings (forth) the cup and leads in the Man of the Stormgod. He bows (down) to the king. He (i.e. the Man of the Stormgod) consecrates the king, scatters water three times (and) recites. The king and the queen sit. They bring water for hand-(washing) and they put (down) the tables.

(2)  

The chief palace attendant carries the marnuant-beer. The king libates twice. The chief palace attendant brings (forth) the cup and leads in the Man of the Stormgod. He (i.e. the Man of the Stormgod) consecrates the king, scatters water three times and recites.251 The king and the queen sit. They bring water for hand-(washing) and they put (down) the tables.

250 The two passages which employ the verb mald-, namely i 8-13 and ii 5-20, are virtually identical, except for a few details: (i) in lines i 8-13 the king and the queen are assisted by a palace attendant, in lines ii 5-10 by the chief palace attendant, (ii) the phrase ANA LUGAL ḫekta is employed only in line i 10 and it is written with smaller signs indicating that it was added later to the text, (iii) the verb mald- in line i 12 is also written with smaller signs and hence it is a later addition to the text, (iv) the sentence introductory particle ta is omitted in line i 12, (v) the Hittite phonetic complements appear with LUGAL and MUNUS.LUGAL only in line ii 9.

251 The verb mald- has been translated in line i 12 as “rezitiert” by Oettinger 1979: 444 and in line ii 9 as “declare” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32.
13. Bo 68/525 (CTH 670), a ritual celebrated by the king, NH/NS.


[The king]ng, standing, drinks to the Sungoddess and Mezzula. He libates to/from the huppar-vessel. They play the large string [instrument]. The performer recites over [...] and marnuwa-beer.

14. KBo 8.117 (CTH 666), a festival celebrated in Arinna, NH/NS. The relevant passage is duplicated by KUB 60.165.


The king bows to the deity. The GUDU-priests bow (down). The kita-[man] calls. The zintu-[woman] (female singer?) recites.

15. KUB 58.33 (CTH 678), a festival celebrated in Nerik, NH/NS.


16. KUB 17.28 (CTH 730), lines ii 33-36 and iii 1-17 are part of a Sammeltafel, which collects rites and incantations of different character, content and aim, MH/NS. Lines iii 1-17 are duplicated by KBo 37.10 (CTH 730.C).


252 KUB 60.165 line 2': [...ma-a]-di
253 The same translation of the verb mald- in the present context was offered by Haas 1970: 265 and Taggar-Cohen 2006: 249.
254 C: 1ZU|ZAG,UDU.
255 C: "SAG.DU"17
256 C: pár-ši-an-da
257 C: 4G8[BANŠUR]-i da-a-i.
258 C: še-er-ra-aš-sa-an
259 C: [...]pa-an-ti
They slaughter the sheep. He (i.e. the person who commissioned the ritual) puts meat, liver (C: shoulder), breast, its (i.e. the sheep) head, and feet in front of the table. They cook the entrails and break the thick breads. He places one (broken) thick bread on the ground and **recites**262: “You (i.e. the table) who stand in front of the Sungod, keep speaking favorably across to the Sungod!” He breaks two thick breads (C: He puts two thick breads on [the table]) and puts them on the table. On them (i.e. thick breads) he puts the liver. He offers wine. They cook the fat meat and eat it. They drink three times and pick up the table.

17. **CTH 733**, invocations of Hattic deities in Hittite and in Hattic languages. Texts with invocations in Hattic include KBo 25.121 (fragmentary), KUB 28.75, KUB 28.77+ KBo 8.133 + KUB 48.12 (fragmentary), KBo 25.120+. Texts with invocations in Hittite include KBo 25.117 (fragmentary), KUB 60.20 (fragmentary), KUB 8.41, KUB 31.143, VBoT 124 + KUB 31.143a and KBo 25.112+.

1 **KUB 28.75** (CTH 733.I.1.A), OH/OS.


When in Kakšat the prince conjures the Sungod at the ūwuši-stone, the GUDU-priest says: “ᵽ₃ᵽ₄ᵽ₅ᵽ₆ᵽ₇ᵽ₈ᵽ₉ᵽ₁₀ᵽ₁₁ᵽ₁₂ᵽ₁₃ᵽ₁₄ᵽ₁₅ᵽ₁₆ᵽ₁₇ᵽ₁₈ᵽ₁₉ᵽ₂₀ᵽ₂₁ᵽ₂₂ᵽ₂₃ᵽ₂₄ᵽ₂₅ᵽ₂₆ᵽ₂₇ᵽ₂₈ᵽ₂₉ᵽ₃₀ᵽ₃₁ᵽ₃₂ᵽ₃₃ᵽ₃₄ᵽ₃₅ᵽ₃₆ᵽ₃₇ᵽ₃₈ᵽ₃₉ᵽ₄₀ᵽ₄₁ᵽ₄₂ᵽ₄₃ᵽ₄₄ᵽ₄₅ᵽ₄₆ᵽ₄₇ᵽ₄₈ᵽ₄₉ᵽ五十-one of the gods, the king/queen”. He (i.e. DUMU-aš) **recites**263 in the same way.

2 **KUB 28.77+** (CTH 733.I.B), text preserved in eleven fragments, OH/NS.

(1)

KUB 28.77 + i: (1) [ma-a-an İ]-NA ÜRÜ ZI-PU-NU-WA DUMU-aš İ-¹NAÉ É a/A [x-x-x-x] / (2) [ x x x]x-ta-i-li-ša Ľ､GUDU₁₂ EGR DUMU-RI [ x x x x ] / (3) [nu ki-i]š-an ma-a-al-di // (4) [ud-ʉ]-ru-ʉ AMAR-mi-en-te-el ḫa-wa,-wu,-na-a-an AMAR-mi-en-te-el / (5) [ḥa]-wa,-aš-ḥa-wi,-i ḫa-aš-ta-nu-e-el DINGIR-ap ka-at-te //

---

260 C: nu a-ta-an-zi.
261 Manuscript C omits nu.
262 The form *malti* in line i 7 has been translated in the present context as “recites” in CHD L-N: 133 as well as by Torri 2004: 134 and as “sagt” by del Monte 1995: 215. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32 translates this verb as “declaims”.
263 The verb *mald-*, has been translated in this context as “utter” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 32.
[When i]n Zipunuwa the prince [ … ] in the temple of A[…], the GUDU-priest [ … ] again/back the prince [and] recites as [fol]lows: “[ud]ḫurū mientel, for mankind (you are) Mientel, but among the gods (you are known) as a ḫašṭumēl, a deity, the king.” (12 more lines in Hattic follow before the text breaks, it is difficult to determine whether or not they are also part of the recitation).

(2) KBo 8.133: // (8’) [... ] a(-)i-e-it ḫa-wa,-wu-na-[a] / (9’) [...] x ḫa-wa,-aš-ḫa-wi,i-pí / (10’) [...] x zi-lu-wa-a-lu-wa DINIGIR-ap ‘ka’-[…] / (11’) [... QA-TAM-MA] ma-a-al-di // [... ] for mankind you are [... ] but for the gods (you are) ziluwāluwa, the god(dess), the king/queen. He recites [in the same way]

(3) KUB 25.120: (8’) ma-a-an DUMU-aš ut-ḫu-ru-u Ka-a-aš-tu-wa-re-e ḫa-pi-pu-na-[a] / (9’) Ka-a-aš-tu-wa-re’e-et ḫa-wa,-aš-ḫa-wi,i-pí ka-[…] / (10’) DINIGIR-ap ka-a-at’-taḫ QA-TAM-MA ma-a-al-di // When the prince (says?): “uṭḫurū, Kaṭšuwarē! For mankind (you are) Kaṭšuwarē, among the gods (you are known as) kaia[ …], a goddess, the queen.” He recites in the same way.

3 KUB 8.41 (CTH 733.II.1), OH/OS.


When the prince conjures the Stormgod’s vizier, the singer says:[s]: “For mankind you are the vizier of the Stormgod, [among] the gods you are the Stormgod of the field, [you hold] heaven and earth.” (These (names) are determined in the invocation of the Stormgod. When the prince conjures to the mountain, [the singer says: “For mankind you are a mountain, but among the gods you are [ … ]. Further, [it is determined in the invocation] of the Stormgod.

4 KUB 31.143 (CTH 733.II.2), OH/OS.

When he conjures Kaštuwarit, the singer says: "For mankind you reside in heaven. Twice you drink eight vessels. You adorn yourself. This is determined in the invocation of Inara."

When he conjures Telipinu, the singer says: "For mankind you are Kaštuwarit, but among the gods you are [ ... ] , the queen. You 8-inzu resid[e] in heaven. Twice you drink eight vessels."

When he conjures his (i.e. the preceding god’s) wife, the singer says: "For mankind you are [ ... ] , the queen. You 8-inzu resid[e] in heaven. Twice you drink eight vessels."

When he [conjures] Kaštuwariti, the singer says: "For mankind you reside in heaven. Twice you drink eight vessels. You adorn yourself. This is determined in the invocation of Inara."
Inara. [He says the same]. [When] he conjures Wašizzil, [the singer says: “For mankind you are Wašizzil, but among the gods you are [a Lion, the king]. You [hold] heaven [and] earth. [This is determined] in the invocation of the Stormgod. He says in the same way].

6 KBo 25.112+ (CTH 733.II.4), OH/OS.  


When the prince [li]bat[es] wi[ne] on the road before the “agrarian (?) field”, the GUDU-priest says: “Behold (?), O [Sun]goddess! For mankind you are the Sungoddess, but among the gods you are a source of light, the goddess, the queen.” The king purifies himself (and) facing (?) the [ša-l]put[ti-]instrument he recites²²⁹ these, in the same way.

18. KUB 28.80 (CTH 737), a festival celebrated in Nerik, NH/NS.

KUB 28.80 iv: (1') tup-pi ma-al-te-eš-na-aš ṢA EZEN₂²⁵ / (2') UR NE-RI-IK KA-IA-MA-NIM / (3') ki-nu-na-aš 'GIBIL-an tup-piš / (4') ma-an ka-u-ru-ra-aš MU. 'HI₂²⁶ / (5') 'EZEN₂²⁶ UR NE-RI-IK / (6') Ha-aq qa-mi-iš-ši²²⁶ / (6') ḫ-ša[wa]-an da-i-e-e nu LÚ 'IM²²⁶ / (7') GUDU₂²⁶ / (8') a-[pš]-e-e-e nu-kán ki-i²²⁶ ma-[a]-te-[e]-ša[r] / (9') a-pé-[e] da-a-aš da-a-e-e x x²²⁶ / (10') ka-ru-ša-li-aš ma-[a]-[t]-te-[e]-na-aš / (11') na-at-ta ša-an-[u]a-a[a-n]

Tablet of recitations²³⁰ of the regular festival of Nerik. Now (there is) a new tablet. When, during the hostile years, they began to celebrate the festival of Nerik in ḫakmiš, the man of the Stormgod and the GUDU-priest came out of Nerik. They took these recitations from those (refugee priests). (This tablet) does not correspond to the former recitations.

19. CTH 744, festival[s] that include cultic recitations in Hattic. Only three texts of this group that employ the verb mald- are relatively well preserved, namely KBo 21.84, KUB 28.74 and KUB 1.1.14 with a duplicate KUB 28.96.
1. KBo 21.84 (CTH 744), OH/MS.

KBo 21.84 iv: (1) \textsuperscript{L}\textsuperscript{GUDU,} \textit{ma-al'-di} / (2) \textit{pu-ul-la ka-an-ni zì-il-la-[an-`]} / (3) an-ta-ši-mi-iz

The GUDU-priest \textbf{recites} in Hattic: “pulla kani zill[ana`] antaši miz”

2. KUB 1.14 (CTH 744.I.A), NS.\textsuperscript{283}

KUB 1.14 ii: (8’) \textsuperscript{L\textsubscript{GUDU,}} \textit{zi-li-pu-ri-ia-tal-la-aš} / (9’) \textit{ú-wa-an-zi nu-za} 6-\textsuperscript{ŠU} / (10’) \textit{wa-al-ḫa-an-zi l-aš-za-kán} / (11’) [Ș]U-ZU \textit{ḫa-at-ta} 1-aš-ma-za-kán / (12’) [G]\textsuperscript{IR}-\textsuperscript{ŠU erasure} \textit{ḫa-at-ta} / (13’) [UGULA\textsuperscript{L\textsubscript{GUDU,}}] \textit{zi-pu-ri-ia-tal-la-aš} / (14’) \textit{ḫa-at-ti-li ki-iš-ša-an ma-al-di}\textsuperscript{285}

Thereafter zilipuriyatalla-men come and strike themselves six times. One cuts himself on his [hand]; the other cuts himself on his [foot]. [The chief] of zilipuriyatalla-men \textbf{recites} as follows in Hattic.

3. KUB 28.74 (CTH 744.4), NH/NS.


[ … ] When on the following morning the sun rises, [ … ] before/facing the Sungod(dess) from [ … ] and he/she \textit{tawal-drink}, \textit{walŠJ-drink}, beer and wine. [And \textbf{recites} in Hattic as follows].

20. KUB 25.37 + KUB 35.132 (CTH 771), a ritual performed by “men of Lalupiya” on behalf of the king and the queen, NS.

KUB 25.37 iii: // (6’) \[ x x x x x (x) -z\] \textit{i nu A-NA LÚ.MEŠ URU LA-LU-PÍ-IA} / (7’) \[u-i-ni-ia-an da-a\] / (8’) \[ x x x x x x] \textit{ki-iš-ša-an ma-al-di} / (9’) \[ ku-i-e-eš ša-aš-nu-uš-kán-[zi]} / (10’) \[ ku-i-e-eš SIG₅[?] in da-a-i-ir nu-wa a-pé-e-pát / (13’)] \[ ak-ku-uš-kán-du\] / (11’) \textit{NINDA.GUR RA-ma NU.GÁL ŠIR-ia} / (14’) \[ x x x NU.GÁL nam-ma ŠJ-u-u-ma-an-ti-ia} / (15’) \[ a-ku-an-na pi-an-zi]} / (16’) \[ ku-i-e-eš SIG₅[?] in da-a-i-ir nu-wa a-pé-e-pát / (13’)] \[ ak-ku-uš-kán-du\]

[ … ] From a cup they give [wine] to drink to the men of Lalupiya. [ … ] \textbf{recites}\textsuperscript{288} as follows: “Those who put [each person] to bed, those who arouse him (i.e. each person), [those who] took/put him up [well], those who] took/put him down [well], also those [should drink]. There is no thick

\textsuperscript{283} Lines ii 8’-14’ of KUB 1.14 are duplicated by lines 11’-18’ of KUB 28.96 (CTH 744.I.B).

\textsuperscript{284} KUB 28.96 omits -\textit{ma}.

\textsuperscript{285} KUB 28.96 reads here \textit{ḫa-at-ti-ki-iš-ša-an [ma-a]-di}.

\textsuperscript{286} The same translation of the verb \textit{mald-} in the present context is offered in \textit{CHD} L-N: 133b.

\textsuperscript{287} All the restorations at the beginning of each line are those of Güterbock 1995: 68.

\textsuperscript{288} The same translation of the verb \textit{mald-} was offered here by Güterbock 1995: 68.
When the king prostrates himself before the gods, the GUDU-priest *recites/prays* \(^{298}\) as follows: “Let the Labarn[a], the king, be dear to the Stormgod alone. The land (is) of the Stormgod alone. The heaven and earth (and) the troops are of the Stormgod alone. He (i.e. the Stormgod) made the Labarna, gods! The land (is) of the Stormgod alone. May the Stormgod destroy the one who approaches the person or the borders of the Labarna, [the king]!”

II.B. (-za) mald-, **KARĪBU** “to vow, to make a vow”; *malteššar, IKBRI**U** “vow”

1. KUB 14.4 (CTH 70.1.A), a prayer of Muršili II regarding deposition of Tawannawa, NH/NS.


\(^{298}\) KUB 48.13 rev. 9’: [ ... ]P[A-NI(?) DINGIR-LIM ki₃-an me-ma-i
\(^{299}\) KUB 48.13 rev. 10’: [ ... ]GE₃-ti-ia a₃₃-[ ... ]LM-na-a₃-pát
\(^{300}\) KUB 48.13 rev. 11’ omits here *nu-za*. The traces preserved could be consistent with *me*.

bread and there is [no] singing […]. Then to everyone [they giv]e [to drink] and everyone drinks.

21. IBoT 1.30 (CTH 821.1), fragment of festival/ritual(?), NS. The passage is duplicated by KUB 48.13 rev. 9’-16’.

IBoT 1.30 obv.: (1) ‘LUGAL’-u₃₃ ku-wa-p₃ DINGIR.MEŠ-a₃₃ a-ra-wa-a₃₃-i₃-zi₃ ¹⁴ GUDU₂ ki₃-an ma₃₃-al-di²⁹⁹ / (2) ta-ba-ar-na-a₃₃-[ ... ] ‘k₃-an’ LUGAL-u₃₃ DINGIR.MEŠ-a₃₃ a-ra-su₃₃-u₃₃-e-e₃₃-du KUR-e ⁴U-a₃₃-p₃-t₃ KUB 48.13 rev. 9’. LUGAL-un²⁹² / (4) ma₃₃-ia-a₃₃-[ ... ]-la-an i₃-ia-at nu-u₃₃-si ¹⁸ KUB.BABBAR-a₃₃ KUR-e²⁹³ / (5) ḫu-u₃₃-ma-an pa₃₃-i₃₃ [nu-u₃₃]-š₃₃-an KUR-e ḫu-u₃₃-ma-an La-ba-ar-na-a₃₃²⁹⁴ / (6) ŠU-a₃₃ ma₃₃-ni-[ ... ]-i₃₃-[ ... ]-ki-id-du ku-u₃₃-sa-an²⁹⁵ / (7) La-ba-ar-na[a₃₃ LUGAL-wa-a₃₃] NI.TE-a₃₃ ir-[ ... ]²⁹⁶ / (8) Š₃₃-li-[ ... ]-ri²⁹⁷ na₃₃-[ ... ] ⁴U-a₃₃-ḫar-ni-ik-du²⁹⁸

For the restorations in lines 7-8 see Goetze 1947: 91 and Taggar-Cohen 2006: 253. Laroche 1964: 10 renders this verb here as “declarer”; Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 32 as “declare”.


By day and by night she stands before the gods and [curses my] wife. And when I draw back the gods with thick bread and lib[ation], and I constantly give them thick bread [and libation], I [ ... ] them for my[self, for my wife, my son], my house, my land, and (my) brothers, and I make vows302 [to them]. Tawannanna, however, stands [by day and by night] before the gods and curses [my wife] before the gods. [….] she keeps libating. My wife's […]

2. KBo 15.33 (CTH 330.2.A) a ritual performed before the Stormgod of Kuliwišna, MH/MS.


The cooks slaughter them (i.e. the ram and the ox mentioned in the earlier paragraphs) on the altar. They give those bronze knives to the cook who can slaughter. But when he finishes the regular slaughtering of the share of the god, if the owner of the house has vowed303 something to the god, (be it) some implement or an ox (or) sheep, they place the implement on the soldier’s breads, but the ox and sheep, the cook cleans [with] a purifying substance. They drive them (i.e. the ox and the sheep) in, and the owner of the house bows down to them. He himself (i.e. the owner of the house) speaks before the god: “I have just vowed this and this for the sake of this matter. Now I have just brought it to the deity. […] it before the deity.

3. KUB 14.10+ (CTH 378.2.C) and KUB 14.11 (CTH 378.2.B), two manuscripts of the second plague prayer, NH/NS.

(1)


301 All the restorations are those of de Martino 1998.
302 The previous translations of the verb mald- in the present context include: “faccio voti” de Martino 1998: 34; “I make vows” Singer 2002a: 76.
303 The forms maltan ħarzi and AKRUB have been translated in the present context as “has vowed”, “I vowed” in CHD L-N: 134, by Glocker 1997: 71 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33, 34.
un nu-za ḫi-in-[a]-ni še-er / (23) [A]-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš 'a-[a](-)[a]-ku-u-wa-ša-ḫu-un 'IK-[RI-B]IV-A.-aš-ma-aš-kā]n / (25) [m]a-a'-aš-ki-nu-'iu
(2)

KUB 14.11 i: (13') [x x x x x x] ku-wa-pí e-eš-ša-aḫ-ḫu-un / (14') [x x x x x x DINGIR.R-LIM-ša-ša-ša-aḫ-ḫu-un / (16') [x x x x x x x x x x x] 'A'-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš / (17') [x x x x x x e-eš-ša-aḫ-ḫu-un / (18') [IK-RI-B]IV-A.-aš-ma-aš-kān ma-a]-ša-ši-nu-un

[Further]more, also when I performed the festivals, I went [bac]k and forth to all the gods. I did not prefer one temple. I have repeatedly made a plea to all the gods concerning the plague and I have repeatedly [vow]ed [vows to you]

4. KUB 22.70 (CTH 566), oracular text, NH/NS.
KUB 22.70 obv.: (22) ... 2 GILIM KÙ.GI-ma-wa ku-e ma-al-de-eš-na-[a]š MUNUS.LUGAL A-NA DINGIR-LIM e-eš-ši-eš-ta nu-wa 1-EN GILIM KÙ.GI/ (23) ु-e-mi-ir nu-wa-ra-at A-NA DINGIR-LIM ar-ḫa up-pé-er
(Of the two golden wreaths which the queen made for the deity (in fulfillment) of a vow, they found one golden wreath and sent it off to the deity.

5. KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 (CTH 570), SU oracle, NH/NS.
KUB 5.6 obv.: (31) A-NA DINGIR-LIM ma-al-du-wa-ar ŠA ʿUTU-ŠI SÌxSÁ-šat nu 1 GUD.ŠE 6 UDU-ia SÌxSÁ-šat / (32) nu-za-kān ka-ru-ú ma-al-ta-aš ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma ʿUTU-ŠI SIG5-ri erasure / (33) na-at pi-i-ia-an-zi erasure

The vow of His Majesty for a deity was determined. It (the vow) was determined (to be) one fattened ox and six sheep. He has already made the vow. But when His Majesty gets well, then they will give them (i.e. one ox and six sheep).

---


306 The verbal noun malduwar has been translated in the present context as “vow” in CHD L-N: 134, by Laroche 1964: 12 and by Lebrun 1980: 447. Puhvel HED vol. M: 33 renders this noun as “votive offering”. The verbal form maltaš has been translated here as “he made the vow” in CHD L-N: 134, by Laroche in 1949: 66 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33. Laroche 1964: 12 and Lebrun 1980: 447 read this verb here as “the vow has been pronounced”. 
6. KUB 22.38 (CTH 575.2), oracle text, NH/NS.

KUB 22.38 i: (1) [ x x] *ku-\textit{it} DINGIR\textsuperscript{1} GAL *TUKU\textsuperscript{1} TUKU\textsuperscript{1} -\textit{u-an-za nu A-NA DINGIR-LIM *ku-\textit{it} / (2) *me-eq\textsuperscript{2}-qa-us\textsuperscript{2} IK\textsuperscript{3} RI-BI\textsuperscript{3} me-ma-an țarmi / (3) na-at GAM-an ar-ța GAR-ru ma-a-an-ma-kán tu\textsuperscript{2}-\textit{uk} / (4) A-NA DINGIR-LIM ta-me-e-da-az \textit{U}-UL ku-\textit{it-ki da-li\textsuperscript{2}-\textit{ia}-\textit{an} / (5) nu TUL al-dan-ni-e\textsuperscript{2} SIG\textsuperscript{2}-ru

Since the great god is angry and since to the god I have spoken many \textsuperscript{307} vows, let it (i.e. the anger) be set aside (lit. set along and away). But if, for you, o god, nothing is omitted by another (person), let the pool (oracle) be favourable. (MUŠ oracle involving releasing snakes into the pool and observing their movements follows. The oracle ends with NU.SIG\textsuperscript{3} “unfavourable.”)

7. CTH 577, SU, KIN and Bird Oracles.

I. KBo 2.2 (CTH 577.1), NH/NS.

(1)

KBo 2.2 ii: (39) nam\textsuperscript{5}<\textit{ma}> \textit{d} UTU URU PÚ-na \textit{d} UTU\textsuperscript{6} ŠI maš\textsuperscript{6}-kán pa-a-i / (40) ma-al-ta-i-za-kán KI.MIN / (41) nu TE\textsuperscript{ME.ES} SIG\textsuperscript{7}-ru 3-ŠU \textit{U}-UL ar-ța / (42) ap-pa-at-ta-at

Furthermore, will His Majesty give a gift to the Sungoddess of Arinna (and) \textbf{will he make a vow\textsuperscript{308} ditto} (i.e. to the Sungoddess of Arinna)? Let the exta be favourable. Three times they were not taken away \textsuperscript{309}

(2)

KBo 2.2 iii: (10) \textit{d} UTU URU PÚ-na ku-it DUMU-an-na-aš SIxŠÁ\textsuperscript{1}-\textit{at}/ / (11) A-NA IK\textsuperscript{3} RI-BI\textsuperscript{3} ŠE-ER / (12) nu TE\textsuperscript{ME.ES} SIG\textsuperscript{7}-ru DUMU\textsuperscript{8} SIxŠÁ\textsuperscript{1}-\textit{at} / (13) ma-a-an-za \textit{d} UTU URU PÚ-na / (14) zi-ik-pár DUMU\textsuperscript{8} (i)-an-na-aš / (15) A-NA IK\textsuperscript{3} RI-BI\textsuperscript{3} ŠE-ER kar\textsuperscript{<\textit{mi}-\textit{ia}>\textsuperscript{310}} u-wa-an-za / (16) nam-ma-ma KI.MIN nu TE\textsuperscript{ME.ES} SIG\textsuperscript{7}-ru / (17) ‘ni’ nu-kán ZAG-na-aš KA\textsuperscript{1}XU-i NU.SIG\textsuperscript{3}

Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny was ascertained, (is it) \textbf{because of (unfulfilled) vows}? Then let the exta be unfavourable. SAG.ME; unfavourable. If, you alone, o Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny (are) angry \textbf{because of (unfulfilled) vows\textsuperscript{311} but further}

\textsuperscript{307} The nominative-accusative plural \textit{IK\textsuperscript{3} RI-BI\textsuperscript{3} has been translated in the present context as “vows” in \textit{CHD L-N:136, by Lefèvre-Novaro and Mouton 2008: 20 as well as by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35. Laroche 1958: 150 renders this noun as “prayers”.

\textsuperscript{308} The verb \textit{mald-} has been translated here as “to make a vow” by van den Hout 1998: 131, Laroche 1964: 12, Lebrun 1980: 447 and Puhvel \textit{HED} vol. 6: 33. Kronasser 1966: 522 renders it as “beten.”

\textsuperscript{309} According to van den Hout 1998: 131 n. 56 the last sentence is to be understood as “they were not completed.”

\textsuperscript{310} The restoration of van den Hout 1998: 132.

\textsuperscript{311} The dative-locative plural \textit{IK\textsuperscript{3} RI-BI\textsuperscript{3} has been translated in the present context as “vows” in \textit{CHD L-N: 136, by van den Hout 1998: 133 and by Puhvel \textit{HED} vol. 6: 35.}
ditto, then let the exta be favourable. *nīpašuri*. In the mouth (it is) on the right; unfavourable.

(3)


Concerning the fact that the aforementioned Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny was ascertained because of (unfulfilled) vows: they will ask His Majesty which vow is subject to compensation and they will pay compensation for it. But, the one which is not subject to compensation, they will pay a penalty to her. If you, o goddess, have approved, then let the exta be favourable; unfavourable.

(4)


[Concerning] the vow[s]¹¹⁹ which (are) not subject to compensation and (for which) they will subsequently pay a penalty, and concerning the fact that until now I have offended the goddess, because of that should they also give offering? Ditto. Then let the exta be favourable. Ke(l)di has turned; unfavourable. They will give compensation for the vows which are subject to compensation. Subsequently, they will pay a penalty and they will offer a gift.

---

312 The hand-copy of the tablet has here šar-ni-in-kan. The word is barely visible on the photograph. The reading šar-ni-in-ku-wa-as (c.f. Goetze 1925: 140) was adopted by van den Hout 1998: 134 and is followed here. The verbal noun makes more sense in the present context than a participle.


314 For these restorations see van den Hout 1998: 134 n. 56.


316 Van den Hout translates the verb šarnink- as “to fulfill”.

317 Van den Hout renders *zankilatar-* in the present context as “compensation”.

318 The restoration of van den Hout 1998: 134.

319 IK-RI-B*nA* in line iii 45 has been translated as “vows” by van den Hout 1998: 135 and Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35; in line iv 7 the same noun has been rendered as “vows” in CHD L-N: 136, by van den Hout 1998: 135 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35.
II. KBo 24.126 (CTH 577), NH/NS.


Patiliš aštaniya[320] for the sake of it. Also they give a gift and a penalty from the palace and they give a ritual from the palace. They make an oracular inquiry about the ritual and if it is ascertained, they give it likewise. Also His Majesty will make a vow[321] for the sake of it. But if the deity likewise, let the SU be favourable; (it is) detached on the right; unfavourable.

That same question through the Old Woman; let the K IN be favourable. The DEITY took for him-/herself the ENTIRE SOUL and put it on WRATH; unfavourable.

And with regard to the offences they will give ... from the palace. That is why they call Tattamaru; they give the gift and a penalty from the palace, and they give a ritual from the palace. Also that is why His Majesty makes a vow[322].

III. KUB 6.22 (CTH 577), NH/NS.

KUB 6.22 iii7: // (13') ma-a-an A-NA IK-RI-pát še-er nam-ma-ma KLMIN nu SU.ME[S ...] //

If for the sake of those very vows again the same, [let] the SU oracles …

IV. KBo 16.98 + KUB 49.49 (CTH 577), oracle text, NH/NS.


321 The verb mald- has been translated in the present context as “to make a vow” in CHD L-N: 134, 210 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33.

322 The verb mald- in the present context has been rendered as “to make a vow” by van den Hout 1995: 119.

323 The restoration of van den Hout 1998: 94.
The queen vowed to Ḫepat of Kummanni, [...], and to Lelwani: “If you, o gods (hear me), (if) you lend me (your) ear, (if) you defeat the enemy (and) the downfall does not occur”, then let [the extra] be favourable, but the following ones be unfavourable. The first extra: the road is backwards down in front, a bladderworm lies (there) twelve coils; favourable. The following extra: the throne is left; unfavourable.

8. KUB 15.1 (CTH 584), dreams of the queen, NH/NS.

(1)

The queen vowed in her dream to Ḫepat of Uda as follows: “If you, o goddess, my lady, keep His Majesty alive (and) do not deliver him to evil, then I will make a statue of gold for Ḫepat and for her I will make a rosette of gold, and they will call it the "Ḵepat's rosette". For your breast I will make a pectoral of gold and they will call it the "pectoral of the goddess."

(2)
[His Majesty] vowed\textsuperscript{329} in a dream [to] the king’s deity $^3$ZA.BA$_4$.BA$_4$ of Urikina: “If you, O god, my lord, continue my life, then I will plate for you a stele and an altar.” Šarruma of Urikina. Since, in a dream, some young men shut the queen behind the bathhouse in Laiuna, the queen vowed, in the dream, 1 golden bathhouse to Šarruma of Urikina.

The queen vowed to Šarruma of Urikina one gold ZI of unspecified weight (and) one silver ZI of ten shekels weight.

His Majesty vowed\(^{332}\) to the goddess Kataḥha as follows: “If Ankuwa, the city, survives (lit. escapes) i.e. it does not burn down completely, then I will make for Kataḥha one silver (model of a) city of unspecified weight (and) I will give one ox and eight sheep”.

The queen vowed to the Stormgod of Heaven as follows: “If Ankuwa, the city, survives i.e. it does not burn down completely, then I will make for Kataḥha one silver (model of a) city of unspecified weight (and) I will give one ox and eight sheep.”

[His Majesty vowed] to the Stormgod of Zippalanda [as follows]: “If Ankuwa, the city, survives i.e. it does not burn down completely, then I will make for the Stormgod of Zippalanda one silver (model of a) city of unspecified weight (and) I will give one ox and eight sheep.”

9. KUB 15.3 (CTH 584), dream of the queen, NH/NS.

The queen vowed\(^{335}\) to the Moongod for the recovery (of His Majesty)\(^{336}\) as follows: “[If], you, O Moongod, my lord, [give] to His Majesty long years and [if] he (i.e. His Majesty) completes the years which (have been) promised by the god, my lord, (I will give) in one year 1 silver goblet and I will give to him in one year 1 golden goblet of unspecified weight. And since a year has twelve months, yearly I will begin to make one year and twelve months of silver (and) gold. I will determine

---

332 All three instances of *kiššan IKRUB* appearing in this passage were rendered as “made the following vow” by Güterbock 1956: 254, Hoffner 2003: 67, Laroche 1949: 67 and de Roos 2007: 102-103.

333 The restoration of Ose 1944: 77 was followed by de Roos and is adopted here. The phrase *kiššan IKRUB* usually requires the particle -za and often appears with the particle -kān.

334 In this restoration I follow Gurney 1940: 63. De Roos 2007: 106, 107 restores here *TUŠI*. In the context of vows *mān* would make more sense, especially when the second condition is introduced into the vow.

335 The same translation of *kiššan IKRUB* was offered by Laroche 1949: 67 and by de Roos 2007: 109. Ose 1944: 77 translated this phrase as “betete folgendermaßen”.

336 The form *appana* was interpreted here as an infinitive of *epp-* “to seize” by Ose 1944: 77, 86 and by Rosenkranz 1959: 421. Laroche 1949: 67 translated this form as “pour qu’il se rétracte”. De Roos takes this form as the Old Hittite dative of the verbal noun *apatar* ending in -a. Although *appana* is not attested in Hittite texts, it would make sense in the present context. The phrase *appa appatar* carries the meaning “recovery” and in the vow that follows the queen is asking for the health and a long life for the king.
the weight (according to my own) judgment and I will begin to give them to the god. And whatever the Moon-god wishes, according to that (wish) will I give the months of silver and gold, either in Urukina or anywhere else

10. KUB 15.11 + KBo 60.99 (CTH 584.3), votive text, NH/NS.


[The queen] vowed341 to Allani (as follows): “O goddess, my lady, since [the dark] earth (is) restrained342 and the grain does not grow (lit. is tied up), [if (you), my lady, release the dark earth and the grain flourishes, [then] for the goddess I will empty (lit. pour) a storage vessel in Ḥattuša and in Ḥakmiš. I will take the storage vessel into consideration and either they will open the storage vessel from the palace or they will send a certain lord. //

338 De Roos 2007: 109 includes nu in his transliteration of this line noting; however, that this sign is marked as erasure in HW². Cornil-Lebrun 1972: 40 read the same sign as the ideogram I meaning “oil”. Although the sign in question does not resemble any other nu employed in this text (already observed by de Roos 2007: 109 n. 178), the phrase DINGIR-LUM is a new sentence and therefore needs some grammatical marking. Since the traces visible on the tablet could be consistent with the sign nu, this reading is adopted here.
339 IN₂ is written here with a single horizontal stroke.
341 IKRUB in line ii 5 has been translated by de Roos 2007: 112 as “made a vow”, by Cornil-Lebrun 1972: 51 as “elle a promis” and in HW as “gelobte”; maltan ħarmi in line ii 13 was rendered by Cornil-Lebrun 1972: 52 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 34 as “I have vowed” and as “I have promised” by de Roos 2007: 113.
342 For a discussion of the form a-ra-a-an see de Roos 2007: 112 n. 196.
Regarding the fact that for the sake of His Majesty’s life I vowed to the goddess Allani 6 to the temple of the Stormgod of Manuziya, I will begin to give [them] yearly to the goddess.

11. KUB 15.23 (CTH 584.4), votive text, NH/NS.


The queen made vowed to the Sungod of heaven of UvJana as follows:

“If you, o god, my lord, make His Majesty live for years, then I will invoke the god and I will make for him a [golden] statue of His Majesty of [unspecified] weight.”

12. KUB 15.17 + KUB 31.61+ (CTH 585.A), votive text, NH/NS.

(1)


344 Lines 20 and 21 are read by Cornil-Lebrun 1972 as:

(20) [A-NA]A ḪU-šI-tu-a-ḫa-ra-šU-šI it-[i-] [...] (21) [...] DŪ-mi KLIN [. . .] The same translation of kišan IKRUB in the present context was offered by de Roos 2007: 117 and by Sürenhagen 1981: 143. Cornil-Lebrun translate kišan IKRUB here as “la reine a fait la promesse.”


346 The reading AŠ-ŠUM is confirmed by manuscript B: KUB 15.16.

347 The reading -wa also appears in line 4 of manuscript B.

348 The reading -ra is restored from line 5 of manuscript B.

349 Restored after line 6 of manuscript B.

350 B: MU.KAM-li.

351 B: MU.KAM.HI KÚ.GI.

352 B: ITU.KAM.HI.

353 Both, manuscripts AA and B have here 1 GAL.

354 B: 1 GAL KÚ.GI

355 Restored after line 6’ of manuscript AA.

356 B: 100 UDU.

357 AA: -it-ki.
Thus (speaks) Puduhepa, the great queen, the queen of the land of Vatti, the daughter of Kummanni: ‘I vowed to Lelwani, my lady, for the sake of the life of the person of His Majesty (as follows): ‘O goddess, my lady, if you keep His Majesty alive and in (good) health for many (lit.) long years, he will appear (lit. go back) before you, o goddess, for many (lit. long) years. And year[ly], I will keep giving you, o goddess, [...] years of silver (and) years of gold, months of silver and of gold, day[s of silver (and) days] of gold, a cup of silver and a cup of gold, one golden statue (lit. person) of His Majesty, [yearly] I will keep giving either a hundred or fifty sheep. (the number) [does not] matter (lit. nothing matters).

13. KUB 56.31 (CTH 590), fragment of a dream and a votive text, NH/NS.

(1)


[The queen] vowed to the goddess GAZ.BA.A.A [as follows]: [If you, o goddess, my lady], run before (i.e. support) His Majesty, then what I have already vowed to the goddess, I have seen Ištar about that matter …

(2)

KUB 56.31rev.: (13’) [MUNUS.LUGAL]-za-’kán’ INA ḡiš-an ‘IK'-RU-UB ma-a-an-mu ḡiš-an ma-al-te-eš-ni A-NA Ú-UL e-eš-z Template/ (14’) Ú-UL ku-it-ki [uš-ki-nu-un ...]

In Yalanta, the queen vowed to Šitarpu as follows: If you Šitarpu intercede on my behalf to [Išta], the goddess and (if) you run before (i.e. support) His Majesty, then o god, I will make a silver statue of unspecified weight …

14. KUB 44.12 (CTH 656), fragment of a festival, NS.


The verbal form maldadūnum has been translated in this context as “I made a vow” in CHD L-N: 134 and by Laroche 1949: 62, Lebrun 1980: 447, Otten and Souček 1965: 17 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33.

The phrase kišan IKRUB and the verbal form maldāḫnum have been previously translated by de Roos 2007: 283 as “made the following vow” and “promised”.

INA is written with a single horizontal stroke.

The same translation of the phrase kišan IKRUB in lines 13’-14’ was offered by de Roos 283.

The noun malteššar in line ii 8’ is broken, CHD L-N: 136 restores the genitive singular maltešnaš, which is followed here.
The king [offers] 1 cattle (and) 8 sheep and he offers [...] to ˹IMIN.IMIN.BI. If there is [a... of a vow ³⁶³ (i.e., a ... which has been promised), he offer[s] it; but if there i[s] not, [he offers] nothing

15. KUB 10.11+ (CTH 660.1.A), a festival celebrated by the king, NS.

KUB 10.11 i: (6’) ku-u-un-ma-an-za-an NINDA.GUR₄.RA [GAL] / (7’) LUGAL.GAL Ṣu-Šu-up-pí-lu-[i]-u-ma-aš / (8’) A-NA ḪIM A-NA KASKAL URU A[r-…] / (9’) še-er IK-RU-UB

The great king, Ṣuppiluliuma, vowed³⁶⁴ this [large] (loaf of) thick bread to the Stormgod for the sake of the campaign to the city of A[r-…].

16. Meškene 74.57 is the only Hittite text that employs the form milteššar. The text is a New Hittite composition that seems to be concerned with oracular inquiries.


We enquired about ‘unfulfilled vow’³⁶⁵ and a ritual as well as votive offering, the same (i.e. were determined). zišaš is [favor]able. We enquired about the ritual and two sheep ambāšši and three sheep keldiya the same (i.e. were determined). zišaš is favourable. We enquired about the votive offering and silver the same (i.e. was determined).

II.C. milteššar, mileššar “ritual in fulfillment of a vow”, “votive offering”

1. KUB 17.21 (CTH 375.1.A), a prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, MH/MS.

Lines i 19-20 are also included in the New Hittite copy of this manuscript, KBo 51.17 (CTH 375.1.C).

(1)


³⁶³ The noun milteššar has been translated here as “vow” in CHD L-N: 136. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35 translates the sentence with miltešnaš as “if he is [the maker] of a vow [= votary].
³⁶⁴ The same translation of IKRUB in the present context was offered in CHD L-N: 134 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33.
³⁶⁵ The noun IKRIBU has been rendered as “vows” in CHD vol. L-N: 253 and by Salvini-Trémouille 2003: 235.
Furthermore, no one had placed such respect for you in the matter of the purity of the rituals (performed in fulfilment of a vow).

2. KUB 7.20 (CTH 475.a.1.A), ritual of Palliya, the king of Kizzuwatna, MH/NS. The text has a New Hittite duplicate KBo 9.115 (CTH 475.a.1.B).

When Palliya, the king of Kizzuwatna, erected (the statue of) the Stormgod of Kummanni/Kizzuwatna, he mald-ed him (or “it”) as follows.

3. KBo 3.22 (CTH 1.A), Proclamation of Anitta, OH/OS. The relevant lines are duplicated by KUB 26.71 (CTH 1.B), NH/NS.


The verb mald- has been translated in this context as “il l’a proclamé/voué” by Laroche 1964-65: 11. CHD L-N: 134 provides a tentative translation of the sentence with mald- as “He provided him (the deity) with offerings/ a ritual in fulfillment of a vow”. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 33 translates the verb mald- appearing in this context as “treat somebody to commitment.”
(B: I built) the temple of Ḥalmaššuit, the temple of the Stormgod, (B: my lord, and the temple of our goddess).\(^{369}\) And goods which I brought from (my) campaign, (B: I dedicated?)\(^{370}\) to that place. I made an offering (in fulfillment of a vow)\(^{371}\) and I went on a hunt.

4. **KUB 5.24+ (CTH 577), oracle text, NH/NS.**

   \[\text{KUB 5.24 ii: (1) } \text{nu ANA} \text{ ṢU-} \text{UTU 'Ka₃-ú-ri-i} \text{ za-an-ki₃-la'tar [aš-kán-na-az(?)]} \text{ / (2) } \text{ma₄-al-te-eš-na-az-zi-ia} \text{ pa-a-i nu 'KIN NU'.[SIG-da] / (3) } \text{DINGIR-LUM-zu} \text{ da-pi₃-an'[a]-a₃} \text{ / (4) } \text{nu-kán an-da 'ḪUL'-u-i NU.SIG.}\]

   Should she (i.e. the queen) give a penalty with a p[ropriatory gift] and with a votive offering\(^{372}\) to the Sungoddess Kauri? [Let] the KIN oracle be un[favourable]. The DEITY took for him/herself the ENTIRE SOUL and (it is) in EVIL; unfavourable.

5. **CTH 585, votive text preserved in sixteen manuscripts, NH/NS.** The better preserved manuscripts include KUB 31.52 (CTH 585.C), KUB 31.51 (CTH 585.D) and KUB 31.54 (CTH 585.O).

   **(1)**

   \[\text{KUB 31.51obv.: (6) ŠA MU II.KAM ma₄-al-te-[eš-šar A-NA \text{ Ṣe-el-wa-ni ...]} / (12) 1 DUMU.NITA \text{ \text{Tu-ut-tu ŠU[M-ŠU 1 DUMU.NITA ...]} / (13) ŠÄ Ė \text{ Pa₄-az-zi-x [1 DUMU.NITA ...]} / (14) 1 DUMU.NITA \text{ x} \text{ x [...]} / (15) \text{[KUB 31.51 breaks]}\]

   The second’s year votive offering\(^{374}\) [to the goddess Lelwani…]: 1 boy by na[me] Tutu, [1 boy by name] in/from the house of Pazzi, [one boy …], one boy by name […]

   **(2)**

   \[\text{KUB 31.54 iv: (15) [k]} \text{e-e-ma-kán IK-RI-Bl₄[Ì₃A ŠA \text{ Ṣe-el-wa-ni ...]} / (16) \text{[GAL.KÜ.GI TUR-TIM 5 SAG.DU [...] / (17) [3]0.ITU.KÜ.SI₂₂ [30] ITU KÜ.BABBAR [...] / (18) [₃₂A-ri₃]-ki₃-[...]} / (19) [...]} / (20) [...]} / (21) [...]} \]

---

\(^{369}\) Hoffner (2003: 183-184) observes that the reading Ṣé-ú-na-naššum-mi-š “of our god(dess)” found in the New Hittite duplicate of this text (Manuscript B) is problematic. If it refers to Ḥalmaššuit, it would be redundant with the first part of the sentence.

\(^{370}\) Hoffner 2003 notes that the principal meaning of Ḥališšiya- is “to plate with silver or gold.”


\(^{372}\) Because the nouns zankilatar and maškan are often employed together in Hittite texts, the restoration of maškan in this context is very likely.

\(^{373}\) The same translation of the noun mašteššar in the present context was offered by van den Hout 1995: 257, Laroche 1964: 13, Lebrun 1980: 448 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 35.

\(^{374}\) The noun mašteššar in the present context has been previously translated as “offrande” by Laroche 1949: 63, “Gebülde” by Otten and Souček 1965: 19 and as “votive offering” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 34.
And these *votive offerings*\(^{375}\) for the goddess Lelwani […] (namely) three small cups of gold, five persons […] , thirty months of gold (and) thirty months of silver […] of Arikimra.

6. KUB 27.1 (CTH 712.A), a festival dedicated to Ištar of Samuḫa, NH/NS (Ḫattušili III).


On account of those campaigns which the king conducted - however many campaigns he had conducted during the past years until he celebrates the goddess - they will enquire an oracle about the *ambašši* and *keldi* offering and the *votive offering*\(^{377}\)


---

\(^{375}\) *IK-R1-B1*\(^{HALA}\) has been previously translated in the present context as: “objects vowed” in *CHD L-N*: 136, “offrandes” by Laroche 1949: 6, “Weihgaben” by Otten and Souček 1965: 35, and “votive offerings” by Puhvel *HED* 6: 34, 35.

\(^{376}\) This sign *an* is written here with a single horizontal stroke and can therefore be mistaken for *pār*; the scribe seems to write *an* in this fashion (i.e. with a single horizontal), more than once in this text. Therefore this sign is not regarded here as a scribal error but rather as a feature idiosyncratic to this particular scribe.

\(^{377}\) The noun *malteššar* in lines 26, 31 and 33 has been translated as “un voeu” by Lebrun 1976: 86 and “(malteššar)-Ritual” by Wegner 1995: 36. With regard to the noun *malteššar* appearing in line i 11 Laroche 1964: 13 wrote: “la nature du *malteššar*, qui vient ici après les rituels *ambašši* keldiya, reste problématique”. Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 34 translates this noun as “vows” and notes that it is unclear whether *malteššar* in the present context appears in the nominative-acceusative singular or plural.
But if during the past years (lit. years that are gone), the king has gone nowhere on a campaign, there is no offering; for (those) years they make up an offering of the “year cycle”. But in that year in which the king goes to the field (for a campaign) and in which year he celebrates the goddess, they will enquire the goddess through an oracle about the *ambašši, keldi* offering and *votive offering* (which) the king (should give) to Ištar of the Field of the city of Samuḫa, the former (goddess), for the sake of that campaign. And what is ascertained, this they will give to Ištar of the Field of Samuḫa, the former (goddess). For the mighty Ištar of the Field of Muršili they will enquire an oracle about the ritual, *ambašši* and *keldi* offering, and what is ascertained for her, this they will give (to her); but there is no *votive offering* for her. But in the year in which the king does not go into the field (for a campaign), for them (i.e. those years) there is no (ritual) of going on a campaign, (no) *ambašši*, *keldi* (or) *votive offering* for Ištar of the Field of Samuḫa, because the king is not going into the field.

7. Meškene 74.57, NH (see also II.B.16).


We enquired about ‘unfulfilled vow’, and ritual as well as a *votive offering*, 378 the same (i.e. were determined). zilaš is [fav]ourable. We inquired about the ritual and two sheep *ambašši* and three sheep *keldiya* the same (i.e. were determined). zilaš is favourable. We enquired about the *votive offering* and silver the same (i.e. was determined).

II.D. mald- “to offer”, malteššar “offering/ritual”

1. KBo 22.242 + KBo 52.225b (CTH 824.1), fragment of the cultic itinerary of the king, NH/NS.

KBo 22.242 + KBo 52.225b ii: (5) \[\text{URU}^BA\text{p-pa-ru-ta-a}\text{z}-\text{ma-aš}\text{URU}^A\text{a}-\text{n}\text{n}\text{i-i}a-ta-pa-iz-zi nu \text{LÜ}^\text{M}^\text{SI}^\text{S}\text{U.GI} / (6) [MÅ]\text{G}^\text{AL DUG.K[A.DÜ NAG} 12 NINDA.GUR₃.RA pi-an-zi / (7) [\text{m}a-al-te-Š}-\text{šar-si}-\text{r} QA-A-TAM-MA \text{URU}^A\text{a-n-i}a-ta-az-ma-aš / (8) r\text{[Pár]-\text{ma-an-na}-pa-iz-zi} \ldots

And [from Ta]pparuta he goes to Anniyatta. And the elders (of Anniyatta) give a [go]at, a jug of PI-I-HU-beer for drinking (and) twelve (loaves of) thick bread. And his [o]ffer[ing] 379 is the same. And from Anniyatta he goes to [Par]manna…"

378 The noun *mielteššar* has been rendered in this text as “votive offering” in CHD vol. L-N: 253 and as was left untranslated by Salvini-Trémouillé 2003: 235, 236.

379 The noun *malteššar* has been translated here as “maltessar-offering/ritual” in CHD L-N: 137 and as “votive offering” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 34.
II.E. malteššanala- “recipient of malteššar”

1. KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.5 + KUB 7.8 (CTH 406), the ritual of the woman from Arzawa named Paškuwatti, MH/NS.\(^{380}\)


Now he had just come to you on his knees for help\(^{381}\) and is seeking you, o goddess, for the sake of your divinity. Whether you are in the mountain, whether you are in the meadow, whether you are in the valley, wherever you are, come down to this man in favour! Let the winds and rain not beat (against) your eyes! He will proceed to make you his (personal) goddess. He will offer you a place. He will give you a house. He will give you a male and a female slave. He will give you cattle and sheep. He will make you a recipient of votive offerings.\(^{382}\)

(2) KUB 7.8 iii: (7') nu-wa-za DAM-ZU da-a-ū l (8') nu-wa-za DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU i-ia-ad-du l (9') nu-wa-za DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ i-ia-ad-du l (10') nu-za zi-ik DINGIR-LUM DINGIR-LIM-tar te-ek-ku-uš-nu-ut // (11') nu-wa-du-za na-ak-ki-ia-tar a-uš-du l (12') nu-wa-du-za DINGIR-LUM ŠA SAG.DU-ŠU l (13') i-ia-az-zi nu-du-za ma-al-ti-eš-na-la-an l (14') i-ia-zi

“Let him take his wife, let him produce children for himself! Let him produce sons and daughters for himself! You, o goddess, show him your divinity! Let him see your power! And he will make you his personal goddess. He will make you the recipient of his vow.”\(^{383}\)

---


\(^{381}\) On this translation see Hoffner 1987: 277, 284 note on lines 38-39.

\(^{382}\) The adjective malteššanala- has been previously translated in this context as “recipient of malteššar” (votive offerings?) in CHD L-N: 135, as “recipient of vows” by Hoffner 1987: 277 and “quelqu’un qui reçoit des offrandes votives” by Mouton 2007: 137 and as “votive (beneficiary)” by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 36. Goetze 1950: 349 translated the sentence that employs this adjective as “he will make vows.”

\(^{383}\) The adjective malteššanala- has been rendered in this context as “recipient of malteššar” in CHD vol. L-N: 135, as “recipient of vows” by Hoffner 1987: 279; as “quelqu’un qui reçoit des offrandes votives” by Mouton 2007: 140 and as “votive (beneficiary)” by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 36. Goetze 1950: 350 translated the sentence that employs this adjective as “He will make vows to thee.”
II.F. IKRIBU ‘object in KIN oracle’

1. KBo 44.210 (CTH 578), KIN and SU oracle, NH/NS.

   (1) Obv. (6') [ŠA MUNUS ŠU.GI IR-TU]M QA-TAM-MA-pát nu KIN SIG,-ru 'LUGAL,-uš [ ...] / (7') [x x x x] x x da-pi-i ZI-ni UD.II.K[AM ...] / (8') x [ x x DIN]GIR. 'MEŠ GUB3-ir TI-tar IK-RI-BU-ia d[|a-a-ir ...]

   That same [questi]on [of the Old Woman]. Let the KIN be favourable. The KING [...], [...] in the ENTIRE SOUL. On the seco[nd] day [... DEI]TIES stand. They [took] LIFE and VOW.

   (2) Obv. (15') [ŠA MUNUS ŠU.GI IR-TUM QA-TAM-MA-pát nu KIN 'SIG,,-r[u ...] / (16') IK-RI-BU-ia ME-aš nu-kán DINIGR.MEŠ-aš INA UD384.[II.KAM ...] / (17') 'nu:-kán EGIR-pa GIŠ1.DAG1 INA UD.II.KAM HUL-lu [ ...] // (18') MUNUS.LUGAL 2IŠTAR URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ia INIM [...] / (19') 'A'-NA DINIGR-LIM IK-RU-UB //

   That same question of the Old Woman. Let the KIN be favourable. And he/she took [...] and the VOW, and (it is) with the GODS. On the [second] day [...], and (it is) back with the THRONE. On the third day EVIL [...]. The queen [...] the matter of Ištar of Lawazantiya. She vowed to the deity.

---

384 INA is written with a single horizontal stroke.
III. MUGAI-, MUGAWAR, MUKEŠŠAR

III.A.a. mugai- “to induce, to urge (into action),”

1. KUB 23.77+ (CTH 138), a treaty of the Hittite king Arnuwanda I and the king of the Kaška lands, MH/MS.

   (1) KUB 23.77: // (65) [ma-a-an] ⸁UTU-ŠI-ma ⸁KAŠ₇,E I-NA KUR 🅂Uri-KAŠ-GA pi-i-ia-mi na-uš-ši x [x x] iš-ši na-an-za ⸁Išk-šu-la-aš // (66) [le]- ’e’ mu-ga-a-ši nu-uš-ši ki-iš-ša-an le-e te-ši ma-a-ab ḫa-an-w’a A-NA 🅂Uri ḪA-AT-TI(?) ša-ra-a a-ar-ti // (67) [ x x x x x x ]

   But [if], I, His Majesty, send a messenger into the land of Kaška, you […] to him, and you, as an ally (lit. friend), will not induce/tempt him and you will not say to him thus: “When you arrive up to Hattuša, [then] run away, and [come] back to me”.


   Do not bring (pl.) those who come as fugitives [from the land of Kaška] to the land of Ḫatti, [and those who] go as fugitives from Ḫattuša [to] the land of [Kaška], […] May they [not] induce/tempt the men of Kaška, who [have] come to Ḫattuša as fugitives, (to go) back to the land of Kaška.

2. KBo 3.16 (CTH 311.2.A), “Deeds of Naram-Sîn in Anatolia”, OH/NS. Lines rev. 5-13 of KBo 3.16 are duplicated by KBo 3.18 + KBo 3.19 + (CTH 311.2.B).


---

[385] The verb mugai- has been rendered in this context as: “entreat” in CHD vol. L-N: 322 sub b; by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 177 and by von Schuler 1965: 121. Gurney 1940: 49 did not translate mugai- in this context but observed that it must have denoted some sort of request or demand for a personal favour.

[386] The verb mugai- has been rendered here as “entreat” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183 and as “zurückbitten” by von Schuler 1965: 121.

[387] The Akkadogram ŠN is written with 5 wedges instead of three.

[388] The Akkadogram IŠTAR is written with two verticals instead of one.
When the Stormgod and the serpent came hand to hand in combat in the town of Kiškilušša, the serpent defeated the Stormgod. Then the Stormgod urged the gods (saying): “Come to my side! Inara has prepared a feast!”

The imperative of mugai- has been rendered in the present context as “invoke” in CHD L-N: 320 and by Mouton 2007: 110. Güterbock 1938: 57 translated it as “klage” and Puhvel HED vol. 6: 178 as “implore”.

The supine mukiškiuwan was translated here as “began to invoke” in CHD L-N: 320 and by Mouton 2007: 11, “begann zu klagen” by Güterbock 1938: 57 and as “began imploring” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183.

E: [...][M-an tar-a[b-ya ...]

III.A.b. mugai- “to invoke”, mukeššar “invocation”

1. KUB 14.4 (CTH 70.1.A), Muršili II’s dealings with Tawannanna, NH/NS.

When I went to Kummanni - my father had promised a Festival of Invocation to Hebat of Kummanni, but (because) he had not given it to her, she weighted it on me - I went to Kizzuwatna and I said as follows: “I will recompense for the omission of my father.” I constantly lured and invoked Hebat of Kummanni for myself, for my wife, my son, my household, my land and my brothers.

2. KUB 30.42 + KBo 31.8 (CTH 276.1), shelf list of the DUBxKAM type, OH/NS.

One tablet. The word of Annana, the Old Woman: “When they invoke the Stormgod”. (Text) not finished.

One tablet. The word of Annana, the Woman of Zigazur: “When I invoke the deity Miyatanzipa”. (Text) finished.

3. KUB 30.57 + KUB 30.59 (CTH 276.3), shelf list of the DUBxKAM type, OH/NS.

---

395 The verb mugai- has been translated in the present context as: “j’ai multiplié invocations” by Lebrun 1980: 438; “ho invocato” by de Martino 1998: 37; “I kept invoking” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183 and “I invoked” by Singer 2002a: 76.

396 The verb mugai- has been translated in the present context as “beschwört” by Dardano 2006: 23; as “invoke” by Hoffner 2003: 69 and as “ invoquer” by Laroche 1975: 162 and Lebrun 1980: 434.

397 The verb mugai- has been translated in the present context as “anrufe” by Dardano 2006: 27; as “invoke” by Lebrun 1980: 434 and by Hoffner 2003: 69.

398 This Sumerogram can also be read here as Lû.

399 Dardano 2006: 27 translates the verb mugai in the present context as “anruft”.

One tablet. The word of Dunnawiyah, the Old Woman: “When I invoke a dead person” (Text) not finished. We have not yet found this last tablet for it (i.e. the ritual of invocation)

4. KUB 8.71 (CTH 276.9), shelf list that includes titles of several tablets whose common denominator seems to be DINGIR GE “The Deity of the Night”, NS. The lines obv. 10’-15’ also appear in KBo 12.116 (rev. 2’-8’) and KUB 56.55 (iv 3’-9’).

(1)

KUB 8.71 obv.: // (10') DUB.8.KAM QA-TI INIM ³[I]-LI-MA-[A]⁴BL / (11') ¹[U]-¹Ar-ša-ki-ti [MUNUS]kat-ra-a[š] ... / (12') [ku]-¹e-¹ez-qa TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za na-aš-ma-a[š] ... / (13') [ku]-²iš-ki pé-ra-an DÜ-anza na-aš-m[a-aš-si-kán] ... / (14') [ku]-²[i]-¹ki ḫar-kán na-an SAG.GÉ[ME.IR.MEŠ ...] / (15') mu-ga-iz-zi //

(2)


(3)


The eighth (KBo 12.116: third, KUB 56.55: fifth) tablet, (text) finished.⁵⁰³

The word of Ilma-abi, the priest of the Deity of the Night, and of Arzakiti, the katra-woman: “When the deity is angered by some matter, either some sacrilege has been done before her, or some implement of her has been

---

400 The verb muqai- has been translated in the present context as “evoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 321 and by Puehl in HED vol. 6: 177; as “anrufen” by Daradno 2006: 49; as “invoquer” by Laroche 1975: 157 and by Lebrun 1980: 433.

401 The only difference between KUB 8.71 obv. 10’-15’, KBo 12.116 rev. 2’-8’ and KUB 56.55 iv 3’-9’ is that KUB 8.71 is the eighth, KBo 12.116 the third and KUB 56.55 the fifth tablet of this composition.

402 Collation of Klengel 1985: 169 n.2.

403 The scribe of KUB 56.55 does not indicate whether the text is finished or not.

404 The name of the woman in line 11 of KUB 8.71 is spelled Ar-ša-ki-ti. It is uncertain whether this spelling is a scribal error for Arzakiti (spelling found in KBo 12.116 and KUB 56.55), or Aršakiti and Arzakiti were two different women.
destroyed, how the servants of the deity invoke her back. (KUB 56.55: not finished)

5. KBo 14.70 + KUB 30.60 (CTH 276.11), shelf list of the DUBxKAM type, NS.


Two [tablet]s. (Text) complete, of invocation of the Gulšaš deity of Durmitta. One [tablet] of invocation of Telipinu. [X tablet] of invocation of the Sungoddess, (text) complete. [X tablet, (text) complete, of the invocation (entitled): “When a dead person is lured away for someone”.

6. CTH 277, “shelf lists” of the TUP-PU type.

I. KBo 31.5+ (CTH 277.6.A), NH/NS. The text is duplicated by KBo 31.26 (CTH 277.6.B).


(B: [x tablet. Wеln] [wе] invoke the Protective deity lulummi. One [tablet]. [The word of Paškuw]atti: “When I invoke the goddess Uliliašši”.


The verbal noun invoke the Stormgod. (Text) complete. [x tablet]: “When the Old Woman invokes the deity Walliyara.” (text) complete. [B: x tablet of] the invoking the Stormgod of the woman Ḥarapšēli. (Text) complete.

II. KUB 30.51 + KUB 30.45 (CTH 277.4.A), a shelf-list. NH/NS. Lines i 10’-27’ of KUB 30.51+ are duplicated by lines 5’-25’ of KBo 31.27 + KBo 14.68 + (CTH 277.4.B).

(1)

One tablet of invocation of the deity Akniya. (Text) complete. One tablet. Three invocation rituals [are recorded]: one (ritual) when Ḫebat, Šarruma and A[llanzu are angry with a man; one ritual when [the land (and) heaven ...] x[x]; one ritual when so[mbody] sins [against] the Sungoddess of the earth. (Text) complete. One tablet. Word of Mallidunn[a]: “When the invocation of the Sungoddess and of the Mother goddess (is) [recorded]. (Text) complete. One tablet. Word of Aštabiššari: “When a man had sworn an oath aga[inst another man] and proceeds to [kil]l (him), this ritual is for him. Included (lit. in it) one invocation (ritual) of the Stormgod. (Text) complete. One tablet: “When the Old Woman invoke[s]
the Stormgod. One long tablet: “When [they invoke] the Stormgod of Zippal[anda]. One tablet. Word of Ananna, the Old Woman of [Zigazhûra]: “When [they invoke] the protective deity. One tablet. Word of Irmimna, the woman of [Kurkûrez-[a]: “When an angry (deity) to whom [ …] I invoke him/her. [(Text) complete. x table]. Word of Tiwiyani: “When I invoke an angry (deity)."

(2)


One tablet. Word of Allaitura [ …] and I invoke ^i45 him/her as follows [ …]. One tablet of invocation of the deity Akniya. [(Text) complete. Two tablets of invocation] of Telipinu of the cities Tawiniya and [Turmitta]. One tablet. Three invocation rituals ^i46 are recorded: one ritual] when Ḥebat, Šarruma and A[llanzu are angry]; one ritual when the land (and) heaven(?) [ … ]; one ritual when] somebody sins against [the Sun goddess of the earth. (Text) complete]. One tablet. Word of Malli[du]na: “When the invocation] of the Sun goddess and the Mother goddess[s (is) done. (Text) complete.] One tablet. Word of Aštabišarri [ …]; one ritual when a man [had sworn an oath against] another man and proceeds to kill him (and) that blood weighs on that man. This ritual is for him [ …]. One ritual when they invoke ^i47 the Stormgod. One tablet. The name of the [Old] W[oman is un]known: “When

^i44 Manuscript A (line i 9') reads here a-ni-i[-a-mi] “I treat”.

The verb mugai-, the verbal noun mugawar, and the noun mukeššar were translated in this passage as “to invoke” and “invocation” by Dardano 2006: 127, 129, Laroche 1975: 159 and in CHD vol. L-N: 322. Kammenhuber HW^i renders the verb mugai- in line i 4' of KBo 14.68 + as “behandeln (mit einem Ritual)”. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 177, 179 translates mugam in line i 4 of KBo 14.68 as “I treat by prayer” and the verbal noun mugawar in line 5' of KBo 14.68 as “invocation”.

The noun mukeššar has been translated here by Dardano 2006: 151 as “Anrufungen”.

The verb mugai- has been rendered here as “invoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 231 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 178.
the Old Woman invokes\textsuperscript{418} the Stormgod. One long tablet: “[When] they invoke the Stormgod of Zippalanda. One tablet. [Word of Anan]na, the Old Woman of Zigazhura: “[When they invoke [the protective deity. One tablet. Word of Irmimma]: “When a (deity) is angry with somebody …] I invoke him. (Text) complete. [x tablet. Word of Tiwiyani]: “when I invoke and angry (deity)”. (Text) complete.

7. VBoT 58 (CTH 323.1.A), myth about the disappearance of a Sun deity, OH/NS.
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(the first two lines are part of the conjuration? ritual of the annanna-woman) “I lost none of the god’s words. When Telipinu has become troublesome to somebody, I [sp]eak the god’s words and I invoke\textsuperscript{419} him”. And the Sungod says: “Let the god’s words go! Where is my allocation?” Annanna (says) as follows: “If you, o Sungod, do a favour to someone, may he give you nine (sacrificial animals). And may the man, who is poor, give you 1 sheep.” It is the (text) of the invocation\textsuperscript{420} of the Sungod and Telipinu; it is finished.

8. KUB 33.21+ (CTH 326.A), myth about the disappearance of the Stormgod, the personal god of the queen Ašmunikkal, MH/NS.

KUB 33.21 + iii: (17’) ga-la-ak-tar ki-it-ta nu-uš-ši [ ... ] / (18’) ga-la-an-ga-za e-eš pär-hu-e-n-[a-š ki-it-ta] / (19’) na-aš-ši-pa an-da mu-ga-a-an-za e-eš-du [ ... ] / (20’) M\textsuperscript{14}UNUS .asm-ni-kal-la-ia DUMU.MEŠ DUMU.M[UNUS ... ] / [ x x x x ]tu-‘-uš ta-la-ga-u[š ... ] //

\textit{galaktar} is placed (for you), so be soothed for her! \textit{parḥu[n]aš is placed (for you)}, so let him (i.e. the god) b[e] invoked\textsuperscript{421} for her! [Let the god give to the king] and to Ašmunikkal, to their sons, daughter[s ... ] and long [year[s].

\textsuperscript{418} The same translation of the verb \textit{mugai-} in this line was offered by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 177.

\textsuperscript{419} The verb \textit{mugai-} was translated in the present context as: “invoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 320, by Haas 2006: 119; Hoffner 1998: 28 and Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1. Gurney 1940: 50 rendered this verb here as “entreat”. This translation was recently followed by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 177, Kellerman 1987: 113 translate \textit{mugai-} here as “je le pousse à agir favorablement” and Mazoyer 2003: 181 as “évoquer”.

\textsuperscript{420} The noun \textit{mugawar} has been rendered in the present context as: “mugawar-Anrufungsgebete” by Haas 2006: 120; “invocation” by Hoffner 1998: 28, Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179, Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1 and as “l’évocation” by Mazoyer 2003: 181.

\textsuperscript{421} The same translation of the participle \textit{muganza} has been offered in CHD L-N: 320, by Hoffner 1998: 25, by Pecchioli-Daddi, by Polvani 1990: 105, by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 178, by Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 326 and by Otten 1942: 59. Lebrun 1980: 436 translated this participle as “ébranler.”
9. CTH 330, various manuscripts of a ritual performed for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna.422

I. KBo 15.32+ (CTH 330.1.C/CTH 329 or 330.1.A), OH/MS.

(1)

[When the ‘lord of the house’ celebrates the Stormgod of Kuliwišna during the course of [the year] – whenever the ‘lord of the house’ can, either in Spring or in Fall or in Winter- then the lord of the house [proceeds] to invoke before the Stormgod of Kuliwišna. For the invocation (ritual) [for] the Stormgod of Kuliwišna [they give] thee: (a list of offerings follows)]

(2)
KBo 15.32 iv: (5’) DUB.1.KAM ŠA dIM URU KU-LI-Û-ÎŞ-NA / (6’) mu-ki-šiš-na-aš Û-UL QA-TI

One tablet of invocation (ritual) of the Stormgod of Kuliwišna. (Text) not finished.

II. KBo 15.34+ (CTH 330.1.O), NH/NS.431


The order of manuscripts differs between the Konkordanz and Glocker 1997: 16, who edited these texts. When the number assigned to a given manuscript is different in Konkordanz and in Glocker, the number listed first is that of Konkordanz. Most of the manuscripts are fragmentary, except KBo 15.32; KBo 15.34 and KUB 12.19.

The restoration is based on line 4’ of KBo 38.224 (CTH 330.1.B).


lit. “at whatever time the [lord of the house] can”,

lit. “harvest time”,

The infinitive mugausanzi has been rendered here as “beten” by Glocker 1997: 19.

The dative-locative mukišni has been translated here as: “Anrufungsrational” by Glocker 1997: 19 and as “invocation” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181.

The noun mukeššar has been rendered in the present context as: “Anrufungsrational” by Glocker 1997: 27 and as “invocation” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181.

The text is duplicated by KUB 12.19+ (CTH 330.1.P/CTH 329 or 330.1.P).


Manuscript P ii 11’ reads here mukišnaš EZEN₄.

Manuscript P ii 12’ has here LÉ mukišnaš=pát.
Then, if, on the day on which [they] finish giving the billy-goat to the male gods, the ‘lord of the house’ is not able, then on the next morning the ‘lord of the invocation (ritual)’, celebrates the festival of invocation for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna. If (things are) favourable for the ‘lord of the house’, then on that day he drives to Kuliwišna and washes himself. But if (things are) not favourable for him, he sleeps somewhere else and washes himself there. On the next morning he drives to Kuliwišna. Then as soon as the sun rises, the ‘lord of the house’ gives to the Stormgod of Kuliwišna, the offering of the invocation as follows (the sacrifices and offerings performed by the ‘lord of the house’ and other festival officiants are listed in columns ii and iii).

III. KBo 34.35 (CTH 330.I.R), NH/NS.

KBo 34.35 iv: // (7') DUB.1.KAM ŠA dU KU-LI-Ú-IŠ-NA // (8') mu-kiš-na-aš [Ú-UL QA-TI]437

One tablet of the invocation of the Stormgod of Kuliwišna. [Text] not finished.

10. KUB 33.68 (CTH 332.3.A), ritual of invocation of the Stormgod, OH/MS.


Just as the šanku-flower grew, so may your, the Stormgod’s, soul grow (like) a flower. May these words of invocation be falling upon

---

435 The phrase ĽE mukišnaš has been translated in the present context as: “the person who has commissioned the invocation ritual (lit. owner/ford of invocation)” in CHD vol. L-N: 325.4’; “Ritualherr” by Gloker 1997: 49 and as “invocant” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181; the phrase mukišnaš EZEN has been previously rendered here as: “the festival of invocation” in CHD vol. L-N: 325.4”; “das Fest des Anrufungsrituals” by Gloker 1997: 49 and as “feast of invocation” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181.

436 The phrase mukišnaš SISKUR has been translated in the present context as: “an offering of invocation” in CHD vol. L-N: 325 sub b and by Gloker 1997: 49 and as “a rite of invocation” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181.

437 The restoration of Gloker 1997: 86, probably based on the colophon of manuscript A.

438 Gloker 1997: 87 translates the noun nukeššar in the present context as “Anrufungsritual”, “Anrufungsräte”.

439 Reading of Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 332.3 confirmed by the photograph. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179 reads here iš.

440 The noun muggawar has been rendered here as “evocation” in CHD vol. L-N: 321 and by de Roos 1995: 2000; as “supplication” by Lebrun 1980: 435; as “invocation” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179 and as “Anspornung” by Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 332.3.

441 For this translation of mummuwai- see CHD vol. L-N: 329.
you! Turn you ear and listen to what the king (and) the queen are saying to you!

11. KUB 33.75 (CTH 334.7.A), myth about the disappearance of the goddess Hānāḥanna (DINGIR.MAḪ), NH/NS.


Behold, here lies for you par[ha][na] for the invocation (ritual)443 [May Hānāḥanna] be lu[red! May] she be lur[ed likewise] [by the princ]es, the king, [and] the land of Ḫatti!

12. KBo 7.28 + KBo 8.92 (CTH 371), prayer to the Sungoddess of the Netherworld, OH/NS.

KBo 7.28 + KBo 8.92 obv. (1') [n]a-aš-[?] [ ... ] / (2') nu ki-’i[p ... ] tāk-na]- ’a-aš 8[UT]U-i ’DINGIR.MES-

The present context requires the verb “to turn,” but the traces preserved seem to be more consistent with Friedrich’s reading na-an-ni “drive” (1957: 218), that is to say, if one accepts the slight emendation of the second sign to -an.


442 All the restorations follow Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 334.7.

443 The noun mukeššar has been translated in this context as “to invoke” in CHD vol. P: 150 and as “Ansporn” by Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 334.7.

444 The present context requires the verb “to turn,” but the traces preserved seem to be more consistent with Friedrich’s reading na-an-ni “drive” (1957: 218), that is to say, if one accepts the slight emendation of the second sign to -an.

the earth. If his [father] defamed [him], do no[t] listen to him! If [his] 
mo[ther defamed] [him], do not listen to her! If [his brother] defamed him, 
do not listen to him! If his sister defam[ed] him, do not listen to her! If his 
in-law or h[is] companion defamed him, do not listen to him! Turn (here) 
your benevolent eyes! Lift (your) thousand eyelashes! Look kindly at the 
king! Turn (your) ears and hear a good wor[d]! Turn towards your servant, 
[fre]e him [from evil] (Lit. Take him from evil)! Establish him in a good 
place! [May there be] gro[wth] in the land! May it thrive and prosper! For 
the gods may the loaves of thick bread and wine libation multiply!

13. KUB 31.127+ (CTH 372.A), hymn and a prayer of a mortal to appease an angry 
deity, NS.

KUB 31.127 i: (1) e4UTU-e iš-ḫu-mi ḫa-an-da-an-za ḫa-an-ni-eš-na-aš / 
(2) iš-ḫa-aš ne-pi-ša-aš da-a-ga-zī-pa-aš-ša LUGAL-u-e erasure / (3) KUR-
e zī-ik du-ud-du-uš-ki-ši ta-r-ḫu-u-ša-tar / (4) zī-ik-pāt pē-eš-ki-ši zī-ik-pāt 
mu-ga-a-u-wa-ar zī-ik-pāt e-eš-ša-at-tī

O Sungod, my lord, just lord of judgment, king of heaven and earth! You 
are constantly controlling the lands (B: and you [set] the boundaries). You 
alone are constantly giving strength (B: you are giving life in [the land]). 
You alone are just! You alone, O god, exercise mer-cy! You alone act upon 
the invocations447 (B: you alone are listening to invocations)

14. KUB 23.115+ (CTH 375.C), prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, MH/NS.

KUB 23.115 iii: (11') [ki-n]u-un-pāt ú-e-eš ṢAr-nu-wa-an-ta 
LUGAL.GA[L] / (12') [Ū] Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL šu-ma-a-
āš DINGIR.ME[S] / (13') [EGI]R-an ar-wa-aš-ta-at nu-kān šu-ma-a-ša549 
[DINGIR.ME[S(?)] / (14') [mu-k]i-ša-ga-u-e-erasure-ni /

And even [no]w, we, Arnuwanda, the gre[at] king, [and] Ašmunikkal, the 
great queen, have [ta]ken care of you, o god[s], and we keep [in]voking548 
you, [o gods].

15. KUB 24.3+ (CTH 376.II.A), a prayer and hymn of Muršili II to the Sungoddess 
of Arinna. The beginning of the text and one of the colophons are included in 
KUB 36.80 (CTH 376.II.B). 1229/u (+) Bo 4328 + AnAr 11621c (CTH 
376.II.C) duplicate lines iii 11'-27' of KUB 24.3+.

446 The reading of Schwemer (awaits publication).
447 The verbal noun mugawar was translated in the present context as "invocations" in CHD 
vol. L-N: 322, Singer 2002a: 36 and Schwemer (unpublished); as "prayers" by Güterbock 
1980: 43 and by Ünal 1991: 796; as "Bitten" by Haas 2006: 246 and as "supplication" by 
448 The verb mugai- was rendered in the present context as “nous adresses sans cesse une 
supplicite” and “nous ne cessons de vous supplier” by Lebrun 1980: 146 and 431; “we kept 
The verb *mugai*-, the nouns *mukeššar* and *mugawar* were translated in this text as “ébranler/supplier, émouvoir” and “(les fêtes) de la mise en branle/suplications” by Lebrun 1980: 166, 167, 171, 431; as “invoke” and “(festivals of the) sacrificial rituals” by Singer 2002a: 50, 51, 53, 54, Ünal 1991: 803, 804, 807-808 translates the verb *mugai*- in KUB 36.80 i 4, 10 and in KUB 24.3 i 3’ as “anflehen”, in KUB 24.3 iii 12 as “gebeten” and in KUB 24.3 iv 1’, 4’, 6’ as “beten”. He renders the noun *mukeššar* in 24.3 i 18’ as “(Feste zur Einweihung) von Opfertieren and the *mugawar* in KUB 24.3 iv 7’ as “Gebet.”
And you yourself, O Sungoddess of Arinna, [let] yourself be invoked! 

(4) KUB 24.3+ iv: (1’) `A³-NA(?!) UTU ²RI-IN]¹-NA mu-ga-u-wa-an-zi² / (2’) x [xxx x am-mu-ak(!)]² tup-pi-ia-š A-WA-TE³ES / (3’) a³-ši a-at-ia-nu-an nu ⁴UTU ²RI-IN-NA / (4’) ⁵KÚ.BABBAR-ši I-NA UD.7.KAM mu-ke-š-kim-u-an (5’) I-NA ²RI-IN-NA-ia I-NA UD.7.KAM (6’) mu-ke-š-ki-nu-an na-aš-ta ki-i A-WA-TE³ES (7’) an-da me-mi-iš-ši-ta µu-u-ga-u-wa-aš-ša (8’) ar-ḫa-ia-an ḫa-an-ti tup-pi

[…] to invoke⁴⁵¹ the [Sungoddess of Arin]na. […] Then I recorded the words of the tablet. I have invoked⁴⁵² the Sungoddess of Arinna in Ḥattuša for 7 days. I have invoked (her) for seven days in Arinna, and I spoke these words. There is in addition a separate tablet of the invocation (ritual).


Colophon B: [One tablet. (text) complete]. When [there has been] dying in the land of Ḥatti. [In addition] there is again a separate [tablet. Wh]en they [injvoke] the Sun-goddess of Arinna [in Ḥattuša], they speak to her [these words].

16. KUB 36.81 (CTH 376.III),⁴⁵³ fragment of a hymn and prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna asking for recovery of Gaššuli yawija.


Only [in the land of Ḥattuša] there are festivals for you (such as) [the monthly festival, the annual festivals of autumn, winter, spring, the auliš-sacrifices, [and the festivals] of invocation⁴⁵⁴, [but in no other land] they exist for you.

450 The verb mugai- was translated in this line as “entreat” in CHD vol. L-N: 322 and by Gurney 1940: 35; as “émouvoir” by Laroche 1964-5: 24; as “erbitten” by Neu 1968: 118 and as “invoke” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183.

451 The verb mugai- and the noun mukeššar have been rendered in this passage as “entreat” and “supplication” by Gurney 1940: 39. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179 translates the verbal noun mugawar in line iv 7 of KUB 24.3 as “invocation”.

452 Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183 translates the verb mugai- in lines iv 4’ and 6’ of KUB 24.3 as “besought”.

453 This text has been assigned the 376.II.E number in Konkordanz. For assigning this text number CTH 376.III see vol. I pp. 141-143.

454 The noun mukeššar in the present context has been translated as “(festivals of the) sacrificial rituals” by Singer 2002a: 73 and as “Bittegebet” by Tischler 1981: 47.
17. KUB 24.1+ (CTH 377.A), a hymn and prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu. The text is duplicated by KUB 24.2 (CTH 377.B).

(1) KUB 24.1 i: (4) u-i-it-ia-at-mu  
MUR-ŠI-I-LI  
[UJAGAL-uš tu]-
-eel IR-KA / (5) MUNUS.LUGAL-AS-SHA tu-e-el GÉME-455[.tu]-i-e-i-it-ia-at-mu  
(6) Te-li-pi-ku-an-an [EN] DINGIR-LAM  
455(7) ŠA SAG.DU-NI  
mu-ga-a-ra  
(8) nu-za-kán ma-a-an na-ak-ki-[i]  
Te-li-pi-ku-an-an ne-pi-ši / (9) DINGIR.MEŠ-AS ši-tar-na  
ma-a-an  
[a-ru-ni] / (10) DINGIR-LUM ša-ša-ša  
(11) ša te-ša-ša  
(12) ša-ša-ša  
(13) ša-ša-ša  
(14) ša-ša-ša  
(15) ša-ša-ša  
(16) ša-ša-ša  
(17) ša-ša-ša

Muršili, the king, your servant, sent me and the queen, your maidservant (sent me). They [sent me saying]: “Go, invoke Telipinu, our lord, our personal god (saying): Whether you, honored Telipinu, are above in heaven among the gods, or in the sea, or you are gone to the mountains to roam, or you are gone to an enemy land for battle, now let the fragrant odour, the cedar (and) the oil summon you. Come back to the (B: your) temple. I hereby invoke you [with] thick bread and libation. Be pacified! O god, turn your ear towards me! Keep listening to what I am saying to you!

HA-AT-TI-pát e- 
(7) nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni KUR URU  
(8) ku-wa-pa-ki-ki e-eš-ka-an-aš-ka

Only in the land of Hatti there are festivals for you (such as) the monthly festival, the annual festivals (lit. of the course of the year) of winter, spring, autumn, the auliuš-sacrifices, and festivals of invocation459, but in no other land and city they exist for you.

---

455 B obv. 4: MUR-ŠI-I-LI
456 B obv. 5: GÉME-KA
457 B obv. 11: ka-ri-im-ni-it-ti
458 The verb munqai- was translated in lines i 7 and 14 as: “invoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 321, by Kassian- Yakubovich 2007: 432, by Singer 2002a: 54 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 178; as “suplica” and “estoy suplicándote” by Bernabé 1987: 273; as “glorifique” in obv. 7 and as “t’appelle” in obv. 14 by Christmann-Franck 1989: 47, 48; as “entreat” and “I am entertaining” by Gurney 1940: 1 and by de Roos 1995: 2001; as “bouger” in line i 6 and “ébranler” in line i 14 by Lebrun 1980: 184, 185, 433.
459 The noun mukeššar was translated in this context as: “las de súplica” by Bernabé 1987: 274; “(festivals of invoking the auliuš” in CHD vol. L-N: 325c.1.; “(fêtes de l’évocation” by Christmann-Franck 1989: 48; “(festivals of supplication” by Gurney 1940: 19; “the
18. KBo 11.14 (CTH 395.A), ritual of Ḥantitaššu from Ḫurma, MH/NS.


You, the door bolt! [As] you keep opening back ak[(the bolt?)] you go and open back the dar[kearth]! Bring (up here) the primeval deities! There they will take [them (i.e. the offerings made to the primeval deities) for themselves]! Let them go there and invoke°° the Sungoddes of the earth! Whatever [evil things] I have committed, [let] the deities [tell] me about it!”

19. KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.5 + KUB 7.8 (CTH 406), ritual of a woman of Arzawa named Paškuwatti, MH/NS.


Thus (speaks) Paškuwatti, the woman from Arzawa (who) lives in Parāšša. “If reproductive power is lacking in some man or (if) he is not a man before a woman, I make offerings to Uliliyašši on his behalf and I invoke°° her for three days.


This word is read by Ünal 1996: 23 as ak-[x]-ki-na-pa, which would be a hapax in this context. The meaning of this word is unknown; Ünal 1996: 23 n. 87 argues that it must mean either a ‘leaf of a door’ or something similar.

The same translation of the verb mugai- was offered in the present context by Collins 2006: 45 and Ünal 1996: 30. Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183 renders this verb here as “implore”.


The verbal form Ôn this translation see Hoffner 1987: 277 and 284 note on lines 38-39.

The Sumerogram GÊME is written here with a vertical stroke at the end, which is not the usual rendering of this logogram.

Goetze 1950: 349, by Hoffner 1987: 278 and by Puhvel renders this verb here as “je suis en train de t’invoquer.”

“Three lines at the beginning of the speech are too fragmentary for translation “He went down to her bedchamber, but this mortal (i.e. the son of mortality) (was just) one of excrement and urine. He did not find you. But now he had just come to you down on his knees for help and is seeking you, o goddess, for the sake of your divinity. Whether you are in the mountain, whether you are in the meadow, whether you are in the valley, wherever you are, come down to this man in favour! Let winds and rain not beat your eyes! He will proceed to make you his (personal) goddess. He will offer you a place. He will give you a house. He will give you cattle and sheep. He will make you a recipient of votive offerings. I am presently invoking and luring you. Come! Bring with you the moon, the star and the Sungoddess of netherworld. Let the female and male slaves run before you! Let the male [and female deities] run before you! Come down to this man! You are his “wife of children” for him. Look after him! Turn to him in favour! Speak to him! Hand your maidservant over to him! He will become a yoke (for her). Let him take his wife and let him produce for himself sons and daughters! They will be your male and female servants. They will keep giving you offerings, thick breads, groats, (and) libations. Till now this man has not known you, but just now he has sought you. Since he has just sought you, you, O goddess, step towards him in favour! Show your divinity, O goddess,
The verbal form *mukeškiueni* was translated as: “we are invoking” in CHD vol. L-N: 321; by Mouton 2007: 138 and by Trabazo 2002: 459; as well as “we are evoking” by Hoffner 1987: 278 and by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 182. Goetze 1950 and Gurney 1940: 48 left this verb untranslated.

The first singular present *mugami* has been translated in this context as: “I evoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 321; “I entreat/will entreat” by Goetze 1950: 350 and by Hoffner 1987: 278. Mouton 2007: 139 renders this verb here as “j'invoque”; Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 177 as “I implore” and Trabazo 2002: 461 as “rezaré”.

The same translation of the first singular present *mugami* in this context has been offered by Hoffner 1987: 279, by Mouton 2007: 140 and by Trabazo 2002:465. Goetze interpreted the verb *mugai*- that appears at end of line 5 as the third singular present and translated it as “he entreated” assuming that it was the client who was entreating the deity. This interpretation is contrary to the entire texts, in which the action expressed by the verb *mugai-*, is performed by Paškuwattiš, the woman of Arzawa.
20. CTH 433, rituals dedicated to the Tutelary/protective Deity of the Hunting bag (LAMMA \textit{KUŠ} \textit{kuršaš}).

I. KBo 17.105 + (CTH 433.2), MH/NS.


Turn in favour towards [the king, the queen] (and) the princes! Turn in favour also [towards] the augurs! As a human continually surrounds you, [the hearth], [during the day], the gods keep surrounding you at night. And when the gods will ask you the following: “What is this that they have done when the gods will ask you the following: “What is this that they have done for the 

II. KBo 20.107 + KBo 23.50 + (CTH 433.3.A), MH.


\textsuperscript{472} The verb \textit{mugai}- has been translated here as “unentwegt anrufen” by Bawanypeck 2005: 89 and “implore” by Puhvel \textit{HED} vol. 6: 183.

\textsuperscript{473} The restoration of Bawanypeck 2005: 110 and 116 is based on the fact that the verbs \textit{talliya}- and \textit{mugai}- often appear together.

\textsuperscript{474} Bawanypeck 2005: 110 restores here \textit{pē-qa-an}. This restoration, however, does not make sense in the present context and is not consistent with the traces preserved.
You, the Ša[la]waneš-deity of the city gates, keep drinking and [e]ating! We have just been [lur]ing and invoking the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting [Bag] away from all the foreign lands, [mountains, valleys, rivers, ]yašša-places, springs and meadows. May [you], yourselves be appeased! And when the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag comes, may you be [...] hasty for him again! And may you [...] hasty with the king and the queen!

21. KUB 17.23 (CTH 439.A), a ritual performed for the deities Anzili and Zukki, NH/NS.

KUB 17.23 i: // (1) [m]a- śa-a-[a]-an-š-kán MUNUS SU. 'GI' [m]u- [g]a- [u]-wa-an-zi' / (2) aš-nu-zi nu a-ru-wa-iz-zi nu 9 NINDA.GUR ,RA.HI.A / (3) an-da ne-ia-an-du-uš tar-na-aš / 9 NINDA.GUR ,RA.HI.A ī tar-na-aš / (4) 3 NINDA a-a-an ku-iš-ša tar-na-aš ú-da-an-zi / (5) nu-uš MUNUS ŠU.GI pár-ši-ia nu A-NA DINGIR- LIM ku-it / (6) GIŠ BANŠUR AD.KID ZAG-ar- ta- ri na-aš-kán a-pí-ia ti-an-zi

[When the Old Woman finishes invoking she prostrates herself. They bring nine turned thick breads of one tarna-measure, nine thick breads with fat of one tarna-measure (and) three warm breads each of one tarna-measure. The Old Woman breaks them and they put them there, on the table of wicker which stands on the right of the (statue of the) deity.

22. KUB 30.27 (CTH 451), one-column synoptic tablet of a funerary ritual, MH(?)/NS.


On the fifth day there is only invocation. On the sixth day there is only invocation. And on the seventh day they perform invocation and they pick up the invocation materials. It is finished. But during the days of invocation they give daily sacrifices for the bones which are brought from a...
distant land, as follows: On the first day, when they pacify him (the deceased), he offers one sheep to the Sungod and to the deities of heaven. He offers one sheep to Allani, the Sungod of the netherworld and to the deities [of the netherworld]. He also offers [one sheep] to Ara.

23. KBo 41.1a + b (CTH 453), ritual of invoking a soul of the deceased, MH.

KBo 41.1a + b obv.: // (1) UM-MA MUNUS ZA-a[r-x-x]-x ma-a-an-kán ak-kán-an-z[a ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki ar-ḫa] (2) tal-li-ia-[n-za na-an EGI]R-pa mu-ga-a-am-mi ú-i-ia-am-mi nu ki-iš-ša-an i-ia-mi /

Thus (speaks) Zar[...]: “If a dead person [has been] lur[ed] away from someone, I invoke [him/her ba]ck, I cry out (to him/her) and I do as follows: (a list of materials to be used in a ritual follows. Then some ritual activities are described; however, because the text becomes very fragmentary, it is difficult to determine what these activities entailed)

KBo 41.1a + b rev.: (30') [...] a-li [...] a-na-aš-ta / (31') [ak-kán-an-z[a [...] x ar-ḫa [ta]l-li-ia-an-z[a / (32') na-an(?)] EGI-R-pa(?) m[ua-ga-a-mi QA-TI [...] wh]en [a dead person] is [lured away], I [in]voke [him/her back]. (Text) finished.

24. KUB 15.34 (CTH 483.I.A), ritual of invoking the male Cedar-gods (DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ GŠ ERIN-aš), MH/NS. The lines iv 27'-34' of KUB 15.34 are duplicated by lines iv 13-18 of KUB 15.38 + (CTH 483.II.A).


And then he draw[s] (the gods) from the heaven in the same way [and says]: “If you, the Cedar-gods […], co[me] out of the temple! […] go up to heaven! We are now drawing you, luring you and invoking you from

---

480: KUB 15.38 iv 15: pa-it ḫa-ri-
481: The scribe of KUB 15.38 indicates in line iv 18 that the tablet from which he copied the text was unreadable.
482: KUB 15.38 iv 19 seems to omit -KU-NU after É.DINGIR-LIM.
483: The verb mugai- has been translated in the present context as “invoke” in CHD vol. L-N: 321 and as “anbeten” by Haas and Wilhelm 1974: 205.
The subject of this sentence and the sentences that immediately precede and follow are not the 'gods'. Rather, it appears that the performer of this ritual is addressing here the chief god of the Hittite pantheon.

The join and the transliteration after Miller 2008b: 134.

The join and the transliteration B 4v'11': [Š1-PAL ˘UTU ˘brt˘i't˘i'...].

Manuscript B 4v'12': [tal]-li-îš-ke-ur-wa-ni ˘u˘'-[...].

Manuscript B 4v'13': [A-NA].

Manuscript A ii 1: [i-]da-la-la-uwa-åš-ša.

Manuscript A ii 3: nu-uš-ša.[...]

Manuscript A ii 3: pi-îš-kán-z.ii

Manuscript A ii 4: IŠ-TU.

Manuscript A ii 4: 2 QA-TT ŠU.-..

Manuscript A ii 4: ta-at'-te-en'.

Manuscript A ii 5: i-da-la-la-uwa-az pa-ap-ra-a%n.

Manuscript A ii 5: 'u˘'-wa[a-at-t]e-en.


The third person preterit active iterative mukiššet has been translated in the present context as “called” in CHD L-N: 320; as “angefleht hat” by Haas – Wilhelm 1974: 153 and as “has been invoking” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 183.

The verb mugišš-ti has been translated here as “invoke” in CHD L-N: 320. Haas – Wilhelm 1974: 153 render it as “beten”, Puhvel HED vol. 6: 182 as “evoke.”

27. KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 (CTH 570), oracle text, NH/NS.

KUB 5.6 + ii: // (21') nu-kán IŠ-TU MUNUS ENSI ŠA x [x ] x x x x / (22') MUNUS URU Iš-ki-i-a-wa-za NÍG.BA.HLA x [ ] / (23') nu-wa-ra-ar A-NA SISKUR ŠA UTU-ŠI [ ] / (24') ŠA É-DINGIR-LIM-ia wa-kán an-tu-šu-[uš] [ … ] / (25') I-NA
And by the divination priestess of ... dammara-woman [...]. “The woman of Ishiya [ ... ] gifts. And [ ... ] these for the offering/ritual of His Majesty. In the temple people (acc.pl.) [ ... ]. Wh[e][n] ... in Maraš šantiya. Tatiwašti Iškiya [ ... ] gifts. And [ ... ] these for the offering /ritual of His Majesty. In


Shall (there be) an invocation (ritual)\textsuperscript{506} of (i.e. according to) the tablet for the Stormgod of lightning?\textsuperscript{507} The nipasūris, šintaḫiš, tanannš, kieltiš, ārkiš, the “path” are favourable.

[...] And the road to the city of Nerik, dahagan [...]. And they will put forth the **invocation (ritual)**. [...] They will carry out(?) the presentation of prayer, and in the very same way [they will] give the propitiatory gift and reparation [...]. If [this] is approved by the god, let [(the oracle) be] favourable. We named/assigned the ‘snake of the head’ to the Stormgod. [... ] He took one HEARTH, he took [...] and held (it) over the FESTIVAL and the DEITY [...].

30. KUB 22.57 (CTH 577), oracle text, NH/NS.


Since it has been determined that the divine ḤAL is angry with His Majesty, 511 we will ‘lift/cancel one of the **invocation (rituals)**. We will give ... and make peace with him again. Further, they will give him a gift and reparation for presenting a plea 512, until His Majesty comes and (until) His Majesty satisfies you. 513 Will you, o god, reconcile your mind with that? Will you, on that day, speak favourably to His Majesty? GREAT EVIL took ... and (it is) with the GODS. Unfavourable.

31. KUB 22.40 + KBo 43.61 (CTH 577), oracle text, NH/NS.


When this is finished, they will pull the goddess of Arinna [...] and they will destroy a fir cone before the goddess of Arinna. Next, Duttarrijati will appease and propitiate 516 the goddess. [Then] they will give the goddess a ritual-offering (SÌSKUR). But when the queen arrives [i]n Ankuwa, should

---

508 This restoration follows CHD vol. L-N: 325.
509 The sign a is written here with two single vertical strokes.
510 Reading of [m]e-[ma]-at-ti in line 18 as well as ḤU[UL]-’u-an-za and [ME-a]š in line 19 was suggested by Schwemer.
511 Lit. “Because ḤAL has been determined to be in anger with His Majesty”
512 The phrase arkanar tiyajuwaš has been rendered here as “presenting a defense” in CHD vol. L-N: 209.2
513 Lit. “will put you on the way”
514 Line count follows KUB 22.40.
515 The sign du is written here with two vertical wedges instead of one.
516 For that translation of these two verbs see CHD L-N: 355 and Puhvel HED vol. 4: 53.
they put\(^{517}\) an **invocation** (ritual)\(^{518}\) to the Sungoddess of Arinna? [B]y the prophetess the **HURRI**-bird (oracle) was ascertained. They(?) already gave the ritual/offering (SISKUR) to the Sungoddess of Arinna.

32. KUB 18.62 + KUB 6.13 (CTH 578), SU and KIN oracle, NH/NS.

KUB 18.62 + KUB 6.13: // (5’) *nu* \(^{\text{MUNUS}}\) **ENSI** *pu-nu-uš-šu-en nu-kán \(^{\text{d}}\)**AMAR.UTU** ú-te-ev\(^{\text{e}}\) erasure / (6’) *tu-uk* \(^{\text{d}}\)**AMAR.UTU** kiš-an **DÜ-an-zi** \(^{\text{L}1}\) *A-ŠI-PU-kán* / (7’) *mu-kš-šar* da-a-i nam-ma **DUMU.MUNUS** du-ad-di-un-un(?) / (8’) *nu* A-NA **DINGIR.LIM** SISKUR SUM-an-zi maš-kán-na-ši SUM-an-zi / (9’) *ma-a-an-ša*-ma’(?) **ZI** DINGIR-LIM wa-ar-ši-ia-zi *nu**SU.MEŠ SIG,ru\(^5\) / (10’)[x x] x x **NU.SIG**\(^5\)//

We asked the prophetess and they brought (the statue of) Marduk. For you, o Marduk, they do as follows: the exorcist puts/ presents an invocation (ritual).

\(^{517}\) CHD L-N: 325.2’ observes that the use of the verb *pai-* “to put” does not necessarily indicate that *mukeššar* here means “an offering” or “ritual implement”, since *dai-* is also employed with the noun *arkuwar* meaning ‘defense.’

\(^{518}\) The noun *mukeššar* has been translated here as “invocation” in CHD vol. L-N: 325 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180.

\(^{519}\) The noun *mukeššar* has been translated in this context as: “invocation” in CHD vol. L-N: 325 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180.

\(^{520}\) The text at the beginnings of lines 29-30 is barely visible on the photograph. The restorations in these lines follow Güterbock and Alp (1983).

\(^{521}\) Alp 1983: 142 as well as Haas and Wegner 1992: 251 restore here and at the end of line 35 the form *mūganzi.*
On the next day the king and the queen go to the temple of xx to take a holy bath, while the incantation priests again invoke Ištar of Ḥattarina. They also purify the hands of the deity. In the evening they offer kulumuršiya-offering. On the next day [they invoke] Ištar of Ḥattarina. On the next day [they invoke] Ḥattarina. It is the day of the holy rituals/offerings... On the next day the king and the queen go to the temple of the Mother Goddess and invoke the Stormgod of Ḥursanašša. On the next day the king and the queen celebrate the Mother Goddess in the ariku-house and [they] invoke the Stormgod of Ḥursanašša.

(2)


An ox and sheep are sent in advance. [The king] goes to the city of Matila, (where) there is a great assembly. He (i.e. the king) inspects the ox of parša Šanna. While the king goes to Arinna to sleep, the queen goes to Vatšša to the “queen’s house”. They invoke the Stormgod Varšannašši. On the next day the king places AN.TA V.ŠUM in Arinna, while the queen places AN.TA V.ŠUM in the “queen’s house.” And in the “queen’s house” there is a great assembly and it (i.e. the great assembly) invokes the Stormgod Ḥursanašši.

34. ABoT 1 (CTH 646.7), festival, in which the queen celebrates the Stormgod of the Head, NH/NS.

ABoT 1 i: // (1) ma-a-an-za MU.NUS.LUGAL ḤUR-ša-an-na-aš / (2) I-NA É LU.MES ŠA TAM.LUGAL-ša-an še-er / (3) MUKAM-ši me-i-ën ku-it imma ku-it / (4) me-ḫur i-ia-zi nu-Za / (5) MUNUS AM.A.DINGIR-LIM ia wa-ar-ap-pa-an-zi / (6) ḤUR-ša-an-na-aš pî-ra-an pa-ra-a / (7) I-NA UD.1.2 KAM kiš-an MU.NUS.LUGAL-SA / (8) I-NA UD.1.2 KAM kiš-an MU.NUS.LUGAL-SA / (9) I-NA UD.1.2 KAM kiš-an MU.NUS.LUGAL-SA / (10) I-NA UD.1.2 KAM kiš-an MU.NUS.LUGAL-SA / (11) I-NA UD.1.2 KAM kiš-an MU.NUS.LUGAL-SA //
When, at whatever time during the course of the year, the queen worships the Stormgod of the head in the house of the chamberlains for the sake of the king, the scribe and the (priestess of the) Mother Goddess wash themselves and for two days invoke before the Stormgod of the head as follows: (the opening of ḫasiyalli-vessel and the display of ingredients such as raisins, figs, malt, BAPPIR etc. follow)

35. KUB 32.130 (CHT 710), a bird oracle, MH/MS, OH/NS or MH/NS.


Ištaš [Ir] of the Battlefield of Samuha has been angry (lit. has been fixed in anger). I, His Majesty, made the following oracular inquiry: “I, His Majesty, will (go and) send to Samuha (my) delegate (lit. a man). He will go and at the very place in Samuha he will give an invocation (ritual)530 to Ištar of the Battlefield, furthermore he will celebrate a festival for her and will speak the words of (lit. for) greeting before the goddess. When the journey to Iššubitta and the journey to Tašmahaya is over, I, My Majesty, will send (men) and they will bring the (statue) of Ištar of the Battlefield to my side. On the way back daily they will offer her ritual. When they bring her (i.e.

526 The verb mugai- has been translated in the present context as “entreat” in CHD vol. L-N: 231: “anrufen” by Glover 1997: 126 and “implore” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 178.
527 This dating of the text is suggested in Konkordanz.
529 The sign pat is written over the line.
the statue of the goddess) before His Majesty, then they will invoke her for eight days in the same way as they keep invoking her in Samuḫa. Furthermore, I, His Majesty, will celebrate her. Then they will bring her back to Samuḫa and then, on the way back, daily they will offer her invocation ritual in the same way. And when they bring her back to Samuḫa, there, they will celebrate a festival for her. If that is pleasing to you, o Ištar of the Battlefield of Samuḫa, (if) you accept (lit. take for yourself) the invocation ritual, (if) you will turn in favour towards His Majesty, (if) you will stand at my side (lit. with me) in favour, and when I go the enemy land (if) you will stand at my side in favour, (if) you will hold my person in favour and alive, (if) you hand over to me my enemies, and I will keep defending them, let the birds establish (this). There are the birds (lit. these birds).

36. KUB 27.16 (CTH 714), festival celebrated for Ištar of Nineveh, NH/NS.

When on the third day she comes back from the journey and when she finishes the fire offering in the temple of [...], the queen continues to invoke Ištar of Nineveh in this way on the third day.

III.B. mukeššar “materials used in invocation ritual”

1. VBoT 24 (CTH 393.A), ritual of Anniewiyan invoking the tutelary deities (‘lAMMA) of lulumi, innarawant-, and KUŞkuršaš (hunting bag), MH/NS.

But on the forth day I pick up all the material of the invocation ritual and carry them out.

III.C. mukeššar “invocation” (an object in the KIN oracles)

1. KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65 (CTH 561), KIN and SU oracle text, NH/NS.

The Sumerograms MUNUS.LUGAL are written above the line.

The verb mugai- has been translated here as: “multiplier les invocations” by Lebrun 1980: 440; “pray” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 182 and as “klagen” by Wegner 1981: 153.

The noun mukeššar was translated in the present context as “the materials of the invocation ritual” in CHD vol. L-N: 326 and by Bawanypeck 2005: 63; and as “invocation [ritual]” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180. Sturtevant and Bechtel 1935: 115 leave this noun untranslated.
na / (42) INIM  Ḫur-ša-ma a-pí-ia DÙ-zi\(^{534}\) KI.MIN SIG,ru LÛ.MEŠ
[Uru] PA-ma-aš EGIR-an ar-ḫa wa-ḫa-tül / (43)  "KASKAL", ŠA LUGAL-ia
da-pí-an ZI-an mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-ir nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš / (44) 2
Lû, Kûr, ZAG-tar, MÊ-ia ME-aš nu-uš-ma-ša-kán ŠA KUR-TI
NU.SIG, //

[His Majesty] will go back only to Ḫaḫana. He will attack Ḫurna. From Ḫurna (he will go) to Kapipišša, to Ḫakmiš (and) to Nerik. He will [attack] Tanizila. Then, (he will go) back only to Nerik. He will carry out there the affair of Taptena and Ḫuršama. Ditto. Let (the KIN oracle) be favourable.
The MEN OF ḤATTI took again the HIDDEN\(^{535}\) SIN, the CAMPAIGN, the WHOLE SOUL OF THE KING (and) INVOCATION\(^{536}\) and (they are) with the GODS. Second: The ENEMY took RIGHTNESS and BATTLE. They (are) for them within the LAND. Unfavourable.

(2)

KUB 5.1 iii: // (44) nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-tar-ma pí-an ti-ia-at nu a-pí-iz-za
NU.SIG, NU.SIG, du / (45) UGULA-zu GÛB-tar IZI mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-aš
nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš NU.SIG, //

(In lines iii 28-32 the questions were asked about the campaigns in Tanizila and against the troops of Mount Ḫaḫarwa. The KIN oracle was carried out with an unfavourable outcome. Then the questions are asked why was it unfavourable).
The divine (statues) traveled in front: is it for that reason that it is bad? Let (the KIN oracle) be unfavourable. The OVERSEER took for himself SINISTERNESS, FIRE and INVOCATION and (it is) with the GODS. Unfavourable.

(3)

KUB 5.1 iii: // (58) na-an A-NA KASKAL  ḪU-\(\text{Uru}\) Tal-ma-li-ia-ma uškat-te-ni
NU.SIG, du LUGAL-za ZAG-tar\(^{537}\) mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-aš / (59) nu-kán an-
da SIG, u-ti 2 UGULA-zu ZAG-tar Gâš DAG ŠA LUGAL da-pí-an ZI-an
MÊ-ia ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš / (60) 3-ŠU GIG GAL TI-tar ME-aš
nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš NU.SIG, //

Will you (gods) see it\(^{538}\) (i.e. the fear) on the Talmaliya campaign? Let (the KIN oracle) be unfavourable. The KING took for himself the RIGHTNESS and INVOCATION and (took them) into the GOOD. Second: the OVERSEER took for himself RIGHTNESS, THRONE, the WHOLE SOUL OF THE KING and BATTLE, and (they are) with the GODS. Third: the GREAT SICKNESS took LIFE and (it is) with the GODS. Favourable.

(4)

KUB 5.1 iii: // (97) A-NA LÛ.MEŠ  ḪU-\(\text{Uru}\) Ti-ia-aš-si-li-ma-kán an-da ša-li-ku-
ar ku-e-iz-za NU.SIG, / (98) LÛ.MEŠ \(\text{Uru}\) PA-kán’ ku-wa-pí an-da ša-li-

---

534 One vertical is added under the four wedges in the sign zi.
535 This notion is expressed here by the adverb arḫa.
536 The noun mukiššar has been translated in this text as “evocation ritual” by Beal 1999 and as “Bitte” by Ünal 1974.
537 ZAG-tar is written above the line.
538 The personal pronoun -an refers here to the king’s fear also mentioned in line iii 56.
For the men of Tiyaššili invasion from any direction (is) not favourable. Should the men of Ḫatti invade somewhere? Let (the Kin oracle) be unfavourable. The MEN of ḪATTI took SINISTERNESS and INVOCATION and (they are) with the GODS. Unfavourable.

The very same question from the Old Woman. Let the Kin (oracle) be favourable. The KING to [ok] for himself the RIGHTNESS and INVOCATION and (took them) into the GOOD. Second: the OVERSEER took for himself RIGHTNESS, THRONE, the WHOLE SOUL OF THE KING and BATTLE and (they are) with the GODS. Third: the GREAT SICKNESS took LIFE and (it is) with the GODS. Favourable.

The very same question from the Old Woman. Let the Kin (oracle) be favourable. The KING took for himself the RIGHTNESS, INVOCATION and VIGOUR and (took them) into the GOOD. He (came) through from both EVIL and GREAT SICKNESS, took the VISION OF THE KING’S EYES and LIFE and (they are) with the GODS. Favourable.

He (i.e. the king) will attack it (i.e. Mount Ḫaḫarwa) up from behind Šarkattešena. Ditto. Let (the Kin oracle) be favourable. The MEN OF ḪATTI took SINISTERNESS, FIRE and INVOCATION and (they are) with the GODS. Unfavourable.

The question is included in lines ii 40-41: (40) 4UTU-ŠI-kán HUR.SAG Ḫa-ḫar-wa x x x x x x x x x aš-su-la-an-ni EGIS-an-pa-iz-zi / (41) DINGIR-LIM-zu-aš tar-na-an-ni “Will His Majesty go behind […] on the mount Ḫaḫarwa in well-being? Is he allowed by the deity?”

The question is included in lines iv 70-72: (70) I-NA HUR.SAG Ḫa-ḫar-wa-kán ku-it [x x x x x x x x x] x UGU-pa-iz-zi / (72) BE-an-ma an-za-aš KAL-i BUN-mi ʾḫar-ši-ḫar ʾši-wa-ar-ša-aš ʾḫe-u-wa-aš UL - ʾbi / (72) KARAŠ.HL A-kán TA ʾUL za-aḫ-ta-rī “Because he (i.e. the king) will go up on the Mount Ḫaḥarwa[…] if he does need to fear for us in strong thunderstorm, wind, […] and rain and the troops will not be struck by the Stormgod”.

The verb at the end of line 75 was erased. Ünal 1974: 88 was probably right in restoring here the verb uwa-.
2. KUB 5.3+ (CTH 563.1.A), oracle text, NH/NS.


The very same question [from] the Old [Woman].\[542\] L[et] the KIN (oracle) [be] unfavourable. The GODS arose, took INVOCATION\[543\] and gave it to the MULTITUDE. Unfavourable.

3. KBo 2.6+ (CTH 569.3.I), oracle text concerning the affairs of Arma-Tarunta and Šaušgatti, NS.


Concerning the fact that the deity has brought back the affair of Šaušgatti: (Is/was it) the slander of that same Šaušgatti (when she was) alive? Because she kept cursing as long as she was alive? Let the KIN (oracle) be unfavourable. The GODS have risen and took INVOCATION\[544\], GREAT SIN and FIRE and (it is) in the GREAT ILLNESS; unfavourable.

4. KUB 49.14 + KBo 23.112 (CTH 577), SU, KIN, MUŠEN oracle text, NH/NS.

KUB 49.14 + KBo 23.112 iii: (3') \[ ... mTa-at-ta-ma-ru ku-it :ú-ra-na-[


Regarding the fact that uranausvar\[546\] was ascertained for [Tattam]aru, [Tat]tammaru is making [now] uranausvar. [...] if, you o deity, [do not ...] any misdoing (or) offence for him, let the [S]U (oracles) be favourable. The throne (is) on the left: unfavourable. Through the ‘Old Woman’ and (through) the dream that same (question): Let the KIN (oracle) be favourable. The SUNGODDESS OF HEAVEN aroused, took INVOCATION\[547\] and (gave it) to a LONG YEAR; unfavourable.

---

542 The question is asked in line 30: “Will the road accident happen to His Majesty due to the negligence of a person?” (Beal 2003: 210).
543 The noun mukiššar was translated here by Beal 2003: 210 as “evocation ritual” and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180 as “prayer”.
544 The noun mukiššar has been translated in the present context as “invocation” in CHD L-N: 326; “prayer” by Hoffner 1998: 205 and by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180.
545 Restored by Hoffner 1995: 121.
546 uranausvar was translated as “fire offering” by Hoffner 1995: 121.
547 The noun mukeššar was translated here as “Gebet” by Hoffner 1995: 121 and as “l’invocation” by Mouton 2007: 204.
5. KBo 41.199 + KUB 49.41 + KUB 49.21 (CTH 577), bird and KIN oracle text, NH/NS.

(1) KUB 49.41 i: // (13’) IŠ-TU MUNUS ŠU.GI 'IR-TUM' QA-TAM-MA-pát nu KIN Nu.[SIG-ru …] / (14’) mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš x […] //

The very same question from the Old Woman: 548 [Let] the KIN oracle [be] unfavourable. […] took […] and INVOCATION and they are with the GODS […].


Since the Storm[god] of Hatti and the Stormgod of Liḥzina have been ascertained [to be angry] (lit. for anger), they will send the man named Zuwanza. He will make an oracular enquiry in (that) place […] he will set them (i.e. both Stormgods) on the road and he will set up an invocation (ritual) 549 for the Stormgod of Ḥatti. They will pull […] in and they will offer him beer.

6. KUB 16.29 + KUB 16.81 (CTH 578), SU and KIN oracle, NH/NS.


[If …] he/she [died and the (if) birds are unfavourable for me (lit. birds are evil for me) the same. But if the land of Šagḫaḫurwa […] for me, let [the KIN oracle] be favourable. The THRONE took STANDING of the KING autma GOOD of the HOUSE and gave them to the OVERSEER. […] took the ENTIRE SOUL [of the ENE]MY and BATTLE and it is given back to the ENEMY. […] took INVOCATION 550 and gave it to the SUNGOD OF HEAVEN. Favourable.

---

548 The question is not preserved in the text.
549 Puhvel HED vol. 6: 180 translated the noun mukeššar in line iv 4 of KUB 49.21 as “invocation”.
550 The noun mukeššar has been rendered in the present context as “prayer” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 181.
III.D. mugawar in trilingual lists

1. KUB 3.103 (CTH 300.5), New Hittite lexical list of the type diri DIR siaku = watru.
   
   KUB 3.103 obv. // (5) (Sum.) [ ... ] /// (Akk.) ta-zi-im-tu\(^{551}\) /// (Hitt.) mu-ga-u-[wa-ar] ///

2. KBo 26.20 (CTH 301.a.1.A), New Hittite lexical list of the series erim.ḫuš = anantu.
   
   KBo 26.20 iii: // (11) (Sum.) [š]u-bal /// (Akk.) ’sù’-up-pu-u\(^{552}\) /// (Hitt.) mu qa-a-u-wa-ar ///

3. KBo 1.42 (CTH 303.1), New Hittite lexical list of the izi = išātu series.
   
   KBo 1.42 iii: // (57) (Sum.) [si] /// (Akk.) ’ṣe-bu-u\(^{553}\) /// (Hitt.) ’mu’-ga-a-u-[wa-ar] ///

---

\(^{551}\) The Akkadian *tazimtu* was translated by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 179 as “lament”.

\(^{552}\) Akkadian *suppū* was translated by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 179 as “prayer”. Güterbock 1985: 110 translated this line as “to implore”, “prayer”.

\(^{553}\) The Akkadian *šebū* was rendered here as “desire” by Puhvel *HED* vol. 6: 179.
IV. TALLIYA-, TALLIYAWAR

IV.A. talliya- “to exhort”

1. KUB 19.49+ (CTH 69.A), treaty between Muršili II and Manapa-Tarḫunta, NH/NS.

KUB 19.49 i: // (1) UM-MA ʼUTU-ŠI ṬAR ʼUŠ-MEŠ-KA DINGIR-LIM 

Thus (speaks) His Majest, Muršili, the great king, the king [of Ḫatti, the hero]: Your father left you, Manapa-Tarḫunta behind […], and you were a child. [PN and Ura-Tarḫunta, your brothers, plotted to kill you and they would have killed you, but you escaped. [They drove you] you out of the land of the [Šeha] River, and you [went] across[es] to the people of Karkiša. [They took] you and the house of your father [away] from you and [they] took them for themselves. [I, My Majesty commended you] [Manapa-Tarḫunta] to the people of Kar[kiša, and] to[o] the people of Kar[kiša I kept exhorting] and bec[au]se of our words the people of Karkiša protect[ted] you.

554 Friedrich 1930b: 4 and Wilhelm hethiter.net //: CTH 69 restore here [… nu zi-iₖ].
555 The original text reads here da-a-i (third singular present). However, because the subject of this sentence is probably plural, indicated here by the enclitic personal pronoun -at that would refer to the brothers of Manapa-Tarḫunta, therefore one may perhaps postulate here the unorthodox reading da-a-i-ir.
556 The restorations at the end of line 10 are suggested in the Mainz lexical card catalogue under the verb talliya-. They are confirmed by line iv 15 of KUB 14.15 (Annals of Muršili II that recount the same event) (cf. Beckman 1999: 82 and note 586). At the end of line 11 Friedrich 1930b: 4 and the entry in the Mainz lexical card catalogue read ŠEŠ-IA-ia-at-ta me-ₖ-iₖ-ja-aₖ PAP-nu-[ir] //

557 Beckman 1999: 82 restores here “but I, My Majesty, commended you, Manapa-Tarḫunta” noting that he draws this and other restorations in this passage from the similar account of events presented in the Annals of Muršili II. Wilhelm hethiter.net //: CTH 69 translates this sentence as: “Ich, Meine Majestät, aber habe dich, Manapa-Tarḫunta anbefohlen.”
558 Wilhelm hethiter.net //: CTH 69 comments that either “my brother” or “my father” could be restored here.
559 The verb talliya- has been rendered here as: “plead” by Beckman 1999: 83; “anrufen” by Friedrich 1930b: 5 and “anrufen” by Wilhelm hethiter.net //: CTH 69.
IV.B. talliya- “to lure”

1. KUB 14.4 (CTH 70.1.A), exculpation prayer of Muršili II, NH/NS (see also supra III.A.b.1).


When I went to Kummanni - my father had promised a Festival of Invocation to Ḫebat of Kummanni, but (because) he had not given it to her, she weighted it on me - I went to Kizzuwatna and said as follows: “I will recompensate for the omission of my father.” I constantly lured⁵⁶¹ and invoked Ḫebat of Kum[anni] for myself, for my wife, my son, my household, my land and my broth[ers].

2. KBo 14.70 + KUB 30.60 (CTH 276.11), shelf list of the DUBxKAM type, NH/NS (see also supra III.A.b.5).


[x tablet, (text) complete, of the invocation: “If/when a dead person is [lure]d [away] from someone”].

3. KBo 31.5+ (CTH 277.6.A), shelf list of the x ṬUP-PU type, NH/NS. The text has one duplicate KBo 31.26 (CTH 277.6.B) (see also supra III.A.b.6.I).

suggest that the object of talliya- are the gods, I agree with Gurney 1940: 49 n. 3, who rightly argued that the restoration of DINGIR.MEŠ at the end of line 1 is questionable. The context clearly suggests that it is the men of Karkiša to whom the Hittite king and his brother are sending gifts and it is the men of Karkiša who are exhorted to offer asylum to Manapa-Tarḫunta.


The participle of the verb talliya- has been rendered in this context as: “wegrunen” by Dardano 2006: 76; “evoke” by Hoffner 2003: 68; “s’est détourné de...” by Larroche 1964-5: 27; “est évoqué” by Lebrun 1980: 440; “durch Beten weggerufen(?)” worden ist” by Otten 1958: 9. CHD L-N: 321.b’ translates these sentences as “[tablet, text complete, of invoking/invocation, if a dead person has been called away from someone”; Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179 renders it as “[tablet] complete of evocation “if a revenant has been revoked by someone”.

561
KBo 31.5 + ii: // (7) | TUP-P(U.IN|M) 41-na-an-na|a MUNUS URU Ir-ha-\-aš-ša ma-an-an-kán \LAMMA\ KUS kur-ša-aš / (8) ku-e-d[a-ni-i]k-ki [ar-ha tal-li-ia-an-za na-an mu-ga-a-mi //

KBo 31.26 obv.: (4) | [TUP-PU INIM] 41-na-a MUNUS URU Ir-ha-\-aš-ša m[a]-a-an-kán \LAMMA\ KUS kur-ša-aš / (5) [ku-e-da-ni]-ik-ki ar-ha tal-li-ia-an-za [na-a]n mu-ga-a-mi //

One table\[et. The word\] of Ananna, the woman of Irhašša: “When the protective deity of the hunting bag is lured away so[me one], I invoke him/her.”

4. KUB 17.10 (CTH 324.1.A), Telipinu myth, MH/MS?


Here lies galaktar. May [your soul, O Telipinu] be pacified! Here [lies] parḫet[na-grain], [may] its essence(!)666 lur[e] him (i.e. Telipinu).

5. KUB 33.62 (CTH 330.I.M), ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna, MS.

KUB 33.62 ii: // (7') | nu-za-kán (?) an-da wa-a-\-

---


564 The restoration of Hoffner 1998: 16.

565 The sign tal is written here with two instead of three verticals.

566 The sign tal is written here with two instead of three verticals.


568 The restoration of Glocker 1997: 34.

569 The restoration of Glocker 1997: 36.

O Stormgod of Kulwišna, turn [yourself], towards the ‘lord of the house’ and to the ‘lady of the house’ in (the giving of) sons and daughters, well-being, life, vigour, health, long years in the future through love of the gods and through the kindness of the gods! Let go of anger (lit. let out the anger)! For the sake of furious eyes of anger, let them/it (go) in the malt and “beer bread”! Let them/it (go) into the beer bread and kureššar-cloth! parḫuen-grain is lying (here), so be lur[ed] forth; kalaktar is lying (here) so [be] fully pacified! As fig is sweet may likewise the soul of the Stormgod of Kul[wišna] be sweet!

6. HT 100 + KBo 33.69 + KBO 26.131 (CTH 334.4.B), myth concerning the disappearance of the goddess Hannahanna, NH/NS.

7. KUB 33.75 (CTH 334.7.A) myth about the disappearance of the goddess Hannahanna (DINGIR.MAH) and a ritual of luring the goddess (see also supra III.A.b.11), NH/NS.
The first person singular present iterative of the verb talliya- was translated in the present context as: “I am drawing you” by Hoffner 1987: 277; “je suis en train de t’implorer” by Mouton 2007: 137; “I am summoning thee” by Puhvel HED vol. 6: 182; “te estoy invocando” by Trabazo 2002: 457.

8. KUB 9.27 + KUB 7.5 + KUB 7.8 (CTH 406), a ritual of a woman from Arzawa named Paškuwatti, MH/NS (see also supra III.A.b.19).


But now he had just come to you down on his knees for help and is seeking you, o goddess, for the sake of your divinity. Whether you are in the mountain, whether you are in the meadow, whether you are in the valley, wherever you are, come down to this man in favour! Let winds and rain not beat your eyes! He will proceed to make you his (personal) goddess. He will offer you a place. He will give you a house. He will give you a male and a female slave. He will give you cattle and sheep. He will make you a recipient of votive offerings. I am just now invoking and luring you. Come! Bring with you the moon, the star and the Sungoddess of netherworld. Let the female and male slaves run before you! Let the male [and female deities] run before you! Come down to this man! You are his “wife of children” for him. Look after him! Turn to him in favour! Speak to him! Hand your maidservant over to him! He will become a yoke (for her). Let him take his wife and let him produce for himself sons and daughters! They will be your male and female servants. They will keep giving you
9. KUB 7.60 (CTH 423.A), ritual of luring foreign deities, NH/NS.575

(1)

KUB 7.60 ii.: (14) [n]a\textsuperscript{MUNUS} SU. ‘G\textsuperscript{I} [UDU] i-ya-an-da-aš SIG\textsuperscript{b}u-[ut-tu-ul]-\textsuperscript{t}\textsuperscript{L}\textsuperscript{576} / (15) ‘T\textsuperscript{s}\textsuperscript{m}U[\textsuperscript{S}] pár-ta-u-wa-ar ga-la-a[k-tar]\textsuperscript{577} / (16) [DINGIR]. ‘ME\textsuperscript{S}-\n[a]-aš ṣa-r-zi G\textsuperscript{S}iš-x-\{x (x)\} / (18) ‘I\textsuperscript{S}-\textsuperscript{TU} U\textsuperscript{L}GAL-UT-TI\textsuperscript{579} ku-iš u-i-y-a-
na-z\textsuperscript{a} / (19) na-at a-pa-a-aš ṣa-r-zi nu DINGIR.ME\textsuperscript{S} UR\textsuperscript{U-LIM} K\textsuperscript{LIR} KÚR / (20) tal-li-ia-ta\textsuperscript{580} na-aš-ta an-da / (21) ki-iš-ša-an me-mi-iš-ši-ži li l\textsuperscript{a} (22) ka-a-ša-wa šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.ME\textsuperscript{S} / (23) UR\textsuperscript{U-LIM} K\textsuperscript{LIR} KÚR K\textsuperscript{LIR} /GAKA.gul-ša-an [s] / (24) te-êb-hu-un G\textsuperscript{S}BANŠUR.HLA-ia-aš-
na-ma-aš [s] / (25) GÜB-la-zi-ia ū-nu-an-da\textsuperscript{582} erasure te-êb-hu-[u\{n\} / (26) [KASKA].LME\textsuperscript{S}-ia-wa-aš-mu-aš I\textsuperscript{S}-TU TÜG.BABBAR TÜG.SA\textsuperscript{5} / (27) TÜG.ZA.GIN kat-ta-an iš-pár-ra-aš-hu-an / (28) nu-aš-ma-aš ke-e-
TÜG.HLA KASKAL.ME\textsuperscript{S} a-ša-[a\{n-d\}] / (29) nu-kán ke-e-êda-aš še-er ar-
a i-a-an-ni-ia-tén / (30) nu-kán A-NA LUGAL aš-šu-li erasure an-da ne-
ia-at-tén / (31) šu-me-el-ma ‘A-NA’ KUR-TI a-wa-an-ša-ḫa / (32) nam-ma
ti-ia-at-tén\textsuperscript{v} …

The Old Woman holds with her [rig]ht hand a wool [tuft], an eagle’s wing, 
galaš\textsuperscript{t}ar], part\textsuperscript{\textit{mena}} of the [god]s, right [thighs]. She holds G\textsuperscript{S}iš\textsuperscript{...}, which has been sent with the “chief”. She lutes\textsuperscript{583} the gods of the [enemy cit\textsuperscript{y}] and (says) as follows: “I have placed for you, o deities of the enemy city, a 
gulaš- vessel. Also [I have] plac\textsuperscript{ed} on your left the covered tables. I have 
covered (lit. stretched on) your [path\textsuperscript{s} with white, red and blue wool cloths. 
[May] these clothes be the paths for you! Walk over those and turn in favour 
towards the king! Step away from your land again!”

(2)

KUB 7.60 iii\textsuperscript{584}. (5\textsuperscript{'} ) [nu ma-âp-ḫa-an DINGIR.ME\textsuperscript{S} UR\textsuperscript{U-LIM}]\textsuperscript{585} erasure 
K\textsuperscript{LIR} KÚR KASKAL-az / (6\textsuperscript{'} ) tal-li-ia-u-wa-an-zi\textsuperscript{586} zi-in-na-i / (7\textsuperscript{'} ) nu-za

575 The text has two New Hittite duplicates, VBoT 67 + KBo 43.52 (CTH 423.B) and KUB 59.59 
(CTH 423.C).

576 B has here ‘b\textsuperscript{u}-ut\textsuperscript{t}’-\textsuperscript{t}.

577 B reads here ga-la-ar\textsuperscript{\textit{ak'-\{ar\}}.

578 B has here ... wa-al-[\{a]-aš ZAG-aš.

579 B has here GAL-TIM.

580 B reads here tal-li-ia-a[z]-z\textsuperscript{a}.

581 B has here ŠA UR\textsuperscript{-LIM}.

582 B reads here ū-nu-wa-an-ta.

583 The verb talliya\textsuperscript{...} has been translated in this context as: “anrufen” by Haas-Wilhelm 1974: 
236: “invocare” by Fuscagni 2007: 202 and hethiter.net\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}}} CTH 423: “ruft an” (bittend, 
fordern die Götter) by Kronasser 1987: 488; “évoquer” by Laroche 1964-5: 25 and by 

584 The photograp of the tablet shows that the beginnings of lines iii 5\textsuperscript{‘}, 6\textsuperscript{‘}, 9\textsuperscript{‘} and 10\textsuperscript{‘} are more 
damaged that it is indicated on the hand-copy of this text. Consequently, the transliteration 
of this passage follows both the photograph and the hand-copy of the tablet.

585 The reading from the photograph: [nu ma-âp-ḫa-an DINGIR.ME\textsuperscript{S} UR\textsuperscript{U-LIM}.

586 Photograph: tal-li{-i}a-4'-wa-an-zi.

[When she finishes luring590 the deities of the enemy city by means (of drawing) paths, the king dresses himself in royal attire (lit. in the manner of kingship) and goes. He librates in the enemy city either with a cup of wine or with a libation vessel (filled) with wine.

10. KBo 20.107 + KBo 23.50 + (CTH 433.3.A), ritual performed to summon the angry Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, MH/MS? (see also supra III.A.b.20.II).


You, the Šal[a]waneš-deity of the city gates, keep drinking and [e]ating! We have just been [luring] and invoking the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag [away] from all the foreign lands, [mountains, valleys, rivers, [kuntu] yašša-places, springs and meadows. May [you], yourselves be appeased! And when the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag comes, may you be […] hasty for him again! And may you […] hasty with the king and the queen!

11. KBo 41.a + b (CTH 453), ritual of drawing a soul of the deceased, MH/MS (see also supra III.A.b.23).

(1)

KBo 41.a + b obv.: // (1) UM-MA MUNUS.Za-a[r-x-x]-x ma-a-an-kán ak-kán-an-za ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki ar-ša / (2) tal-li-ia-a[ν-za] na-an EGIR Pa mu-ga-a-am-mi ū-i-ia-am-mi nu ki-iš-ša-an i-ia-mi /

Thus (speaks) Zar[...]: “If a dead person [has been] lured away from/to someone, I invoke [him/her] back, I cry out (to him/her) and I do as follows: (a list of materials to be used in a ritual follows. Then some ritual activities are described; however, because the text becomes very fragmentary, it is difficult to determine what these activities entailed)

---

587 Photograph: ‘LUGAL-uš.
588 Photograph: na-aš-šu.
589 Photograph: ‘na-[a]-ši-ša.’
590 Photograph: ‘na-[a]-ši-ša.’

12. KUB 15.34 (CTH 483.I.A), ritual invoking the male Cedar-gods (DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ GISER.AŠ), MH/NS. (see also supra III.A.b.24).

KUB 15.34 iv: // (27') EGI-
R U<ma> ne-pi-sha-az QA-TAM-MA hu-it-ti-
t[az x x x x] / (28') ma-a-an šu-ma-a-aš DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ GISER.AŠ x [x x x x] / (29') ka-ri-im-na-az-wa-kán pa-ra-a u-w[a-at-
ten x x x x x / (30') ša-ra-a ne-pi-ši i-it-tin ni-na-aš-ma-aš [a-a-š]a 'ne-pi-ša-az l / (31') hu-it-ti-ia-an-ni-iš-ki-u-ša-wa-ni' tal-li-ši-shi-
im-uni' / (32') [n]u-uš at-ta-aš ne-pi-ša-an-[a] EGI-
or-na nu-zu-an 'EGIR-pa' / (33') [š]u-me', en-za-an A-NA E. DINGIR-LIM. 'KU-

And then he draw[s] (the gods) from the heaven in the same way [and says]: "If you, the Cedar-gods [...], co[m]e out of the temple! [...] go up to heaven! We are now drawing you, luring 591 you and invoking you from heaven. O father return them from heaven! (you, O gods), come back to your temple! Turn in favour to the king and the queen!

13. KUB 13.29 + Bo 3444 (CTH 483.I.C), invocation ritual of the male Cedar-gods (DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ GISER.AŠ), NH/NS (see also supra III.A.b.25).

ni 592 ū-iš-ke-u-ni / (7') [mu-ki-iš-ke-u-ni na-aš-[a] A-NA KUR LÍKUR i-
da-la-la-wa-aš-ša / (8') [a]r-ta-urša-aš iš-ta-ra na [a]r-ša u-wa-at-te:n na-aš-
ta A-NA KUR LÍKUR / (9') i-da-la-la-wa-aš-ša-an-ta-ul[ša-aš] iš-ki-aš na-iš-
ten A-NA LUGAL-ma-kán / (10') MUNUS.LUGAL IGI.ḪI.a-an-da-aš-[š]-li n[a-ši-šen nu-uš-ma-aš SISKUR par-kù-i / (11') pe-es-kán-zi nu aš-sù-
l[ī tâk-šul-ia]-at-te:n nu-uš-ma-aš-kán / (12') SISKUR ar-šu l/Š-TU 2 QA-
TI 10 Š[U.SI <ta-at-te-en] na-aš-ta IŠ-TU KUR LÍKUR / (13') i-ta-la-wa-
az pa-[a]-ra-an-na-az ar-[ša u](t)a-wa(aš)-at-te:n //

We are continually [d]raw[ing] you (forth), [lur]ing you (pl.), crying[g out] (to you) and invoking you in [div]ine guidance under [the Sun]. Therefore, come [a]way from among the enemy land (and its) evil [men]. Turn (your) back to the enemy land (and) to (its) evil me[ns], but to the king and the queen [t]urn your eyes in fav[our]! They are giving you a pure ritual. Be [friend]ly in favour! Take your offering with [both hands and ten finge]rs and then come away from the enemy land (and its) evil un[cleanness]!

591 The verb _WALL_ was translated in the present context as: "evoke" in CHD vol. L-N: 321.2' and as "anfehlen" by Haas and Wilhelm 1974: 205.

592 Manuscript B iv' 12': [tal]-ši-shi-ki-u-wa-ni 'u'-[...].
14. KUB 15.31 (CHD 484.I.A), invocation ritual of the DINGIR.MAḪ and Gulš-deities: Zukki and Anzili, MH/NH (see also supra III.A.b.26).

KUB 15.31 i: // (43) ki-iš-ša-an-na me-ma-i m[a-an-wa-za x x x x x] / (44) na-aš-ma-wa-ra-aš-ma-aš-kán a[r-ḫa x x x x x x x] / (45) ta-li-ia-an mu-ga-a-an [ x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x] / (46) ḫu-wa-ap-pa-aš ḫar-wa-a-ši-ša-[ia i x x x x x x x x x x x] / (47) ka-a-ša an-za-a-ša pa-r[a-a x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
15. KUB 58.11 (CTH 678), invocation ritual performed in Nerik, NH/NS.


[Wh]en the king [goes] from the […] to the dašanga, before[hand] they do as follows: The chief scribe of wooden tablets, the chief [of] palace [attend]ant, the scribe, the Man of the Stormgod and the GUDU-priest go beforehand [to] the dašan[g]. The man of the Stormgod holds a noisemaker (mukar). They step on the paššu.⁵⁹⁶ of the dašanga, but they don’t yet enter[er] the dašanga. They recite thus the words of luring⁵⁹⁷ as they know (them).

(Offerings are carried from the king’s palace to the dašanga. The mukar is placed before the tree/pole in the dašanga, but they don’t yet enter[er] the dašanga. They recite thus the words of luring as they know (them).)

The chief[s] of the wood scribes (i.e. scribes writing on wooden tablets) offers to the Stormgod of Nerik a lamb and the words of [l]uring. But to the Stormgod he offers one bull and four sheep and to ZABABA they offer one sheep.

16. KUB 28.92 (CTH 678.5), invocation ritual performed in Nerik, NH/NS.


The man of the Stormgod calls a deity and says “…, from Nerik!” He recites the entire tablet, (namely) the words of calling and [of] luring of Nera

⁵⁹⁶ Friedrich translated this noun as “Felsblock(?), Steinblock(?)” and referred to this meaning to the study of Zant and to his own study (1950: 252). Haas 1970: 215 renders this noun as “Sockel” or “Stufe”. CHD P: 211a: “an elevated structure [e.g. a step, a podium, or pedestal] or elevated locality [e.g. a terrace]”. The translation of mukar as a ‘noisemaker’ follows CHD P: 211a.

⁵⁹⁷ CHD L-N: 232.b translates the genitive singular of the noun talliyatar as “evocation”; Haas 1977: 215 renders this noun here and in line 15 as “Anrufen”.

⁵⁹⁸ All the restorations and emendations in this passage follow Laroche 1964-5: 26. The noun talliyatar was rendered in this passage as “evocation” by Laroche 1964-5: 26 and by Lebrun 1980: 441 as well as “Beschwören” by Tischler 1991:59.
and Lalla, the mountain Ḥaḥar[wa], the mountain Zīṭarunuwa (and) the river Daḥaštā, as well as the words of luring of the god Zaḥal[qa]. With the thick bread, [they] draw the deities along the path. They bring the (statues of the) deities inside the temple; they wash them (i.e. the statues of the deities), anoint (them), […] (them) and arrange (them).

IV.C. talliya- “to implore”, talliyawar “entreaty”

1. KBo 26.20 + (CTH 301.a.1.A), lexical list Erim.ẖuš, NH/NS.

   KBo 26.20 iii: // (12) (Sum.) [š]u-lum /// (Akk.) ’sū-ul-lu-u /// (Hitt.) ta-li-
   ia-u-wa-qr /// “entreaty”

2. KUB 29.3 (CTH 414.B), a ritual for the erection of a new palace, OH/OS? Lines 6’-8’ of KUB 29.3 are duplicated by lines 26-27 of KUB 29.1, the New Hittite copy of this text (CTH.414.A).

   (1)
   KUB 29.3 // (6’) nu a-ap-pa at-ta-<aš>-ma-an ²[IM-a[w]a-al-lu-uš-ki-mi] / (7’) nu an-ku GIŠ.H.I.A LUGAL-uš ta-al-[i-ia-zī²⁶⁰²] / (8’) ḫe-e-a-u-e-eš-
   ma-aš ša-al-[la-nu-uš-ki] /

   (2)
   KUB 29.1 i: // (26) nu EGIR-pa ad-da-aš-ma-an ²[U-an wa-a-lu-uš-ki-mi nu
   ki-ir šal-la-nu-uš-ki-ir] /

   “Thereafter, I have been praising my father, the Stormgod.” The king implores⁶⁰³ (the Stormgod(?)) unconditionally for the trees […] but the rains [made] them gre[at]. (A: the king implores the Stormgod for the trees, which the rains made strong and great).

---

⁶⁰⁰ Güterbock 1985: 110 translated this line in the lexical list as “to invite, invoke”; Puhvel HED vol. 6: 179 as “summon[s], elicitation”.

⁶⁰¹ Line 7’ of KUB 29.3 seems to employ either the first singular or the third singular present of the verb talliya-. Given that the New Hittite copy has a verb in the third person singular here, the restoration talliyazi is more plausible. See also Neu 1983b: 187 and n. 552.


⁶⁰³ The verb talliya- was rendered here as “bitten, anfliehen” by Neu 1983: 187 and as “chiedere” by Carini 1982: 489.
V. WALLA-; WALLU-; WALLIYATAR; WALLI-

V.A. walla/i-, wallu- “to praise, to honour, to celebrate”; walliyatar “(song of) praise; glory”; walli- “pride”

1. KUB 19.13 + (CTH 40.V.1.A), fragment of “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma,” NH/NS.

All the restorations at the beginning of lines 45’-51’ are those of Güterbock 1956: 110.

The noun walli- in the present context has been previously translated as “stronghold” by Gurney 1940: 43, “pride” by Güterbock 1956: 110, Hoffner 1997b: 191 and Kloekhorst 2008: 948. Del Monte 2008: 141 translates this noun as “vanto”.

The verb wallu- has been previously translated in the present context as “loben” by von Schuler 1965: 122.

604 All the restorations at the beginning of lines 45’-51’ are those of Güterbock 1956: 110.

605 The noun walli- in the present context has been previously translated as “stronghold” by Gurney 1940: 43, “pride” by Güterbock 1956: 110, Hoffner 1997b: 191 and Kloekhorst 2008: 948. Del Monte 2008: 141 translates this noun as “vanto”.

606 The verb wallu- has been previously translated in the present context as “loben” by von Schuler 1965: 122.

2. KUB 23.77 + KUB 13.27 + (138.1.A), treaty between Arnuwanda I and the Kaška people, MH/MS.

But in addition when the enemy fl[ees], you (pl.) will not [allow him] again in the city as an ally! You will not [give] him bread and water! You will not lead him back to the city! You [will not abandon], but instead you will honour it!

3. KUB 21.38 (CTH 176), letter from Puduḫepe to Ramses II, NH/NS.

All the restorations at the beginning of lines 45’-51’ are those of Güterbock 1956: 110.
The daughter of Babylonia and [the daughter of] Amuru whom, I, the Queen, took for myself – were they not indeed a (source of) praise for me before the people of Hatti? Was that not so? I myself did that: I took a foreign daughter of a great king for a daughter-in-law. And if at some time his (i.e. great king’s) messengers come in full splendour to the daughter-in-law, or one of (her) brothers or sisters comes to her, is that not also a (source of) praise (for me)? Was there no woman at all available to me in Hatti? Have I not done this for (my) name’s sake?

4. KUB 31.141 (CTH 312.II), hymn to the goddess Ištar, NH/NS.

KUB 31.141 obv.: // (1) [... MU]NUS.LUGAL [... DIN]GIR-LIM-iš // (2) [zi-ik (?) ...] b[i-ru-u-ana-da-kán KUR.KUR.] ku-ša ‘aš-nu-uš-ši-
// (3) [wa-al-liš-kán-zi ku-in šal-la-as-kán DINGIR.MES-aš ku-ša šal-li-
// (4) [ud-da-a-ar ku-e-da-ni da-aš-ša ŠUM-an-ti-it da-aš-šu //
[ ... qu[een [ ... you are the] goddess, [ ... ] who puts in order [a]ll the lands, whom they continue to [praise]608, who is greatest among the great gods, whose [word]s are strong (lit. who has strong words), (whose) name is strong.

5. KBo 26.88 + HFAC 45 + (CTH 346.12.A), Kumarbi myth, NH/NS. Lines iv 4-7 are duplicated by lines 1’-6’ of KBo 26.89 + KBo 52.11 (CTH 346.12.B).

(1)


(2)

KUB 26.89 + KBo 52.11: (1’) [ ... ] x x x / (2’) [ ... me-mi-i]a-[an pi-e-da]-aš / (3’) [ŠI-im-mu-ur-r]a-wa pa-aš-tu-ul / (4’) [nu-wa] 4 MU-NUS.Ku-ti-

607 The noun walliyatar was rendered here as “praise” by Beckman 1999:134, Edel 1994: 221 and by Helck 1963: 91. Stefanini 1964: 12 translates it as “onore” in line 48 and as “una cosa onorevole” in line 51.

608 The same translation of the verb walli- in the present context was offered by Lebrun 1980: 381 (“louanger”) and by Reiner – Güterbock 1967: 157.

609 HFAC joins KUB 26.88 in column iv (join made by Lorenz). In line iv there appears to be a scribal error; instead of sign mu the scribe writes me-eš.
Takidu heard the words of Ṣepat. [He went to Šimmurra and questioned the woman named Kutiladu. Kutiladu “abandoned her sin” and she continues to [praise] Ṣepat. Takidu carried the word to Ṣepat: “I went to Šimmurra and I questioned [the woman] named Kutiladu. [She “abandoned her sin”] and continues to [praise] Ṣepat.”

6. KUB 24.1 + KBo 58.10 (CTH 377.A), hymn and prayer of Muršili II to Telipinu, NH/NS. KUB 24.1+ has one duplicate, KUB 24.2 (CTH 377.B).

KUB 24.1 + KBo 58.10 i: (1) [ke-e]-ma-kâte [up-pi x x x DINGIR-LÍM an-i-da/ / (2) [x U]D-at me-mi-iš-sí-[lí]-i[z-i] x x x ] 'wa'-al-li-iš-sí-lí-zí-


The scribe reads [this] tablet out daily to the god and praises the god (saying): “O Telipinu, you are a powerful and an honoured god!”

7. KBo 4.6 (CTH 380.A), prayer of Muršili II to Lelwan i for the recovery of Gaššuliyawiya, NH/NS.

(1)


If you, o god, my lord, are searching for something evil in my [wife], I [am] thus sending you an adorned substitute. Compared to me (lit. with me) she is good, she is pure, she is radiant, she is white, she is endowed with everything. Look at that one (standing) before you, o god, my lord! Let this woman thus appeal before you, o god, my lord! Turn in favour to the great god...

---


611 For the possible explanation of the epithet EN-IA “my lord” employed in this prayer, addressed to the goddess Lelwani, see Lebrun 1980: 253 comment on line 10’.

612 The restoration follows Singer 2002a: 72. Lebrun 1980: 249 restores here DUMU.MUNUS.GAL on analogy with lines 16’ and 18’. However, because of the employment of the pronoun ammel “mine” Singer’s restoration and translation “my wife” makes more sense.
daughter again! Save her from this illness! Remove this (lit. the aforementioned) sickness from her and let her be healthy again! Then, in the future, the great daughter will proceed to constantly praise you, o god, and she will pronounce only your name, o god.

(2) KBo 4.6 rev.: // (18’) [a]r-

Gaššuliyawiya, your maid, has sent you, o god, separately, in good will, your bill[y] goat together with a fattened cow, fattened sheep, bread and beer-wine. You, o god, take this offering also in good will and you, O god(dess) turn in favour to Gaššuliyawiya once more! Save her from this illness! Take it from her again and let her be healthy again! Then, in the future, Gaššuliyawiya will proceed to constantly praise you, o god, and she will pronounce [only your] name, o god.

8. KUB 6.45+ (CTH 381.A), ‘prayer’ of Muwatalli II to the assembly of Hittite gods, NH/NS. The text is duplicated by KUB 6.46 (CTH 381.B).


The last two signs -ti-ia are not clearly visible on the photograph.

Lit. ‘further, place it (i.e. the illness) for her for cutting’.

The verb walli- in rev. 25’ has been translated as “...ne cessera pas de te célébrer” by Lebrun 1980: 252, as “praise” by Singer 2002a: 73 and by Tischler 1981: 17 and as “verherrlichen” by Ünal 1991: 813.

B: DINGIR.ME.ES A-WA-TE ME.ES; end of a line.

B: end of a line.

B: end of a line.

B: end of a line.

B: LUGAL.ME.ES
When the gods will hear my words, they will make right and lift from me the evil thing which is in my soul. For whom (the source of) praise will it be? Will it not be (the source of) praise for the Stormgod of lightning, my lord?

And it will happen that in the future, my son, my grandson, kings and queens of Ḫatti, princes and lords will always be in awe of the Stormgod of lightning, my lord, and they will say as follows: "Truly, that god is an outstanding hero, a rightly guiding god!" The gods of heaven, mountains and rivers will praise you.

Just as the Stormgod fills the mother's breast for our well-being, [so let]...

Just as we are satisfied with cold water, so [let] the Stormgod, my lord, [let] the water. May there be saturation for men and [may] it [be] (a source of)

626 B: MUNUS.LUGAL.ḪA
627 B: DUMU.ME.Š
628 B: EN.ME.Š-ia; line break.
629 B: na-ḫša-ri-šš-i-ki-wa-an
630 This reading follows Singer 1996: 23. B: DINGIR-LIM.
631 B: -ut-ta is written above the line.
632 B: DINGIR.ME.Š.
633 B: ḪUR.SAG.ME.Š ÍD.ME.Š
634 B: ḪUR.SAG.ME.Š ÍD.ME.Š
636 For the interpretation of these sentences as the first person questions see Singer 1996: 66 comment to line iii 48f.
638 According to Houwink ten Cate and Josephson 1967: 113 (note on line 21) the restoration of the noun waliyatar has been suggested here by Güterbock; it has been adopted by the successive editors and translators of this text and it is followed here.
639 Although pa-an-ku(-)e-š-zī is written here as one word, one should interpret it as the nom.-acc.n. of the adjective paknu and a third person singular present of the verb eš- "to be."
praise\textsuperscript{640} for the Stormgod, my lord. The thick bread will be plentiful in the land, and the libation wine […] for the Stormgod. May the Stormgod, my lord […] good people!

10. KUB 29.1 (414.A), ritual for the erection of a new palace, OH/NS. \textsuperscript{641}

KUB 29.1 i: (17) LUGAL-i-ma-mu DINGIR.ME.EŠ ūTU-uš IM-aš-ša ut-ne-e Ř-ir-mi-it-ta / (18) ma-ni-ia-aḫ-ḫi-ir nu-za LUGAL-uš-ša ut-ne-me-et Ř-ir-mi-it-ta / (19) pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-mi zi-ik am-me-el ŏ-na li-e ō-wa-ši / (20) ū-ga tu-e-el par-na ū-ul ū-śa-ša-am-ii // (21) LUGAL-e-mu DINGIR.ME.EŠ me-ek-ku-uš MUKAM.HI-usahaan-ša ū-ta-ša / (22) ū-it-ta-an-na ku-ut-re-eš-me-et NU.GAL // (23) LUGAL-u-e-mu \textsuperscript{642} ma-ni-ia-aḫ-ḫa-en \textsuperscript{643} ŋ0-ľa-\textsuperscript{644} ga-an-ni-\textsuperscript{645} en / (24) a-ru-na-za ū-aš-aš DINGIR-na-aš-ma-aš KUR-e ū-eš-ša-eš-er \textsuperscript{646} nu-mu-zā \textsuperscript{647} LUGAL-\textsuperscript{648} ūn / (25) La-ba-ar-na-an ḫu-lā-si-i-e-er / (26) nu EGIR-pa \textsuperscript{649} ad-da-aš-ma-an \textsuperscript{650} \textsuperscript{647} U-an \textsuperscript{651} wa-al-\textsuperscript{652} lu-\textsuperscript{653} uš-ki-mi nu \textsuperscript{654} GİŞ.HI-A LUGAL-uš \textsuperscript{655} / (27) \textsuperscript{656} \textsuperscript{647} U-ni ū-e-ek-zi ū-e-ia-u-še-ša-aš ku-ši ta-aš-nu-uš-ki-ir šal-la-nu-uš-ki-ir //

The gods - the Sungoddess and the Stormgod - have entrusted to me, the king the land and my household and I, the king, will protect the land and my household. You should not come into my house, and I will not come into your house. To me, the king, the gods have granted many years, there is no limit (lit. brevity) to (my) years. To me, the king, the Throne, has brought from the sea the authority and a 
al-\textsuperscript{657} uš-carriage. 

The gods have opened the land for you and they have called me, the king, Labarna. Thereafter, I will be constantly praising my father, the Stormgod. The

\textsuperscript{640} The noun waliyyatar was translated in the present context as “glory” by Bachvarova 2002: 140; “praise” by Houwink ten Cate and Josephson 1967: 119 and by Singer 2002a: 85; as “motivo de orgullo” by Bernabé 1987: 297 and as “hombre” by Lebrun 1980: 303.

\textsuperscript{641} The text is a duplicate of the Old Hittite fragmentary manuscript KUB 29.3 (CTH 414.B). The KUB 29.1 has two copies, KUB 29.2 + (CTH 414.C) and HT 38 (CTH 414.D). Lines 1-21-27 of KUB 29.1 duplicate lines 1'-8' of KUB 29.3.

\textsuperscript{642} B: LUGAL-i-mu

\textsuperscript{643} B: ḫu-lā-si-i-iz 'a'[ra]

\textsuperscript{644} B: ū-e-ša-eš-er

\textsuperscript{645} B: nu-mu-az

\textsuperscript{646} B: LUGAL-un-na

\textsuperscript{647} B: ap-ap-pa

\textsuperscript{648} B: at-ta-aš-šu-i-iz 'a'[ra]

\textsuperscript{649} B: *IM

\textsuperscript{650} B: adds an-ku

\textsuperscript{651} After LUGAL-uš manuscript B adds ta-al-x […]

\textsuperscript{652} B: ū-e-ša-eš-ša-aš ū-ta-ša-al-[…] 

Schwartz (1947) read here GİŞ-tal-lu-ga-an-ni-en and translated it together with maniya as “the assigned sceptre.” This reading; however, is not consistent with the cuneiform original; the sign hu is clearly visible on both the photograph and a hand-copy of the tablet. All other editors of this text and scholars discussing this passage unanimously read here GİŞ-tal-lu-ga-an-ni-en and this reading is followed here.

\textsuperscript{653} The verb walla- has been translated in the present context as “io esalto” by Carini 1982: 489; “I have been directing my requests” by Goetze 1950: 357; “preise ich” by Haas 1977: 11; “and again I will praise” by Hout 1991: 195 note 5; “и я вновь и вновь прославляю” (“I glorify again and again”) by Ivanov 1977: 47; “pray to/ask (of a deity)” by Kloekhorst 2008: 952; “celebrerò” by Marazzi 1982: 151; “I (shall) praise” by Schwartz 1947: 27; “ensalzo” by Trabazo 2002: 486-487.
king will ask from the Stormgod for the trees, which the rains made strong and great.

11. KUB 2.1 (CTH 682), festival for a protective deity (\textsuperscript{d}LAMMA), NS.

\textsuperscript{d}A-a-la-aš \textit{wa-al-li-i[a-an-na-aš]} “Ala of glory/praise.”\textsuperscript{655}

12. KUB 24.7 (CTH 717), Hurro-Hittite hymn to the goddess Ištar, NH/NS.\textsuperscript{656}

KUB 24.7 i: // (12’) [\textit{wa-al-[}]a-b[a]-ia-aš\textsuperscript{657} ŠA \textit{GAŠAN} \textit{šu-an-te-ez-zi-uš} \textsuperscript{MUNUS} \textsuperscript{SU} \textsuperscript{HU} \textsuperscript{LA} \textsuperscript{ ח} \textit{LA} / (13’) [\textit{Ni-na}-]at-ta-an \textit{Ku-li-it-ta-an} \textit{Ši-en-tal-
ir-te-in} / (14’) [\textit{Ši]-am-ra-zu-un-na-an} ... // (22’) \textit{wa-al-}la-aš \textit{ia-aš} ŠA \textit{GAŠAN} \textit{ap-pé-}e-zi-uš \textsuperscript{MUNUS} \textsuperscript{SU} \textsuperscript{HU} \textsuperscript{LA} \textsuperscript{ ח} \textsuperscript{LA} / (23’) [\textit{A]-li-in} \textit{Hal-za-a-ri-in} / (24’) \textit{Ši-na-an-da-da-}kar-ni-in \textit{wa-al-la-aš-\textit{a}]-b[a]-i\textsuperscript{658}

[I will praise\textsuperscript{659} them, the “first” handmaids\textsuperscript{659} of Ištar, namely [Nin]atta, Kulitta, Šintalirti (and) \textsuperscript{659}Vamrazunna ... I will praise them; the “last” handmaids of Ištar: Ali, \textsuperscript{659}Naalzari, Taruwi (and) Šinandadukarni. (Them) \textsuperscript{I} will praise.

13. KBo 32.14 (CTH 789), the “Song of Release”, MH/MS.

(1)

KUB 32.14 ii: // (42) te-eš-šum-mi-in \textsuperscript{SIMUG} la-a-[\textit{šu}]-uš / (43) la-a-[\textit{šu}-ša-an ti-iš-ša-a-it na-an šu-up-pi-iš-du-wa-ri-it / (44) da-iš na-an gul-aš-ta nu-uš-ši-es-ta ma-iš-ti / (45) an-da la-a-li-uk-ki-iš-nu-\textit{u}-uš la-
\textit{a}-ši-ša-an ku-iš / (46) na-an a-ap-pa mar-la-a-an-za URU\textit{DU}-aš \textit{šu-ur}-za-\textit{ki-u-an da-[iš]} / (47) ma-a-an-wa-mu la-a-[\textit{šu}]-uš ku-iš ma-an-wa-aš-
ši-kán ki-iš-\textit{šar}-\textit{a}-ši / (48) ar-\textit{ša} du-wa-ar-na-at-ta-ri ku-u-nu-na-aš-ma-an-
wa-aš-ši-kán / (49) iš-\textit{ša}-na-\textit{u}-uš ar-\textit{ša} ú-šu-u-ri-i-at-ta-ri / (50) ma-a-[b]-\textit{ša-an} \textsuperscript{LÜ} \textsuperscript{SIMUG} iš-ta-ma-aš-ta / (51) nu-uš-ši-es-ta Š\textit{u}-ŠU an-da iš-tar-ak-
ki-at //

A smith cast a cup for praise\textsuperscript{660}. He cast and moulded it (lit. made it ready). He inlaid it with ornamentation. He engraved it. He made it shine (lit. He

\textsuperscript{655} The noun \textit{walliyatar} was translated in the present context as “glory” by McMahon 1991: 111.

\textsuperscript{656} The tablet contains two compositions, the hymn and a mythological tale entitled “The Sungod, the Cow and the Fisherman”. For arguments supporting the idea that this tablet is a Sammeltafel see Güterbock 1997: 65.

\textsuperscript{657} Nearly all the restoration are those of Güterbock 1997: 66 (reprint of Güterbock 1983:155-164), except at the beginning of line 15’ and at the end of line 27’, where Güterbock restores \textsuperscript{MUNUS} \textit{É},[GLA-x].

\textsuperscript{658} The verb \textit{walla-} in lines 12’, 22’ and 24’ has been previously translated as: “to praise” by Goetze 1933: 262, Güterbock 1997: 66 (reprint) and by Haas 2006: 200.

\textsuperscript{659} Translation of \textit{CHD Š}: 85.a. Güterbock translates \textsuperscript{MUNUS} \textit{SU} \textit{HU} \textit{LA} \textit{ ח} \textit{LA} as “lady attendants” (1997: 68-69 comment on line 12).

\textsuperscript{660} The noun \textit{walliyann-} was translated in the present context as “glory” by Bachvarova 2002: 67; “praise worthy fashion” by Beckman 2003: 216 and as “Ruhme” by Neu 1996: 81.
gave light into its glow. But the foolish (piece of) copper began to curse the one who had cast it; if his right upper arm were wasted away (lit. tied up, suffocated). When the smith heard it, he became sick at his heart.

14. KBo 32.19 (CTH 789), the “Song of Release”, NH/NS.

Beckman 2003: 216 translates the sentence as “He put a shine on it with a woolen cloth” and interprets the noun mäštä as the dative/instrumental of šu-me-em-za-an “fiber, flock or strand of wool (?)”. Kloekhorst (2008) takes mäštä as a noun meaning “glow”.

Lit. “but the one who casts it, him the foolish (piece of) copper began to curse.”

Lit. “the one who casts it, if his hand were broken.”

The noun walliyann- has been translated in the present context as “praise worthy fashion” by Beckman 2003: 217 and as “zum Ruhme” by Neu 1996: 89.

Lit. “but the one who built it, him the foolish tower begun to curse.”

Lit. “the one who built it, if his hand were broken”

All the restorations are based on the duplicate KUB 32.24 and an almost identical passage in KUB 32.19.
Now, before you, he, Meki, [...] stands up. 671 If you (pl.) make release in Ebla, the city of the throne, if you make release, I will exalt your weapons in the manner of [...] . It will pass that your weapons will begin to defeat the enemy (acc.pl.). It will pass that your plowed fields will thrive for praise. 672 But if you will not make release in Ebla, the city of the throne, 673 then within seven days I will come to you, yourselves, and I will destroy the city of Ebla as if it had never been. 674 I will do so.

V.B. -za walla/i-, wallu- “to boast”

1. KBo 5.6 (CTH 40.IV.1.A), “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma”, NH/NS.

Then he (i.e. the king) returned to Mount Zukkuki and built two cities: Atülišša and Tuḫupurpuna. While he was building the cities, the enemy kept boasting: 675 “We will never allow him down into the land of Almina.”

But when he finished building the cities, he went into Almina, and none (of the) enemies could resist him in battle any longer.

---

671 The speech in lines iii 36’-51’ is marked by the quotative particles.
672 The noun walliṣatar was translated in the present contexts as “praise” by Bachvarova 2002: 84 and by Neu 1996: 381, 393.
673 Lines iii 45’-46’ of KBo 39.19 read: “if you will not make that, namely the release in Ebla, the city of the throne.”
674 Lines iii 50’-51’ of KBo 39.19 read: “As if it, the city, had never been.”
2. KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 (CTH 182), letter from a Hittite king to an Anatolian ruler in Miliwatta, NH/NS.

KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 lower edge: // (1) 'A'-BU-KA-[\(1^\text{st}\) x x x] \text{ka}-iš am-me-el ŤUL-u-wa-[\(2^\text{nd}\) x x x] [A-NA ŤUTU-ŠI] / (2) ŤUL-u-wa-aš INIM.MES-aš\(\text{?}\) ku-iš INIM-aš SAG.DU-aš\(\text{?}\) nu-mu a-pa-a-at iš-[ ...nu-za-kán] / (3) am-me-el x-iš\(\text{?}\) wa-li-at\(\text{?}\) nu-za-kán ka-ru-ú ku-wa-pí \text{URU} TÜL-na-an \text{wa-}li-at\(\text{?}\) nu me-mi-iš-ta ... ] / (4) ši-wa-ri-ia-wi\(\text{?}\) \text{GIM-} an-ma-mu A-BU-KA \(\text{L}^1\) LI \(\text{L}^1\) LI TÜTU) \text{URU} U-(TI-MA) \text{URU} AT-(RI-IA) NU.SUM nu \(\text{?}\) an-da\(\text{?}\)? [UL u-uḫ-ḫu-\text{an}?] / (5) nu \(\text{?}\) KIL.KAL.BAD-ZA\(\text{?}\) u-i-ta-nu-un //

Your father [...], who always wished for my, [My Majesty’s], misfortunes, and who was the principal factor in evil affairs, [he ... ] that to me. He 

boasted\(\text{?}\) about my ... 680. And when previously he boasted[d] about the city of Arinna, [he said to me: “... I will retain [them]”. But when you father did not give me the hostages of the city of Utima and the city of Atriya, then I [ ... ], and I sent Kulana-ziti. 690

3. KUB 36.44 (CTH 323.1.B), myth about the disappearance of the Sungod, MH/MS.

KUB 36.44 i\(\text{?}\) ; // (5') [ma-a-an ŤUTU]-un e-\text{cp}-mi na-an nu-u-\text{an}-\text{na}-\text{mi} nu ku-it i-e-\text{ez}-zi ŤIM-aš / (6') [ x x x-a]b₃ hi ma-a-ne-\text{ez} wa-al-lu-uš-ki-u-an

...
da-i-e-er a-ru-na-ša DUMU.MUNUS-aš / (7') [ne-pi-ša]-až' ṣul-za-iš na-an a-ru-na-ša iš-ta-ma-ša-ta nu-za a-ru-na-aš ḫAB.HAB-x / (8') [x x x] ṣul-ṣul-da-a-mi-ši-ši da-ši nu ku-wa-pr īUTU-uš mu-mi-e-ez-zl / (9') [x x]-i-ku ḫa-ap-pē-e-ni-ik-ku GĪŠ-i-ik-ku ḫa-ṣa-a-ši-ik-ku mu-mi-e-ez'-zi[i] / (10') [x x x] iš-ša-a-i-ši-ki-š-u-ta / 692 // (11') [a-ru-ña-aš īUTU-i tar-aš-ki-iz-zi ki-i-wa-at-ta ku-it x [ x x x x (x)] / (12') [x x x x (x)] īUTU-uš a-ru-ni an-ta-ga-aš-ša pa-it na-aš DUG ḫA[HAB x x x (x)] / (13') [IŠ-TU] DUH.LAL ga-ri-e-et še-ra nam-ma URUDU-an iš-ta-[p-pa-aš] / (14') [nu te]-e'e-et wa-al-lu-uš-ši-id-du-ma-at-wa-za ku-it-ma-an [x x x x (x)] / (15') [x x x x x x x (x)] / (15') [x x x x x x x (x)] / (16') [x x x x x x x (x)] / (16') [x x x x x x x (x)]

“[If] I seize [the Sungod] and I hide him, what will the Stormgod do? I will [...].” When they began to boast, the daughter of the Seagod called from [heaven] and the Seagod heard her. Then the Seagod placed the ḪAB.HAB-vessel [...] on his ḥalḫaldana. (saying): “When(ever) the Sungod falls, (if) he falls in [...] or, in flame, or on a tree, or in bush, he [...] The Seagod says to the Sungod: “This is what [I ...] for you.” [...] The Sungod went to the Seagod, to his chamber and he covered the ḪA[HAB]-vessel [...] with wax. Then he close[d] (it) with copper [and said: “Will you keep boasting about it until [...]?” The Seagod [heard word]s of his daughter.

4. KUB 48.99 (CTH 337.1.A), myth about the disappearance of the god Pirwa, NH/NS.


that this passage belongs to column iv. I agree with Mazoyer and Hoffner. Contentwise, the relevant passage appears at the beginning of the entire text rather than at the end. The third singular present iterative middle verbal form iš-ša-a-i-ši-ki-š-u-ta is a hapax. The meaning of the verb iššā- remains unknown. It was translated by Hoffner 1990: 27 as “he will be caught” and by Mazoyer 2003: 177 as “the frost will be installed”. Puvel HED vol. 2: 354-355 leaves this verb untransladed and comments that Eichner’s 1971: 30, 39 translation of this verb as “burst, crack” (“iššā-”), which is akin to tga-i “cool down, freeze, become paralysed”, could be appropriate in the present context.

ḥalḫaldana- has been translated in the present context as “shoulders” by Mazoyer 2003: 177. Also Puvel HED vol. 3: 22 observes that this noun is a name for a body part and remarks that in the present context the translation “shoulders” makes sense. He then notes that perhaps Ḫalḫaldana- is a Luwoid term for “shoulder”.

For the discussion of this text see Imparati 1998: 128-134.

All the restorations are those of Imparati 1998: 128-134.

For the discussion of the reading a-aš ŚA versus a-aš-ša and on the restoration at the end of the line see Imparati 1998: 128, comment on line 3.

For this restoration and other possible readings see Imparati 1998: 129, comment on line 4.

For various possible restorations at the end of this line see Imparati 1998: 130-131. If one restores LUGAL-[un] (suggestion of Imparati) the sentence would read “and Pirwa will
The Goddess Queen saw that and she looked into the heart of Pirwa. The Goddess Queen [began] to speak to the young men of Pirwa: “Who will bring it, namely the eagle, from Hāššuwa to Pirwa, to him we will give many goods and Pirwa, the king, will make him rich. The young men of Pirwa under[took] the road. They took the assembly and began to boast. The deity Ilali boasted: “I myself [will] bring it”, [the deity x x] x-huppia b0[a]s[t][ed]: [I myself will] bring it.”

5. KUB 4.1 (CTH 422.A), ritual performed in the regions bordering the enemy lands, MH/NS.


They (i.e. ritual performers) say as follows: “Zitiḥariya continues to prostrate himself before all the gods. Whatever permanent allotments belonged to (the temple of) Zitiḥariya, whatever lands, where they used to celebrate great festivals for him, were turned (i.e. in turmoil), now the Kaška people have

make the king rich.” It is also possible to assume that the reference is here to the reward that will be given to the one who will find and return the eagle to Pirwa.

This clitic chain is interpreted as KASKAL-an.za=šan.

It is difficult to place this noun within the context. It appears at the end of a paragraph and therefore could be governed by either the preceding verb (line 10’) or the verb at the beginning of line 12’. The verb in line 10’ already takes a noun in the accusative case, namely KASKAL-an; the verb in line 12’ has the enclitic particle -wa attached to it and should therefore be interpreted as appearing at the beginning of the sentence. Moreover, it also governs a noun tuliyan, which appears in line 12’. I follow Imparati 1998: 132, who opts for the second possibility, namely that this noun is governed by the verb at the beginning of line 12’ and the repetition of the noun tuliyan before and after the verb is a form of emphasis. The unusual sentence structure could be justified by the fact that this text is very likely a poetic composition. For various interpretations of this sentence see Imparati 1998: 131-132.

The verb wallu- was translated in this text as “to boast” by Imparati 1998: 128 and by Otten 1968: 188 note 1. Ivanov 1977: 41 rendered it as “to glorify” (“восславить” and “был прославлен”). Kloekhorst refrains from translating the verb in this context, stating that it’s meaning here is unsure 2008: 952.

The form iš-ki-ir is a rare spelling of the third person plural preterite iterative of the verb iya- “to make, to perform, to celebrate”.

The line 1’ of KUB 31.146 that partially duplicates KUB 4.1 reads here [ … wa-al-li-iš-kán]-³-ZI³
taken them. The Kaška people initiated conflict (lit. quarreled). They continually boast about their force and power of resistance. They humiliated you, o gods.

---

The verb *walli-* was translated in the present context as “to boast” by Goetze 1950: 354, Gurney 1940: 42, von Schuler 1965: 169 and by Trabazo 2002: 513. Dardano 2002: 335 translates it as “(Les Gasgas) continuent à célébrer” and Puhvel *HED* vol. 3: 234 as “extol”.

---
APPENDIX 2: JOIN SKETCHES

This appendix contains joins sketches of several manuscripts of texts edited in chapter four. These include: ms A of CTH 376.I, ms A and ms C of CTH 376.II, ms A of CTH 378.1, mss B and C of CTH 378.2 and ms A of CTH 377. All the drawings are copied from the Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte included on the hethitologie Portal (Mainz).
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APPENDIX 3: CTH 376 – ADDITIONAL PRAYERS (CTH 376.III, CTH 376 IV and CTH 376.V)

This appendix contains the transliteration and translation of three fragmentary prayers (CTH 376) that are mentioned in chapters three and four: the hymn and prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna for recovery of Gaššuliyawiya (here CTH 376.III), a New Hittite prayer to an unknown deity (here CTH 376.IV) and a prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna and her circle (here CTH 376.V).

CTH 376.III. HYMN AND PRAYER OF MURŠILI II TO THE SUNGODDESS OF ARINNA

Manuscript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>KUB 36.81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>5086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transliteration

0  [ ... nu-ut-ta]
1’ A i 1’ [ka-a ša mu-uk-ki-iš-ki-miNINDA]ḫar-š[i-it]
3’ A i 3’ [e-eš x x x x x x nu]-mu₄UTU₄URU₁-[RI-IN-NA iš-ta-ma-na-an(?)]
4’ A i 4’ [la-ga-a-an(?) ṣar-ak(?) nu-ut-i]a ku-it me-mi-[š-ki-mi]
5’ A i 5’ [na-at iš-ta-ma]-₄₄₄-aš-ki

6’ A i 6’ [zi-ik-za₄UTU₄AR-IN-NA] na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-LIM-i[s]
7’ A i 7’ [nu-ut-ta È.DINGIR.MEŠ DINGIR-LIM]-'IA₁ I-NA KUR [URU HA-AT-TI-]
pát
8’ A i 8’ [ta-aš-ša-nu-wa-an nam-ma-ma-at]-ta da-me-e-da-ni KUR-e È.DINGIR
9’ A i 9’ [Ū-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-eš-z]i nu-ut-ta EZE₄ H₂ SI₄ KUR₂ H₂-I[a]
10’ A i 10’ [I-NA KUR珉EA HA-AT-TI-pát šu-up-p]i pár-ku-i pé-eš-kán-zi
11’ A i 11’ [nam-ma-ma-at-da-me-e-d]a-ni KUR-e Ū-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki
12’ A i 12’ [pé-eš-kán-zi È.DINGIR.MEŠ]-ia-at-ta pár-ga-u-wa IŞ-TU KÛ.BABBAR
13' A i 13' [KÜ.GI ú-nu-wa-an-ta I-NA] KUR ŠAR URU HA-AT-TI-pát e-eš-zi
14' A i 14' [nam-ma-ma-at-ta da-me-e-d]a-ni KUR-e Ú-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki
15' A i 15' [e-eš-zi] GAL. HILA-ta BL-IB-RIG KÜ.BABBAR KÜ.SI₂ NA₃ HILA
16' A i 16' [I-NA KUR ŠAR URU HA-AT-TI-pát] e-eš-zi EZEN₄ HILA-ia-at-ta
17' A i 17' [EZEN₄ ITU EZEN₄ HILA MU-ti mi]-i-ia-na-aš zé-e-na-an-d[ ]a-aš]
19' A i 19' [EZEN₄ HILA I-NA KUR ŠAR URU HA-AT]-TI-pát e-eš-š[a-an-zí nam-ma-ma-

The column i breaks. Only beginnings of 6 lines are preserved from column ii.

21' A ii 1' KUR [ ... ]
22' A ii 2' ŠA x [ ... ]
23' A ii 3' nu-ušši [ ... ]
24' A ii 4' ṢU₄ UTU ŠAR URU A-RI-IN-NA ... ]
25' A ii 5' ki-nu-n [a ... ]
26' A ii 6' a-r[u ... ]

The following 15 lines are left either from the column ii or the reverse.

27' A 1' [ ... ] x [ ... ]
28' A 2' [ ... ]-a-pí-ra-a[n x x ]-šu [ ... ]
29' A 3' [ ... ] x-a-uš a-aššu-un 'nam-ma' [ ... ]
30' A 4' [ ... ]-ni ṢU₄ UTU ŠAR URU A-RI-IN-NA a-ašš[u ... ]
31' A 5' [ ... ] 'aš-ašša-u-[i nam-ma] me-mi-ni [ ... ]
32' A 6' [ ... ] x an-da aššu-li nam-ma x [ ... ]
33' A 7' [ ... ] ḫu-i-iš-nu-ut nu-kán MUNUS.LUGAL ku-x [ ... ]
34' A 8' [ ... ] x 'Gašu-li-ia-wi-an x [ ... ]
Translation:

1’-5’  [ … I hereby invoke you by means of thick bread and libation. Be pacified! O Sungoddess of Arinna, lend me your ear! [Keep listening to what I am saying to you!]

6’-20’  [You, O Sungoddess of Arinna], are an honoured goddess. Only in the land of Ḫatti [there are strong temples dedicated to you], my goddess, [but in] no [other] land [in addition to ours there is] a temple for you. [Only in the land of Ḫatti] they offer you holy and pure festivals and rituals, [but in] no [other] land [in addition to ours they perform (them) for you]. Only [in] the land of Ḫatti there are lofty temples dedicated to you, [adorned] with silver [and gold, but] in no [other] land [in addition to ours they exist for you]. [Only] in the land of Ḫatti there are cups and rhyta of silver, gold and precious stones [for you]. Only [in the land of Ḫatti] there are festivals for you (such as) [the monthly festival, the annual festivals of autumn, winter, spring, the auliš-sacrifices, and the festivals] of invocation, [but in no other land in addition to ours] they exist for you. (Rest of the text is too fragmentary for translation)
376.IV. NEW HITTITE PRAYER TO AN UNKNOWN DEITY

Manuscripts:

| A₁ | KUB 30.13 + | 2156/g + | HaH\(^{709}\) |
| A₂ | KBo 12.132 + | 286/t | HaH |
| A₃ | VBoT 121 | Götze 2 | HaH\(^{710}\) |


Transliteration:

\[
\begin{align*}
A₁ & \quad 1' \quad [\ldots \text{tar-na-at-tén nu K[UR} \, \overline{\text{HA-AT-TI}} \, \ldots] \\
& \quad 2' \quad [\ldots \text{NINDA} \, \overline{\text{ḫa}-r-ši-in}] \, \overline{\text{DUG}} \, \overline{iš-pa-an-tu-zi} \, \ldots] \\
& \quad 3' \quad [\ldots \text{k}u-i-e-eš \, \text{an-ni-eš-kir na-at-} \ldots] \\
& \quad 4' \quad [\ldots \text{na-at-t}a \, \text{ku-iš-ki} \, \text{MUNUS.MEŠ} \, \overline{\text{NA}} \, \overline{\text{AR}}[A₃, \ldots] \\
& \quad 5' \quad [\ldots \text{n}[\text{am-ma Š}A \, \text{DINGIR.MEŠ} \, \text{NINDA.GUR}, \text{RA.ḪI.A} \, \text{Ŭ-UŁ} \, \ldots] \\
& \quad 6' \quad [\text{UDU} \, \text{a-ū-ú-i-ú-uš-k} \, \text{án GU.ḪI.A} \, \text{UDU.ḪI.A} \, \text{ḫa-a-li-ia-az} \, \text{a-[ša-a-ú-na-az} \ldots] \\
& \quad 7' \quad [\ldots \text{a-k}i-ir \, \text{ḫa-a-li-ia} \, \text{a-ša-a-u-w[a-ar} \ldots] \\
& \quad 8' \quad [\ldots \text{NINDA.GUJR.A.ḪI.A} \, \overline{\text{DUG}} \, \overline{iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi} \, \ldots] \\
& \quad 9' \quad [\ldots \text{DINGI[R.MEŠ} \, \text{a-pé-e-da-ni-ia} \, \text{ud-} \{\text{da-ni-ia} \ldots] \\
& \quad 10' \quad [\ldots \text{ḫa-at-ta-tar]-.createFromText("\şum-mi-it \, źar-ak-t[a} \ldots]
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{708}\) For dating the KUB 30.13 fragment to the reign of Muršili II see van den Hout 2007: 406. The linguistic and orthographic features also safely date VBoT 121 to the New Hittite period.

\(^{709}\) HaH = Haus am Hang (temple 1).

\(^{710}\) The find spot of this fragment was determined by join.
11' [...]  

12' [...] 'uš-ka'-[at-te-ni ...]

A:

void

1' [...] ša-an-ḫi-iš-kān-zi[(?) Ė.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-ma

2' [...]-[a]-aš-ma\textsuperscript{711}

3' [...] ZA.GA]R.RA.HL.A\textsuperscript{712} pī-[ip-pe-er Ė.DINGIR.MEŠ-ia (rev. 1') ša-ar-wa'-er URU.HL.A-m[a]\textsuperscript{713} (rev. 2') ŠA\textsuperscript{714} wa-ša-[l] (rev. 3') ša-an-ђ-eš-kān-zi [∅]

4' [...]šu-[l]-a-an-da(?)\textsuperscript{715} KUR.KUR.MEŠ-TIM

5' [...]-ia-an-ta-ma

6' [...] x \textsuperscript{10}SIPA.UDU \textsuperscript{11}SIPA.ŠA\textsuperscript{716}

7' [...]-kam-ma-an pîd-da-[a-er

8' [...]ar]-kam-ma-an ar-ђ-[l][∅]

9' [...]pe-eš-še-i-e-er ... ka-r[u-]\textsuperscript{URU \textsuperscript{HA.AT\textsuperscript{3}}-[TI]}

\textsuperscript{711} Van den Hout reads here [Kar(?)-]a'-aš-ma

\textsuperscript{712} Van den Hout has here [-zA.GA]R.RA.HL.A

\textsuperscript{713} I follow here Torri (2010: 364, 365) and van den Hout (2007: 403) who read Ė.DINGIR.MEŠ-ia ša-ar-wa'-er URU.HL.A ŠA \textsuperscript{714} wa-ša-[l] ša-an-ђ-eš-kān-zi as continuation of line 3' of the obverse.

\textsuperscript{714} This sign is read by Torri as tu; the hand-copy of this tablet has here clear ne. The traces visible on the photograph are most consistent with te.

\textsuperscript{715} Van den Hout (2007: 403) reads here [ḥu-u-[l]-a-an-da

\textsuperscript{716} Van den Hout (2007: 403) has here ŠA\textsuperscript{717}
Translation:

A1

1'-2' [...] you(pl.) allowed [...] into [...] the la[nd of Ḫatti ...]. [...] the thick bread] and the libation [...] [...].

3'-5' [...] who used to work [...]. No one [...] The women of the mill-stone [...] No one prepares the thick breads of the gods anymore.

---


718 Torri (2010: 364) reads here 'ḫur-ṣ[īn-kī-iš-ki-it(?)].


The corrals and sheepfolds … the sacrificial animals, (such as) cattle and sheep, … have died, the corral and the sheepfold are neglected.

… the thick breads, the libation … o gods, … in that matter.

… our wisdom has been lost …

… you perceive …

[They continue to see]k …. [They …] the temples … xxx. […] broke down [the altars; they plundered the temples and they continually seek the cities of the deity Tewaši[II].

The quarrelsome lands, […] xxx. […] the shepherds and the swineherds […] they carried/paid [the tribute].

… they have repudiated (their) tribute […]. [Formerly, the land of Ḥatti […] like a lion. […] x […]

… not of the gods, […] perish … the evil ones. […] a single house or a single person ….

But […], O gods, […] the land of Ḥatti [with] favorable …. Give the evil plague to the evil lands.

… But [in the land of] Ḥatti let (everything) thrive and prosper …, let […] become as previously.

If the king [should] make a plea in Arinna [let the KIN oracle be favourable. He took […], and […] in/for the good […]. He took the PRESENTING OF [PRAYER] and he [presented] it to [the gods]. He took the THICK BREAD and the BLOOD (?) and [gave] them [to] MUL[TITUDE].
Transliteration:

4’  LÚ.MEŠ KÚ.R.ḪL.A-ma-za ku-i-e-eš tu-el [ŠA dẖTU URU A-RI-IN-NA]
5’  dME-EZ-ZU-UL-LA dḪU-UL-LA [BL-IB-RĪḪA GAL.ḪL.A (ŠA)]
6’  KÚ.BABBAR KÚ.SI₂₂ Û-NU-TÉMEŠ-KU-NU ṭu-u-[ma-an-du-uš da-an-na]
7’  i-lā-a-li-iš-kān-zi LÚ.MEŠ A[PIN.LÁ LÚ.MEŠ NU. GIŠ KIRI₆]
8’  MUNUS.MEŠ NA₄ ARA₄ MUNUS.MEŠ UŠ.BAR da-a-[an-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-kān-zi]
9’  É.DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU ma-az ar-ḫa [wa-ar-nu-um ma-an-zi i-lā-a-li-iš-kān-zi]
11’ [d]a-an-na-at-ta-af ṭu-wa-[n-zi ša-an-ḫi-iš-kān-zi]

Translation:

4’-11’ The enemy who wishes to [take] for itself your, [O Sungoddess of Arinna], Mezulla and Ḫulla, [rhyta, cups of] silver and gold (and) all your cult objects; (who) [seeks to capture (your) farmers, gardeners], women of the mill (and) weavers; (who) [wishes to burn] down your temples; (who) [seeks to] lay waste (your) farmlands, your orchards (and) [your] border regions

721 For the transliteration and translation of the entire fragment see Schwemer 2006: 239 -241.