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Ever since its publication in hand copy by E. Weidner in 1916,1 KBo I.11 (CTH 7), a fragmentary Akkadian-language narrative of the Old Hittite wars in North Syria, has posed difficulties for the Hittitologist. Preserved is approximately the lower one-half of a single-columned tablet, so lacking. This circumstance naturally renders interpretation difficult, as does the poor quality of the single surviving manuscript.2 Although no new textual material has been added to CTH 7, more than a half-century has now passed since its primary edition (Güterbock 1938, 113–38). In view of advances in scholarship during this time, it is appropriate to reopen discussion of this particularly interesting example of Old Hittite historical writing. The absence of a reliable published English translation of CTH 73 provides additional justification for my efforts here, which consist of a new transliteration and translation, accompanied by a brief philological commentary and a discussion of some literary aspects of the text.4

KBo I.11 obv1

1'. (traces)
2'. ăngŠa-an-da [šē₄₄-reg]-mah ub-lam
    Me-r[n]-a-ni-[yā']
3'. 5 KASKAL HLA Ša-an-da 3⁰ KASKAL
    Me-na-ni-ya [ ]
4'. ăng-ṃa LUGAL-ma ăngŠa-an-da a-lik
    šu-te-[šē₄₄-si-r[i]²] x x [ ... ta-ḥa-zu-an₄]²
5'. ep-ša a-di ta-la-ku URUKI i-ḥal-li-iq lu-ū
    na-a-[š]-ra-tu-nu u' URUKI²
7'. i-ḥal-li-iq-ma i-nu-na [a-na] ta-ḥa-zi
    ta-al-la-(ka) LÚMEŠ GAL a-na
    pa-n[i]-ku-nu
8'. ruqṭ-iš ku-ul-li-ma (erasure) URGI₇ a-na
    pa-ni-(ku-nu) i-la-ak-ma URGI₇ šu-na [\(\cdot\)]
9'. ma-an-nu i-mar-šu um-ma šu-nu-ma
    ni-na-ša-[ar₄] ma u ʾihi-ṭi-tam nu-ḥal-[la-aq]

10'. ăng-ṃa LUGAL-ma i-nu-ma URUKI
    i-ḥal-li-qū ʾihi-ṭi-tum in-ne-e-pu-uš a[r-nu]m
11'. in-ne-e-pu-uš um-ma šu-nu-ma a-na 8-šu
    ta-ḥa-zu-an₄ ni-ip-pu-uš-ma
12'. URUKI i-ḥal-li-iq u ʾihi-ṭi-tam²₄ nu-ḥal-la-aq
    LUGAL i-dam-mi-iq

---

1. See also his corrections given in KUB 4 (1922) 50a.
2. The scribe was inconsistent in his use of the Personennamen and omitted signs in several lines: obv. 7', 8', 22', 31'(?), 34', rev. 14, 19, and 30. He added extra signs in obv. 23(?), rev. 9, and 12. An erasure in obv. 8' indicates a correction, and erroneous or poorly-formed signs are found in obv. 12', 13', 14', 16', 19', rev. 19, 25(?), and 29(?).
3. The rendering of Luckenbill (1920, 207–9) is largely obsolete, and Gurney (1954, 178–79) is only partial. See also Smith (1942, 65–66), Goetze (1963, 128), and Gurney (1973, 245–46).
5. Text: 'tim.
13'. GISGUDSLILU is-te-el-ru LUGAL i-te-zi-iz bu-ni la ba-nu²⁰-tum a-wa-at bi-shi-im
14'. it-ta-na-ba-lu⁷-nim ⁴⁴IM li-i-hi-iš-ku-nu-ti um-ma LUGAL-ra la ta-as-ta-na-sú-ka
15'. GISGUDSLILU LÚMEŠ Ḥur-ri ep-ša-ma li-is-ša-ki-in Ḥur-ša-an ep-ša-ma šu-uk-na
16'. GISGUDSLILU GAL is-tu HURSAG Ḥa-as³š-su ik-se-x ma lu-ú ša-ki-in ep-ra²⁰-a[m]
17'. ša-pa-ka ša-ab-ta i-nu-ma tuq[a] ta-ta-a ma-am-ma qa-yar-su li-is-hat
18'. ta-ḫa-za-am li-pu-šu ú ša šu-nu-ši ḫe-em-šu-nu i-pa-ar-ri-ir

20'. u an-nu-ut-tum li-iš-ta-as-sú-ku LUGAL ud-da-mi-iq

21'. LUGAL mŠa-an-da i-na ḪURU Lu-ḫu-us-zan-di-yu iš-sí ụ ARAD LÚ ḪURU Kar-ka-mi-is
22'. LUGAL is-ša-na-aš-šu KUR-tum ki i-[d]āb-bu-ub um-ma šu-úl-ma šum-ma ḪURU Ur-šu² ki-ḫal-li-ḫu
23'. ARAD i-na qa-ti-i ni-in qa-šu an-na ARAD.MEŠ šu-[nú] ụ i-na ḪURSAG aš-bu in-na-ta-łu
24'. um-ma LUGAL ma te-eš-te-ne-em-me-e es-te-ni-me a-li̞k du-bu-ub-šu-nu-ši
25'. šum-ma at-ta ú šum-ma at-ta lu-ú em-qé-ēt u dam-qí-iš ú-e-ra
26'. i-na²² ḪAR-AT-ši-bi-šu-tum ú-ul i-ba-aš-ši i-na-an-na Nu-tu-nu ú Kūlti-ašt
27'. bi-ištam i-pu-šu in-na-an-na ša LÚ ḪURU Kar-ka-mi-is²² i-pu-šu ta-nu-ra

28'. ma-am-ma li-iš-su₃₄-súš mI-ri-ya-ya i-la-kam-ma ú-sa-ar-ra-ra-ar

29'. ANZAGAR u GISGUDSLILU nu-ub-ba-lam ANZAGAR u GISGUDSLILU ú-ul ú-ba-lu-ni
30'. ú a-wa-ta i-nu-fa-al-ša ul-li-ša-a[m] ú-bal i-na-an-na ku-uš-su-da-šu
31'. u ki-ša-am qi-bi-šu at-tu-nu ni(-a²)ti tu-su-ra-ra ụ i-na i-nu LUGAL nu-sa-x-ra-ar
32'. i-na²² ḪA-at-ti ANZAGAR u GISGUDSLILU u-ul i-ba-ašši aš-súm an-nu-ú
33'. géer-bu ni-ri-iš

34'. (um-ma) LUGAL(-ma) a-wa-at a-bi-ya a-wa-at a-bi-ya e-te-zi-b x [...]}
35'. 1-en LÚ-lum GAL i-la-a-k ËRIN.MEŠ i-šú-um i-la-a-k i-na x [...]}
36'. aš-ri-[š] LÚMEŠ GAL.GAL aš-ri-išUGULA LÚMEŠ GİŞTUKUL ú-ul iz-z[a-su]...
37'. x [0000000000] ki]a²-am te-zi-ba ú-ul LUGAL a-na ḫe-em-iš śu [...]...

38'. [0000000000] ma-du-tim ú-ul a-ta-az-zí-[z²] ...
39'. [00000000 ma] du-tum i-qa-ab-bu a-na i-x[ ]...
40'. [0000000000] x-nu be-el né-me-qt ki-m[a]...
41'. [0000000000] i-qa-ab²²]-bi a-na mi-nim la ga-aš-ma-x [...]
42'. [0000000000] x ub²²-lam-ma a-na mi-nim ma-ta-he [...]
43'. [0000000000] a[d]-di-na-šu [...] ...

rev!
1. [0000000000 -z]a²-zi-ik-ki x [...]}
2. [0000000000 -r]-i-ma du[ ]...
3. [00000000] x-ù-ra-an-na[ ]...
4. is-pur-ma a-lík an-na am-ra-ni ki-na(a)q[000] x x x [...]
5. sa-ar-ra ki ih-shi 50 GIS.GIGIR.ḪILA ša URU Hu-ru-ub-ši-[i] š
6. ša a-na URU Aš-ši-ḫi i-ru-bu iš-ba-tu-ma a-na URU Hu-ru-ub-ši-[i] šš
7. um-ma Kūli-e-et-ma DUMUMES DUMU ²⁴IM aš-súm šar-ru-tim im-ta-ḫa-šu
8. [at-la mini-ma ta-sa-ah-hu-ur ụ ú ma ša a-na pa-ni LUGAL tu-ub-la[m]
9. [um-ma šu-nu] ma šu-nu na-ak-ru ʷa-na-ku na-ak-ra-ku-ma

10. [mŠ]a-an-da te₄-ma-am ub-lam um-ma LUGAL-ma a-na mi-nim ta-hā-za la te-pu-šš

11. [ki-m]a i-na ˢ⁴GIGIR.HIA ša me ev ta-az-za-az a-na me-ma-an ta-tu-ur-na

12. [t]e⁵-rī-ib-[ka] šum-ma-an a-na pa-ni-šu ta-ak-mi-is lu-um-ma-an ta-du-uk-[šu]

13. šu⁶ lu-[u]-ma-an tu-pa-al-li-šu šu i-na-an-na ku-la-ša-ta-an te-pu-šš


15. KISLAH la-aḥ-ni-it še-ḫu-wei(PT)-I-en URTUR kur-zi-wa-ni-es GUD.SAG KISLAH

16. ub-lu-nim la ši-la it-ba-u-pa-la-qa ub-lu-ni CLHIA it-ba-ša ki-ra-aš-sa

17. ub-lu-nim SAG.GULGIS it-ba-šu ku-li-e-es-sar MUIM.MA ʷ⁵Tu-ut-ḥa-li-ya

18. i-pu-šš ša-i-nu-a-na at-ta te-pu-šš ku-la-[u]-tam

19. um-ma LUGAL-ma a-lik ša-al-šu-nu(t)-ti i-nu-nu a-na ʷ⁵URU UR-ši ta-al-la-šu ABULLA ta-ša⁻⁴-ra-pa

20. ta-ša-a-ša te-ep-pu-[ša] um-ma šu-[n]-ma a-na šu-[š]-u a-na ša-[u]-zi-[a]-ma-ri-i-pu-šš-[u]-ma

21. [te₄]-šu-nu nu-pār ra-ad ma ʷ⁵URU⁻⁵-lam nu-ḥal-la-aq um-ma LUGAL-ma da-mi-iš

22. a-di a-la mi-im-ma ʷu-ul i-pu-[ša] ARAD.MEŠ LUGAL ma-dim-im ʷu-ma-aḥ-ši-sa

23. ū ma-du-tum i-mu-tu LUGAL ut-ta-kâ₄-ar um-ma LUGAL-ma KASKAL.HIA uš-ra

24. ša a-na ʷ⁵URU⁻¹ i-r[u]-ša iš-tu ʷ⁵URU⁻¹ uš-[u]-ši-u uš-ra bi-ri-[š]-a-na ˡ⁴KUR la uš-[u]-ši

25. a-na ʷ⁵URU-Ze₄-ru-a-ar a-na ʷ⁵Ur-la-ašᵇ⁻¹⁻¹ a-na ÉRIN.MEŠ Ḫur-ri ū a-na Zu-[u]-pa

26. um-ma šu-nu-ma na-aš-[u]-nu ³⁴GIGIR.HIA ⁴ÉRIN.MEŠ ⁵URU⁻¹-lam la-a-[m] ˢÁ₂-bi LUGAL

27. l-a-na-ak-ku-[u]-d a-na aš-ri-[š]-ša-[š]-ba-[š]-ku ū ˡ⁴MU-[n]-aš-[u]-a-[š]-du-tu iš-tu ʷ⁵URU⁻¹

28. šu-[š]-i-im-ma um-ma šu-[š]-ma ARAD LŪ ʷ⁵URU Ḫa-la-ašᵇ⁻¹⁻¹ ⁵šu i-[š]-ba

29. ARAD Zu-up-pa i-na ʷ⁵URU⁻¹-lam a-ši-[š]-ib LŪMEŠ ⁵URU-Za₄-ru-a-ar i-r[u]-bu uš-[u]-ši-sa

30. ARAD DUMU ⁴IM bel-[š]-it-ta-na-la-[š]-am um-ma šu-[š]-ma an-nu-[š]-ši KÛ.BABBAR TŪ-CLS.GUD.[HIA UDU.HLA

31. ū-[š]-pa-[š]-hi-[š]-i a-na ÉRIN.MEŠ Ḫur-ri a-na-ad-di-in-ma šum-ma im-ta-ag-ru ⁷šu id-[š]-tum

32. a-na-[š]-ši šum-ma DUMUMES KUR-ti ū-[š]-ba-lam ²šu a-na-[š]-ši a-na ma-[š]-har LUGAL [ipple] ⁵URU-X o x

33. LUGAL i-te-zí-iz um-ma LUGAL-ma a-na a-wa-ti iš-te-it ta-ak-la-ša a[m a s a]

34. ū x x x o x wa x [oo o x x o o o o o o o x x x] ³⁴GIGIR.HIA ⁸ÉRIN.MEŠ ...]

35. L¾KUR [oo o x x] a i x [oo o o o o o o o o o o o o o o x x ú ul te² x ...]

36. x [ ...]

left edge.

tup-pi ša x [ o o o o o o o o ]

Chariots of Water

(oov. 1³⁻⁹) ... Šanda brought a message: “Menani[ya ...] five columns of Šanda (and) three[²] columns of Menaut[ya [...]]” Thus said the king: “Šanda, go, march [on² ...] give [battle]! While you are going, the city will come to ruin!—be vigil[ant, lest] the city come to ruin and an offense occur. If you (pl) are vigilan[t, the offense] will come to nought. When you go [into] battle, exhibit (your) nobles before [you] from afar! (But) a dog will run before (you). That dog [will ...]—(but) who will see him?²? They answered: “We will be vigilan[t], and the offense we will eradicate!”

(oov. 10⁻¹⁸) Thus said the king: “When the city comes to ruin, an offense will have been committed, a [sin] brought about!” They answered: “We will give battle eightfold. The city will (indeed) come to ruin, but we will eradicate the offense.” The king approved. (Then) they broke the battering-ram. The king was furious, (his) face (was) unpleasant—“They are always bringing me foul news! May the Storm-god wash you away!”
The king continued: “You shall not continually slack off." Construct a battering-ram of Hurrian type and let it be put in place! Make siege-works and set (them) up! Cut a great battering-ram from the mountains of the city ḫaššu and let it be put in place! Begin to pile up earth! When you are finished let each take his place! Let them (the enemy) give battle, but their strategy will be foiled.”

(obv. 19'-20') Thus said Šariwanda: “Winter is here—let some continually heap up earth, but let the others continually rest!” The king approved.

(obv. 21'-27') The king summoned Sānda to the city Luḥazzandiya, and the king interrogated him concerning the servant of the man of Carchemish (i.e., the king of Uršu): “What is the country saying?” He answered: “If Uršu comes to ruin, the servant will fall into our hands. At the moment his servants are posted in the mountains and are keeping watch.” Thus said the king: “Are you listening?”—“I am listening” (he replied)—“Go, speak to them: Whether you, be clever and command well! In Ḫatti there is (ideally) no foul deed, but now Nunu and Kuliqat have committed a foul deed. Now you have witnessed what the man of Carchemish has done.”

(obv. 28'-33') “Let each give it some thought—Iraya will come and be deceitful (saying): ‘We will bring a (siege)-tower and a battering-ram.’ But they will not bring a (siege)-tower and a battering-ram. He will examine the situation and transport (them) elsewhere. Now bring him in and speak to him thus: ‘Will you (pl) deceive us, so that we (in turn) will deceive the king? There is no (siege)-tower or battering-ram in Ḫatti! (But) since this one is nearby, we will requisition (it).’”

(obv. 34'-37') (Thus said) the king: “Have I forsaken the word of my father (and) the word of my grandfather? […] A single nobleman will go, and a small army will go in […] In that place neither the noble[men] nor the overseer of the liegemen will be in[n] position. […] you (pl) have [th]us forsaken. I, the king, will not […] to his report.”

(obv. 38'-43') “[…] many. I have not stood […] many will say: ‘To […] …, Lord of Wisdom, like[…], …, say[…]. Why … […] I brought? Why the land[s] I gave to him […]’

(rev. 1'-9') He sent: “Go, look at this for me! Are they true? […] Are they false?—How was it? They captured the thirty chariots of the city Ḫurūḥḫšiš which entered into the city Ašîḫi, [but they took them (back)] to Ḫurūḥḫšiš.” Thus said Kuliqet: “The sons of ‘the Son of the Storm-god’ are fighting one another over kingship. What are you seeking, and (what) have you brought today before the king?” He answered thus: “They are hostile, and I am also hostile!”

(rev. 10'-21') Sānda brought a report. Thus said the king: “Why have you not given battle? Do you stand [as] on chariots of water, or have you perhaps (yourself) turned to water? Have you taken revenge? If you had fallen on your knees before him, you would certainly have killed him, or at least have frightened him! (But) now you have engaged (only) in hesitation! The sons of Lariya and Lariya (himself), while inactive, sang the song of the War-god Zababa: We have clogged the threshold-floor with lahini The puppies were wearing helmets? They brought a fine ox of the threshold-floor, (but) they carried off (something that was) not a shield?; they brought a spindle, (but) they carried off (mere) reeds; they brought a hair-clasp, (but) they carried off a wooden club! Last year Tutḫaliya engaged in hesitation—now you have engaged in hesitation!”

The king continued: “Go, ask them: ‘When you go against Uršu, will you burn down the city gate? Will you give battle?’” They answered: “Eightfold we will give battle! We will scare them out of their wits, and we will destroy the city!” The king replied: “That’s good!”

(rev. 22'-32') While they did nothing to the city, many servants of the king were hit, and many died. The king became angry and said: “Guard the roads—keep watch on those who would enter the city and those who would go out of the city! Let no (one) go over to the (other) enemies—to the city Zaruar, to the city Aleppo, to the Hurrian army, or to Zuppal!” They replied: “We will be on guard. Eighty chariots (and) eight armies encircle the city. May the heart of the king not be
troubled. I am in place!” Then a fugitive came out of the city and said: “The servant of the man of Aleppo has entered five times; the servant of Zuppa is present in the city; the men of Zaraq go in and out; the servant of ‘the Son of the Storm-god,’ my lord, goes back and forth, saying: ‘I have gathered these (quantities of) silver, garments, oxen (and) sheep, and I will give (these) to the Hurrian troops. If they should agree, wages seven times I will deliver! If I bring ‘sons of the land,’ twice I will deliver.’” Before the king . . . (rev. 33-36) The king became angry and spoke: “Trust (pl) in a single word! . . . eighty chariots (and) eight armies . . . the enemy . . . ” (colophon, left edge) Tablet of . . .

Philological Commentary

Numerous Hittiteisms betray the native tongue of the author of CTH 7, and several portions of the text (rev. 14–15, 17) are indeed in Hittite. It is my view that the present text is the translation of a lost Hittite original, made already in the Old Kingdom, as shown both by the archaic script of the tablet and by a number of Mari-like features of the Akkadian. Compare here the Hittite and Akkadian versions of the Annals of Huwana I (CHT 4), the ruer to whom KBo 11.1 is almost certainly also to be attributed.

obv. 3: For the emendation 3 here, yielding a total of eight columns, cf. 8-šu in obv. 11’ and rev. 20, as well as 8 ŠER NAŠIŠ in rev. 26. Of course, the eight columns might also be arrived at through an emendation 6 at the beginning of the line, or through the restoration of a unit in the break at its end. Cf. comment on rev. 28–30 below.

obv. 4’–5’: The restoration šū-te-iš-tiš-i-tiš, št imperative, 2. m.sg., of eseru, “to march on” (CAD E 558) fits the context well, but collation is needed.

For the restoration at the end of the line, cf. obv. 11’, etc. Since taltu is 2. m.sg., I have interpreted ep-sha as a singular ventive imperative epša(m) rather than as plural epša with Güterbock (1938, 115)—cf. comment below on obv. 25’.

obv. 6ff: While the king is certainly interested in capturing the besieged town, he is evidently also concerned lest it be totally destroyed by his forces. Throughout this text there is play on the several nuances of ḫalāqum/hulluqum (CAD H 36–40).

11. See also in general Güterbock (1938, 124–30).
12. Güterbock has already cited the unusual usages of alak (obv. 4’, 24’, rev. 4, 19), summa . . . summa (obv. 25’), and awar . . . ezeru (obv. 34’). Starke (1977, 157 n. 17) compares šanatuk šensu in obv. 18’ with the common Old Hittite construction involving nomencl of the independent and enclitic genitive pronouns, postulating an underlying *šanamanz . . . šmati in this instance. Note also the construal of ERIN MES in obv. 35’ as a singular, probably under the influence of the Hittite collective tuuzi (but cf. Ahu 1072a for the possibility that ERIN HLA = šenu(m) is sometimes a grammatical singular). H. Hofman has pointed out to me that the construction of alakum with surru rum in obv. 28’ is modeled on the common phraseologic use of Hittite awar-with a second verb. (That is, the Akkadian is a rendering of Hittite *utuzzi itigas markeškeš) See also my remarks below on obv. 17’. Note finally the use of signs of the S-series (obv. 16’, 28’, 31’) to indicate samekds, a phenomenon familiar from later Boğazköy Akkadian (see Labat [1932, 35–36]).

13. Of course it is also possible that the piece was composed directly in Akkadian by a speaker of Hittite—cf. Kempatiski (1983, 34). However, the fact that several other Akkadian-language historical texts from the Old Kingdom (CHT 4, CHT 6, and CHT 19) are portions of bilinguals makes it more likely that a Hittite version also existed for CHT 7. Although KBo 360, the “Menschenfressertext” (CHT 17—see Güterbock 1938, 104–13), may well deal with the same complex of events as KBo 1.11 (so Klenkel [1992, 81 n. 218]), it differs completely in character and is unlikely to be a part of this postulated Hittite-language version of CHT 7.

14. See Neu (1983, x n. 7), who judges this text to be inscribed in Old Hittite: “Duktus I.” He also reports that inspection of a photograph shows that Weidner miscopied several URU-signs (obv. 4’ and elsewhere), whose shapes are actually consistent with an early date of inscription.

15. See below on obv. 25’ and 31’ and rev. 22.

16. There can be little doubt that the king in CHT 7 is either Huwana I or Muršili I, the rulers under whom the initial Hittite expansion into North Syria was accomplished. Indeed, the Annals of Huwana I mention campaigns in the land of Waššuwa/Uršu (Hitt. KBo 102 16–17 = Akk. KBo 10.1 obv. 7–9), although it is uncertain if the events of our text are identical to those briefly touched on there—cf. Klenkel (1969, 7–8 and 1982, 81), Gurney (1973, 245–46) and Kempatis and Kosak (1982, 106–10). See Güterbock (1938, 134) for strong arguments that the events referred to occurred before the reign of Muršili I. I see no reason to believe that the composition was not roughly contemporary with the incidents described. See also Klenkel (1965, 36–37 with n. 21), and Goede (1963, 128).
obv. 7': In this and the following line the terminative preposition ana is employed in place of the locative preposition ina. For this usage in Akkadian and Hittite texts from Boğazköy see Labat (1932, 100) and Neu (1974, 26).

obv. 8': The Sumerogram here must be read URGI—see Güterbock (1938, 115 n. 14)—despite the representation of the second element with KU instead of the TUG usual at Boğazköy. Since Gordon (1958, 72) demonstrates that UR “KU” is normative in Kassite texts, perhaps the writing in our composition is due to Babylonian influence.

obv. 9': According to the copy and Güterbock (1938, 126), space is not sufficient to allow the restoration of the long sign AR here. As there can be no question but that a form of nasnrum is intended, however, we might either choose Güterbock’s suggested RU, which would present a grammatically incorrect form, or assume some partial writing of the correct AR, e.g., “su-(RI).”

obv. 12': hi-ti-im as it stands in the text is morphologically genitive singular, despite its function as the object of nuhallaq. I have corrected this error through emendation. Cf. CAD H 209–10 where this emendation is assumed without comment, and Marazzi (1986, 26).

obv. 13': For the emendation see CAD B 321. On the concentration of early references to GUDSILDILI in Syrian sources see Steinkeller (1987).

obv. 14': ta-š-ta-na-ZU-ka here and li-iš-ta-AZ-ZU-ku in obv. 20’ are correctly-formed GUn present/future and preceptive, respectively, of a root šZk, which however, does not exist! Güterbock (1938, 126) suggests that they may be incorrect forms of sumsumum, “to give a bad name” (CAD M/I 322). That is, sumsumum > šussukum through assimilation, resulting in a pseudo-root ššk. On the other hand, CAD N/I 20b interprets these as irregular Št forms from nsk, translating obv. 20’ “some should heap up earth, and some should remove(?) it,” although the general definition given for šutassukum is “to be rejected, canceled.” Neither of these solutions is satisfactory, but comparison of the two contexts in which the difficult verb appears—one positive, the other negative—leads us to the general idea of inactivity. Ahw 1206, sub šaz/saku, “sich ausruhen” (happe), suggests possible contamination from Hittite šes, “to sleep” (HW 1, 191). See also Marazzi (1986, 29).

obv. 15': The appearance of hur-ša-an without case ending is curious. Perhaps this arose due to misinterpretation of a Sumerogram HURSAG (i.e., [hursa4]) in an earlier version of the text as a phonetic writing. Compare the Hittite plant name ḫur-ša-an in KUB 37.1 obv. 20, which Köcher (1952, 54) plausibly explains as a rendering of Sumerian ḫURSAGSR. In any case, the term “mountain” is employed here metaphorically for earth piled up by the besiegers. CAD H 254 renders it “siege ramp.”

obv. 17': For šabatum with infinitive as “to begin,” see Ahw 1068b and CADS 21. However, I suspect that in fact we have here a calque on the normal usage of Hittite ep (HW 1, 41). Similarly qaqqaram šabatum is modeled on Hittite pedan ep (cf., e.g., KBo 10.25 vi 8’ and IBOT 1, 36 i 9).

obv. 18': Starke (1977, 157 n. 17) points out that i-pa-ar-ri-ir here must be interpreted as an N-stem ipparmir, contra Ahw 830a (6). Cf. also KUB 4, 66 ii 5: 7eq-em KUR ip-pa-ru-ur.

obv. 22': For diverse opinions on the location of Uršu, see del Monte (1978, 475–76) and Groneberg (1980, 250). P. Matthiae has also voiced the possibility that Tell Toukan, a site near Ebla also excavated by his team, might be the ancient Uršu—see Matthiae (1979, 9 and 1983). The close connection of Ebla and Uršu was stressed already by Kupper (1949, 79–83) and Smith (1956, 39–40). For summaries of our knowledge concerning Uršu, see Klenge (1965, 255–68; 1989, 265–67; and 1992, 74–77).

obv. 25': Since lu emqet (for emqet, a Mari-ism?) is 2.m.sg. of the stative preceptive, it is best to interpret u-e-ra with Ahw 1472b as wera(m), 2.m.sg. ventive of the D-stem imperative, rather than as the plural imperative wēr, despite the preponderance of mimation in this text.

obv. 31': Instead of the emendation ni-4(-a)-ti one might, with Starke (1977, 120 n. 67), see another Mari-ism, né-ti.
obv. 34': My emendation, which attributes the words of this and the following lines to the king, is necessary since "my father" and "father of my father" in this context can refer only to earlier monarchs. Güterbock (1938, 119) renders ʾetēzib as "hat... verlassen," but as H. Hoffner has remarked to me, this text is consistent in distinguishing i- and e-vocalization of verbal prefixes, and we should therefore expect ʾetēzib for the third person. I also owe to Hoffner the interpretation of obv. 34' as a rhetorical question.

obv. 36': Emend perhaps with Marazzi (1986, 34 with previous lit.) to UGULA LÚUŠŠIPA, but cf. Güterbock (1938, 127), and CAD A/2 455b. On LÚ GÎS-TUKUL see Beal (1988a, 282) where our context is discussed. I believe that we indeed have here a reference to military personnel enjoying usufruct of land in return for their service. My translation "liegenmen" is of course anachronistic and inadequate, but it is employed for want of a better short English equivalent for the more judicious German "Arbeits-Kriegsdienstpflichtiger."

obv. 40': Due to the fragmentary context, it is uncertain if bēl nēmegi here has its usual function as an epithet of Ea—see CAD N/II 161.

rev. 1: For saḥārum as "suchen," see AHW 1006a, where this passage is cited.

rev. 11: For the reading and restoration [ki-m]a, see Kempinski (1983, 39). On the problem of the relationship of Hittite kuleššar and secondary Akkadian kulāūn, see Otten and von Soden 1968: 24. Beal (1985b) discusses the Anatolian word kuli and its derivatives. The semantic field covered by these words seems to be that of "inertia, idleness; peace."

rev. 14: For the emendation *La-ri ya-aš-(ša), see Kempinski (1983, 40).

rev. 15: As opposed to Güterbock (1938, 129), I see this and the following line and one-half as the text of the "war song,"sē-hu-PI-EN is probably a Hittite preterite, 1.pl. For the assumption that PI as a bilabial here retains its indifference to vowel quality, see Kempinski (1983, 40–41) and cf. Otten and Souček (1969, 47 and 78–79). See also Laroche (1978, 750–51). For the fuller form of the first person plural verbal ending, cf. ḫašš-suweni (ḫa-as-su-a-e-ni) KBo 8.74++ ii 9 (Neu 1980, 221), and pariš-uwanı (par-ša-wa-a-en) KBo 17.4 III 16 (Neu 1980, 16; cum. line ct. iii 47).

Despite the e-vowel in the first syllable, I understand the verb as a form of šaḫ. In connection with laḫni, a potable liquid (see CHD III 12), it is probably to be rendered "clog"—see Güterbock (1964, 272 n. 20), and cf. Puhvel (1979, 300–301).

URTUR ʾkurziwanes is apparently a Sumerographic noun modified by a Hittite adjective. I interpret the expression as a plural, although the Sumerogram carries no MS or HLA, because the preceding and following subjects are plural. In addition, ʾkurziwanes is best interpreted orthographically as nominative plural. This word, if correctly read, is a hapax, but it may be related to the adjective ʾgurziṃant, "provided with a helmet."15

rev. 15–17: The text returns to Akkadian here, but the interpretation of the sequential actions described nonetheless remains problematic. As Güterbock (1938, 129) recognized, we are confronted with three pairs of bringing (ubšāni(m)) and carrying off (ištabu).20 In each case we have

19. For ʾgurziṃant, see von Brandenstein (1943, 63 a. 1). The underlying (Hurrian?) ʾgurzi attested in various shapes at Mari, Amarna, Bogazköy, and especially Nuzi (see CAD C 139–40) [sub ʾgurṣišu], AHW 929b [sub ʾgurīšu], and Laroche (1978b, 155) [sub ʾgurbīšu] denotes a piece of armor protecting the head—see Kendall (1981, 202–6). For the Bogazköy material, see Kümmel (1965, 106). Note that ʾgur-zı̂ -iš-an (KBo 1329 b 2) confirms that the item was worn on the head; hence my translation "provided with a helmet." H. Hoffner (private communication), while expressing uncertainty as to the equivalence of ʾgurziṃant and ʾkurziwanes, points to the leather(? ) protective collars worn by Hittite charioteers in Egyptian relief (see Yadin [1963, 196–97]) and tentatively renders URTUR kurziwanes as "puppies wearing (leather) collars."

20. CAD K 407 incorrectly segments this passage: "They took away the... and brought (instead) a spindle, they took away the arrows and brought (instead) a hair clasp." See also Archi (1977, 35), who deals only with the second two pairs: "Portaron un fuso e toserlo le frecce, portaron uno spilone e toserlo il chiavistello."
the replacement of the first item by the second, in an apparent parody of the Hittite ritual for the conferring of martial qualities—see below.

My reading là silla near the beginning of rev. 16 represents a rather desperate attempt to provide some interpretation for a sequence of signs Güterbock found “sinnlos.” I tentatively propose to see here a substantivization of the secondary meaning of sillum, “protection, aegis” (CAD § 189–92), with the sense of “screen, shield.” In view of the theme of futility expressed by this song, I understand GI here not as “arrow,” but as “(mere) reed.”

For the reading of SAG.GUT.GIŠ as sankullum, “club,” see already Güterbock (1938, 129 with n. 5) and more recently Marazzi (1986, 36). Note that the present line is cited under this Akkadian lemma by AHw 1023a.

Although in the Annals of Ḫattušili I (CTH 4) the Sumerogram MU.IM.MA in the Hittite version (KB 10.2 i 15 and 22) corresponds to e-na ba-la-at, “the next year,” in the Akkadian (KB 10.1 obv. 6 and 10, respectively), this certainly represents an error on the part of the author of this text, or more likely, on that of the scribe of the thirteenth-century tablet KB 10.2. Note that this usage of MU.IM.MA is not found in any of the other manuscripts of CTH 4. The only additional copy to preserve a relevant portion of the text is KB 10.3, which has MU-an-niš-m[a] in line 15′ (duplic. of KB 10.2 i 15). Even KB 10.2 i 11 shows MUKAM-an-ni-na.

That is, MU.IM.MA at Bogazköy does not generally stand for ana balat, as the reader who consults CAD B 51 might conclude. The passages cited there—in addition to those of CTH 4—include only our passage and KUB 3.1253 (Hagenbühchner 1989, 360), which is too fragmentary for interpretation. In the present text, both the preterite verb i-pa-us and the context indicate that MU.IM.MA must stand for its usual Akkadian equivalent ṣaddagda, “in the previous year” (CAD Š 1.39). Cf. Kempinski and Košak (1982, 110 n. 6).

rev. 21: ṭemšunu nuparrad-ama, lit. “we will frighten their sense(s)”—cf. AHw 827b.

rev. 22: mimma ul epešum might also be understood as “to achieve nothing”—for this view see Houwink ten Cate (1984, 73)—but “to do nothing” seems even more contemptuous and in harmony with the tenor of the king’s remarks.

rev. 23: Marazzi 1986: 38–39 points out that uttakkar may be parsed only as a DT present. However, rather than follow his efforts to accommodate the sense of the formation (“[in den Plänen] geändert werden”) to the present context, I prefer to interpret the form as an error for the D perfect (uttakkir) and retain the translation “became angry.”

rev. 24: CAD B 249 renders bi-ri-iš as an adverb, “to the other side,” while AHw 122a lists it under beriš, “hungry”—see also von Soden (1968, 459), where doubt is expressed as to the very existence of biriš. Nonetheless, I have followed the CAD since its understanding of the word better fits the present situation.

rev. 25 and 29: For the possible emendation Za-ra-ru-ar, see the bibliography collected sub Aruar in del Monte 1978: 41. Since Klenkel (1965, 168 n. 83) reports that collation of the tablet allows this reading, and Dossin (1939, 109) demonstrates the close association of Zarua with Ḫaṣšim (cf. UR VI Ḫaššu or obv. 16 here) in the Mari texts—extending so far as a common monarch Aniššurbi—I have accepted this suggestion.

---

21. See Güterbock (1938, 133) and more generally Hoffner (1966).

22. Marazzi (1986, 36) reads kuleššaršumu inama, “indeed in regard to me (T. practiced) hesitation,” but this is unlikely. If the beginning of this sentence were entirely in Hittite we would expect some sort of conjunctive element also to be present. Furthermore the adverb MU.IM.MA stands here in contrast to the following inama.

23. Given the other Mari-isms in this composition it is also possible that we have here the idiom alan epešum, “to conquer a city” (CAD E 203). The line should then be rendered “while they in no way captured the city.”

24. Forlandi (1985, 54–55) makes the interesting suggestion that the toponyms Zaruar of the Mari and Bogazköy texts, Zalwar of Alalakh, and the southern Zalpud of Bogazköy all refer to the same city.
rev. 26: For lämi as a transitive stative see Marazzi (1986, 39).

rev. 28–30: I am indebted to B. R. Foster for the observation that the report of the fugitive mentions eight incidents in which the Hittite siege was penetrated. In view of the significance of the number eight in the present composition—see comment above on obv. 3'—this eightfold failure is probably intended as humorous. See the following discussion of literary aspects.

Since the “Son of the Storm-god” is seemingly a designation of the leader of the Hurrians (cf. Güterbock [1938, 135], Klenge [1965, 264], and Wilhelm [1982, 29]) his “servant” is probably the king of Urşu.

rev. 31–32. These lines recount the efforts of the local ruler to hire mercenary forces. For našûm as “to deliver payments due” see CAD N/II 92-93. id-dú-tam is apparently, with Güterbock (1938, 125 and 130), an aberrant form of idû, “hire, wages.” It seems as if those hired locally during this crisis will be compensated at twice the usual rate, while other Hurrian mercenaries will receive seven times their normal pay.

Literary Aspects

As Güterbock (1938, 137–38) and Hoffner (1980, 299–300) have pointed out, this text is literary in character. In particular, the extensive attribution of speeches to the main actors, a device reminiscent of the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides, demonstrates conclusively that we are not dealing with a primary historical source, but rather with a conscious effort to understand and interpret the course of events, that is, with historiography.

The seventy-five or so preserved lines of the text treat the encirclement of the town of Urşu by the Hittite army—hence the modern title of the piece, “The Siege of Urşu.” Within these lines the action advances but little. Instead we find a number of anecdotes centering on the activities of particular Hittite officers, some of whom are attested in other Old Hittite sources. Such anecdotes are not unusual in early Hittite historiography, being used extensively in “The Testament of Ḫattušili I” (CTH 6), for example, and constituting the totality of “The Palace Chronicle” (CTH 8–9). What is remarkable in KBo 1.11 is the sustained employment of this Old Hittite rhetorical mode towards a single goal. Even more striking is the presence in the anecdotes of a quality that many scholars have declined to recognize in cuneiform literature, namely humor.

In our text the Hittite monarch is a long-suffering figure. Only indirectly commanding the siege from his base in Cilicia, he is forced to endure the ignominy of constant oversights and failures on the part of his subordinates. The king’s rage at this course of events is expressed by means of withering sarcasm. Note his exclamation in rev. 10–13 upon learning of a delay. While Güterbock (1938, 132) judges these lines to be “ironic,” I would go further, and despite the difficulties of recognizing in an ancient text so culturally specific a quality as humor, declare this passage funny. Similarly, in obv. 28’–31’ the king effectively mocks the efforts of an officer by the name of Iryaya.

An eye for the humorous, or at least the ironic, indeed contributes to the understanding of three passages that have up to now remained cruxes: Early in the preserved portion of the obverse (lines 7’–9’), the king exhorts his commanders: “When you go [into] battle, exhibit (your) nobles before [you] from afar! (But) a dog will run before (you). That dog [will . . . ]—(but) who will see him?” I believe that we have here a play on the Hittite idiom piran ḫuwaiti, “to run before” (HW1 78), used of the champions—divine and human—and/or

27. See Foster (1974, 69–85) and the literature cited p. 69 n. 1, and p. 70 n. 4. M. Riemenschneider (1954, 114–16) argues that all of the Hittite epic texts are “Schwänke,” a view which is surely overstated.
28. The data in regard to deities are collected in del Monte (1986).
29. See Beal (1992, 513–18) for piran ḫuwaiti used of persons and also the nomen actoris piran ḫuqattala, which he renders “leader.”

commanders of a military force. On the other hand, it is a common observation that dogs—considered by the Hittites along with swine as unclean—often accompany the movements of a military force. Thus the burden of the king’s comparison seems to be that while his officers might have a high opinion of themselves due to their responsible position within the line of march, this position in itself is an empty form—even a dog may “run before” an army—in the absence of performance justifying that honor. Such a deliberate confusion of semantic levels—of the commonplace and the metaphorical—as is at work in this passage is a typical instrument of humor.

Rev. 14–15, which contain the material left in Hittite by the translator, also seem to be humorous. I readily admit that the interpretation of the Hittite text of the war song is extremely uncertain, but it is clear that these soldiers are mocked by their leader for preferring the form to the substance of martial activity. In my understanding of the words provided by the king for the song, the audience is presented with both a ludicrously ineffective activity—the washing of the threshing-floor with a beverage—and with the doubly incongruous picture of young dogs decked out in armour. If both lines refer to Lariya and his sons, we have a sharply critical comment on the quality of their efforts and on their pretense to military virtue, as well as perhaps a reference back to the dog imagery discussed earlier.

In rev. 15–18 the king continues berating Lariya and his offspring through a parody of the Hittite ritual for the conferring of martial qualities. As Hoffner (1966, 330–32) has demonstrated, the usual pattern of such a rite features the exchange of feminine attributes such as distaff and mirror for masculine military equipment. In our text either the replacement of feminine attributes—or of possessions emblematic of peacetime, in the case of the ox—went awry, resulting in the acquisition of an unsuitable shield, mere reeds, and a fragile club, or else the whole activity again served as a substitute, rather than as a preliminary, for actual battle. Parody may of course also be viewed as a form of humor.

One might well ask the purpose of such a humorous composition. In my opinion the basic function of all Hittite historiography was the justification of the office of kingship, as well as of its current incumbent, in the eyes of both gods and men. This might be accomplished in a positive manner—through the cataloging of royal achievements, as in the Annals, or through the demonstration of the smooth and equitable functioning of society, as in the “Hittite Laws” (CTH 291–92). But the purpose is equally well served by a negative approach in which other humans are shown to be inferior to the person of the monarch. That is, the rule of the Hittite king is justified in “The Siege of Uršu” by means of the favorable comparison of this wise ruler with his incompetent subordinates. It must be remembered that any internal threat to the position of the Hittite king could have arisen only within the ranks of those nobles depicted so negatively in this text.

In conclusion I should add that this extremely interesting “negative” stream within Hittite historiography did not ultimately prove productive. While, of course, historiographic texts of the Empire period present unfavorable pictures of var-

30. A good example of both usages is found in KB 36 ii 21–24.
31. . . nu mu apīy aga šIŠTA GAŠAN-YA piran
32. ḫūwiša tila apīy aga šIŠTA VIITE-YA taraḫšan
33. LU-ŠUM-ia kūši piran ḥūwianza ešiša nankan GIM-an keunun
34. LÔKUR-mazza piddäii

And at that time Šaušua, My Lady, ran before me, so that I on my own defeated the enemy in even that instance. And when I slew the man who was “running before” (them), the enemy fled.

32. Note that the majority of attestations of piran ḥuwat indicate simply spatial precedence in a parade or line of march, eg., KUB 52.95 iv 1–3:
1. LÔGUDU LUGAL-i piran
2. ḥūwai GAL MESEDI-ma EGIR-an
3. ḥūwai

The “anointed priest” runs before the king, the chief of the bodyguard behind.

33. See also Marzazi (1986, 37–38), whose interpretation of the use of the rite in this passage differs greatly from mine.
ous individuals—of Mariya in the Ḥuqqana treaty (CTH 42),\(^{34}\) and of Urḫi-Teshub in the “Apology” of Ḥattušili III (CTH 81), for example—none of these compositions is structured around the contrast between the competent and virtuous king, and the incompetent and often untrustworthy others. Like what Houwink ten Cate (1984, 59) has called the “sacred lore literature,”\(^{35}\) in which the historical and the mythical are presented on a common level, “negative historiography” as represented by “The Siege of Uršu” and “The Palace Chronicle” seems not to have survived the Old Kingdom.

34. KBo 5.3 iii 53–58.

35. See also Cancik (1976, 59).
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