

Sass B., 2004-2005, « The Genesis of the alphabet and its development in the second millennium B.C. Twenty years later », *KBN* 2, p. 147-166.

Tappy R. E., McCarter P. K., Lundberg M. J. et Zuckerman B., 2006, « An Abecedarium of the Mid-Tenth Century B.C.E. from the Judaean Shephelah », *BASOR* 344, p. 5-46.

Laurent COLONNA D'ISTRIA, <laurent.colonnadistria@unige.ch>
Université de Genève

49) KBo 18.117: A further join to the “Milawata Letter” – The tablet KUB 19.55+KUB 48.90 contains a letter of a Hittite king to a vassal in western Anatolia, commonly referred to as the “Milawata letter”. The king has been thought to be Tudhaliya IV and the addressee Tarkasnawa, king of Mira during the latter part of Tudhaliya’s reign (Hawkins 1998: 19). The preserved parts of the letter discuss various issues including the border with Milawata, a stronghold of Ahhiyawa most likely to be identified with classical Miletus, the re-instatement of king Walmu of Wilusa, probably ancient Troy, and an affair concerning an exchange of the hostages (^{LU}*LI-TÜ-TUM*) of Awarna and Pinali for those of Atriya and Utima, a conflict which had originated during the reign of the addressee’s father. The first two of these localities were probably in Lycia, the second two in Caria. The new join mainly fits into the narrative concerning this affair.

KUB 19.55 stems from the early excavations at Boğazköy-Hattusa, and has no recorded find-spot. The same is true of the join made by H. Hoffner in 1980: KUB 48.90 (Hoffner 1982; 2009: 315). The new join, KBo 18.117 (364/v), was re-excavated in 1963 from the dump of H. Winkler’s original excavation of Temple I at Hattusa (Güterbock 1971: XI; S. Košak, *Konkordanz der Hethitischen Texte/ www.hethiter.net*, version 1.84). While this does not give us a precise find-spot for KUB 19.55+48.90, it does indicate that the original tablet must have been housed in the region of the temple at some point.

The fragment, which is given the no. 399 in Hagenbuchner 1989, contains the remains of six lines on the obverse, supplying the beginnings of KUB 19.55 obv. 22-27, and nine lines on the reverse, including paragraph dividers after lines one and nine, which must fit into the estimated thirteen to fifteen line gap between rev. 17 and 32, as the lines are labeled in KUB 19. The left edge contains part of six lines, which fill the gap in the middle of the left edge of KUB 19.55 almost completely. The very poor handwriting and most notably one particular aspect of the orthography, the abbreviations, are identical to those of KUB 19.55.

There remain many problems with identification of signs and interpretation, not least stemming from the missing signs at the left side of the left edge. There may be as many as ten to thirteen of these on each line. The text of the relevant lines now runs as follows, using the line numbers as supplied in KUB 19.55. The following photographs were used from www.hethiter.net: BoFN01077, BoFN00372, 373, B0967f. I am additionally grateful to F. Fuscagni for sending me photos of the obverse and reverse of KBo 18.117. As the intention here is merely to present the join, readings and assignment of signs to lines that differ from previous treatments of this part of the “Milawata letter” are not all discussed. Previous editions can be found at Sommer 1932: 198-202, 204; Hoffner 2009: 317, 320; Beckman *et alii* 2011: 124, 130.

KUB 19.55+KBo 18.117

Obv. 22-27

22: [ZAG]-IA-[ma]-mu-za [le-e][?] i-[la-liš-ki-ši ...][?]

23: nu kiš-an [me]-ma-[i] [k]u[?]-iš-k[i]

24: na-aš-ma A-NA [A]-BU-KA ku-w[a-pi][?] ...]

25: tu-uk-ma ma-a-an A-BU-KA A-NA L[UGAL[?]-UT-TI ...]

26: INIM NAM.RU-[ma][?]-kán ŠÀ-ta x[...]

2 7: A-NA ZAG-IA RA-an-zi nu[- ...]

Rev. (between KUB 19.55 rev. 17' and 32')

18': x

- 19': *ma-a-an* x[...]
 20': *nu-wa-ra*-[...]
 21': *ku-i-e*-[eš]
 22': *ḫu-u-m*[*a-an-te-eš*? ...]
 23': *na-at* [...]
 24': *ki-nu*-[*un*(-) ...]
 25': *nu*^{URU}[x ...]
 26': *na-an* [...]

Left edge:

- 1: [... *zi-i*]q-qa INIM^{URU} *a-wa-ar-na* Û^{URU} p[*i*]¹-*na-li-ia* GI[M-an x x x-m]a²- *kán* ^DUTU-ŠI
 [am]²-[m]e²-el [DUMU]-[IA] ^[URU]? [pí]²?
 2: [...]x^{GIS}TUKUL :*tar*¹-*aḫ*¹-*ḫa*¹-*te*: UL *an-da u-uh-ḫu-un nu-mu* {GAM} GAM-an¹ x-[x x]
^[URU] [pí] IŠ-TU^{GIS}TUKUL^{GI}GAG.[Ú].[TAG.GA-]az²
 3: [...]x SIG₅-an-[n]i *an-da UL u-uh-ḫu-un na-aš-ta pa-ra-a u-uh-ḫu-un* INIM^{URU} a^{URU} pí *zi-*
i[q-q]a
 4: [...] x^{LÚ}LI-ṬÛ-TUM^{URU} *a-wa* ^{URU} pí-na *pa-a-i am-mu-uk-ma-wa-ta* ^{LÚ}LI-ṬÛ-TUM^{URU} u-ti-
ma^{URU} *at-ri-ia pa-ra-a* [SUM]-ḫi²?
 5: *nu*^DUTU-ŠI^{LÚ}LI^{URU} u^{URU} pí [pa]-ra-[a]-pát AD-D[I]N *zi-ik*-[ma] NU [SUM] xx x x
 6: *na*-[at] UL *im-ma ku-it-ki tu*-[e]-el ḪUL ŠA ZI DINGIR-[at] ḪUL

Translation:

Obv. 22: but don't [carry on] de[siring] my border ... (23) and *someone* speaks thus ... (24) Or to your father ... (25) so when your father ... you for *k[ingship]*² (26) the deportee issue in (his/your?) heart ... (27) they are attacking my border ...

Rev. 19: if ... (20) “and ...” (21) who ... (22) all ... (23) and it/they ... (24) now ... (25) and the town of ... (26) and him/it ...

Left edge 1: ho[w y]ou [x-ed] the matter of Awarna and Pinali, but I, My Majesty, oh my son, [x-ed] the town *Pinali* (2) ... mace ... I did not take any notice and [you x-ed?] *with me/me down*. *The town Pinali* with mace and arrow ... (3) ... for (our) friendship I did not take any notice and looked away. As for the matter of Awarna (and) Pinali you (4) ...[saying] “give (me) the hostages of Awarna and Pinali, then I will give you the hostages of Utima and Atriya”. I, My Majesty, have indeed given over the hostages of Awarna and Pinali, but you have not *given*. This is not at all any evil(-doing) of yours, it (is) an evil against (lit. of) the will of a god.

Obv. 26: for NAM.RU see Kümmel 1967: 41, also citing this example.

Left edge 1: The marking of the connective with both Akkadographic Û and -ia on *Pinaliya* is pleonastic.

Left edge 2: I read the single wedge before and the double wedge after the word *tar*¹-*aḫ*¹-*ḫa*¹-*te*, which is itself written over an erasure and is difficult to interpret, as punctuation or editorial marks of some kind. GAM-an¹?: This interpretation assumes that the scribe has forgotten to write the broken horizontal in the sign AN. In this case the scribe may have been distracted after writing and then erasing GAM once already, having mistakenly written it without a word-space to the preceding *nu-mu*. If a better explanation for these traces can be found, it is to be preferred.

Bibliography

- Beckman, G.M., Bryce, T.R. and Cline, E.H. 2011: *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Atlanta.
 Güterbock, H.G. 1971: *Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy. Achzehntes Heft. Hethitische Briefe, Inventare und verwandte Texte*. Berlin.
 Hagenbuchner, A. 1989: *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil*. Texte der Hethiter 16. Heidelberg.
 Hawkins, J.D. 1998: Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel. *Anatolian Studies* 48, 1-31.

- Hoffner, H.A. 1982: The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted. *AfO Beiheft* 19, 130-137.
Id. — 2009: *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta.
Kümmel, H.-M. 1967: *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*. StBoT 3. Wiesbaden.
Sommer, F. 1932: *Die Ahhijava-Urkunden*. Munich.

Mark WEEDEN, mw41@soas.ac.uk,

SOAS, University of London, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, LONDON WC1H 0XG, UK

50) Sur l'importance du Vizir et des grands fonctionnaires à Qaṭna méd.-bab. – Les tout récents textes de l'ancienne Qaṭna qui viennent d'être publiés par Th. Richter et qui documentent ce qui se passait dans cette région entre l'époque de Mari et celle de Tel Amarna sont les bien venus et la place que semble y tenir la langue hourrite pour spectaculaire qu'elle soit, n'étonne pas.

Plus déconcertante serait, selon les rares lettres que comporte cette archive, la place que semblent alors tenir à Mischrihé les hauts fonctionnaires du royaume d'après les vœux d'un correspondant : son vizir et, ce qui est bien plus étonnant, son *râb nuhatimmi*. Cela peut être tiré de l'excellente édition que nous en propose Th. Richter, *Das Archiv des Idadda*, Qaṭna Studien 3 qui lit:

TT 1: 1-5 *a-na I id-a-an-da šeš-ia, um-ma I tá-ku-wa šeš-ka, bu-lu-uṭ lu-ú šul-mu, a-na ugu-ka sukkal-ka, é-gal lu-ú šul-mu* = « Zu Idanda, meinem Bruder (sprich), folgendermaßen (sagt) Takuwa, dein Bruder: Lebe! Wohlergehen sei dir (und) deinem Wesir, dem Palast sei (auch) Wohlergehen! »

De même **TT 2:** 4-6 qui répète, après des l. 1-3 identiques, *a-na ugu-ka sukkal-ka, gal^{munus} mu-ka sig₅^{qiš}, lu-ú šul-mu* = « Wohlergehen sei dir (und) deinem Wesir, ... in guter Weise sei Wohlergehen ! »

Si la place donnée au (grand) Vizir est en soi extrêmement étonnante, pour le second exemple, il est proposé (*ibid.*, p. 49a) que *gal^{munus} mu* « deutet zwar auf **rabi nuhatimmati* », titre inconnu mais qui rappellerait le *rabi nuhatimmi* du I^{er} millénaire.

Ce n'est là en fait qu'une impression fallacieuse à corriger tout de suite. Je proposerais en effet de lire avec la copie qui est excellente:

– **TT 1:** 4-5 : *a-na ugu-ka é*-ka, ma*-gal lu-ú šul-mu* = « En ce qui te concerne, ta maison, puisse-t-il y avoir grandement prospérité! »

– **TT 2:** 4-6 : *a-na ugu-ka é*-ka, kál mim(MÍ)-mu-ka sig₅-qiš, lu-ú šul-mu* = « En ce qui te concerne, ta maison, tout ce qui peut t'appartenir, puisse-t-il y avoir bellement prospérité! »

Pour ce qui est de **TT 2:** 5, on remarque que les textes en gros contemporains d'Emar recourent dans ce genre de formule à l'expression *gáb-bá mim-mu*. Il faut donc supposer que GAL a ici la valeur /kál/, attestée il est vrai depuis Mari comme variante de KAL, au moins dans des noms propres; *kalû* est donc ici en variante avec *gabbu*. Quant à *mimmu*, ce dernier terme est écrit avec le signe /mim/ (MÍ), ce que l'on trouve couramment au lieu de *mi-im-*.

Dans **TT 5** 2, il n'est pas sans intérêt de voir que Šarrupše s'adresse à *id-a-an-da* qui est à la fois son seigneur et son père « *be-lí-ia lú a-bi-ia* » (l. 1 et l. 3), comme *dumu-ka ir*-ka-ma*, comme l'indique clairement, sinon l'autographie, au moins la photographie que comporte l'édition. Il faut donc abandonner le *dumu-ka-na-ka-ma* de l'édition qui ferait douter de l'acribie du scribe antique.

Ces vœux sont typiques de l'époque moyenne et sont importants pour replacer l'écriture de ces textes dans leur époque; *bu-lu-uṭ dun-qiš* se trouve à Alalah, mais *bu-lu-uṭ* fait déjà partie des salutations de certaines des lettres de Mari (non dans CAD pour des raisons de date de publication de ARM X, mais cf. entre autres, ARM X 93 : 5 ; 103 : 5 ; 116 : 5 ; 141 : 5). Il y a des indices que l'usage de l'impératif, au lieu d'une forme en *l-* + D ou de *lû* + permansif, représente à l'époque paléo-babylonienne une façon occidentale de s'exprimer.

Jean-Marie DURAND
IPOA, Collège de France, PARIS

51) Two Remarkable Aspects from Tall Hadidi/Azû – The Middle Euphrates archaeological site of Tall Hadidi (ancient Azû), excavated in the 1970s by R. Dornemann, has yielded 15 Syrian-type clay