2. M. CECCARELLI, « Die *adab*-Komposition *Išme-Dagan B* », *WZKM* 109, 2019, p. 137-170 (avec *corrigenda* dans *NABU* 2020/37). L'épithète šim-mu$_2$ de la l. 7 a été traduite « Beschwörungspriesterin » (p. 147, sans commentaire p. 152) ; je préfère celle d'« herboriste » (cf. *RA* 109, 2015, p. 197 n. 3).

3. Ce texte doit être publié dans le livre que je prépare sur des archives privées d'Isin, à paraître dans la série Archibab.

4. La lecture *ka-la-ab-ta* de Figulla (UET 5, p. 46b) a été corrigée par F. R. KRAUS (*OLZ* 50 1955, col. 516).

5. Ces noms peuvent être désormais ajoutés au *CAD* K, p. 72a. On me permettra de renvoyer à D. CHARPIN, *La vie méconnue des temples mésopotamiens*, Docet omnia 1, Paris, 2017, p. 31-60.

6. Et cette caractéristique est restée visible dans l'onomastique néo-babylonienne, avec Kalbi-BaU (cf. J. J. STAMM, *Die akkadische Namengebung*, MVAG 44, Leipzig, 1939, p. 12 et n. 2).

Dominique CHARPIN

91) KBo 50.4 and Tutḫaliya III as Coregent? — In a recent paper Taracha (2014: 959-961) offered a reading and restoration of the first three lines of KBo 50.4 (cf. Soysal 2005: 140-142; Groddek 2008: 3-4) that he suggests would clinch the existence of a Tutḫaliya I (son of Kantuzzili) who would have reigned before a Tutḫaliya II (spouse of Nikkal-madi). He reads and translates:

1 [*UM-MA TA-BA-AR-N*]*A* ⌜m*AR-NU-WA-AN*⌝-*T*[*A* LUGAL.GAL *Ù* ᶠ*AŠ-MU-NI-KAL*]
2 [MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU.MU]NUS *ŠA* ᵐ*DU-UT-ḪA-LI-YA* L[UGAL.GAL UR.SAG
DUMU.DUMU.MUNUS (or: ŠÀ.BAL.BAL[?])]
3 [*ŠA* ᵐ*DU-U*]*T-ḪA-LI-YA* LUGAL.GAL UR.SA[G

[Thus say Tabarn]a Arnuwand[a, great king, and Ašmunikkal, great queen, dau]ghter of Tudhaliya, [great] k[ing, hero, granddaughter (or: descendant?) of Tu]dhaliya, great king, he[ro.

While Taracha's suggestion should not be rejected out of hand, it has already been called into question by de Martino (2016: 38f., n. 16), who correctly notes that these restorations and interpretations are hardly the only possibilities and writes that "la presenza del nome Tuthaliya in due righe l'una di sequito all'altra (rr. 1'-2') potrebbe spiegarsi ipotizzando che il re Arnuwanda I dichiari prima la filiazione della sua consorte da questo sovrano e poi la sua propria dallo stesso Tuthaliya I, in quanto suo figlio adottivo." This also must remain a possibility, though I am not sure how exactly one would restore the lines in order to yield a sensible rendition of de Martino's suggestion. It should also be noted that seeing these first lines of KBo 50.4 as providing an extended genealogy for Ašmu-Nikkal, though not to be excluded *a priori*, would be unique, as no Hittite queen is otherwise provided with any more geneological information than her parentage.

An alternative restoration, however, seems no less likely. One need only restore *Ù* rather than *ŠA* at the beginning of line 3, which would result in the text having being dictated by Arnuwanda, his queen Ašmu-Nikkal, and their son and coregent Tutḫaliya III, i.e.:

1 [*UM-MA TA.BA.AR.N*]*A* ⌜m*AR.NU.WA.AN*⌝.*T*[*A* LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG ᶠ*AŠ.MU.NI.KAL*]
2 [MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU.MUN]US *ŠA* ᵐ*DU.UT.ḪA.LI.IA* L[UGAL.GAL UR.SAG]
3 [*Ù* ᵐ*DU.U*]*T.ḪA.LI.IA* LUGAL.GAL UR.SA[G]

1 [Thus (speak) the *tabarn*]*a*, Arnuwand[a, great king, hero, Ašmu-Nikkal,]
2 [great queen, daugh]ter of Tutḫaliya, [great] k[ing, hero,]
3 [and Tu]tḫaliya, great king, her[o].

Though Tutḫaliya III is thus far not otherwise unequivocally attested as ruling contemporaneously with his parents Arnuwanda and Ašmu-Nikkal, for a number of reasons understanding these three lines as the first such potential attestation need not surprise. First, seeing Tutḫaliya of line 3 as a son of rather than an ancestor of the issuing royal couple recalls texts such as CTH 260 (Miller 2013: 194-205), in which several town commanders swear their allegiance to the same threesome, though in that text Tutḫaliya is clearly designated as crown prince (*tuḫukanti*), not coregent. KBo 50.4 would thus have been created at some later date than CTH 260. Second, a connection can plausibly, though not securely, be made with CTH 271.C, a woefully fragmentary loyalty oath imposed upon the Hittite court, according to some, but not all, by Arnuwanda and Ašmu-Nikkal on the occasion of the installation of their son Tutḫaliya III as king (Miller 2013: 155, 164-167, 354, n. 84). Third, as is well known, Arnuwanda himself is clearly attested alongside

his own father, Tutḫaliya I, as coregent (CTH 143), so that, even if one might not wish to speak of a late Middle Hittite tradition, Arnuwanda was certainly familiar with the institution of coregency, and therefore might have found it an expedient measure with regard to the reign of his own son, Tutḫaliya III.

This suggested restoration and its interpretation must, of course, remain tentative until it can be confirmed or refuted on the basis of unequivocal evidence. It should be clear, however, that employing the first lines of KBo 50.4 as support for a Tutḫaliya I (son of Kantuzzili) who would have reigned before a Tutḫaliya II (spouse of Nikkal-madi), as Taracha does – not to mention his additional insertion, yet again, of a Ḫattusili II between them – is far from self-evident.

Bibliography

DE MARTINO, S. 2016. Da Kussara a Karkemish, storia del regno ittita (Laboratorio di Vicino Oriente antico 1), Firenze.
GRODDEK, D. 2008. Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KBo 50 (DBH 28). Wiesbaden.
MILLER, J.L. 2013. Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts (SBL WAW 31), Atlanta.
SOYSAL, O. 2005. Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts, ZA 95, 121-144.
TARACHA, P. 2014. Tudhaliya I Redivivus, in: Taracha P. (ed.), Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, September 5–9, 2011, Warsaw, 956-963.

Jared L. MILLER <jared.miller@lmu.de>
LMU München, Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1, 80539 München (GERMANY)

92) On some Central Anatolian Neo-Hittite ruler names with *Šarruma* — According to the *communis opinio*, the names Wassurme and Sandasarme of Neo-Hittite rulers (mentioned between 738-730/729 in Tabal and in 648/645 in Cilicia, resp.) preserved in Neo-Assyrian transmission are theophoric names based on the name of the god Šarruma.[1)] Although the theonym and the rulers' names are formally obviously not identical, the popularity of this view is probably not independent of the fact that those who denied the connection referred at best only to the linguistically and geographically different origin of the names, which is obviously not decisive.[2)] The god Šarruma is well attested in Tabal (see ACLT s.v.) and his name was indeed used in personal names in this region (most notably the Great King Wasu-*SARMA*, for a full list of names with Šarruma in the Iron Age [all written logographically] see Adiego 2019: 154 with refs.); thus, there is no theoretical problem with the traditional explanation. Nevertheless, while his name is mostly written logographically, precisely in Tabal it is attested in syllabic spelling, too, as (DEUS)*sa*$_5$+*ra*/*i-ru-ma-sá* (ÇİFTLİK §6 and §10).[3)] Thus, the above quoted names do not reflect Šarruma's name regularly: in Sandasarme, an [u] is missing and in Wassurme, an entire syllable [sa] is also missing (its first member is based on the Luwian word *wāšu-* 'good', the geminate sibilant has Neo-Assyrian reasons, cf. Simon 2018: 127 s.v. Mut(t)alli/u).[4)] Any connection of these names with the theonym Šarruma should obviously explain these differences. Very few scholars have addressed this problem, however: Simon 2018: 127 cautiously entertained a Luwian sound law for the missing [u] (but see below) and Adiego 2019: 155 claimed that "it is impossible to determine whether the contraction already took place in Luwian or whether it is the result of an adaptation to Akkadian". In other words, the widespread assumption of the identity of these names has not yet been proved. Setting aside that we are dealing with syncope and not contraction (if these names are connected at all), there are basically two possible ways in order to save this proposed connection: the assumption of a Neo-Assyrian distortion or a Luwian sound law. A Neo-Assyrian distortion is implausible: although such a distortion can never be excluded, the Neo-Assyrian renderings of Luwian royal names were basically correct (Simon 2018: 123-124, 127-129),[5)] and there is no phonotactic or analogical reason for these specific changes. Moreover, the assumption of distortion requires that the Assyrians consistently rendered the same name in numerous occasions in two different regions with a separation of c. 80 years with the same distortions, which is hardly believable. A Luwian sound law can be safely excluded in case of the disappearance of the entire syllable [sa], and in the case of a missing [u] it is contradicted by the verb *zarumata-* 'to erect' precisely from Tabal (KULULU 2 §4) showing an [u] in the same positon. KULULU 2, a funerary stele, is dated to the mid-8th century (Hawkins 2000: 488), i.e. to the same period as Wassurme (ÇİFTLİK, a building inscription, is also dated to the mid-8th c. [Hawkins 2000: 448], but this depends on the dating of Great King Wasu-*SARMA*, which is problematic; see below).