Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient
Band 31

Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient

Herausgegeben von

Dominik Bonatz
Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum
und
Jörg Klinger

Sprachwissenschaftliche und kulturhistorische Reflexionen

Festschrift zu Ehren von Jörg Klinger

herausgegeben von
Rainer M. Czichon, Sebastian Fischer und Tomoki Kitazumi

PeWe-Verlag

2026

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

© PeWe-Verlag – Gladbeck 2026

Alle Rechte, insbesondere das Recht der Vervielfältigung und Verbreitung sowie der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Kein Teil des Werkes darf in irgendeiner Form durch Fotokopie, Mikrofilm usw. ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages reproduziert oder unter Verwendung elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.
Wir behalten uns die Nutzung unserer Inhalte für Text und Data Mining im Sinne von § 44b UrhG ausdrücklich vor.
Bei Fragen zur Produktsicherheit wenden Sie sich bitte an info@pewe-verlag.de.

Layout und Prepress: PeWe-Verlag, Gladbeck
Umschlaggestaltung: PeWe-Verlag, Gladbeck
Umschlagabbildung: Luftbild der Ausgrabungen am nordanatolischen Oymaağaç Höyük in der hethitischen Kultstadt Nerik © Nerikarchiv

Druck und Verarbeitung: Rudolph Druck, Schweinfurt
Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier

Printed in Germany

ISBN: 978-3-935012-73-7



© Nerikarchiv

Inhalt

Vorwort 11

Veröffentlichungen von Jörg Klinger 17

Metin Alparslan und Meltem Doğan-Alparslan
Einige Überlegungen zu dem *tawinia*-Tor von Hattuša 31

Alfonso Archi
Silver as Money – Silver and Gold as Sign of Prestige. The Evidence from Ebla 37

Ana Arroyo
The Constructors of Hittite Hydraulic Structures and Their Labour Organization 53

Johannes Bach
KAR 130+131: A Prayer to Aššur-Enlil about the Suffering People 81

Gary Beckman
Gilgamesh on the Edge 99

Kaira Boddy
The Star Omens of *Šumma ālu* 115

James M. Burgin
Town and Country in Telipinu's Anatolia. New Results from the Akkadian Version of the Telipinu Proclamation 137

Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum
Schreiber und administrative Schriftlichkeit im mittelassyrischen Reich 159

Birgit Christiansen
Die Sorge um Nerik und den geliebten Sohn. Die hethitische Außen- und Innenpolitik in der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel des Orakelberichts KUB 5.1+ 171

Yoram Cohen
The Substitute King Ritual in Assyria and in Hatti 199

Rocío Da Riva
Reflections on the Beginnings of the Chaldean Empire 223

Stefano de Martino
The Hittite Princess Muwatti and her Seals 239

Sophie Démare-Lafont
Carchemish and Emar: An Example of Softpower? 245

Aron Dornauer
MARV 3,19 und die hethitisch-assyrischen Beziehungen der Salmanassar-Zeit 257

Sebastian Fischer
Zur Übersetzung der hurritischen Wurzel *tid-* 273

N. İlgi Gerçek
Thinking of (Hittite) Kings 283

Thomas L. Gertzen
Der Tontafelfund von Amarna. Historische Reflexionen zu Textkultur und Königtum 293

Shai Gordin
The Shape of Writing: Morphometric Approaches to Cuneiform Transmission at Ḫattuša and Beyond 311

Suzanne Herbordt
Hittite Kingship and Governance as Reflected in the Royal Seals and Sealing Practices in the Hittite Capital of Hattusa 333

Jochem Kahl
śḫr – ein ägyptisches Wort für „Governance“ 355

Tomoki Kitazumi
Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften … oder doch? Philologische Betrachtungen zur Kombination LU_2 ^{URU}(Ortsname) in alt-hethitischen Texten 373

Jürgen Lorenz und Elisabeth Rieken
Ein Kultinventar aus Kayalıpınar (Kp 15/45a) 387

Federico Manuelli
A Myth on Stage? Illuyanka at Iron Age Arslantepe 399

Massimiliano Marazzi
Die gemalte Hieroglypheninschrift C von Yerkapı 411

Dirk Paul Mielke und Pavol Hnila
Rituelle Deponierungen und kultische Entsorgungen in Nerik/Oymaağaç Höyük 427

Jared L. Miller
'Examine that Treaty of Kummaḫa that Lies before Assur!'. A Letter from a Hittite King to His Assyrian Counterpart (KBo 18.28++) 457

Cosima Möller
Das demokratische Element in der römischen *res publica* – Geschichte und Struktur, Gesetzesverständnis bei den Fachjuristen und Staatstheorie bei Cicero 483

Marta Pallavidini
Parnašše(y)a šuwa(y)ezzi: Ein möglicher Fortschritt bei der Deutung einer noch rätselhaften Formel 505

Andreas Schachner
Erich Schäffer in Boğazköy. Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Geschichte der frühen Erforschung der hethitischen Hauptstadt Ḫattuša 531

Jürgen Seeher und Handan Üstündağ
‚Skull Cult' at Ḫattuša? Hittite Burial Customs Revisited 553

Theo van den Hout
Who Helped Mursili II Against Arzawa? Some Brief Philological Notes on a Passage in His Extensive Annals 569

Šárka Velhartická
Die Boğazköy-Tafeln und die Universität Wien in der Korrespondenz von Alois Musil und Bedřich Hrozný 577

Susanne Voss
Die Hintergründe für die Wiederaufnahme der Boğazköy-Grabung von 1931 unter Kurt Bittel und der Zeitgeist 613

Felix Wiedemann
Hethiter und Armenier. Felix von Luschan und die biohistorische Kartierung Vorderasiens am Vorabend des Völkermords 635

Lisa Wilhelmi
The Role of the Akkadian Language in the Nascent Administration at Ḫattuša: Considerations on the Beginnings of Hittite Written Tradition 657

'Examine that Treaty of Kummaḫa that Lies before Assur!'

A Letter from a Hittite King to His Assyrian Counterpart (KBo 18.28++)

Jared L. Miller
LMU München

Introduction

Four fragments (580/u+596/u+598/u+1240/u) of the letter presented here were published in 1971 as KBo 18.28 by H.G. Güterbock, who noted in the Inhaltsübersicht (p. V) that the letter was 'anscheinend an einen Vasallen (ÌR-*IA*) gerichtet.'[1] A. Hagenbuchner (1989b: 406–415) then provided a first transliteration, translation and commentary of KBo 18.28 in her pioneering treatment of the Hittite letter corpus. At some point thereafter C. Kühne, who had previously joined 596/u+598/u to 580/u+1240/u, noted that 1014/u might belong to the same tablet.[2] While Hagenbuchner (1989b: 409) assumed that the letter would have been written by one subordinate king to another,[3] Mora and Giorgieri (2004: 96, n. 57) followed

[1] Bibliographical abbreviations used here can be found in The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (CHD), also available online at https://oi.uchicago.edu/research/publications/hittite-dictionary-oriental-institute-university-chicago-chd. For signs and conventions employed, see Miller 2013, xv-xvi. The photographs referred to are those available on the Hethitologie Portal Mainz at https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrage.php. I am indebted to Boris Alexandrov and Craig Melchert, who generously read and commented on an initial draft of this paper. The more concrete or substantive of their suggestions I have noted specifically where appropriate.

[2] According to an undated file card in the archives at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, and mentioned by Otten (1980/83). Cf. Neu (1968: 66, n. 2), Güterbock (KBo 18, p. V, sub Nr. 28).

[3] In this she was followed, e.g., by Hutter (1992: 225, n. 34); Houwink ten Cate (2007: 193); Christiansen (2012: 80).

Güterbock in suggesting that the sender must have been the Hittite Great King, but assumed that it would have been addressed to a vassal,[4] so that they did not include it in their corpus of correspondence between the Hittite and the Assyrian kings.

After first joining Bo 3626 (now CHDS 7.197, *non vidi*) to 1014/u (now KBo 50.73), and thereafter these two fragments to KBo 18.28, I published first a partial and then a full transliteration of the resulting text in my Joins and Duplicates series (Miller 2007b: 127; 2008: 121–124). In the latter (2008; 121, n. 27) I suggested that the missive should probably be seen as a letter from a Hittite Great King to his Assyrian counterpart. Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009) then published a paper ostensibly treating the letter's use of the Hittite term *āssweni*, but in fact providing a thorough treatment of obv. i 4'-12' and numerous philological and historical aspects of the text, which they also regarded as belonging to the Hittite-Assyrian royal correspondence.[5] Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2011) subsequently expanded their discussion in a further communication. Alexandrov (2010) also published a Russian translation of the text in addition to repeatedly utilizing its contents in several papers treating the history of the period.

More recently I discovered that KBo 50.126 (1306/u) also directly joins these fragments, and since this piece provides further geographical information regarding the conflict continually referred to in the letter as well as confirmation of the Assyrian addressee (obv. i 19'), it seems that the presentation of a full edition, notwithstanding countless significant difficulties,[6] is warranted.

It is a pleasure to dedicate this paper to Jörg Klinger, my friend and colleague since those days many years ago in Würzburg, where I was beginning my PhD and he was finishing his Habilitation.

Transliteration (KBo 18.28+KBo 50.73+KBo 50.126+CHDS 7.197)

Obv. I[7]

1']ʳ*ma-a-an-ma* LUGAL LUGAL$^{?}$-*aš*$^{?}$ *i-wa-ar ku*$^{?}$ˀ-*i*[*t*$^{?}$-

2' *Ú-UL*$^{(?)}$ *ku-i*]*t-ki* ME-*un tu-uk-ma-kán kat-t*[*a*

3' *A-NA D*]*I-NI* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *a-ra-an-ta-* [*ru*

[4] Similarly, e.g., Liverani (1990: 70); d'Alfonso (2005: 50); CHD L-N, 66a, 'Hittite king to a subordinate.' Of course, the letter, found in Ḫattusa and drawn up in Hittite, must be considered a draft and/or an archival copy.

[5] Followed also by Yamada (2011: 207–209). Hagenbuchner-Dresel (2010: 159 and n. 32, 161 and n. 52) notes the suggestion that the letter would be from a great king to a great king, but assumes again that the letter is from one vassal king to another.

[6] Indeed, the translation and analysis of nearly every line must be regarded as tentative. The only lines that are fully or nearly enough preserved to be somewhat confidently reconstructed are obv. i 6'-12', but even these present significant interpretive difficulties. Especially obv. i 8'-12', 28'-34' and 35'-43' are devilishly difficult, as they are, in addition to being more or less fragmentary, full of quoted dialogue, figures of speech, rhetorical questions and emotionally charged language.

[7] In KBo 18 Güterbock provided the Vs. of the four fragments published there as Nr. 28 with the

4’]x-*la ku-i*[*ṭ*ᵃ *e*]-*eš-ša-at-ti* ZI-*KA* NÍ.TE-*KA- i*[*a*]
5’]x GIM-*an ni-eš-ke-ši* [*z*]*i-ik-ma-at-kán ar-ḫa* ME-*ši*
6’ [-*za*ᵃ*-k*]*án am-mu-uk ḫa-an-ta-*ʳ*an*ˀ*-ti* UN-*ši zi-ik-ke- ši*
7’ [*nu a*]*-pád-da-ia* DINGIR^{MEŠ} [ ] *uš-kán- du*

8’ [*kiš*ᵉ]*-an-pát ku-it* DU$_{11}$-*ši a-aš-šu-e-ni-m*[*a*ᵃ*-a*]*n*ᵃ*-*ˌ*wa*ˌ*-kán* ʳ*ma*ᵃˀ*-an TUP-PU MA-MIT* DÙ-*u-e-ni*
9’ [*nu*] *te-ek-ri-in ku-in te-ek-ri-i*[*š*ᵉ*-ke*ᵉ*-z*]*i* 𒄑 *pa-la-wi*$_5$*-ti-wa ku-it*
10’ [GIŠ]B]AN SUD-*ši* DAB-*ši-ia-wa a-pa-a-at t*[*e*ᵉ*-eš*ᵉ] ˹*I*˺*-NA* URU*kum-ma-ḫi ku-it TUP-PU*
11’ [*MA*]*-MIT* IGI-*zi* DÙ-*u-en nu-za a-pa-a-at-pát* [*TUP-PU*$^{(?)}$ *p*]*é-ra-an* GAM *ti-i-ia*
12’ [*na-a*]*t-kán* GAM *a-ú a-pé-e-ta-aš-pát* U[*L*ᵃ *ku-i*]*t wa-aš-ta-*ˌ*aš*ᵉ˺

13’ [*A-NA PA*]*-NI* DUMU KIN-*IA ku-wa-pí kat-ta g*[*e/i- -k*]*e-e*[*t*]x[
14’]*-ta TUP-PU MA-MIT* ˹*ku-it*˺ *AD-DIN* ʳAˀ[
15’ IN]IM^{MEŠ} *e-eš-ta ku-*ʳ*wa-pí*ˀ*-at a-pé-e A-WA-*[*TE*^{MEŠ}

16’]SAG.DU-*i ka-a-aš* INIM-*aš* DÙ-*an-za e-eš-ta* [
17’ *t*]*i-ia-u-e-ni ma-a-an-wa* URU-*LU*$_4$ *ku-iš-ki ku-*ʳ*e*ᵃˀ*-*[*da-ni-ik-ki*$^{(?)}$]
18’]*ú-e-te-ez-zi na-aš-ma-wa* NUMUN$^{ḪI.A}$ *ku-iš-ki* [*a-ni-ia-az-zi*$^{(?)}$]
19’ *TU*]*P-PU Ú-UL PA-NI* ^{d}*aš-šur* GAR-*ri zi-ik-m*[*a*
20’ EGIR-*p*]*a a-ar-ḫu-un zi-ik-ma* URU*tù-ut-t*[*ù-*
21’]x-*ia pa-*ˌ*ra*ˌ*-a* DU$_{11}$-*un* UN-*aš-*ˌ*wa*ˌ*-kán* ˌ*ma*ˌ-[
22’]x *ki-*[*nu*ᵃ*-n*]*a*ᵃ *kiš-an* AQ-*BI wa-aš-ta-*[*aš-wa ...*ᵃ]

23’$^{(1')}$ [*am-m*]*u-uk-ma-at-ta Ú-*[*UL ku-it-k*]*i* Ḫ*UL-un* URU*a-ra-*[*ši-ga-an-ma*? *Ú-UL*$^{(?)}$ … *-tta*ᵃ]^{8}
24’$^{(2')}$ [UR]U*na-at-ki-na-an* K[Áᵃ.GAL$^{ḪI.A(?)}$] ˹*Ú-UL*˺ *kar-aš-ta am-me-e*[*l-la-* …]
25’$^{(3')}$ [lᵃ*-š*]*Úᵃ Ú-UL ú-wa-te-et n*[*u* ^{d}]ʳUTU-*ŠI*ˀ *kiš-an nam-ma* ʳDU$_{11}$ˀ*-u*[*n a-pé-e-wa*$^{(?)}$ URU$^{DIDLI.ḪI.A(?)}$]
26’$^{(4')}$ [*t*]*a-la-aḫ-ḫi nu-ut-ta* U[RU*a*]-ˌ*ra*ˌ*-ši-ga-an* URU*na-at-ki-n*[*a-an-na* …ᵃ]
27’$^{(5')}$ [SIL]IM-*li pa-ra-a* [ ] *pé-eḫ-ḫu-* [*un*]

28’$^{(6')}$ [*z*]*i-ik-ma-mu A-NA P*[*A-N*]*I* DUMU KIN-*IA ḫur-za-ke-et nu ku-*[
29’$^{(7')}$ [*n*]*u kiš-an TÁQ-BI* ^{d}LIŠ-*w*[*a*] ʳ*ša*ˀ*-ak-du ma-a-an-wa-mu-za-kán z*[*i-ik*ᵃ
30’$^{(8')}$ [*an*]*-da nu-ut-ta QA-TAM-*ˌ*MA*ˌ*-pát* PAP-*du* ^{d}LIŠ *ma-a-an-za* SAḪAR *ḫ*[*al-z*° …

comment ‘unter der Mitte’, the Rs. with ‘über der Mitte’. Thus, with the further joins as now extant, we have roughly ⅔ of the middle of obv. i and, since the rev. of 1014/u is entirely, the rev. of Bo 3626 mostly lost, only ca. ⅙ of the rev. iv in its upper half. Some 10 lines are missing between obv. i 1’ and the top of the fragment, i.e. 1014/u, which seems to reach the top of the tablet, or nearly so. The original tablet must have included at least some 60+ lines in each of cols. i-iii and at least some 30+ in col. iv.

8 For ease of reference, beginning here I have provided in parentheses the numbering of KBo 18.28 Vs. I from before the new joins.

31’(9’) [*ku*]-*it-ki ḫur-da-uš* [*a*]*n-da* ZI-*at-ta dam-pu-pa-tar l*[*e*ʾ-*e*ʾ
32’(10’) [LU]GAL *e-šu-un* dUTU-[*u*]*š-kán* **ku-e**-*ez* GUB-*ri* dUTU-*uš-kán* [
33’(11’) [DING]IR-*LU*$_4$-*mu ku-e* KUR.KU[R^{M}]^{EŠ} *pí-iš-ta* 2-*an ta-pa-ra-an-za*~[
34’(12’) [2-*a*]*n ta-pa-ra-an-*[*t*]*a-an-ma-an-za* SAḪAR *ḫal-za-a-* [*išʾ*]

35’(13’) *kuʾ*]-˹*e*˺-*da-ni A-NA* LÚKÚR ÌR-*IA* IGI-*an-da p*[*a-a-un*(?) *na-an*(?)
36’(14’) *ku-it-m*]*aʾ-an*(?) *na-wi*$_5$ *ku-e-nu-un* ÌR-*IA-za* SAḪAR […ʾ *ḫal-z*° …ʾ]
37’(15’) *k*]*uʾ-in* LUGAL.GAL SAḪAR *ḫal-za-a-iš* dUTU-*ŠI-m*[*a-mu-za*
38’(16’) *ḫal-zi-iš-ša*]-˹*a*˺-*i* LUGAL-*mu-za ḫal-zi-iš-ša-a-i nu-m*[*uʾ-za*
39’(17’) *ḫal-zi-iš-ša*]-˹*a*˺-*i* SAḪAR-*aš-za na-aš-ta* UD *DI-NI DI-*ʻ*NU*ʼ[
40’(18’) *-m*]*u-za* d10 SAḪAR *Ú-UL ḫal-zi-iš-š*[*a-a-i*
41’(19’) dUTU U]^{RU}*A.RI.IN.NA ke-e-da-*˹*ni*˺ [*DI-NI*(?)
42’(20’) *Úʾ-U*]*Lʾ* SAḪAR *ḫal-za-a-iš Ú-*˹*UL*˺*-m*[*aʾ*~
43’(21’) *-m*]*a-mu-za* SAḪAR *ḫal-za-i*[*tʾ*- *taʾ*]

Rev. IV

1’]x ʻAʼ[
2’ í]Dʾ UG[U
3’ *n*]*am-ma u-i-*ʻ*eš-ke*ʼ-[

4’ *-m*]*uʾ za-at-ta-an* UGU U[*L*
5’ *-m*]*u ḫur-za-ke-ši PA-NI* MUNUS^{MEŠ}[
6’]*tar-uḫ-mi* LÚ*ṬE*$_4$*-MU-ma-at-t*[*a*
7’ [EGI]R-ʻ*pa* ḪULʼ-*a*[*n-ni* U]GU *na-at-ta u-i-ia-nu-un* [
8’ [*z*]*i-ik-mu* LÚ*ṬE*$_4$-[*M*]*U Ú-UL u-i-ia-at up-pé-eš-ša*[*r-ra Ú-UL*]
9’ [*u*]*p-pí-iš-ta am-mu-*ʻ*uk*ʼ*-ma-an-du-za ku-it-pát* SAG.KI-[*i ti-ia-mi*(?)]
10’ ZAG-*na-ta pa-aḫ-ši* DI ˹DINGIR˺-*LÌ UL-ma-at-ta* ZAG-*na w*[*a-*
11’ dUTU-*ŠI-ma-***du**^{9}*-za Ú-UL* LÚKÚR *X* *up-pé-eš-šar-ra-za tu-*[*el*(?) ME-*un*]
12’ *zi-ik-ma-za am-me-el Ú-*˹*UL*˺ *ta-at-ta* [Øʾ]

13’ *TUP-PU MA-MIT-ma-mu ku-it* TÀŠ-ʻ*PUR*ʼ *TUP-PU* **MA***-MIT-wa-mu ar-ḫa* [*pé-eš-ši-ia-at*(?)]
14’ *nu zi-ik wa-aš-ta-aš nu-kán A-NA TUP-PÍ MA-MIT ku-it* DÙ-*an* [*e-eš-ta*(?)]
15’ *nu* URU$^{DIDLI.ḪI.A}$ ˹*zi*˺-*ik ú-e-*˹*da*˺-*aš ki-nu-na* {NA} **ú-e***-tu*$_4$*-ma-a*[*n-zi* EGIR-*pa*(?)]
16’ *i-ia-at-t*[*a-t*]*i nu wa-aš-t*[*a*]-*aš zi-ik MA-MIT-ia-kán z*[*iʾ-ikʾ šar-ra-aš*(?)]
17’ ˹*am*˺-*mu-uk-*˹*ma ú-i-tu*$_4$-*ma*˺-*a*[*n-z*]*i* ˹EGIR˺-*an zi-ik-*˹*ke*˺-*š*[*i …*ʾ]
18’ [*TU*]*P-*˹*PU MA*˺-*M*[*IT I-NA*] ˹*É*˺.DINGIR-*LÌ* ˹GAR-*ri*˺[
(ca. 5 lines missing)

[9] Written over *-mu-*.

24'']ʳÚ'-U[L
25'' -*i*]*a-mu* [
26'']-*du ma-a-a*[*n*
27'' SA]G$^{?}$ *t*[*u*$^{?}$-
28'']ˌÚ$^{?}$ˌ-UL-*aš*$^{?}$-*ma*$^{?}$-*a*[*š*$^{?}$

Translation

Obv. I

1'-3' (1')[…] But if/when a king […] like *a king bec*[*ause/som*[*ething* …] (2')[…] I took [*noth-ing*] at all, but you dow[n/wit[h …] (3')[… at the *leg*]*al case* may the gods be present!

4'-7' (4')[…] *which/since* you achieve, your soul an[d] your body (5')you keep *turning* like […], but you yourself take them away. (6')[…] you are undertaking […] against me, an upright man. (7')May the gods observe (all) this, too!

8'-12' (8')Why do you speak especially [*as follo*]*ws*? 'We ought to reconcile! We ought to draw up a treaty tablet!' — (9'-11')What *reproach* is he *reproaching* (*me with*)!? — 'Why are you drawing the bow *to the full* and holding (it)?!' That (*is what*) [*you said*]! The first treaty tablet that we made in Kummaḫa, put that very [*tablet*] down before yourself (12')[and] examine [i]t! Have you *n*[*ot*] violated those very (terms) [in any w]ay?

13'-15' (13')When [*in the presen*]*ce* of my messenger h[e …-e]d down, […] (14')[…] the treaty tablet *which* I gave *to you* […] (15')[… *the wo*]*rds* were, *when* those wor[ds …].

16'-22' (16')[…] *personally* this matter was done: '[…] (17'-18')[…] we are placing: If someone for-tifies […] a town [*against*] *any*[*one* …] or someone [*sows*] seeds,' (19')[… is the tabl]et not lying before Assur? You, thou[gh, …] (20')[…] I stood [*behi*]*nd*, but you […] the city of Tutt[ul]. (21') […] I declared: 'A man […].' (22')*B*[*ut no*]*w* I have said: '[*You*] violated (the terms)!'

23'-27' (23')But I [mys]elf did you n[o] evil [whatsoeve]r. [*Did you*, *though*, *not* …] the town of Ara[siga]? (24'f.)Did *you* not *breach the g*[*ates*] *of* the [to]wn of Natkina? [*And*] not [*on*]*ce* did you bring my […]. Moreover I, My Majesty, spo[ke] thus: '[*Those towns*] (26')I will leave in peace.' And the to[wn of A]rasiga [and] the town of Natkin[a …$^{?}$] (27')I [ami]ably handed over to you.

28'-34' (28')You, though, kept cursing me in the presence of my messenger, and […], (29'-30')and you spoke thus: 'May Ištar know! If you *yo*[*urself*] (are) [i]n my […], may she, Ištar, protect you just the same way!' If […] *c*[*alled*] (someone) dirt, (31')then curses (are) somehow [*inv*]*olved*; *your* soul *sh*[*ould not* …] crudeness, […$^{?}$] (32')I was king! On whose (side) does the sun-deity stand? The sun-deity […]. (33')The lands which the deity gave me, […] a second rank ruler? (34') A [seco]nd rank ruler [*she*] might (well) [*have*] call[ed] dirt!

35'-43' (35')[…] against [*wh*]*ich* enemy, my vassal, [*I*] *w*[*ent* …] (36')[… *as lon*]*g as* I had not yet vanquished [*him*], my vassal [… *calls/called* …] dirt. […] (37'-39')[… *wh*]*ich* great king he called dirt. Bu[t …] does he [call me …] My Majesty? Does he call me king? [… does] he [cal]l *m*[*e*]? You're dirt! So (*on*) the day of the (divine) court case, the (divine) court case […] (40')[…] the

Storm-god [*will*] not call [m]e dirt! […] (41')[… the Sun-goddess] of Arinna in this [*court case* …] (42')s/he [… *did no*]*t* call […] dirt, *b*[*ut*] not […] (43')[… b]ut [*you*] call[ed] me dirt!

Rev. IV

1'-3' […] (2')[…] ov[er]/o[n] the [*ri*]*ver* […] (3')[…] further send […]

4'-12' (4')[…] no[t … *m*]*e* about *this* […] (5')[…] you keep cursing [m]e. In the presence of women […] (6'-7')[…] I will prevail. But I did not send a messenger [bac]k to you […] in bad faith. (8'-9')You yourself did not send me a messenger, [and] you sent [no] gift. And since I myself might *confr*[*ont*] you, (10')defend well the divine legal case against you, though *it* (will) not (be) a favourable […] *for you*. (11')But I, My Majesty, am not your enemy! I [accepted] *yo*[*ur*] gift, (12')but you did not accept mine!

13'-18' (13')The treaty tablet, though, about which you wrote to me (saying), '[*You have thrown*] out the treaty tablet relating to me!' (14')You are the one who violated (it)! Contrary to what [*was*] stipulated on the treaty tablet, (15')you yourself have fortified towns. Now, though, you are proceeding to fortify (towns) [*once again*]. (16')So it was you who violated (it), and it was *yo*[*u yourself who abrogated*] the oath. (17')But you *keep accusing* me of fortifying (towns). (18')The trea[ty ta]blet […] lies [in] the temple […].

(ca. 5 lines missing)

24''-28'' (24'')[…] no[t …] (25'')[… a]nd (to/for) me […] (26'')[…] should/must […], if/when […] (27'')[…] (28'')[…] not (*to/for*) *them* […]

Philological Commentary

Obv. I

1': I also considered ˹LUGAL.GAL˺*-aš i-wa-ar*˺, 'like a great king', which should perhaps not be excluded, but the trace following ˹*ma-a-an-ma* LUGAL˺ suggests a diagonal rather than a horizontal, and comparison with LUGAL.GAL in i 37' does not favour the reading. The ˹*ku*˺-*i*[*t*˺ ~ at the end of the line is quite uncertain, and could just as well be ˹*ku*˺-*i*[*t*˺-*ki* or something else entirely.

3': (1) At first glance one might read]*PA-NI* at the beginning of the line, but the clear initial vertical as well as comparison with DI in i 27' and iv 10' and with KA in i 4' (and *passim*) suggest that one should read either *D*]*I-NI* or IN]IM-*ni*. The DI ˹DINGIR˺-*LÌ* in iv 10' might favour the former. If one opts for *D*]*I-NI*, then one might assume either *A-NA D*]*I-NI* or *A-NA A-ŠAR D*]*I-NI*, 'the gods are present [for a le]gal case' or 'the gods are present [at the venue of a le]gal case.' For the latter one might compare *A-ŠAR DI-NI* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ku-e-*[*da-ni*] ˹*pé*˺-[*di t*]*u-*[*l*]*i-ia* [*t*]*i-iš-kán-zi* in KUB 31.121++ i¦ 21'-22', 'the place of the court case, the pla[ce] in wh[ich] the gods gather in [as]sem[bl]y.' If one opts for IN]IM-*ni*, then perhaps *ke-e-da-ni* IN]IM-*ni*, 'the gods are present in [this mat]ter.' (2) That *-ru* should probably be restored at the end of the line is suggested by the scribe's tendency to place the last sign of a word toward

the end of the line, as in obv. i 6', 7', 12', 27' and 34', by the parallel with *uskandu* in 7' (as pointed out to me by Craig Melchert, email of 19 Dec. 2025), and by the *-ia* in the same line.

4'-13': It should be noted here, since it affects these lines, that the physical join between Bo 3626 and 1014/u, as can be seen on the photos, is somewhat askew. 1014/u must be rotated slightly in a counter clockwise direction vis-à-vis Bo 3626.

4': The *apaš*]*ila*(?) suggested by R. Francia (in Alexandrov/Sideltsev 2009: 60, n. 4) seems to be excluded by the traces, as there is a vertical directly before the *-la* and seemingly a horizontal approaching and just cutting through it, suggesting something like an A]N and ruling out a *š*]*i-*. Neither do the traces seem to favour *-e*]*l-la* (i.e. *tuell=a*, *ammell=a* or *apell=a*); cf. EL in rev. 12'. Nor do they allow *iš-ḫi-ú-u*]*l-la*, but *iš-ḫi*]-˹*ú*˺*-la* might be a possibility if it turns out that the seeming horizontal is but a scratch, yielding '[…] but the [treat]ies which you achieve'. If one opts to read the *-la* as an *-at*ˡ, then with an exclamation mark, as this scribe does consistently differentiate between the two. Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025) suggests *zi-k*]*i-la*, perhaps even [*ki-nu-na zi-k*]*i-la*, '[But, now], what do you [your]self keep doing?', which would indeed fit the space available quite well, notes, however, that it would leave the antecedent of the *-at* in l. 5' unclear. Also the seeming horizontal of what would be *-k*]*i-* would not compare well with the KI in the following line. In light of the consideration of [kin-*ma-za-k*]*án* for the beginning of 6', perhaps, if one should accept *-k*]*i-*, [kin-*ia-za-kán zi-k*]*i-la* here?

5': (1) I assume we are dealing here with the imperf. *nae/iske-* of *nai-*, though no comparable writing of the initial vowel or vowel sequence is attested (CHD L-N, 349f.; EDHIL 598f.) and though which meaning or nuance is to be understood remains uncertain. (2) I have opted for 'them' here and in 6' rather than the likewise possible 'it' for *-at-* on the assumption that *essatti* in 4' refers to a plural object and that the pronouns resume this object. (3) I find no other attestations of me-*ši*. One could assume an error for me-*ti*, i.e. *datti*, 'you take'. (Maybe the scribe was influenced by the *-ši* endings of *ni-eš-ke-ši* and *zi-ik-ke-ši* — and perhaps also un-*ši* — in these two lines.) Otherwise, one might consider an intrusion of the *-si* ending into the paradigm of *da-*. Alternatively, one might opt for the *-ske-* form of *da-*, *daskesi*, an option which might be strengthened by the string of 2nd sg. pres. *-ssa-* and *-ske-* verbs in 4', 5' and 6'. Of course, ME can be used in Hittite texts for either *da-*, 'to take', or *dai-*, 'to put', but neither of these show the *-si* ending; and *da-* appears often with *arḫa*, while *dai-* does not. If not for the *at-*, 'it/them', in the enclitic chain one might have considered 'you step away', i.e. *arḫa tiyasi*, though ME seems to represent *tiya-* only rarely, if at all.

6': Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025) reminds me that the idiom with *zikke-*, 'to undertake something against someone' (e.g. KUB 21.1++ iii 18-19), consistently takes *-z*, while a direct object may be expressed or be only implicit. While Melchert thus entertained restoring [*nu-za-k*]*án*, this would likely be too short for the available space, while [*na-at-za-k*]*án* would probably be too long. Perhaps [kin-*ma-za-k*]*án*, which would indeed fit the space available rather well, is worth considering, thus '[But] you are undertaking [the works] against me, an upright man.'

8'-12': These lines have been thoroughly analysed by Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009; 2011),[10] so I will limit my comments to a few pertinent points. I would like to provisionally understand these difficult lines as follows: (Hittite king:) 'Why do you (the Assyrian king) speak especially [*as foll*]*ows*? (Assyrian king:) 'We ought to reconcile! We ought to draw up a treaty tablet!' — (Hittite king:) What *reproach* is he (the Assyrian king) *reproaching* (*me with*)!? — (Assyrian king:) 'Why are you drawing the bow *to the full* and holding (it)?!' (Hittite king:) That (*is what*) [*you said*]! The first treaty tablet that we made in Kummaḫa, put that very [*tablet*] down before yourself [and] examine [i]t! Have you n[ot] violated those very (terms) [in any w]ay?!' I take these lines as suggesting that the Assyrian king wants to draft a new treaty, presumably in order to codify gains made since the treaty of Kummaḫa, and that the Hittite king wants to remain with the treaty of Kummaḫa, which presumably codifies an earlier situation more favourable to him.

8': (1) See Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 60, with n. 6) for [*kiš*]-*an-pát*, suggested to them by J. Hazenbos, rather than Groddek's [*ma-a*]-*an-pát* (2008: 64) or my [GIM$^{?}$]-*an-pát* (Miller 2008: 122; followed by Groddek 2011: 40). Since their translation 'in this same way', following CHD, doesn't quite make sense in this context, I have opted for 'Why do you speak especially [*as foll*]*ows*?' (2) In a note to my earlier transliteration (Miller 2008: 122, n. 29) I suggested that *tesi* might stand behind DU$_{11}$-*ši*, which is naturally a possibility. In the light of the discussion above on ME-*ši* in line 5', however, perhaps one should consider *memiskesi* as a further option for DU$_{11}$-*ši*. (3) For likely ˹*ma*$^{?}$˺-*an* rather than Groddek's (2008: 65) ˹ŠU$^{?}$˺-*an*, see Groddek (2011: 40, with n. 22) and Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 60, 76f.; 2011).

9': (1) Few words have provoked as much discussion as *tekri-* and its derivative *tekriske-*. In addition to the literature cited by Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 63–67), cf. now Groddek (2011), Gabolde (2012), Breyer (2013) and Nikolaev (2021). I am neither able nor inclined to add anything to the discussion of the etymology or origins of the word, and I have opted for a translation that reflects what most commentators seem more or less to agree upon, i.e. that it likely connotes a speech act with a negative meaning, such as 'reproach', 'condemn', or the like. Tomoki Kitazumi (email of 29 Jan. 2026) kindly informs me that a further attestation of *te-ek-ri-*[can now be found in the Ortaköy tablet Or. 98/3 r. col. 2' (now available at https://sapinuwatablets.org/transliterations), unfortunately in a fragment with little further context. (2) Francia's suggestion (in Alexandrov and Sideltsev 2009: 68, n. 42) of seeing the phrase [*nu*] *tekrin kuin tekri*[*skez*]*i* as external to the quoted speech of the Assyrian king is syntactically and contextually quite attractive and has been adopted here. It would thus be an exclamatory comment of the Hittite king on the Assyrian king's statement. Otherwise it is very difficult to divine who the subject of the sentence might be. (3) Whatever its precise etymology and literal meaning (Alexandrov/Sideltsev 2009: 66–68), I assume that the

[10] One instance of (presumably) *assu-* being used in phrases pertaining to good relations between persons that was overlooked by Alexandrov and Sideltsev is those in KUB 19.15++ iv$^{!}$ 26–28 (Miller 2007a: 534–536).

intention with *palawiti* must be drawing the bow 'to the full', i.e. creating maximum physical (literally) and diplomatic (metaphorically) tension.

10': For four reasons I am now somewhat uncertain about my suggested – and initially seemingly obvious – reading and restoration *a-pa-a-at-w*[*a-kán*] (Miller 2008: 122), followed by Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009; 2011) and others. First, there seems to be ever so slightly too much space between the *-at-* and the wedges of the supposed *-w*[*a-*; second, if one understands *āssuweni=man=wa=kan man* TUPPU MĀMĪT DÙ-*uweni* as two clauses, as one probably should, then the 'make a tablet' clause in 10' would have a *-kan* that the closely parallel clause in 8' does not have; third, there seems to be little reason for *kuit* to occupy the third position in the clause rather than its normal second position; fourth, contextually I have a difficult time seeing this clause as a continuation of the quoted speech of the Assyrian king, and it would seem to make better sense as the beginning of the Hittite king's retort. The best alternative that occurs to me is *t*[*e-eš*] or *t*[*e-ši*], yielding 'That (*is what*) [*you said*]!' or '[*Is*] that (*what*) [*you are saying*]!?' A counterargument might be found in the use of DU_{11} for *te-/tar-* or *mema-/memiske-* in 8', 21' and 25', but it is difficult to know for certain if this outweighs the four arguments for the reassessment. If *t*[*e-eš/ši*] should be rejected, one might consider *k*[*iš-an*], yielding 'That (is) a[s follows],' or 'That (matter is) a[s follows].' Both would fit the traces and available space very nicely, but I find no direct parallels for either.

11': Despite its absence from GrHL², §13.21 and EDHIL, 806 (cf. HEG III, 19), it seems hard to deny that *tīya* here is the 2nd sg. imp. of *dai-*.

12': For U[*L*ʾ, see Miller (2008: 122, n. 31). The *-aš* at the end of the line seems sure enough, and I have added the question mark only because it is placed oddly high in the line, so that one would have thought that further elements of the sign were to be expected beneath the horizontal, allowing an *-ꞌi*, for example. A 3rd sg. pres., however, would be hard to explain.

13': While I (Miller 2008: 122) originally read *kat-ta z*[*i- -k*]*i-i*[*t*, the traces in the newly joined 1306/u force one to read G[I instead. (Indeed, an older, mildly surprising, GI. There are no other GI signs on the tablet with which one could compare.) The only verb that occurs to me that would fit the traces, the spacing and (perhaps) the context would be *g*[*e-nu-ša-re-eš-k*]*e-e*[*t*,[11] yielding 'When he k[neele]d down [befo]re my messenger,' but while enticing and worth mention in the commentary, it seems too uncertain to be restored and translated. The only attestations I find with *katta* are *kat-ta ge-e-nu-uš-ši-*[in KBo 12.33 iii 9' and GAM *ki-nu-uš-ri-i*[*a*ʾ- in KUB 39.61+ ii 4. The only case with the *-ske-* morpheme seems to be that in KBo 15.2++ rev. 12', *gi-nu-uš-ša-re-eš-ke-ez-z*[*i*]. Contextually it would raise the question of who would have knelt down before the Hittite king's (presumably high-ranking)[12] messenger: a Hittite vassal who had been encroaching on Assyrian territories and thus endangering the prevailing détente? And thus signifying his agreement to the terms of the Hittite-Assyrian treaty mentioned in the previous paragraph? Or a (low-ranking) Assyrian delegate? One can

[11] The more common writing with *-uš-ša-* would likely be too long for the available space.

[12] Thus a personage such as the king of Karkamiš?

only speculate, it seems. Alternatively, might one find a way to read/restore the line other than the seemingly obvious [*A-NA PA*]-*NI* so that it would be the messenger who bowed down before, presumably, the Assyrian king?

14': (1) For the beginning of the line, [*nu-ut*]-*ta* would be somewhat short for the available space; [*na-at*]-*ta* would fit quite well but would be rather odd syntactically. For the end of the line one thinks of *A*-[*WA-TE*^{MEŠ}, *A*-[*NA* or *a*-[*pa*-, but there are too many possibilities for speculation to be sensible. (2) Also possible, '[…] *because* I gave you a treaty tablet […].'

15': The traces, it seems, would also allow D]I^{MEŠ} (cf. *D*]*I-NI* in i 3' and *DI-NI* and *DI-NU* in i 39' as well as DI in iv 10'), but DI, as far as I can see, is nowhere attested in the Hittite corpus as DI^{MEŠ}. (The DI.MEŠ in the transliteration given in CHDS 5.33 is clearly a mistake for the INIM^{MEŠ} visible on the photo.)

16'-17': The sense 'personally' (see HW² Ḫ, 355)[13] was suggested to me by Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025), who would also restore [*nu-ut-ta*] before SAG.DU-*i* (which would indeed fit the space nicely) and translate 'This matter was done [for you] personally:' Also placing *tiyaweni* within the quoted clauses from the end of 16' through 18' is his idea.

17': (1) Though formally nom., it is hardly surprising that a Hittite scribe seems to have employed URU-*LU*$_4$ for the object. (2) At the end of the line the traces seem to suggest a sign with two rather than three horizontals, and placed rather high in the line, thus perhaps *ku-*$^{\lceil}$*e*$^{?\rceil}$-[*da-ni*$^{(?)}$ or *ku-*$^{\lceil}$*e*$^{?\rceil}$-[*da-ni-ik-ki*$^{(?)}$ rather than *ku-i*[*t*$^{?}$*-ki*$^{(?)}$. The impression is confirmed by comparison with *ku-it* in i 8' and *ku-e* in i 33'.

18': Presumably something along the lines of [… URU$^{DIDLI.ḪI.A}$] *ú-e-te-ez-zi na-aš-ma-wa* NUMUN$^{ḪI.A}$ *ku-iš-ki* [*a-ni-ia-az-zi*], '$^{(17')}$ … If some town […] $^{(18')}$fortifies [towns] or someone [sows] seeds'. For URU$^{DIDLI.ḪI.A}$ together with *wete-* one can compare iv 15', but the restoration here would leave space for about one further sign at the beginning of the line.

20': Without sufficient context, it is impossible to know what *appa arḫun* here might mean, so I have gone with a literal translation.

21': Without further context it is difficult to know whether 'to speak in addition, continue speaking', 'to pass on, divulge, reveal' (CHD L-N, 262b) or to 'speak forth, pass along' (HED M, 126) might be apt here. I have opted for the English version of the literal 'speak forth'.

22': Based on iv 14' and 16' one might want to add *zi-ik* at the end of the line.

23': One might initially assume that the writing ḪUL-*un* should be an acc. sg. comm. adj. (cf. attestations in HW² I, 283, 294f.). In that case, though, one would either have to assume that it modifies Arasiga or restore a substantive before ḪUL-*un* with which it agrees, neither of which seems promising. One would also have to restore a transitive verb at the end of 23' or assume that the sentence continues to *karsta* in 24', in which case it would be difficult to reconcile the 1st sg. *ammuk* with the 2nd or 3rd sg. *karsta*. It thus seems likely that ḪUL-*un* represents *idalawaḫḫun*, despite the uniquely succinct phonetic complementation. And if so, then the restoration *ú*-[UL *ku-it-k*]*i* obviously suggests itself.

[13] Where, however, all the examples cited are in the abl.

23'-24': One could assume only a single clause from ^{URU}*a-ra-*[*ši-ga-an* …$^{?}$] to *kar-aš-ta*, implying that the scribe neglected to employ the conjunction connecting the two towns, i.e. [^{UR}]^{U}*na-at-ki-na-an-na*, yielding 'The town of Ara[siga …$^{?}$] $^{(24')}$(*and*) the *g*[*ates*] of the town of Natkina he did not breach.' My tentative partial restoration and translation avoids this issue by assuming a further transitive verb at the end of 23', e.g. ^{URU}*a-ra-*[*ši-ga-an-ma* Ú-UL *walḫta/ wetet*], '[Did you, though, not attack/fortify] the town of Ara[siga]?' *vel sim*.

24', 25': Both *karsta* and *uwatet* can be understood either as 2nd or as 3rd sg. pret. forms. I have opted for the 2nd person based on the assumption that the sender is again contrasting his own faultless behaviour with the illicit conduct of his addressee. If one opts for the 3rd person, one could see here a Hittite vassal as the subject, whose behaviour the sender is defending from accusations of impropriety, i.e. 'The town of Ara[siga *my vassal did not* …]; *the g*[*ates*] *of* the [to]wn of Natkina *he* did not breach. Not [*on*]*ce* did *he* bring my […].' The same as accusatory rhetorical questions would also be possible (i.e. '[*Did your vassal not* …] the town of Ara[siga]? Did *he* not breach *the g*[*ates*] of the [to]wn of Natkina? Not [*on*]*ce* did *he* bring my […].'), in which case the subject would probably be an Assyrian vassal who had violated the stipulations of the treaty, presumably encouraged or at least tolerated by the Assyrian king.

24': At first glance the sign following [^{UR}]^{U}*na-at-ki-na-an* would seem to be an obvious UB, so that I read *up-*[in my initial transliteration (Miller 2008: 123). While still a possibility, no word beginning with *up-* occurs to me that might fit the space and the context provided by the ˹Ú-UL˺ *kar-aš-ta* from the new join with 1306/u. As an alternative, a reading K[Á is surely worth considering, and K[Á.GAL$^{ḪI.A}$] would fit the available space quite well. I do not, however, find KÁ or KÁ.GAL associated with *kars-* elsewhere, except in KUB 17.10+KBo 55.8 ii 6", where we find *aska karsta*, unfortunately in a fragmentary passage which precludes determining whether it might constitute a parallel to our passage; one would presumably expect *askan karsta* for 'he breached the gate'. Thus, the suggestion must remain provisional. Alternatively, one might think of 'did you not cut off the g[ates]?' in the sense of laying siege to the town or placing a trade embargo on it. Similarly, as Boris Alexandrov (email of 10 Jan. 2026) points out to me, referring to comparable usage with *parāṣu* (CHD P, 166), one could think of *up-*[*pé-eš-šar*], resulting in 'did you not cut off Natkina from de[liveries]?'

25': (1) For [*n*]*u* at the beginning of the line one would expect to see traces of a horizontal in addition to the visible tail of a wedge, and since the space might be just slightly too long for a mere [*n*]*u* (cf. the similarly broken [*n*]*u* in 29'). I thus suspect that we might have something like [1-*š*]*ú*, [2-*š*]*ú* or, less likely, [1-*pá*]*t*, which might be a bit too long. It would also eliminate the need to assume an entire clause beginning with *amme*[*l-* and ending in the break at the end of 24', with a further clause here. (2) Hagenbuchner's *ḫal-zạ-ạ*[*-iš/t* (similarly, but 2nd sg. pret., in EDHIL, 276: *ḫal-za*[*-a-it-ta*]) can be excluded, whereby it should be noted that Hagenbuchner based her transliteration on the copy in KBo 18.28 and had no recourse to photos. The traces of the first sign are clearly KA, those thereafter are quite amenable to *-u*[*n*.

26': ^{URU}*a-ra-*[*ši-ga-* in 23' from the new join confirms what I assumed (Miller 2008: 123, n. 34) should be ^{U}[^{RU}*a*]-˹*ra*˺*-ši-ga-an* here in 26'.

27': Also possible, with Yamada (2011: 208), would be the restoration of [UL] or [Ú-UL] in the gap following *pa-ra-a*, and thus a negative rhetorical question, 'Did I [not ami]ably hand over to you the to[wn of A]rasiga [and] the town of Natkin[a …]?'

28': (1) As detailed in GrHL², §11.13, the 3rd sg. *-t* ending intrudes into the 2nd sg. pret. slot in the *mi*-conjugation, so that *ḫurzaket* is unproblematic as the 2nd sg. here.[14] One finds, however, some imprecision in the literature: HW² Ḫ, 764b, e.g., books it as a 3rd sg. pret. but translates it (p. 766a) as a 2nd sg. pret. with no further comment. And though GrHL², §11.13, acknowledges the *-t* for the 2nd sg. pret., also listing two *-ske-* verbs, it does not include the ending in the table for the *ske-* verbs, §12.33, which Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025) informs me is simply an oversight. Also in EDHIL, 135f., one finds no indication that the *-t* ending is extant for the 2nd sg. pret. of the *ske-* stems. HED H, 434, in contrast, has '2 and 3 sg. pret. act. *ḫur-za-ki-it*'. (2) The last sign of the line is probably a *ku-*, though a *ma-* cannot be entirely excluded, as the difference between the two in this text is slight. If, as I suspect, the sender begins his discussion of the problematic nature of calling a fellow great king dirt with *mān=z* SAḪAR toward the end of 30', then it seems not unlikely that it will already have been mentioned by that juncture that the addressee had called him dirt, so that the restoration *nu ku-*[*in-ki* SAḪAR *ḫal-za-a-it-ta*] *vel sim*. at the end of 28' suggests itself as a possibility, i.e. 'You, though, kept cursing me in the presence of my messenger, and som[eone you called dirt], and you spoke thus:' I raise the possibility only cautiously, though, *inter alia* because the phrase is otherwise constructed with the reflexive. To avoid this issue might one consider perhaps *nu ku-*[*it* SAḪAR], 'but what is dirt', i.e. 'what do you mean with "dirt"?' Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025), entertains the possibility of restoring simply *nu ku-*[*it*] (or *nu ku-*[*wa-at*]), and translating 'So w[hy]?' While certainly worth considering, these latter solutions would leave space for ca. 5-7 signs at the end of the line.

29'-30': (1) *Pace* Hagenbuchner (1989a: 150, n. 9; 1989b: 407, 410), I assume that the quoted speech following TÁQ-BI includes not only ^{d}LIŠ-*w*[*a*] ⌜*ša*⌝*-ak-du*, but also the following subordinate clause marked with *-wa-* as well as the (unmarked) main clause ending with PAP-*du* and the postponed ^{d}LIŠ in 30'.[15] And though the latter two clauses remain somewhat obscure, I would like to understand them as the addressee's sworn denial of wrongdoing, which in turn prompts the sender's ensuing lecture on the impropriety of cursing one's royal counterpart. The phrase 'If you *yo*[*urself*] (are/were) [i]n my [*curses*],' perhaps 'If it (was) you (who were) [i]n my [*curses*],' (*ma-a-an-wa-mu-za-kán z*[*i-ik*$^{(?)}$ *ḫur-di-ia-aš*$^{(?)}$] / [*an*]*-da*) or 'If it (was) you (who were) [i]n [*that matter/those words*] of mine' (*z*[*i-ik*$^{(?)}$ *a-pé-da-ni*$^{(?)}$ INIM-*ni*$^{(?)}$] / *z*[*i-ik*$^{(?)}$ *a-pé-da-aš*$^{(?)}$ INIM-*aš*$^{(?)}$]), would seem to admit that the words were spoken, but to claim that they were not intended with regard to the sender. I am not confident that I properly understand the following presumably explanatory clause; perhaps the intent is, to paraphrase, '(If I really

[14] Cf. already Hagenbuchner 1989b: 413 (on Rs. 8'); 1989a: 147f., with n. 2.

[15] For discussion of the distribution of the particle *-wa*(*r*) in this text, see Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 68–69), and for recent discussions of the particle in general, Sideltsev (2020); GrHL², §§28.6–18.

wronged you with my choice of words), then may Ištar protect you just as she protects me, i.e. may I no longer enjoy any divine advantage over you.' (2) The *-mu*, of course, is not a true poss., but 'my' is sometimes the least clumsy translation in English (cf. n. 34).

30'-31': I suspect that the intent of the first two clauses of the sender's lecture is something akin to 'If [one/you calls/called] (someone) dirt, then curses are [inh]erent (in such an utterance).'[16] In other words, 'one must not speak flippantly in such a manner, as such language is dangerous regardless of one's intent; and thus your deflection is not valid.' One might thus restore *ḫ*[*al-zi-iš-ša-an-zi*] or *ḫ*[*al-zi-ia-an-zi*], if formulated in the impersonal, or *ḫ*[*al-zi-iš-ša-at-ti*]/*ḫ*[*al-zi-iš-ši-iš-ta*] or *ḫ*[*al-zi-ia-at-ti*]/*ḫ*[*al-za-a-it-ta*] if phrased more personally, with other variants of course being possible. One might have expected *k*[*u-iš-ki ḫalzai-*/*ḫalziss*(*a*)-] if expressed impersonally, but the trace at the end of 30' suggests a sign beginning with a single horizontal, not with three.

31'-32': At the end of 31' *še*-[, *t*[*u-*, *t*[*e-*, *p*[*u-* and *l*[*e-* are all plausible, to name only the most common possibilities. I tentatively assume that the sender intends something akin to '(uttering such curses) only shows the inferiority of your own soul.' How exactly this might have been expressed, and what the connection with [LU]GAL *e-šu-un* at the beginning of 32' might be,[17] are difficult questions to answer satisfactorily. Hagenbuchner (followed by HEG III, 89) opted for *t*[*e-ik-ku-uš-nu-ud-du*], '… [*soll sie*] dir die Barbarei der Seele z[eigen].' With the same verb, but with an alternative interpretation, one might consider *t*[*e-ek-ku-uš-ši-ia-az-zi*], 'Your soul de[monstrates] (thereby) crudeness.' Perhaps more likely would be the prohibitive, *l*[*e-e*, with a verb such as *malai-*, or similar, i.e. *l*[*e-e ma-la-a-i*], 'Your soul sh[ould not countenance] crudeness'; or simply with the all-purpose verb *iya-*, *l*[*e-e i-ia-zi*], 'Your soul sh[ould not produce] crudeness.'

32': (1) As suggested by ^{d}UTU U]^{RU}*A.RI.IN.NA* in i 41', the speaker is likely thinking here of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, not the male sun-god, so that either 'sun-goddess' or the non-committal 'sun-deity' should be preferred here to Hagenbuchner's 'Sonnengott'. (2) I believe I am able to see faint traces of a wedge before the vertical of what is therefore presumably an *-u*]*š-* rather than a *-m*]*a-*, as read by Hagenbuchner; cf. also the ^{d}UTU-*uš-kán* toward the end of the line. (3) For *kuez* with the meaning 'on which side', cf. KBo 4.9 vi 5-12 (here *kuezzi*), cited in GrHL², §30.111.[18] And one can compare the common usage of *kez … kezzi=ya* for 'on/from the one hand/side … on/from the other hand/side.' I do not, however, find any direct parallels for 'standing on someone's side', the sense of which is normally expressed with *appan ar-* or

[16] Cf. similarly Sideltsev (2015: 250, n. 291): 'Some curses are inside.'

[17] Of course, 'I was king' is unexpected in any case, and I can only assume that the preterite pertains to the point in time at which the curses were uttered. One might consider *natta* at the end of 31', perhaps with *ammuk*(*=pat*), 'Was I [not] king?' or 'Was I [myself not] king?' or 'Was it [not] I [myself] (who) was king?' Available space would of course become increasingly an issue. Cf. Hagenbuchner: 'Ein König bin (wörtl. war) ich.' Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 70, n. 49) have 'I am king', which is presumably simply an oversight.

[18] In GrHL², §30.111, *kuez … kuēz«zi»*, where *ku-e-ez-zi … ku-e-ez-zi* is found in the text, and iv 5-12 instead of vi 5-12.

with other phrases, so that the suggestion must remain tentative at best.[19] (4) Hagenbuchner opts for GIN-*ri*, restores [*ku-e-da-ni* GIN-*ri*/*paizzi*] at the end of the line, and translates 'Woher der Sonnengott [ab]er kommt (wörtl. geht), (und) [*wohin*] der Sonnengott [*geht*], die Länder, die der Gott mir gegeben hat, [*dort bin ich*] ein Zweitbefehlender.' The verb *iye/a-*$^{tta(ri)}$ is only rather rarely attested for DU, compared with hundreds of attestations for *ar-*$^{tta(ri)}$.[20] Also the mismatch between the abl. *kuez* and the verb 'geht,' which Hagenbuchner solves with the parenthetical comment in her translation, gives one pause. I therefore suspect that GUB-*ri* is to be understood as 'she stands' and *kuez* as 'on which/whose side,' yielding either a rhetorical question, 'On which/whose (side) does the sun-deity stand?' or a subordinate clause to the ensuing main clause. (5) At the end of the line perhaps something like [*ša-ak-ki*] or [*a-pa-at ša-ak-ki*], 'On which/whose (side) does the sun-deity stand? The sun-deity [knows]!' or 'The sun-deity [knows] on which/whose (side) she stands!' *sakk-* would thus constitute a retort to *sakdu* in 29'. As *sakk-* only rarely takes *-kan* (e.g. in KUB 13.2 i 14-15; CHD Š, 23b), though, one would want to consider other verbs as well, such as *tekkussa*(*nu*)- or *sakuwai-*.

33'-34': At the end of 33' presumably something along the lines of Hagenbuchner's [*a-pí-ia e-eš-mi*], perhaps [*a-pí-ia am-mu-uk*], but likely to be understood as a rhetorical question, '[Am I] a second rank ruler in the lands which the deity gave me?!' Or maybe negated if an emphatic denial [*Ú-*UL *am-mu-uk*], 'In the lands which the deity gave me [I am no] second rank ruler!' Also conceivable would be a verb for 'to rule, govern' [*apē ḫassuwai-/tapariya-/maniyaḫḫai-*], negated or not, yielding '[Does] a second rank ruler [govern] in the lands which the deity gave me?!' or '[It is no] second rank ruler (who) [governs] in the lands which the deity gave me!' For the Hittite king's denial of being a 'second rank ruler', cf. the very similar KBo 18.24 i 10 (Mora/Giorgieri 2004: 96; Alexandrov/Sideltsev 2009: 70, ns. 48–49).

34': (1) My translation follows Mora and Giorgieri (2004: 96) and Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 70, n. 49)[21] in analysing *=man=z*, with the irrealis/optative, rather than Hagenbuchner's likewise possible *=ma=an=z* (as implied in her translation, 'Einen Zweitbefehlenden aber, ihn hast du IŠ genannt');[22] Alexandrov and Sideltsev translate '(It is) a second rank ruler (whom) you should have called dust!' (2) At the end of the line Hagenbuchner reads/restores *ḫal-za-*

[19] Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025), understands phrases such as *IŠTU ŠA* LUGAL, 'on the side of the king' as support for this interpretation, which he feels is quite certain.

[20] The varied sumerographic usage of the sign DU in Hittite texts should be given the attention of a thorough paper. While GUB for *ar-*$^{tta(ri)}$ is ubiquitous, DU for *iye/a-*$^{tta(ri)}$ is, I suspect, considerably more rare than is sometimes assumed, and probably limited to late texts of certain genres (festival prescriptions, oracle protocols). HZL, 152, in addition to listing DU, GIN, RI$_6$, RÁ for 'gehen' and GUB for 'stehen, aufstehen', notes the 'Ideogrammvertauschung DÙ for DU', 'DU-*zi* = heth. *tii̯*[*azi*]' and 'GIN in der Bedeutung „festsetzen, festigen".' In HED A/E/I, 124f. (also HW² A, 244–246), one finds five cases of GUB- booked under *arai-/ariya-*, '(a)rise, raise.' In CHD Š, 611b, one finds GIN-*zi*, 'They place the meat (on) the altar.' All provide further refs.

[21] The *taparanzan=* there is just a typo for *taparantan=*. Cf. also Lyutikova and Sideltsev (2021: ex. 12): 'But you(?) would call a governor of the second rank dirt.'

[22] Followed, e.g., by HW², Ḫ, 390a: [2-*a*]*n taparantan=ma=an=za* SAḪAR *ḫalza*[*iš* 'einen [Zwei]tbefehlenden aber, ihn hast du Staub genan[nt].'

a-[*iš*], which she translates 'hast du … genannt,' and this seems to have been followed by all subsequent commentators. Graphically, it is indeed reasonable to restore only a single sign at the end of the line, since there is significant free space between *ḫal-za-a-* and the break, suggesting that the scribe has likely right justified the last sign of the line. My initial inclination to restore *ḫal-za-a*-[*it-ta*] for 'you called,' though not to be rejected out of hand, is thus graphically less appealing. Restoring the graphically more attractive *ḫal-za-a*-[*iš*], however, raises the possibility of translating a 3rd sg., in which case one would have to call into question the assumption that the addressee is the subject.[23] And in fact, one might just as well assume that it is again the sun-goddess who is the subject here, as she has been in the preceding two lines (except perhaps for the end of 33'). Thus, one might translate '[*she*] might [have] call[ed] a second rank ruler dirt!' If so, the seemingly odd hypothetical or counterfactual statement would presumably refer to the just mentioned divine decision to place the lands of the Hittite empire in the sender's hand and to presage lines 39'-42', in which the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess are said not to countenance the labelling of the Hittite king as dirt. In other words, these deities would hardly place a second rank ruler who is to be called dirt at the head of an empire and would not afford him victory in a divine court case.

34', 36', 37', 42', 43': Hagenbuchner reads (and/or restores) *ḫal-za-a-iš* in these lines (*ḫal-za-iš* in 43'), translating each occurrence as the 2nd sg. pret.[24] Hagenbuchner (1989a: 147f.) briefly discusses the issue of 3rd person verbal forms being employed for the expected 2nd person in the letter corpus, though, curiously, she does not include these attestations of *ḫalzā/ais* in 34'-43' in her list of such occurrences,[25] but from KBo 18.28 only that of *ḫurzaket* in 28'(6'). In any case, as Hagenbuchner notes (1989a: 148 and n. 2), the *ḫurzaket* in line 28' is a clear case of a 3rd person form being employed for the 2nd person, rendered undeniable by the [*z*]*ik=ma=mu* at the beginning of the clause. Whether *ḫur-za-ke-et* should be viewed as a scribal error for 2nd sg. *ḫur-za-ke-eš/eš*$_{15}$, a case of 'eine besondere Höflichkeitsform' (ibid.), or an actual linguistic intrusion of the *-t* ending into the paradigm of the *ske/a*-stems remains an open question. It also must be judged independently of whether (any of) the 3rd sg. *ḫalzā/ais* forms in the following lines should likewise be translated in the 2nd person.

35'-43': My very tentative understanding of these difficult and fragmentary lines is as follows: In order to further illustrate for the addressee the problematic nature of calling a fellow

[23] One could perhaps just as well restore the 3rd pres. *ḫal-za-a*-[*i*], which would only negligibly alter the sense of the passage. My opting for the 3rd. pret. is based, in addition to the fact that contrary to fact conditionals generally show the preterite (GrHL², §§30.79–82), on the tentative assumption of a parallel with the *ḫalzāis* of 42', perhaps with the same subject.

[24] The current dictionaries and grammars agree (GrHL², §13.21, and n. 91; EDHIL, 276; HW² Ḫ, 93b; HED H, 58) that *ḫalzā/ais* should be the 3rd sg. pret., *ḫalzaitta* the 2nd sg. pret. Cf. HW², Ḫ, 390a; Mora and Giorgieri (2004: 96).

[25] One can only surmise that Hagenbuchner might have first translated these occurrences of *ḫalzā/ais* in the 3rd person, after which she compiled her lists in §X.2, only then revising her translation of lines 34'-43'.

king dirt, the sender gives in these lines an example of a vassal who had similarly called a great king, his own overlord, dirt.[26] In 35'-37a' the sender relates how he had campaigned against but not yet vanquished his rebellious vassal, and how this vassal had called his king dirt. In 37b'-39a' he continues by relating that this vassal does not call him by any of his proper titles, but rather dirt. In 39b' through at least 41' the sender declares that this vassal will be vanquished before the divine court,[27] in which the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess confirm that the great king is not to be called dirt. In 42' we have again a mention of (maybe) this vassal having called someone (presumably his lord) dirt (or perhaps rather a continuation of a deity having called [or not] him/someone dirt); and finally, in 43' either a final mention of this vassal's (or a deity's?) utterance (*ḫal-za-i*[*š* …]) or a switch back to the actual issue at hand, the addressee having called the sender dirt (*ḫal-za-i*[*t-ta* …]).

35': (1) Along with *ku*]-ꞌe₁-*da-ni* at least *ta-me*]-ꞌe₁-*da-ni*, *a-pé*]-ꞌe₁-*da-ni*, *ke*]-ꞌe₁-*da-ni* and 1]-ꞌe₁-*da-ni* are all conceivable here. (2) While it is possible, with Hagenbuchner, that ^{LÚ}KÚR functions as a dat., ÌR-*IA* as a nom., it seems no less likely that they stand in apposition in the dat. Further, if we assume *p*[*a-a-un* for the end of the line (congruent with *kuenun* in 36'), this results in 'The enemy, my vassal, against [wh]om [I] w[ent …], […] I have not yet vanquished.' And if one tentatively assumes *ku-it-m*]*a-an* instead of *n*]*a-an* at the beginning of 36', one would have '[As lo]ng as I had/have not yet vanquished the enemy, my vassal, against [wh]om [I] w[ent], …' thus forming the background for the unsavoury situation in which this wayward vassal constantly insults his lord in the ensuing lines.

36': (1) The *-an* at the beginning of the line could, following Hagenbuchner, be the acc. sg. pron., 'him', but it could just as well be, e.g., the acc. sg. ending of an adjective. Given the following *nawi*, also *kuitman* seems a possibility worth considering. (2) At the end of 36' maybe EN-*ŠU* or *ammuk* as the object, perhaps emphasized with *-pat*, though one cannot exclude the possibility, preferred by Hagenbuchner, that ÌR-*IA* is the object, whom someone else (the addressee for Hagenbuchner) has called dirt.[28] The syntax, ÌR-*ia-za* SAḪAR [EN-*ŠU*/

[26] I assume it is a didactic example, *inter alia*, because I have a difficult time imagining why the Hittite king should be upset at the Assyrian king due to his own vassal calling him dirt. If it is, in the end, not a didactic example, must one assume that these lines imply that the sender is accusing the Assyrian king of somehow being responsible for the vassal having done so? Or only that the Assyrian king listened to such curses and did nothing about it? Thus encouraging the behaviour? Or that the Assyrian king had supported the rebellious vassal and condoned his behaviour? And is this the reason that the sender concludes at the end of the paragraph, if to be understood as such, that also the Assyrian king has thereby called him dirt? Boris Alexandrov (email of 10 Jan. 2026) compares the similar complaint of a vassal having been called *lu"ūtu*, 'garbage', in IBoT 1.34 obv. 18.

[27] The illustrative example given by the Hittite king presumably would have been more convincing if the vassal had already been vanquished, but the pres. forms in 38'-40' seem to speak against this. Perhaps the Hittite king assumes the vassal to already have been vanquished before the divine court, even if he has not yet been defeated on the battlefield and captured?

[28] Either way, one wonders why ÌR-*IA* is mentioned here explicitly, rather than resumed with a pronoun, a question which cannot be satisfactorily answered with the present state of preservation.

ammuk(*=pat*) *ḫalzissāi/ḫalzāis*], however, for 'My vassal [calls/called his lord/me] dirt' would be unexpected.[29] That said, *ḫal-zi-iš-ša-a-i* would fit the space at the beginning of 37' very nicely, assuming *k*]*u-in* thereafter, itself only one of numerous possibilities. (In each of the following two lines, 38' and 39', there is space for ca. 2 signs before the assumed *ḫal-zi-iš-ša*]-ꞌa₁-*i*.) One could, alternatively, assume the otherwise well attested meaning 'to cry (out)' here as opposed to the double accusative constructions in the rest of the paragraph, thus 'My vassal [keeps crying] dirt!'

37': Hagenbuchner's ì]R$^{?}$-*in* cannot be excluded, though the traces do not comport particularly well with the ÌR in 36', even less so with that in 35'; and instead of her 'den Diener des Großkönigs hast du IŠ genannt' one would presumably want to translate '… hat er IŠ genannt', raising the question of who such a further party might be. Along with *k*]*u*$^{?}$*-in*, also *ta-m*]*a*$^{?}$*-in*, '*some oth*]*er* great king,' would be worth considering, among other possibilities.

37'-38': Cf. also HW² Ḫ, 105b, essentially following Hagenbuchner: ^{D}UTU^{ŠI}*=ma*[*=mu=za* SAḪAR/IŠ] (16) [*Ú-UL ḫal-zi-iš-ša-*]*ḳ-i* LUGAL*=mu=za ḫal-zi-iš-ša-a-i* 'Meine Sonne aber [nenn]t [mich nicht Staub$^{?}$], er nennt mich König.'

39': (1) Rather than understanding SAḪAR-*aš-za* as a rhetorical question, 'Ist das IŠ?', with Hagenbuchner (1989b: 408, 412), I suspect that this clause is rather the emphatic answer to a series of rhetorical questions beginning probably in 37', i.e. something akin to '[… *whi*]*ch* great king he called dirt. Bu[t …] does he [call me …] My Majesty? Does he call me king? [What] does he [call] *m*[*e*]? You're dirt!' Due to the refl. particle *-z* one must also translate SAḪAR-*aš-za* either in the 1st or the 2nd person (cf. iv 11'), the latter being contextually the most reasonable solution, though a repudiating rhetorical question 'Am I dirt?' cannot be excluded. In any case, one should be cautious, since there is room for some 5-7 signs at the beginning and a similar number at the end of each line at this point, which are only partially accounted for with such an interpretation. (2) In KBo 18.28 i 17' *ki-nu*-[is drawn, and this is followed by Hagenbuchner,[30] but as far as I can gather from the photos, DI-ꞌNUꞌ[is clearly the preferable reading.

40': (1) Also possible is '[…] the Storm-god [*does*] not call [m]e dirt!' as a general statement, but if, as I suspect, 39b' and 40' are to be understood as 'And (*on*) the day of the court case, the court case [will be decided in my favour! And on that day] the Storm-god will not call me dirt!' *vel sim.*, then the future tense is to be preferred, as the passage foresees a Hittite victory and vindication in the divine court and/or concomitant battle. (2) Before the break perhaps ^{d}UTU-*ŠI-m*]*u-za* or LUGAL.GAL-*m*]*u-za*; both would leave room for ca. 4 further signs.

41': Hagenbuchner's [INIM-*ni* is of course entirely possible, but since we have DI-*NI* (and DI-*NU*) just two lines previously, perhaps this is more likely.

[29] Indeed, this is one advantage of Hagenbuchner's suggestion, 'Meinen Diener hast [*du*?] IŠ [*genannt*.]' And though this is perhaps to be preferred in the end, I cannot currently reconcile this suggestion with the contents of the rest of the paragraph. It also raises the question, would the Hittite king really have been so upset about his addressee having called a vassal of his dirt?

[30] Cf. also CHD Š, 499b–500a: *n=ašta* UD *DĪNI kinu*[*na* …] 'The day of the court case no[w …]'.

42': The switch from pres.-fut. *ḫalziss*[*āi*] in 40' to pret. *ḫalzāis* in 42' might conceivably imply something along the lines of, to paraphrase, 'the Storm-god will not call me dirt (in the brewing confrontation between you and me) just like the Sun-goddess of Arinna did not call me dirt (in her decision to stand on my side and place the said lands in my hand).'

43': One could, with Hagenbuchner, restore *ḫal-za-i*[*š*.[31] It would, though, be the only case in this text without the plene *-a-*, which gives one pause, but so much variation does, of course, occur in such Hittite texts. However, since this scribe tends to right justify the last sign of a paragraph, reading *ḫal-za-i*[*š* would also suggest that there may have been a further short clause (an exclamation?) thereafter (there is room for ca. 10 signs at this point), which, though not impossible, does not seem likely. Thus an alternative reading and restoration, perhaps *ḫal-za-i*[*t- ta*], seems more credible, whereby the tablet at this point is broken in just such a way so that the traces allow *-i*[*š-* and *-i*[*t-* equally well.

Rev. IV

4': (1) At the beginning of the line one could also consider reading and restoring ^{LÚ}*ṬE*$_4$*-M*]*U*, yielding '[… the messeng]er about *this* […] not […].' (2) For *zattan* as a Luwian dem. pron., otherwise written *za-at-tan*$_x$(DIN) in KpT 1.58, 8' and KUB 40.1 rev.$^{!}$ 6, see my comments on the former (Miller 2019: 142).[32] Admittedly, there seems to be less space between the M]U$^{?}$ and the *za-* than appears in the copy (cf. Beal 1993: 249b), but since space between words on this tablet is often minimal, this should not be seen as a serious obstacle. (3) For *zattan ser*, also 'on account of this' is possible. (4) *U*[*L* at the end of the line with Beal (1993: 249b), rather than Hagenbuchner's *u-i*[-; see also *UL* rather than the usual *Ú-UL* in iv 10'.

5': Hagenbuchner's *zi-i*]*k* is not amenable to the traces, neither on the photos nor on the copy in KBo 18.28.

5'-6': One might consider the possibility that the clause from *PA-NI* MUNUS^{MEŠ} through *tar-uḫ-mi* might constitute the 'curse', perhaps in the form of mockery, presented as quoted speech, that the addressee was said to have uttered, i.e. something akin to 'In the face of women […] I am victorious.' Otherwise it is difficult to divine what was intended here.

7': Though badly damaged, the traces on the photos toward the beginning of the line are quite clearly ḪUL, as comparison with the ḪUL in i 23' confirms, and one can even see the bottommost part of the vertical of what is probably *-a*[*n-* thereafter. Before this the traces are amenable to *-pa*, and [EGI]R-*pa* thus suggests itself. Hagenbuchner's ^{L}[^{Ú}*ṬE*$_4$*-MU* U]GU is far too long for the available space, as seen by Beal (1993: 249b). Her *-kán* might have been a possibility, though one clearly sees only two inset horizontals, not the consistent three as elsewhere on this tablet.

[31] Though one would then want to translate 'hat [er] … genannt' rather than 'hast [*du*]', if, as I suspect, the other attestations of *ḫalzā/ais* are indeed to be understood as 3rd sg. pret. forms.

[32] Cf. also [x]*-za-at-*DIN in CHDS 6.133, 1', where, however, other readings and restorations must be considered as well.

8': Also possible, e.g., *up-pé-eš-ša*[*r-ra-mu* Ú-UL *ku-it-ki*], or the like, but space becomes increasingly an issue.

9': (1) My tentative translation assumes *ammuk=man=du=z* rather than the *ammuk=ma=an=du=z* implied by Hagenbuchner's translation ('Weil ich mich aber für dich bei ihm? *einge*[*setzt habe*,] wirst du dir das günstige Wohlwollen der Gottheit bewahren.'), as well as SAG.KI-[*i ti-ia-mi*] rather than SAG.KI-[*an-za* . . . (. .)] and her *ḫark-* or *epp-* construction. (2) The particle *-pat* attached to *kuit* is quite rare; I find seven such cases, only three in useful contexts.[33] A translation 'specifically since/because; eben weil' might be most apt for this occurrence, but sounds so clumsy in English that I have opted for 'And since'.

10': (1) I assume *paḫsi* 2nd sg. imp. rather than Hagenbuchner's pres., as well as DI DINGIR-*LÌ*, 'divine legal/court case' rather than her 'Wohlwollen der Gottheit' (i.e. SILIM DINGIR-*LÌ*), in part due to an assumed connection with *ḫant*[*i tiya-*] in 9', in part due to the *D*]*I-NI* DINGIR^{MEŠ} in i 3' and the UD *DI-NI DI-*ʿ*NU*ʾ in i 39' and also otherwise the terminology of the divine legal case in this text (and in the comparable KBo 18.24). That said, this understanding of lines 9'-10' must remain quite hypothetical: the phrase *ḫanti tiya-* is otherwise not found with *-z*; I find no parallels for the use of *paḫs-* as 'defend a (divine) legal case'; the exact meaning of *kunna* (ZAG-*na*) here, presumably in adverbial use, is uncertain. (2) On the photos can be seen a clear, single horizontal before the break, not found on the copy, so that Hagenbuchner's *u*[*d-da-a-ar* is unlikely, even apart from the unexpected phonetic writing in this late text. There are quite a number of verbs beginning with *wa-*, none of which seems to provide an overly obvious solution: perhaps *wasta-* in the 1st person, with *-tta* as the object: 'but [I have] not properly s[inned] against you,' or 'have I really s[inned] against you?' The unparalleled construction with *-tta* and *kunna* forces one to be cautious. Alternatively, Craig Melchert (email of 19 Dec. 2025) suggests parsing *natta=ma=at=ta* and restoring the predicatival gen. sg. of a verbal noun, thinking of *waḫnu-* in its sense 'to alter', though I assume *walḫesnas* from *walḫ-* would probably make better sense, thus 'but *it* (the legal case) (is) not (a thing) of *b*[*eating*]/*s*[*triking*] *for you*', i.e. 'but *it* (will) not (be) a favourable *v*[*ictory*] *for you*.' Boris Alexandrov (email of 10 Jan. 2026) similarly thinks of *waḫnu-*, yielding something akin to 'I did not properly d[istort] (the words of the tablet) with regard to you,' comparing the curse formula in KBo 1.28 rev. 8ff.

11': (1) As noted by Mora and Giorgieri (2004: 96, n. 57), followed by Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 59, n. 3), the particle *-z* here mandates the translation 'But I, My Majesty, am not your enemy,' *contra* Hagenbuchner's 'Meine Sonne ist aber nicht dein Feind.' Correctly also Liverani (1990: 236, n. 28). (2) I was initially hesitant to read and restore *tu-*[*el*, despite the otherwise clear contrast with the following clause, as the possessives generally precede their noun. I do, however, find at least one counterexample, in *ŠUM-ann=a tuēl=pat ŠA*

[33] KUB 33.112++ iii 26' (CTH 343): KBo 30.77 iv 22' // CHDS 3.6 obv.? r. col. 16' (CTH 626); KBo 18.24 obv. 4 (CTH 187); the usage in the latter two appears to be more or less parallel to that in our passage.

DINGIR-*LA*$_{12}$ *memiskezzi* 'and she will speak only your, the deity's, name' (KBo 4.6 obv. 19'-20'; cf. GrHL^2, §24.34).

12': I assume nothing is to be restored at the end of the line, though this scribe does tend, at least in obv. i 3', 4', 6'-7', 12', 27' and 34', to right justify the last sign of a line, and especially at the end of a paragraph. Though it is difficult to be sure, I suspect that a hint of the column divider can be seen at the break at this point, in which case rev. iv (ca. 8.5 cm.) would be ca. 1.5 cm. narrower than obv. i (ca. 10 cm.) at lines 8'-11'.

13': Probably not, as in CHD L-N, 65b–66a, '[You took] away from me the tablet of the oath,' whereby no verb is restored in the transcription (followed by Yamada 2011: 208, who restores [*da-a-aš*]$^?$). How could the addressee 'take away' the oath tablet from the sender? Presumably the intent is that the addressee has violated the treaty in relation to the sender (*-mu*), which is what most commentators have assumed.[34] Hagenbuchner (1989b: 413), e.g., writes concerning line 13', 'Als Ergänzung kommen *-kán*$^{(sic)}$ *šarra-* , "Eid brechen" oder *arḫa paršiia-*, "völlig zerbrechen" in Betracht.' But while *sarra-* (with *-kkan*, *-asta* or *-ssan*) is indeed the expected locution for 'to violate an oath', this is clearly not what we have here in 13', as there is no local particle, while we do have *arḫa*, which, as far as I can gather, never occurs in this usage with *sarra-* (CHD Š, 237, sub *šarra-* D.3.d, and similarly with violating words, D.3.e-f). And *arḫa sarra-* means 'to divide up' (CHD Š, 234), not 'violate (an oath)'. Neither do I find *arḫa pars*(*iya*)- employed in this sense. Thus, we would seem to have some other phrase here for, presumably, '[*You have*] gravely [*violated*] the treaty tablet *in relation to* me,' assuming the meanings 'fully/gravely' for *arḫa* and 'in relation to me' for *-mu*.[35] One possibility might be *arḫa* [*wastas*], in which case the counterpoint at the beginning of 14' would be even more direct, but I find just one pairing of *wasta-*, in its causative form *wastanu-*, with *arḫa*, in DAAM 1.56++ i 86, EZEN$_4$ *satlassas=wa arḫa wastanuer*, 'they have turned the *satlassa*-festival into an abomination' (Miller 2019: 122f.). The oft occurring *arḫa pessiye/a-*, 'to discard; reject' (CHD P, 320), is perhaps a no less likely candidate, and is even found once with *MA-ME-TU*$_4$, 'You shall discard (*arḫa pessiyatten*) the oath of the person who makes you swear to the brothers of My Majesty' (KUB 21.42 iv 21; Miller 2013: 290f.). Cf. also the rejecting or discarding of a tablet, in this case seemingly a letter, in KBo 18.54 obv. 7-17 (Hoffner 2009: 342).

14': (1) Van den Hout (2016: 427) translates 'Concerning the oath tablet that you had written me about, (saying:) "The oath tablet […] from me", you have erred! What [was] written on the oath tablet […].' If I understand his translation correctly, he seems to understand *nu*

[34] The *-mu* is rather difficult to translate gracefully into English; the German 'du hast mir die Eidtafel verworfen' is more apt. The possessive pronoun is often used in English translations in such cases (e.g. GrHL^2 §16.59), but I generally prefer, if at all possible, to find a circumlocution with a dative, even if, as here, it involves an adjectival phrase essentially modifying 'tablet'.

[35] Perhaps also worth mentioning is *nu ŠA* ^{d}IŠKUR *linkiyas* ^{NA4}KIŠIB *arḫa ḫullanzi* (KUB 17.21 iv 18-19), 'and they deface/violate the sealing of the oaths of the Stormgod' (CHD Š, 342b), as this phrase contains both 'oath' and *arḫa*, so that *ḫulliyat* would be a further option for the end of 13'. That said, the phrase seems to relate more concretely to damaging the actual seal impression on the document, while 'violate the oath' is found in lines 16-17 in the expected locution, *n=asta lingaus sarranzi*.

zik wastas in the sense 'the statement you just made is incorrect.' This is, however, not how *wast*(*a*)- is generally used, but rather to indicate the commission of a serious crime, transgression or 'sin'. For this reason, and also because the accusation is repeated in 16' (*nu wastas zik*), I would prefer to understand the writer's intent rather as 'It was you (not me) who violated (it, i.e. the oath of the treaty tablet),' i.e. as a counter accusation to that quoted as having been made by the addressee in 13'. (2) Hagenbuchner (followed by HEG IV, 406; Hutter 1992: 225) understands the two clauses of 14' as a main clause followed by a subordinate clause, 'Du hast gesündigt (gegen das), was auf der Eidtafel(n) getan [*ist*],' but this seems unlikely, *inter alia*, since the subordinate clause with *kuit* is more likely to precede its main clause. CHD L-N, 65b–66a, though accepting the *kuit* clause as the subordinate one, essentially sees *nu* URU$^{\text{DIDLI.ḪI.A}}$ ⌞*zi*⌟*-ik ú-e-*⌞*da*⌟*-aš* as an irrealis, 'Because it was written on the tablet of the oath, you were going to build (i.e., fortify/repair) cities,' which is hardly justifiable. It also suggests that the addressee was 'going to build' 'because it was written on the tablet,' i.e. that the stipulations of the treaty required the building/fortifying rather than forbidding it, which is unlikely. The difficulty, it seems, that these two suggestions attempt to deal with is how the statement 'you yourself have fortified cities' can be understood as a sensible main clause following the subordinate clause 'what (*kuit*) [*was*] done/written on the treaty tablet,' or 'because/since (*kuit*) it [*was*] done/written on the treaty tablet.' Contextually, Hagenbuchner's addition, '(gegen das),' seems to be required in some manner, and of course, *ana* can in certain contexts be understood as 'against'. Thus, 'Contrary to what [*was*] stipulated on the treaty tablet, you yourself have fortified towns,' seems an obvious solution.

15': (1) Due to the contrastive force of *kinun=a*, 'now, though,' this clause should contrast in some way with the previous clause, and two possible solutions suggest themselves. One might either understand *wetumanzi iyattati* not simply as 'you are beginning to fortify,' which would in fact make little sense in light of the fortification activities in the previous clause, but as 'you are beginning to fortify in earnest,' i.e. in a more dynamic manner than previously; or one could restore *namma* or *appa* at the end of 15' (with Yamada 2011: 208), resulting in 'Now, though, you are beginning to fortify [once again].' I have opted for the latter, chiefly because I am aware of no real justification or parallel for the translation '… in earnest.' Cf. HED E/I, 330. (2) Neu (1968: 66, n. 2) has *ki-nu na-na*, but offers no translation or discussion, so that one should probably assume a simple typo.

16': (1) Perhaps it is only the way the traces are damaged, but the *z*[*i*$^{?}$- at the end of the line looks rather different than the other ZI signs (more like a MH EN, and not like the EN in i 11'), so that a question mark seems in order. (2) As the 2nd sg. pret. of *sarra-* is apparently not attested, it is only a guess that one might expect *sarras* here as opposed to *sarratta* (GrHL^{2}, §13.18); cf. CHD L-N, 66a, which opts for the m.p. *z*[*ik šarrattat*?].

17': (1) Hagenbuchner's *-ẹ*$^{!}$- in her *ụ́-ẹ-tum-ma-a*[*n-z*]*i* is excluded by the traces, which she herself realized, as indicated by her exclamation mark.[36] In my treatment (Miller 2008: 124,

[36] Hagenbuchner's further consideration (p. 413), 'Vielleicht wurde das Verbum mit *ui*$_5$ und nicht *ú-e-* geschrieben,' can also be rejected in view of the traces visible on the photographs.

n. 45) I suggested the sign is clearly to be read -˹*i*˺-, but the ˹*waš*˺*tumma*[*nz*]*i* (i.e. [*w*]*a*-˹*aš*˺-) in CHD L-N, 66a, cannot be excluded. A close comparison of the traces here with the *wa-aš-* signs in 14' and 16' and the *i-* (and *ia-*) signs in 16' suggests, however, that -˹*i*˺- is the better match, though without absolutely excluding the possibility of [*w*]*a*-˹*aš*˺-. Grammatically and contextually both are entirely possible; *wetumanzi* enjoys the advantage of several close parallels with *ep-* and *dai-* (as *ṣabātu*), not to mention the *wetuma*[*nzi*] in 15'. And the verb is attested in the 1st sg. pres. with *-i-*, i.e. *ú-i-te-mi* (KBo 22.71 ii 9'), and in the infinitive as *ú-i-du-ma-an-zi* (KBo 22.264(+) iv 9;[37] KUB 31.86++ ii 17'), so that an *-i-* here need not be a hindrance to the reading. (2) The meaning of *āppan zikkesi* here is not entirely clear. Hagenbuchner suggested '(Nun) beginnst du (schon) wieder gegen mich zu bauen.' CHD L-N, 65b–66a, has (assuming *wastummanzi*) 'But you keep attributing the sin to me?' Yamada (2011: 208f.) has 'But for [m]e, you (have to) la[y] aside build[in]g [cities].' In the dictionaries I find no explicit mention of the combination *āppan dai-/zikke-*, and I find only one other case of *āppan zikke-*, in fragmentary KUB 33.103 ii 15 // KUB 33.100+, 24', which Hoffner (2016: 49a) translates as 'you (Kumarbi) are putting wisdom behind [the …] of all […].' If we assume the literal translation 'but you keep placing fortifying/to fortify behind me,' then perhaps something akin to 'but you *keep accusing* me of fortifying (towns)' is not too far from the mark; this essentially accepts CHD's translation for *āppan zikke-*, but substitutes *wetumanzi* for *wastummanzi*. One might also consider something akin to 'but you keep forcing me to fortify (towns)', which might imply that any fortification activities that the sender had undertaken were in the sender's view justified as defensive measures in response to the addressee's fortification activities.

18': (1) In light of *TU*]*P-PU Ú-UL PA-NI* ^{d}*aš-šur* GAR-*ri* from the new join in obv i 19', perhaps [*TU*]*P*-˹*PU MA*˺-*M*[*IT ŠA PA-NI* ^{d}*aš-šur I-NA*] ˹É˺.DINGIR-*LÌ* ˹GAR-*ri*˺[, 'the trea[ty ta]blet [which] lies [before Aššur in] (his) temple,' or similar. Cf. CHD L-N, 66a: [*ṬU*]*PPU MA-MI*[*T INA* ^{URU}*Ḫatti*? *INA*] É.DINGIR-*LIM* ˹GAR-*ru*˺?, '(Therefore) let the tablet of the oath be deposited [in Ḫatti in] the temple;' and Yamada (2011: 208): [*ṬU*]*P*-˹*PU MA*˺-*M*[*IT ku-it* DÙ-*an I-NA*] ˹É˺ DINGIR-*LIM* ˹GAR˺-*r*[*i*], '(For) the oat[h tab]let [that was made (between us)] is (still) la[id in] the [t]emple.' (2) Certainly ˹GAR-*ri*˺, not ˹GAR-*ru*˺, as in CHD L-N, 66a, as can be seen on the photos.

26'', 28'': The *ma-* in 26'' and the *-aš*$^{?}$*-ma*$^{?}$*-* in 28'' seem oddly different than, e.g. the MA signs in iv 14', 15' and 16' or the *-aš-ma-* in i 18', as if a different scribe had taken over.

A Brief Note on Context and History

The historical situation reflected in this letter, including the dating of this and related sources and the identities of the letters' senders and addressees, have been the subject of several

[37] Booked under *u̯edae-*, 'to bring', EDHIL, 1009.

thorough examinations in recent years (Alexandrov 2017; 2022; 2023; 2024; Alexandrov/Sideltsev 2009; Devecchi 2015: 164–166; Tenu 2020; Yamada 2011), and pertinent new sources have also emerged (Alexandrov 2026; Cohen/Torrecilla 2022; 2024; Shibata 2017). Thus, since this paper is already rather long for a *Festschrift* contribution, I will strictly limit my remarks to the said references and to the briefest of comments on what the information from the new joins might add to the discussion.

Above all the occurrence of Aššur in obv. i 19' supports the assumption that the addressee is indeed the Assyrian king, and thus, that this letter belongs to the corpus of Hittite-Assyrian correspondence. The appearance of Tuttul in i 20', in addition to that of Arasiga and Natkina,[38] confirms and complements our understanding of the matters addressed in this letter and of the disputed territories at issue, namely those along the Baliḫ and between the Baliḫ and the Euphrates.

A status quo seems to have been reached on these issues, which had been codified in a treaty agreed upon in Kummaḫa.[39] Our letter hints at the Assyrian king's desire to draft a new treaty, probably in order to codify gains made since the treaty of Kummaḫa, and at the Hittite king's insistence upon the terms of the extant treaty, which presumably codified an earlier situation more favourable to him. The discussion of the building and/or fortification of various towns in rev. iv 13'-18' suggests again that the two great kings had reached a settlement regarding these territories, according to which the status quo should be respected, and neither would attempt to increase their military advantage vis-à-vis the other. Both accused the other of violating these provisions, and presumably both were indeed doing so, though both felt justified in denying it.

Addendum: Soysal and Demirayak (CHDS 7.197) read](-)x̣ʾ-kụʾ-ul-te-x̣-[in rev. 28'' (their rev. 5'), suggesting that the 'signs may be part of the name of the Assyrian King Tukulti-Ninurta I; cf. the spelling ^{m}*Du-ku-ul-t*[*e-* … in KUB 3.74 obv. 2.' While one might indeed cautiously entertain the possibility that the signs might be part of the name Tukultī-Ninurta (or Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta), one would have to read *-k*]*u*ʾ*-ul-te*ʾ-x[here in 28'' and one must read ^{m}*tù-ku-ul-tu-*^{d}IB in KUB 3.74 obv. 2 and ^{m}*tù-ku-ul-t*[*u-*^{d}IB in obv. 3.

[38] On Arasiga/Araziqu, see Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 70–72); Miller (2012: 357, n. 21); Tenu (2020: 135, n. 17); MTT I/2, 18; on Natkina, see Alexandrov and Sideltsev (2009: 70–72); Boese (2009: 72, n. 49; 80); Yamada (2011: n. 56); MTT I/2, 97 (sub Mutkīnu); Redford (2018: 146).

[39] The assertion of Lorenz and Schrakamp (2011: 127, 131; similarly d'Alfonso 2006: 303f.), according to which Assyria was 'the only major power that had not established peaceful diplomatic agreements with Ḫatti at the time of its downfall,' is thus not correct. For the most recent summary on Kummaḫa, see Hawkins and Weeden (2017: 289–291), where, however, neither KBo 18.28++ nor the important text from Dūr-Katlimmu (BATSH 4.2) are mentioned (see Yamada 2011: 205 and n. 42). That the Hittite language letters to Assyrian kings found in Ḫattusa were intended solely for an internal audience, as Mora (2005: 251f.; 2010: 165) and Mora and Giorgieri (2004: 14, 17f., 21f., 25) suggest, is surely unlikely.

Bibliography

Alexandrov, B.E.

2010 The Hittite Kingdom and Upper Mesopotamia in the Times of Tudhaliya IV and His Sons (Latter Half of 13th – First Decades of 12th Centuries BC): New Sources and Hypotheses, Journal of Ancient History 4 (275), 112–132 (in Russian).

2017 Tuttul and the Hittite-Assyrian Boundary at the Middle Euphrates in the Middle – End of the 13th Century B.C., in: A. Petrova et al. (eds.), Ethnocultural Development of the Ancient Near East in the IV – I Millennia B.C. Materials of the Scientific Conference, 26-27 October 2017 (Institute for Oriental Studies, RAS), Moscow, 7–8 (in Russian).

2022 On the Hittite-Assyrian military conflict(s) in the late 13th century BCE once again, Journal Asiatique 310, 17–25.

2023 RS 34.165: The Letter about the Battle of Nihriya, Journal of Ancient History 83/4, 975–1003 (in Russian).

2024 Shalmaneser I in Šināmu: On Two Aspects of a New Middle Assyrian Royal Inscription from Üçtepe, Journal of Ancient History 84/3, 597–610 (in Russian).

2026 The God of Tudhaliya IV's Cylinder Seal, Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires.

Alexandrov, B.E. and Sideltsev, A.V.

2009 [2011] Hittite *ăššweni*, Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale 103, 59–84.

Beal, R.H.

1993 Hittite Correspondence (Rev. of Hagenbuchner 1989), Journal of the American Oriental Society 113, 245–250.

Boese, J.

2009 Murmuriga und Nappigu. Zur historischen Topographie am nördlichen syrischen Euphrat vom 15. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr., Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin 141, 65–84.

Breyer, F.

2013 Ägyptisches in den "Mannestaten Suppiluliumas": Zur aktuellen Diskussion um *Nibḫururiḭa* und *tekri-*, in: St. de Martino – J.L. Miller (eds.), New Results and New Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I (Eothen 19), Firenze, 11–32.

Christiansen, B.

2012 Schicksalsbestimmende Kommunikation. Sprachliche, gesellschaftliche und religiöse Aspekte hethitischer Fluch-, Segens- und Eidesformeln (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 53), Wiesbaden.

Cohen, Y. and Torrecilla, E.

2022 The Campaign against the Suteans and the Project in The Land of Mukiš: A Consideration of Letters RSO 23 28–36, and 39 from the House of Urtenu in Ugarit, Israel Oriental Studies 21, 29–49.

2024 Shepherds, Armies, and Prisoners of War in Late Bronze Age Hittite Syria, in: J. Mynářová et al. (eds.), Migration and Mobility in the Ancient Near East and Egypt – the Crossroads IV. Proceedings of an International Conference Held in Prague, September 19–22, 2022, Columbus, GA, 69–78.

d'Alfonso, L.

2005 Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a. C.) (Studia Mediterranea 17), Pavia.

2006 Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.-12. Jh. v.Chr), in: M. Witte et al. (eds.), Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus" – Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365), Berlin – New York, 303–329.

Devecchi, E.

2015 Missing Treaties of the Hittites, KASKAL, 12, 155–182.

Gabolde, M.

2012 Ghost Egyptian-Hittite / Hittite-Egyptian loan-words, Göttinger Miszellen 233, 109–114.

Groddek, D.

2011 Zur vermeintlich ägyptischen Herkunft von hethit. *tekri-*, Göttinger Miszellen 230, 37–48.

Hagenbuchner, A.
1989a Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 1. Teil, Die Briefe unter ihren kulturellen, sprachlichen und thematischen Gesichtspunkten (Texte der Hethiter 15), Heidelberg.
1989b Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 2. Teil, Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar (Texte der Hethiter 16), Heidelberg.

Hagenbuchner-Dresel, A.
2010 Fluch (*ḫurtai-*) und Verfluchungen (*ḫu*(*wa*)*rt-*) in der hethitischen Gesellschaft, in: J. Fincke (ed.), Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anläßlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010, Dresden, 155–174.

Hawkins, J.D. and Weeden, M.
2017 Kizzuwatna and the Euphrates States: Kummaha, Elbistan, Malatya: Philology, in: M. Weeden – Z. Ullmann (eds.), Hittite Landscape and Geography (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/121), Boston – Leiden, 281–294.

Hoffner, H.A.
2009 Letters from the Hittite Kingdom (Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World 15), Atlanta.
2016 The Kumarbi Series Myths, in: K. L. Younger (ed.), The Context of Scripture, Vol. 4: Supplements, Leiden – Boston, 39–57.

Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J.
2007 The Hittite Usage of the Concepts of 'Great Kingship', the Mutual Guarantee of Royal Succession, the Personal Unswerving Loyalty of the Vassal to his Lord and the 'Chain of Command' in Vassal Treaties from the 13th Century B.C.E., in: C. Wilcke et al. (eds.), Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient – Sprache, Religion, Kultur und Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden, 191–207.

Hutter, M.
1992 Die Verwendung von Hethitisch *waštul* in historischen Texten im Vergleich mit Akkadisch *ḫīṭu*, in D. Charpin – F. Joannès (eds.), La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient ancien. Actes de la XXXVIIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, 8-10 juillet 1991), Paris, 221–226.

Liverani, M.
1990 Prestige and Interest. International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C. (Hsitory of the Ancient Near East, Studies 1), Padova.

Lorenz, J. and Schrakamp, I.
2011 Hittite Military and Warfare, in H. Genz – D.P. Mielke (eds.), Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, Massachusetts, 125–151.

Lyutikova, E.A. and Sideltsev, A.V.
2021 Active Participles in Hittite, Altorientalische Forschungen 48, 102–117.

Miller, J.L.
2007a The Rebellion of Ḫatti's Syrian Vassals and Egypt's Meddling in Amurru, Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 49, 533–554.
2007b Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (11-20), Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie 97, 125–132.
2008 Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (31-45), Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie 98, 117–137.
2012 The Location of Niḫriya and its Disassociation from Na'iri, in: H. Baker et al. (eds.), Stories of Long Ago – Festschrift für Michael D. Roaf (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 397), Münster, 349–372.
2013 Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts (Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World 31), Atlanta.
2019 The Oracular Inquiries from the 2015 Excavations at Kayalıpınar (Šamuḫa), in: E. Rieken (ed.), Keilschrifttafeln aus Kayalıpınar 1 – Textfunde aus den Jahren 1999-2017 (Documenta Antiqua Asiae Minoris 1), Wiesbaden, 113–156.

Mora, C.
2005 Il conflitto tra Ittiti e Assiri e le molteplici interpretazioni di un evento non narrato, in: F. Pecchioli Daddi – M.C. Guidotti (eds.), Narrare gli eventi. Atti del Convegno degli Egittologi e degli Orientalisti italiani in margine alla mostra "La battaglia di Qadesh" (Studia Asiana 3), Rome, 245–256.

2010 Les Hittites en Syrie du Nord. Contacts, influences et échanges, in: I. Klock-Fontanille et al. (eds.), Identité et Altérité Culturelles. Le cas des Hittites dans le Proche-Orient ancien – Actes de colloque, Université de Limoges 27-28 novembre 2008, Bruxelles, 163–170.

Mora, C. and Giorgieri, M.
2004 Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Ḫattuša (History of the Ancient Near East, Monograph 7), Padova.

Neu, E.
1968 Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 5), Wiesbaden.

Nikolaev, A.
2021 [2023] New Phrygian (-)τετικμενος, Hittite *tekri-* and other descendants of PIE **deiḱ-*, Chatreššar 4, 41–56.

Otten, H.
1980/83 Kummaḫa, in: D.O. Edzard (ed.), Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie 6, Berlin – New York, 334.

Redford, D.B.
2018 The Medinet Habu Records of the Foreign Wars of Ramesses III (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 91), Leiden – Boston.

Shibata, D.
2017 An Expedition of King Shalmaneser I and Prince Tukultī-Ninurta to Carchemish, in: Y. Heffron et al. (eds.), At the Dawn of History: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of J. N. Postgate, Winona Lake, Indiana, 491–506.

Sideltsev, A.V.
2015 The Riddles of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns, Altorientalische Forschungen 42, 199–275.
2020 Syntax of direct speech particle *-wa(r)* in Hittite, Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 73, 155–185.

Tenu, A.
2020 From Karkemiš to Rapiqu: The Assyrians in the Euphrates Valley in the 13th century, Res Antiquitatis 2, 132–160.

van den Hout, Th.P.J.
2016 A Brief Note on the Syntax of Writing in Hittite, in: Š. Velhartická (ed.), Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 79), Leiden – Boston, 426–437.

Yamada, M.
2011 The second military conflict between 'Assyria' and 'Ḫatti' in the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale 105, 199–220.