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Chapter One

Introduction

The Kaška of the Black Sea region played a role in Hittite History that has been likened to that of Germans in Roman history, or that of Inner Asian groups in Chinese history—the well-known scenario of empire vs. barbarian threat.¹ Records of the Hittite state present the Kaška as an uncontrollable people, who represented a permanent menace to the Hittite state and created an irresolvable conflict on their northern frontier. The grievous consequences of the “loss” of the north to the “Kaška enemy,” the constant threat of Kaška incursions into Hittite territory, and the repeated campaigns Hittite kings had to carry out to stabilize the frontier feature prominently in a variety of textual genres including royal annals, “treaties,”² prayers, rituals, oracle inquiries, and letters. According to the testimony of these documents, the frontier was dotted with settlements shifting in and out of Hittite control and the precarious situation that threatened Hittite settlements there had to be stabilized by regular military campaigns at least until the reign of Ḥattušili III (c. 1267-1237 BCE).³ Modern histories of the Hittites suggest that the lack of a centralized political authority among the Kaška, along with the presumed

² This dissertation will reconsider the appropriateness of the generic label “treaty” in respect to the texts CTH 137-140; see also Klinger (2005: 354-59).
³ And possibly later; Klinger (2005: 347).
advantage they had over the Hittites in mountainous northern Anatolia rendered ineffectual the Hittite methods of political control: diplomacy and military conquest. Scholars view the Hittite-Kaška conflict as the “most persistent and chronic problem faced throughout the history of the Hittite state.”\(^4\) Some have suggested that the Hittite-Kaška conflict spanned the entirety of Hittite history, from the beginning of the Old Kingdom until the end of the Empire period, and that the Kaška played a part in the final collapse of the Hittite state in the 12\(^{th}\) century BCE.

This dissertation undertakes a reevaluation of the interactions between the Hittite state and the Kaška in the empire’s contested northern frontier region in light of newly available and previously known but understudied textual and archaeological sources. The main part of the present study consists of the editions of the Middle Hittite Kaška agreements (CTH 137-140) and the closely related prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal (CTH 375). In the analytical chapters that follow, I will present an overview and discussion of what we know about the Kaška (Chapter Two) and their interactions with the Hittite state in the frontier region (Chapter Three) through the Early Empire (c. 1400-1350 BCE) and Empire Periods (c. 1350-1200 BCE). This study employs recent theoretical perspectives on ethnicity, frontiers, and mobility, discussed in Chapters Two and Three.

**Present state of research**

The bibliography of studies dedicated to the Kaška is fairly short. The only comprehensive and systematic study of the Kaška is Einar von Schuler’s *Die Kaškäer,* \(^4\) Glatz et. al. (2009: 112).
published in 1965. Based on Hittite texts available at the time, *Die Kaškäer* was intended as an “ethnography” of the Kaška people,\(^5\) and attempted to reconstruct their history, culture, and language. Von Schuler’s work has maintained its deserved place as the authoritative reference book on the Kaška, and its conclusions have shaped the view of the Kaška in current scholarship, especially with regard to the following points: 1) The Kaška were tribally-organized nomadic groups, who practiced livestock husbandry and small-scale agriculture, and whose lack of central political authority kept them out of the reach of Hittite control; 2) they were divided into three large territorial groups (east, center, west), but lived in small communities that could form war-time alliances; 3) they built no big cities, and their material culture is virtually untraceable; and 4) the emergence of the Kaška problem and the loss of the Black Sea region took place after the Old Hittite period, probably shortly before the reign of Arnuwanda I (c. 1400-1350 BCE). Despite von Schuler’s convincing argument for the final point, the opinion that the Hittite-Kaška conflict began sometime in the Old Hittite period still prevails in some modern histories.\(^6\)

Von Schuler’s work has been criticized on two major points. First, he did not provide a complete edition of the textual sources in the prevalent Assyriological tradition,\(^7\) but presented a selection of the texts—and some only in translation—excluding variants and a detailed philological commentary. And second, his

\(^5\) As von Schuler notes in the introduction, *Die Kaškäer* appeared at a time when there was growing interest in territories or “peoples” peripheral to central Near Eastern civilizations, such as studies on the Kassites or ḫabīru in Mesopotamia, or the so-called regional histories of Asia Minor such as Goetze’s *Kizzuwatna* (1940).


\(^7\) Von Schuler (1965: iii) explains in the preface to *Die Kaškäer* that he originally intended to prepare an edition of the entire Hittite state treaties that would include the Kaška treaties as well.
chronological ordering of the texts was based on the now discredited notion that some texts of the empire period contained “archaizing” elements (Klinger 2005: 348-49). He therefore dated the majority of the Kaška corpus to the later Empire Period, rather than the Middle Hittite period where we now know they belong. Von Schuler’s work was, as Klinger notes, “Forschungsgeschichtlich zu früh” (2005: 349); after its publication new text-dating criteria were developed, changing von Schuler’s chronological ordering of the texts. In the meantime, excavations brought new archives to light from provinces on or close to the northern frontier of Ḫatti (Maşat Höyük, Ortaköy).

The few contributions that have appeared since Die Kaškäer have focused on 1) the chronology and genre of some of the texts pertaining to the Kaška (Neu 1983, Klinger 2005); 2) questions having to do with the “origins” of the Kaška and their affinities with other ancient or modern groups (Singer 2008); 3) the question of Kaška presence and the extent of Hittite controlled territory in northern Anatolia during the Old Hittite period (Klinger 2002, 2008). Freu’s contribution (2005) to the study of the Kaška differs from those mentioned above; following a conventional overview of the history of Hittite-Kaška interactions, Freu seeks to demonstrate that the Hittites viewed the Kaška as barbarians. Two recent contributions stand out on account of their research issues and anthropological perspectives: Glatz and Matthews (2005) recently studied the nature of the Hittite-Kaška frontier based on the preliminary results of their archaeological survey project (Project Paphlagonia, see below). They emphasize the porous nature of the frontier and present a very brief overview of interactions between the Hittites and the Kaška. Zimansky (2008) applies Lattimore’s model of the frontier to the northern
frontier of Ḫatti, and was the first to suggest the possibility that the Kaška could be viewed as a creation of the Hittite empire.

**Hittite records pertaining to the Kaška**

Records of the Hittite state constitute our primary source of information on the Kaška and their interactions with the Hittite state. These records are many and diverse, spanning a period of c. 150-200 years, from the first attestation of the Kaška in documents dating to the reign of Tudḫaliya I (c. 1450 BCE), marking the beginning of the Early Empire Period, to the downfall of the Hittite state in sometime in the 12th century BCE.

**Chronological distribution of sources**

There are no sources from the Old Kingdom that mention the Kaška (von Schuler 1995, Klinger 2002). Historiographic documents in which we would expect to find such references, such as the Annals (CTH 14) or the so-called or Political Testament of Ḫattušili I (CTH 6), the Ammunu Chronicle (CTH 18), or the Edict of Telipinu (CTH 19) do not mention them. The earliest contemporary reference to the Kaška comes from the Annals of Tudḫaliya I (dating to the reign of Tudhaliya I, c. 1450 BCE), describing a military campaign led by Tudḫaliya I against the Kaška troops (ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Gašga).

---

8 The provenance, date, and concordance of each tablet is available online at [http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonkl](http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonkl) (*Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*, henceforth *Online Konkordanz*).  
The majority of our sources pertaining to the Kaška come from the Early Empire period, corresponding to the reigns of Tudḫaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, and Tudḫaliya III.\(^\text{10}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Historiography</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Empire Period</td>
<td>Tudḫaliya I/II</td>
<td>Annals of Tudḫaliya (CTH 142)</td>
<td>Kaška agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnuwanda I</td>
<td>Annals of Arnuwanda I (CTH 143)</td>
<td>The Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudḫaliya III</td>
<td>Kaška agreements (?)</td>
<td>Maṣat correspondence (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Period</td>
<td>Šuppiluliuma I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muršili II</td>
<td>Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (CTH 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ten Year Annals (CTH 60.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive Annals (CTH 60.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prayer to the Sun goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muwatalli II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urḫi-Tešup II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hattušili III</td>
<td>Apology of Ḥattušili (CTH 81)</td>
<td>Tilura Decree (CTH 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ḫekur of Pirwa (CTH 88)</td>
<td>Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory (CTH 422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudḫaliya IV</td>
<td>The Cult of Nerik (CTH 524)</td>
<td>Oracles (?) (CTH 561-562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Šuppiluliuma II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Chronological distribution of texts pertaining to the Kaška

Middle Hittite Kaška Corpus

Central to the present study is a group of Middle Hittite/Early Empire Period documents that deal specifically with the Kaška: the Kaška agreements and the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal I (see Chapters Four and Five for the editions of these texts).

These documents are also known as the “Kaška corpus.”\(^\text{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 56) note erroneously that the majority of sources come from the Empire Period, probably based on von Schuler’s erroneous dating of the texts.

\(^{11}\) “Kaška corpus” is a modern designation. The concept of a Middle Hittite/Early Empire Period “corpus” of texts pertaining to the Kaška was first introduced by Neu (1983) in his study “Überlieferung und Datierung der Kaškäer-Verträge,” originally referring to the treaties CTH 137-140, and on account of its
**Kaška Agreements (CTH 137-140)**

The agreements with the Kaška (most of them dating to the reign of Arnuwanda I) are our main source of information on interactions between the Kaška and the Hittite state outside of military conflicts. The stipulations of the agreements mostly concern topics such as the exchange of fugitives and hostages, wartime alliances (between the Kaška and the Hittite king), and economic interactions (trade and animal husbandry). The agreements incorporate lists of Kaška leaders placed under oath, which provide us with the personal names of Kaška individuals, the names of the settlements with which they were affiliated, and an estimate of the number of troops the Kaška leaders swore to deliver to the Hittite king. Unfortunately, the agreements lack historical introductions and do not contain any references to historical events.

**The Prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal (CTH 375)**

This document, conventionally labeled as “prayer” in Hittitological literature, consists of two main sections: 1) a prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal addressing the Sun Goddess of Arinna and the gods, in which the royal couple brings to the attention of the gods the conflicts in the north with the Kaška, and 2) a list of towns and their “commanders.” The primary purpose of this text was to convince the gods of the piety and innocence of the royal couple and to ensure their support in the struggle against the Kaška, who, by contrast, are depicted as villains who destroy and loot temples and break oaths. The narrative of the devastation caused by the Kaška in the north is vivid, but also

---

similar content and date of composition, the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375). Klinger (2005) proposed including in this corpus CTH 422, the description of a ritual to be performed before a campaign against the Kaška (see below), preserved on the Empire Period/NH Sammeltafel KUB 4.1.
tendentious and formulaic. This document has played a critical role in shaping modern descriptions of Hittite-Kaška interactions and how the Hittites viewed the Kaška.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Maṣat correspondence}\textsuperscript{13}

Excavations at Maṣat Höyük (1981-1990), now identified as Hittite Tapikka, brought to light an archive consisting of official correspondence between the Hittite king and various officials stationed in Tapikka. The archive is dated roughly to the reigns of Arnuwanda I (de Martino 2005: 315) and/or Tudḫaliya III (Alp 1990, Klinger 1995: 74-108), c. 1400-1350 BCE. It is agreed that this corpus covers a relatively short time-period, probably no more than a decade, since the highest offices are held by the same officials throughout the correspondence (Beckman 1995: 23; Klinger 1995: 82).

The historical background of the official correspondence from Maṣat Höyük/Tapikka was the conflict between the Hittite state and the Kaška, who are often referred to simply as “the enemy.”\textsuperscript{14} Maṣat letters contain invaluable information on the administration of the frontier, the settlements in this region, and the nature of the conflict between the Hittite state and the Kaška. Although the administration of the provinces has been treated in considerable detail (e.g., Beckman 1995), there hasn’t been a study of the Maṣat material focusing on Hittite-Kaška relations in the frontier region.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Most recently, Freu (2005).
\textsuperscript{13} The Maṣat correspondence has been edited by Alp (1991). See Hoffner (2009) for a recent English translation with some historical and philological commentary. The administrative documents from Maṣat Höyük have been edited by del Monte (1995).
\textsuperscript{14} See Klinger (1995: 83) and Giorgadze (2005).
\textsuperscript{15} Von Schuler’s \textit{Die Kaškäer} (1965) predates the discovery and publication of the Maṣat Corpus, as does Bryce’s “The Boundaries of Hatti and Hittite Border Policy” (1986). I do not agree with Klinger’s (2005) assertion that the discovery of the corpus of letters and administrative documents form Maṣat Höyük does not significantly alter the prevailing picture we have of the Kaška and their interactions with the Hittite state.
The amount of detail we find in the Maṣat letters can vary considerably. Whereas some letters contained more detailed descriptions of the types of conflicts and the steps taken by the administration to effectively control the frontier region, other letters (e.g. HKM 30) merely contain the warning “be very protected against the enemy!”

*Kaška in Hittite historiography*

The Hittite-Kaška conflict features prominently in all major historiographic works from the Early Empire and Empire Periods: the Annals of Tushaliya I/II, the Annals of Arnuwanda I, the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, the Ten Year and Extensive Annals of Muršili II, and the “Apology” of Ḫattušili III. The Kaška feature also in various historiographic accounts incorporated into other types of documents (characteristically not described as historiographic works), such as decrees, prayers, or treaties.

Depictions of Hittite-Kaška interactions in historiographic documents are restricted to military conflicts. In these accounts, it is always the Kaška who “begin hostilities,” usually by refusing to send troops to the Hittite king, attacking Hittite territory, or, in some instances, by refusing to deliver Hittite subjects who happened to be in their territory (i.e., fugitives). Such obviously one-sided and formulaic narratives should be approached with caution, since they were created with the purpose of justifying the Hittite kings’ actions to a select audience consisting of the royal elite, bureaucrats, and vassal rulers.16

---

16 See Klinger’s (2001) article on Hittite historiography entitled “Historiographie als Paradigma.”
**Ḫattušili III’s decree concerning Tiliura (CTH 89)**

This decree was issued by Ḫattušili III to regulate the interaction of the inhabitants of the town Tiliura and the Kaška. The extant provisions restrict not only Kaška access to the town, but also various types of interactions between the Kaška and the inhabitants of the town. Like the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal discussed above, this document plays a significant role in shaping modern representations of Hittite-Kaška interactions. Firstly, the historical introduction of this text, which recounts the history of the northern periphery starting with Labarna and Ḫattušili I, has resulted in the erroneous presumption of Kaška presence and hostility in the north as early as the Old Kingdom. Second, the interactions described in this document have been interpreted as characteristic of all interactions between the Kaška and the population of Hittite-controlled urban environments, although in reality, it only reflects the conditions in the later Empire Period, under the more effective administration of the north implemented by Ḫattušili III.

**Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory**

This unique yet seldom-discussed text describes a ritual to be performed before a military campaign, “on the border of enemy territory.”\(^\text{17}\) The text is devoid of historical references, but the mention of Telipinu of Turmitta\(^\text{18}\) may indicate a military campaign in that region. Although the text comes down to us on a NH Sammeltafel, Klinger (2005: 350-53) has suggested, based on orthographic and linguistic criteria, that the composition itself was MH/Early Empire Period.

\(^{17}\) KUB 4.1 i 1 (CTH 422): 1-NA ZAG KUR LÚ.KÚR.

\(^{18}\) KUB 4.1 i 4.
**Oracles (CTH 561 and 562)**

We may lastly mention oracle queries dating to the later phases of the Empire period (the reign of Ḫattušili III or Tudḫaliya IV) that concern military campaigns in the north against the Kaška. The well-preserved oracle query CTH 561, for instance, asks for divine approval for prospective campaign strategies against the Kaška. These documents describe in detail the routes of military campaigns and the order in which towns are to be attacked. Though devoid of references to contemporary historical events, these documents are especially important for the study of historical geography and the military strategies the Hittites employed against the Kaška.

**An excursus on the archaeology of the Black Sea Region**

Whereas the Kaška are widely represented in many different types of Hittite texts, their presence is barely, or according to some, not at all attested in the archaeological record of the Black Sea region, long accepted as the homeland of the Kaška and the geographical stage for their interactions with the Hittite empire.

Archaeological research in the Black Sea region has so far yielded only limited information pertaining to the Kaška, the Hittite-Kaška frontier, or the effects of Hittite imperialism on the northern periphery. Part of the problem is that excavations and surveys in this region have not engaged with these issues. Another problem is the limited number and scope of archaeological investigations in the Black Sea region.

---

19 The well-preserved oracle query CTH 561 (KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65) has been edited (in translation) recently by Beal (1999). Fragments of oracle queries in the north are collected in the Online Konkordanz under CTH 562.

20 Notable exceptions (to be discussed in more detail below) are the Çankırı survey entitled Project Paphlagonia led by Roger Matthews and the recent excavations at Oymağaç in Samsun province led by Rainer M. Czichon.
compared to some other parts of Anatolia. This situation is rapidly improving with the initiation of new excavations (i.e., at Oymağaç and Oluz Höyük) and survey projects.

So far, there have been systematic excavations at İkizepe (possibly ancient Zalpa\(^{21}\)) in Samsun province (Alkım et al. 1988, 2003), İnandıktepe in Çankırı province (Özgüç 1988), Kınık in Kastamonu province (Greaves and Helwing 2001: 498-99), Maşat Höyük near Zile in Tokat province (Özgüç 1978), and more recently at Oymağaç (possibly ancient Nerik) in the vicinity of Vezirköprü in Samsun province (Czichon 2006, 2007, 2008) and Oluz Höyük in Amasya province (Dönmez and Naza-Dönmez 2009). There have also been reports from short-term investigations conducted at Dündartepe, Tekkeköy, and Kavak (Kökten, Özgüç, and Özgüç 1945), a salvage excavation at Boyabat-Kovuklukaya (Dönmez 2004), and a number of archaeological surveys.\(^{22}\) Among the latter, the multi-period survey in Çankırı province entitled Project Paphlagonia is of utmost importance to the present study, on account of its contribution to the study of the dynamics of the Hittite-Kaška frontier and the historical geography of the region in the Late Bronze Age.\(^{23}\)


\(^{22}\) For the history of archaeological investigations in the Black Sea region, see Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner (2009); Czichon (2008: 266); and Dönmez (2001, 2002). General surveys of the Black Sea region include Von der Osten (1927); Burney (1956); Dengate (1978); Yakar (1980). Smaller-scale surveys have been carried out in Çankırı (Matthews and Glatz 2009a), Kastamonu (Marro et al. 1996, 1997), Sinop (İşın 1998; Dönmez 2005), Samsun (Kökten et al. 1945, Kızıltan 1992, Dönmez 2001), Çorum (Yıldırım and Sipahi 2004), Amasya (Özsait 1998, Dönmez 2001), Sivas (Ökse 2000), and Tokat provinces (Özsait 1999, 2000).

\(^{23}\) The results of this of this multi-period survey project have been presented in a series of publications (Glatz and Matthews 2005, 2009, Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009, Matthews and Glatz 2009b) dedicated to the relations between Hittites and Kaška on the frontier, the archaeology of the frontier, and the historical geography of this region during the Late Bronze Age.
In the following summary and critique of the current state of archaeology in the Black Sea region, I will focus on the problems of Kaška material culture, Kaška territory/homelands, and the archaeology of the Hittite-Kaška frontier.24

Geographical setting and environment

There exists no doubt today that the geographical setting of Hittite-Kaška interactions was the Black Sea region to the north of Ḫatti.25 Scholars have often treated the Black Sea region as if it were comprised of two distinct areas: the northern periphery of Ḫatti (or rather, the Hittite-Kaška frontier), where north-central Anatolian material culture (conventionally called “Hittite” material culture26) has been documented, and a hypothetical “Kaška homeland” in the coastal Black Sea region beyond the northern frontier of Ḫatti. A hypothetical line running through the modern districts of Vezirköprü-Merzifon-Suluova-Amasya-Taşova, which marks the border between the coastal and inland regions of the Black Sea region, is thought to be the border between these two territories (Dönmez 2002: 275; Yakar 2000: 296).

---

24 For more detailed discussions of the archaeology of the Black Sea region during the Late Bronze Age see Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner (2009: 107-15); Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 53-56); Yakar (2000). The recent article by Yakar (2008) entitled “The Archaeology of the Kaška” provides an overview of textual information on Kaška habitats and a summary of previous archaeological investigations in the area. Most of Yakar’s assumptions on the socio-economic structure of the Kaška and their interactions with the Hittite state derive from an incomplete assessment of relevant Hittite sources (for example, Yakar ignores the Early Empire period Kaška agreements), reading into the absence of Late Bronze Age remains in the coastal parts of the Black Sea region which can be attributed to the Kaška. Zimansky (2007) also incorporates archaeological data in his analysis of Hittite-Kaška interactions on the frontier.

25 The localization of the Kaška to the north of Ḫatti was first suggested by Goetze (1930), and confirmed by von Schuler (1965: 12-15) in his evaluation of the theories on the localization of Kaška-Land in circulation at that time.

26 Glatz (2009: 129-30) notes that the designation “Hittite” is an “altogether unsuitable label for material culture” and prefers the designation “north-central Anatolian,” which “avoids a priori ethnic, linguistic or cultural labeling of either the producers or the consumers of products described in this way.”
The Kaška are generally thought to have inhabited the mountainous highlands and fertile river valleys in the coastal parts of the central Black Sea region, in a territory seemingly devoid of known Late Bronze Age settlements. More specifically, the Kaška homeland is thought to correspond roughly to the territory between Sinop in the west and Ordu in the east, north of the Amasya-Merzifon line (Czichon 2006: 160). This presumed Kaška homeland is identified through the absence of north-central Anatolian/“Hittite” material culture.

Hittite records demonstrate that the Hittite state and the Kaška interacted in a contested frontier zone. So far, the only attempt to locate the Hittite-Kaška frontier on the ground (i.e., based on the archaeological record) has been the multi-period survey of the Çankırı region (Project Paphlagonia). The survey results demonstrate that in the west the Late Bronze Age Hittite-Kaška frontier corresponds to the modern Çankırı province. The survey team suggests that the Devrez Çay, which they have identified with the Hittite Dağara, functioned as “a natural frontier.”

The remainder of the territories that constituted the Hittite-Kaška frontier in the north and northeast of Ḫatti have not benefited from intensive survey projects comparable to Project Paphlagonia. In the area directly to the north of Ḫatti (i.e., the central part of the Hittite Kaška frontier) Late Bronze Age sites (probably fortified frontier outposts of the Hittites or the Kaška) on the Kargı-Merzifon-Taşova line, or those further north on

---

27 Following von Schuler (1965: 62), Yakar (2000: 296) has suggested that the Kaška were divided into three territorial groups: the eastern Kaška in the Çarşamba plain, the lower Yeşilirmak and Kelkit valleys; the central Kaška in the Bafra plain, its southern territory, and the lower Kızılırmak valley; the western Kaška in the modern districts of Sinop and Kastamonu.
28 See n. 7 above.
29 Surveys in these regions have been preoccupied with finding “Hittite” (i.e., north-central Anatolian) settlements and identifying the northern “border” of Ḫatti, rather than investigating the “Hittite-Kaška frontier.”
the Taşköprü-Boyabat-Durağan-Vezirköprü-Havza line probably constituted the Hittite-Kaška frontier zone (Yakar 2000: 296). The northernmost among these sites is Oymağaç in Vezirköprü, described by its excavators as a “Hittite island” in the midst of Kaška territory (Czichon 2008: 273).

The least explored part of the frontier is the area to the northeast of Ḫatti. Here in this region, the frontier may be located in Sivas and Tokat provinces (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 114), up to the Kelkit valley. ³³

Kaška homelands and material culture

In the Middle Bronze Age, the central Black Sea region was part of the central/north-central Anatolian cultural horizon, with material similar to that found at Alişar, Alacahöyük, Boğazköy, and Kültepe, and was part of the Old Assyrian trade network due to the importance of metallurgy in this region (Czichon 2008: 266). But this state of peaceful interaction between the Black Sea region and central/north-central Anatolia did not continue into the Late Bronze Age. In this period (coinciding with the Hittite Early Empire and Empire periods), the Black Sea region appears to have undergone a process of depopulation and a shift of settlements from north to south, probably from the early to middle Late Bronze Age (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 115). Consequently, surveys and excavations in the Black Sea region have so far not yielded any material cultural remains (settlements, pottery, etc.) that can be attributed with any degree of certainty to the Kaška.

³³ According to Yakar (1980: 77-81) fortified Hittite border towns were located in the southern portions of the Kelkit valley; see below.
Surveys in the provinces of Kastamonu, Sinop, and Samsun north of the Taşköprü-Boyabat-Durağan-Vezirköprü-Havza line have identified no sites yielding Late Bronze Age material.  

Excavations have produced similar results. The site of İkiztepe, for example, the longest running excavation (more than 30 years) in the entire Black Sea region and considered to be the type-site in the Bafrä region, was not occupied during the Late Bronze Age according to the excavators (Bilgi 1998).  

It is important to consider here the metal finds from various locations in this region. These include the hoards found at Kıнак (Kastamonu) and Eskiyapar (Çorum), metal objects of unknown provenance housed in the Samsun museum, two axes found in the villages Bülbül and Dibekli in Sinop (Dönmez 2005: 263), and a Mycenaean-style sword from Buz Mağarası near Pınarbaşı (Czichon 2008: 267). These metal finds, according to Czichon (2008: 267), are evidence “für eine Besiedlung dieser scheinbar unbesiedelten Zone.” They have conventionally been interpreted as “hoards” looted by the Kaška from Hittite settlements, rather than as specimens of Kaška metalworking or material culture.  

Renewed excavations at Kıнак, however, have unearthed a metal

---

31 Contra Yakar (1974: 43-47; 1980: 81-84; 2000: 296), who has argued that sites such as Bağ Tepe, Dedeıstü Tepesi, Dündartepe, and Kaledoruğu were used by the Hittites as forward posts in the Late Bronze Age.  

32 Dönmez (2001: 876) argues that the so-called “Hittite levels” identified during the short-term excavations at Dündartepe, Te(k)keköy, and Kavak, originally excavated by Kökten, N. Övgüç, and T. Övgüç (1945), must be re-dated the Old Assyrian Period in the Middle Bronze Age in light of the results of the İkiztepe excavation. Czichon (2008: 266) notes that the alleged lack of Late Bronze Age occupation should be approached with caution, since the Hittite/Late Bronze Age levels have not been the focus of the İkiztepe excavation and thus have not been thoroughly researched. In his report on the emergency excavations at the site of Boyabat-Kovuklukaya, Dönmez (2004: 38-84) does not mention Late Bronze Age levels or material, from which we are probably to understand that the excavators did not identify this period there.  

33 E.g. Czichon (2008: 267); Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner (2009: 113-14); Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 53); Yakar (2008: 823). Often cited in this context (e.g., Matthews and Glatz 2009b: 53) are the passages in the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Asmunikal (CTH 375) which relate the looting of temples in the Black Sea region, for which see the next note.
workshop associated with the finds, which may suggest that they were produced at the site rather than looted and hidden by the Kaška.\textsuperscript{34} Whether we can interpret Kinik as a Kaška site beyond the northern frontier can be confirmed or refuted only by further investigation.

Scholars have explained the collapse of settlements in the Black Sea region in the Late Bronze Age and the lack of material cultural remains that can be attributed to the Kaška as a consequence of the arrival or predominance of the Kaška in these parts of the Black Sea region sometime during the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{35} This interpretation is based on the premise that the Kaška were tribally organized nomadic pastoralists and as such would have left no traces in the archaeological record.\textsuperscript{36} We may point out a number of problems with this interpretation.

First, most of what we know of the archaeology of the Black Sea region derives from surveys, which, as “low-resolution” methods of investigation, should be

\textsuperscript{34} This interpretation may be supported by the fact that the Black Sea region has been a territory exploited for its rich metal resources throughout its history (Koçak 2006). Contra Matthews and Glatz (2009: 53), who conclude that “despite the excavated evidence for metalworking, however, there is still the likelihood that the hoard from Kinik-Kastamonu is a deliberate deposition made by Kaška individuals of materials taken by them as loot from Hittite settlements including temples, a practice well attested in texts such as the Prayer of Arnuwanda I and Asmunikkal (Pritchard 1969: 399; Singer 2002: 40-43).” It is also possible that exotic weapons were brought to these workshops for use as models, for repair, etc. Such assumptions can only be evaluated with detailed archaeo-metallurgical study.

\textsuperscript{35} E.g. Dönmez (2002: 275); Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 55); Yakar (2000: 287; 2008: 819). Czichon (2008: 267), for example, points out that the lack of material culture in these regions can lead to three interpretations: 1) that the region was not inhabited, 2) that those who inhabited this region employed organic building materials and/or tents, and 3) that the ceramics of the inhabitants cannot be distinguished from those of earlier periods. Yakar (2000: 287) likens the presumed “arrival” of the Kaška to the arrival of Türkmen pastoralists in the Pontic region in the 11th century CE. This event, according to Yakar, pushed the settled indigenous Greeks to abandon their settlements and adopt a more pastoralist way of life at higher elevations, and was not archaeologically visible save for the abandonment of villages. Note that Yakar (2000: 287; 2008: 819) supposes the arrival of the Kaška to have taken place sometime in the Middle Bronze Age/Hittite Old Kingdom.

\textsuperscript{36} Based on ethnographic data, Yakar (2000; 2006) has suggested that the Kaška may have practiced seasonal transhumance, with winter villages in the fertile valleys and summer villages in higher-elevation mountainous regions and that their primary building material would have been wood, which in the humid conditions of the Black Sea region would not have been preserved. A similar scenario has been suggested by Glatz and Matthews (2005: 59).
approached with caution (Matthews 2009: 13). For the majority of these surveys, archaeologists have relied on north-central Anatolian material to identify Late Bronze Age occupation layers in the Black Sea region, and have hypothesized that the territory lying beyond the northernmost limits of north-central Anatolian material must constitute Kaška territory (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 108). In actuality, we do not know what Kaška material culture might have looked like or whether it can be distinguished from north-central Anatolian material culture. Furthermore, recent studies of north-central Anatolian pottery, represented by the type-site Ḫattuša, stress the formal continuity of pottery repertoires of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and the consequent difficulties of establishing precise ceramic sequences, which casts doubt on definitive statements on the date of occupation layers of surveyed sites (Glatz, Mathews, and Schachner 2009: 107-08).

An alternative interpretation of the virtual absence of Kaška material culture of the Late Bronze Age in this region is the possibility that the material cultural traditions of earlier periods (i.e., Early Bronze Age) might have continued in this region in the Late Bronze Age, in which case Late Bronze Age material would have been persistently misdated (i.e., mistaken for Early Bronze Age material) in surveys (Czichon 2006: 7). Support for this idea may be the recurrence of Early Bronze Age pottery traditions at Boğazköy in the beginning of the Iron Age, if a Kaška population indeed inhabited

37 Zimansky (2007: 165), for example, notes that “identifying where the Kaška were archaeologically is best achieved indirectly, by finding the northern limits of the Hittites.”
38 Özsait (2003: 203), for example, has argued that Kaška material culture might have been indistinguishable from Hittite material culture. Glatz and Matthews (2005: 339) reject this assumption on the grounds that parts of the Black Sea region “known from texts to have been inhabited by the Kaška” have not produced “typical Hittite pottery.”
Ḫattuša after the gradual abandonment of the city. Based on this very assumption, Glatz and Matthews (2005: 51) have sought to reconstruct Kaška material culture from the early Iron Age remains at Ḫattuša.40

Second, the absence of evidence of Late Bronze Age material has been interpreted as evidence for the presence of a nomadic pastoralist population (the textually-attested Kaška) in these regions, whose presence is then expected to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to detect archaeologically.41 This, in fact, is circular reasoning; the notion that the Kaška were nomadic pastoralists is conjecture based loosely on Hittite textual sources, and there is otherwise no archaeological evidence to clarify the subsistence strategies practiced by the Kaška.42

We may finally call into question the assumption that the Kaška homeland (i.e., Kaška settlements and material culture) should be sought beyond the frontier, in the coastal parts of the Black Sea region. In their recent contribution to the historical geography of the Çankırı region, Matthews and Glatz (2009b) locate most of the settlements mentioned in Hittite records in the context of Hittite-Kaška conflicts (i.e., settlements controlled by the Hittite state, those controlled by the Kaška, those which were autonomous to some degree, and the majority which switched back and forth

---

40 Based on Early Iron Age remains, they tentatively suggest (57-59) that the Kaška 1) used handmade pottery resembling Early Bronze Age and Chalcolithic pottery, 2) raised pigs, 3) practiced equid consumption, 4) cultivated flax-seed, 5) and raised zebus (humped cattle), which might be related to a reduction in the size of cattle and sheep herds.
41 The “invisibility” of nomadic groups in archaeological records is debated. Recent studies (see Cribb 1991), the contributions in Hauser 2006, and Wendrich and Barnard 2008) demonstrate that material cultural remains of nomadic groups can be detected through the use of special methods. Most surveys in the Black Sea region are not really suitable for studying the material culture of nomadic pastoralist groups.
42 As I argue in Chapter Two, Hittite sources pertaining to the Kaška are far from clear as to their subsistence strategies. I should, however, stress that I do not refute the idea that the Kaška were mobile pastoralists to some degree, though probably not exclusively.
between Hittite and Kaška control) within the contested frontier region. On this contested frontier, we should not expect to find distinct material culture that can be identified as either “Hittite” or “Kaška” (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). Mathews and Glatz stress that Late Bronze Age settlements on the Hittite-Kaška frontier which display north-central Anatolian material must have swung back and forth between Hittite and Kaška control and accommodated at certain times and places both Hittite and Kaška populations (see Hittite-Kaška frontier below).

We have no convincing reason to believe Kaška settlements to have been exclusively ephemeral nomadic encampments built of organic materials, although some of them may indeed have participated in a type of seasonal transhumance reminiscent of the traditional yayla pattern. In fact, Hittite records make the following points about Kaška settlements reasonably clear: At least parts of the Kaška were settled in “towns” (ambiguously referred to with the Sumerogram URU in Hittite records)—possibly permanently—and practiced agriculture. Some of these settlements were fortified, while others are attested as far back as the Old Assyrian period. Their representation in Hittite records casts doubt on the “invisibility” of Kaška settlements.

---

43 See the map (Fig. 2) and Table 1 in Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 58, 69) for the localization of topographical features, regions, and settlements. Although they demonstrate that “much of the Hittite-Kaška interaction attested in the Ḫattuša texts takes place closer to Ḫattuša than has previously been thought,” and although they accept the possibility that Late Bronze Age sites on the frontier could equally be called “Hittite” or “Kaška,” they too assume the Kaška homeland to be beyond the frontier (Matthews and Glatz 2009b: 51-56).

44 For the representation of Kaška settlements and material culture in Hittite records see Chapter Two.
Hittite-Kaška frontier

Judging from the distribution of sites that display north-central Anatolian material culture (architecture, pottery, cuneiform tablets, etc.) the Hittite-Kaška frontier may be located south of the Taşköprü-Boyabat-Durağan-Vezirköprü-Havza line, comprising most of Çankırı province and parts of Çorum, Samsun, Amasya, Sivas and Tokat provinces. The archaeology of the Hittite-Kaška frontier is an undeveloped area of research (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 112). So far, only the Çankırı province in the Black Sea region has been subject to an archaeological investigation (i.e., Project Paphlagonia) focusing on the dynamics of the Hittite-Kaška frontier.

Extensive survey in Çankırı has revealed that in the Late Bronze Age this territory was part of what the survey team has referred to as “a system of communication and control” indicative of a contested frontier region. This system is characterized by the defensive traits of sites as well as their location in places with optimum visibility, the lack of smaller settlements and villages that would “maximize the agricultural potential of the land,” and the use of the Devrez Çay as a natural frontier.45 The survey team sees this system as “the Hittite response to the recurrent Kaška threat along the northern frontier, as vividly attested in numerous texts of the time” (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 126). In the Paphlagonia survey, 26 sites from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages were identified (116-17). Among these, the sites of Maltepe, Salman West, Dumanlı,

45 Most Middle and Late Bronze Age sites identified during the Paphlagonia survey are situated to the southeast of the Devrez Çay, which, according to Project Paphlagonia survey team, confirms its use as a natural frontier (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 126).
46 Of these, 16 are höyükş, 4 are fortified lowland sites, and one is a flatland settlement. However, Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner (2009: 119) emphasize the difficulty of separating Middle and Late Bronze Age sites due to the lack of clear Middle/Late Bronze Age ceramic sequences and the conservative character of north Anatolian pottery (108).
Eldivan, as well as the previously excavated İnandık, judging from their defensive traits and/or strategic locations seem to have been important frontier settlements.

Unfortunately, we are not as well informed on the northern and northeastern sectors of the Hittite-Kaška frontier, which may be located in the northern parts of Çorum, inner Samsun, Amasya, and parts of Tokat provinces. Survey in Çorum province yielded a number of Old Hittite sites, including the mounds of Hüseyindede and Boyalı, but none from the Late Bronze Age/Empire period in the area to the northwest of Ḫattuša (Sipahi, Yıldırım 2001: 105; Yıldırım, Sipahi 2004: 310, cited in Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 114). But the dating of some of these sites to the Old Hittite period (latest phases of the Middle Bronze Age) has to be revised in light of the lowering of the date of İnandıktepe ceramics (by Mielke 2006) by comparison to which some of the material from the Çorum survey (e.g., the cultic vases from Hüseyindede) has been dated (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 114).

North of Çorum, in the Vezirköprü area, the site of Oymağac (probably Hittite Nerik) seems to be the northernmost limit of north-central Anatolian material and the northernmost limit of Late Bronze Age settlement. The excavator Czichon believes it to have been a “Hittite island” in the midst of Kaška territory (2008: 373). Recent archaeological investigations at Oymağac and the survey of the surroundings indicate that the site of Nerik, at least for parts of the Early Empire period, was not under the direct control of the Hittite state.

In the northeast, the river Kelkit is supposed to have constituted an important feature of the frontier, which comprised the southwestern parts of Tokat province and parts of Sivas province:
The distribution of Bronze Age settlements along the lower Yeşilirmak and the Kelkit where second millennium settlements are mainly found to the south of the Kelkit valley and the west of the lower Yeşilirmak ... Both these valleys were apparently important lines of defense for the Hittites. These natural borders were further strengthened by the building of fortified towns or military garrisons. (Yakar 2000: 296)\(^{47}\)

Maşat Höyük (Hittite Tapikka) near Zile in the southwest of Tokat province was the seat of a BÊL MADGALTI and an important Hittite frontier town in this territory. Aside from the Maşat Höyük excavations, our knowledge of the archaeology of the Tokat region is limited to the documentation of 19 sites from the second millennium, of which 11 revealed Late Bronze Age layers with north-central Anatolian material. The letters unearthed at Maşat Höyük confirm that the territory around Maşat Höyük was part of the contested Hittite-Kaška frontier.\(^{48}\) Sivas province, too, appears to have constituted part of the frontier, with “a settlement nucleation and location likely to indicate an increased concern with security in this Hittite border zone” (Matthews, Glatz, and Schachner 2009: 114).\(^{49}\)

It should be emphasized that the application of the designation “Hittite” to settlements and other material cultural elements on the Hittite-Kaška frontier is arbitrary; they could just as well be called “Kaška.” Late Bronze Age settlements identified in the frontier region swung back and forth between Hittite and Kaška control, and at times

\(^{47}\) It is not clear from this statement whether Yakar’s assumption of the existence of “fortified towns or military garrisons” is based on textual or archaeological data.

\(^{48}\) In Tokat province, of the 19 sites dating to the second millennium BCE, 15 display Early Hittite material, and 11 display imperial Hittite material (Özsait and Özsait 2001, cited in Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 114).

\(^{49}\) Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner (2009: 114) note that “LBA settlement appears to have centered around four large sites, each between 18-26ha in area and located in broad fertile plains, with smaller sites at key strategic locations such as passes.”
accommodated both Hittite and Kaška populations (Glatz, Matthews, and Schachner 2009: 126). 50

In sum, there was a shift (or rather, decrease in the number of settlements) in north-central Anatolia from the north to south, from the early to the middle Late Bronze Age (Matthews et al. 2009b: 111), which must be related to the Hittite-Kaška conflict. Whereas the coastal parts of the central Black Sea region are characterized by a dramatic drop in the number of settlements from the Middle to the Late Bronze Age, the northern limits of north-central Anatolian material culture, that is, the Hittite-Kaška frontier, in contrast underwent a “strengthening…in the form of fortified lines of defense and increasing settlement activities in their hinterland” (Glatz 2009: 134).

A comparison of the archaeological record of the Black Sea region to the rest of Late Bronze Age Anatolia confirms what we already know from Hittite textual records, namely, that this area was not under the direct imperial control of the Hittite state. The lack of monumental Hittite rock carvings in this region corroborates this notion. 51 Due to the lack of a finer chronological framework against which we could evaluate the archaeological material from this region, we cannot detect changes that might have taken place in Hittite-Kaška relations through the Hittite Early Empire and Empire periods.

50 I do not agree with the rest of the original argument, where Matthews et al. (2009b: 126), citing Houwink ten Cate (1967: 53), note that “Hittites and Kaška will have co-existed for episodes at particular sites, as masters and slaves for example.” That the Hittite-Kaška relationship should resemble that between masters and slaves is not supported by the textual record.

51 According to Ullman (2010: 187-88) the rock carvings were not “boundary markers” functioning as “external propaganda” but should be viewed as “projections of centralized power to lay claims over territories, rather than actual, achieved centralized control.”
Conclusion

The current state of archaeological research in the Black Sea region does not allow us to test the prevailing theories on the social, economic, and political structure of the Kaška. The archeological record is silent on the issue of the presumed arrival of the Kaška in the Black Sea region sometime in the late Middle Bronze Age or early Late Bronze Age, or on the question of the existence or nature of a Kaška identity/ethnicity distinct from Hittite identity and recognizable by its own members. On the subsistence strategies adopted by the Kaška, too, we are equally in the dark from an archaeological point of view.

The archeological record does suggest, however, that the Kaška, at least those who came into the ambit of Hittite records, inhabited the contested northern frontier of Ḫatti. By tracing the distribution of sites that have yielded Late Bronze Age/north-central Anatolian materials, we gain a geographical framework which facilitates the rough localization of important frontier towns attested in Hittite textual records, as exemplified by Matthews and Glatz (2009b), and thus assists our investigations of the dynamics of the Hittite-Kaška frontier (Chapter Three).

A note on terminology and chronology

The present study adopts the following periodization of Hittite history and succession of Hittite kings: 1) Old Kingdom (c. 1650-1400 BCE), Ḫattušili I, Muršili I, Ḫantili I, Zidanta I, Ammuna, Ḫuzziya I, Telipinu, Alluwamna, Taḥurwaili, Ḫantili II, Zidanta II, Ḫuzziya II, Muwatalli I; 2) Early Empire Period (c. 1400-1350 BCE), Tudḫaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, Tudḫaliya III; 3) Empire Period (c. 1350-1200 BCE),
Šuppišliumia I, Arnuwanda II, Muršili II, Muwatallii II, Urḫi-Tešup, Ḥattušili III, Tudḫaliya IV, Arnuwanda III, Šuppišliumia II. Middle Hittite/Middle Script (c. 1500-1350 BCE) and New Hittite/New Script (c. 1350-1200 BCE) are employed as linguistic and paleographic designations and do not reflect historical periods.

The terms “Hittite” and “Kaška” when referring to population groups are to be understood as “subjects of the Hittite state” and “people designated as Kaška in Hittite sources,” respectively. These labels do not denote presumed ethnic, linguistic, or cultural affiliations.
Chapter Two

Who were the Kaška?

Introduction

The underlying assumption in modern studies of Kaška society or Hittite-Kaška interactions is that the people designated as “Kaška” in the Hittite sources were a distinct ethnic group. Yet, with the few exceptions I point out below, this assumption and its implications are not explicitly stated or discussed.

In his pioneering study of the Kaška, Einar von Schuler starts out with the question of whether the Kaška may be considered an ethnic group, and as the subtitle of his monograph implies (Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasiens), concludes that they were indeed an ethnic group. His conclusion rests on the following considerations: 1) the existence of the Kaška name itself; 2) the inhabitation by the Kaška people of the same territory for centuries; 3) the recognition of the Kaška in contemporary Egyptian and later Assyrian sources, even after the demise of Ḫatti; and 4) the disappearance of the Kaška name from historical sources, which he interprets as the result of “ethnische Umschichtungen.” In his article on the northern towns Zalpa, Nerik, and Ḫakmiš, Klinger (2008: 279) asks whether the population groups designated as “Kaška” constituted an ethnic group with their own language and culture, a social category, or whether they were characterized by their way of life and economic
organization. He finds it unlikely for “Kaška” to have denoted an ethnic group on the
grounds that there is no indication of a Kaška language and that the personal names of
Kaška men can hardly be distinguished from those of the Hittite onomasticon. Zimansky (2007: 162) asserts, without further discussion, “there is an undeniable degree
to which the Kaška must be conceived as some sort of ethnic category, although the rigor
with which any modern definition of ethnicity may be applied to them is highly
questionable.”

To evaluate this proposition that “Kaška” was an ethnic category, we must first
point out certain underlying methodological issues having to do with the definition of
ethnicity, the nature of our sources, and whether our sources may allow us to identify a
Kaška identity or ethnicity. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must ask whether
the assumption that the Kaška were an ethnic group has any explanatory value for the
history of the northern frontier of Ḫatti and Hittite-Kaška interactions. In other words, we
must question whether ethnicity was a structuring principle in Hittite-Kaška interactions.

Definitions of ethnicity in current sociology and social anthropology stress that it
is a process of self-definition through which a group develops “a membership that
identifies itself and is identified by others” (Barth 1969: 10-11). Hall (1997: 32), for
example, stresses that ethnicity is socially and discursively constructed and subjectively
perceived. Language, religion, material culture, and other such traits can be chosen by the
group to define their (own) ethnic identity, though none of them are obligatory.

---

52 Klinger had posed this question in an earlier article, though without further commentary (2005: 348, n. 3): “Die Herkunft des Namens Kaška liegt ebenso im Dunkeln wie die eigentliche Bedeutung dieser
Bezeichnung - wird damit eine bestimmte ethnische Herkunft bezeichnet, eine lokale Zugehörigkeit, eine
sprachliche Gruppierung oder gar eine bestimmte Art der Lebensweise?”
“Association with a primordial territory and a shared myth of descent,” on the other hand, appear to be common to most ethnic groups (p. 32). Our only sources of information on the Kaška are Hittite texts, which carry the biases of the central elite, and the meager archaeological record of the Black Sea region. With the available sources it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine if the people designated as Kaška perceived themselves as belonging to a single (or any) ethnic group under that name, or how they may have defined their own identity. It is difficult to say if “ethnicity” was a structuring principle in the interactions of the Hittite state with the people they referred to as Kaška, or even if “ethnicity” was a distinction that was considered relevant for the Hittites who kept the records.

The uncritical application of the ethnic category to the groups designated as Kaška is characteristic of a number of studies devoted to determining and describing the traits of Kaška society—language, religion, social and economic organization, etc. A more productive approach, in my opinion, is to focus on the question of what kind of category “Kaška” represented from the perspective of the Hittite state, which may be established through the careful analysis of the use of the name Kaška and the descriptions of the people designated as Kaška. This approach ultimately has more explanatory value for Hittite-Kaška interactions and the history of the northern frontier of Ḫatti. In the following discussion I will leave the question of ethnicity aside in order to establish what

53 For the sake of simplicity in the following chapter I will use “(the) Kaška” as shorthand for “(the) Kaška people,” by which I ultimately mean groups designated as Kaška in Hittite sources.
54 See History of Scholarship in Introduction.
constituted a Kaška from a Hittite viewpoint. I will return to the question of ethnicity by way of conclusion (Chapter Six).

I would like to stress that this chapter is not intended as an objective description of Kaška society. Indeed it is more likely that Hittite descriptions of Kaška society based on Hittite sources may tell us more about the nature of “Hittite identity” (by which I mean an identity forged by the Hittite bureaucracy and ruling elite), which was reinforced through contrast with depictions of the “other,” in this case, the Kaška. I would finally like to emphasize that “Kaška” was a designation applied by outsiders to people dispersed across a large territory (the Black Sea region and north-central Anatolia) over more than two centuries. Any discussion of the “Kaška,” therefore, must reckon with the potential for significant variation across time and space among the people so designated, especially as a result of their interactions with the Hittite Empire.

Kaška in previous scholarship

Einar von Schuler (1965) described the Kaška as a semi-nomadic people who practiced seasonal transhumance (Bergnomadismus). Their predominant, though not exclusive, economic activity was animal husbandry. Groups of Kaška moved within the confines of their territory, though they were free to abandon their settlements and move to the mountains with all their belongings when under attack.

More recent scholarship offers a slightly modified view of the Kaška as transhumant pastoralists engaged in agriculture in the fertile valleys most of the year and

---

55 Although this question has been posed by Klinger (2005) and Zimansky (2007), there has not been a systematic discussion of what constituted a Kaška from a Hittite perspective.
56 Fleming (2004: 39) warns that the outsiders’ naming and categorization “will be unconscious of native identities and therefore both inaccurate in whom it groups together and liable to carry negative overtones.”
traveling with their herds to higher elevations in the summer. This type of economic subsistence is thought to be especially suitable for the ecology and geography of north-central Anatolia and the Black Sea region. It is still found in various regions of Anatolia today and is generally referred to as yayla(g) pastoralism in anthropological literature (Khazanov 1983: 23-24).

It is still generally assumed, and without much supporting evidence, that the Kaška were mountain dwelling people who inhabited the mountain ranges of the Black Sea Region and north-central Anatolia (Bryce 1986, Glatz and Matthews 2005, Freu 2005).

Recently, it has been suggested that at least part of the Kaška must have been “largely sedentary.” This assumption is based on a problematic passage in Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A), in which a reference to the Kaška (listed among the lands that had belonged to Ḫatti but were now lost) is followed by the remark that the Kaška were “swineherds and weavers” (more on this below). The argument here is that raising pigs and cultivating flax are not activities suitable for a mobile lifestyle.

The typical description of “Kaška towns” (designated with the sumerogram URU, which does not differentiate settlement size or type) is that they were “small and shifting,” easily abandoned, resettled, and relocated in times of peril. The predominant building materials were the archaeologically difficult-to-trace wood (abundantly available in the region), mudbrick, and in some cases undressed stone—all of which are

---

57 The most important works are Glatz and Matthews (2005), Freu (2005), Zimansky (2007), Yakar (2008), Singer (2008).
still in use in the region as the primary building materials (Glatz and Matthews 2005: 59).

There have been no discussions or revisions of the socio-political organization of the Kaška since von Schuler’s work. Kaška society is generally viewed as tribally organized and egalitarian, with intermittent episodes in which certain leaders managed to control significant territories and numbers of Kaška (e.g., the Piḫḫuniya affair, see below).

Based solely on Hittite texts, depictions of the Kaška in scholarly literature are biased and often more explicit than their sources justify. Examples include “Kaška tribes,” “nomads,” “barbarians,” “marauders,” “eines unorganisierten Naturvolkes” (von Schuler 1965: 20, 73; Bryce 1998: 54; Freu 2005). Glatz and Matthews claim to have employed a more anthropological approach in their research, and see the Kaška as a “loosely federated group of people,” admitting to the one-sidedness of the textual material (2005: 47).

In sum, a predominantly pastoralist economy accompanied by some degree of mobility, differing settlement patterns from that of the “Hittites” (i.e., smaller settlements located at higher elevations in the mountains), and a “tribal” social organization are generally pointed out as the distinguishing characteristics of the Kaška. In the rest of this chapter, I analyze these issues in turn.

The Kaška name, “Kaška men,” and “Kaška Land”

The linguistic affiliation of the name “Kaška,” its etymology, and meaning are not known. Since the Kaška name is attested primarily in Hittite documents it is hard even to
say if the people so designated ever used it as a self-designation. Still, that this label was somehow significant to the people so designated and was not merely the outsiders’ terminology seems to me to be reflected in the use of the element “Kaška” in personal names belonging to people classified as Kaška in Hittite texts. The examples we have so far are Kaškaili, Kaškamuwa, Kaška-, ..., and, Kaškanu. Interestingly, the name Kaškaili consists of the element Kaška plus the Hattic element -ili, whereas Kaškamuwa combines “Kaška” with the Luwian suffix -muwa. Both elements appear often in Hittite personal names and usually denote place of origin, as in Ḥattušili, Nerikkaili, or Mizraimuwa.

With only a few exceptions the name Kaška was written with the determinative URU. The use of URU, though, was merely an orthographic convention and as far as we know there never was a town named “Kaška.” URU Kaška could be used in combination with specific nouns in what appears to be a genitive construction in Hittite, though best translated into English as an adjectival phrase: LÚ.MEŠ URU Kaška “Kaška men,” KUR URU Kaška “Kaška land / territory,” URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A URU Kaška “Kaška towns,” ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Kaška “Kaška troops,” DINGIR.MEŠ URU Kaška “Kaška gods,” and LÚ.KÚR/LÚ.KUR URU Kaška “Kaška enemy.” With LÚ.(MEŠ) ‘man/men’ and KUR

---

58 The use of the element Kaška in personal names is attested already in Middle Hittite texts.
59 HKM 10: 15.
60 On the use of the Luwian -muwa in names consisting of place name + -muwa, see Melchert (2003: 178-79, n. 9.)
61 The list of attestations of the Kaška name provided by von Schuler (1965: 85-86), though it was published prior to the Mašat correspondence, gives a fairly accurate picture of its use.
62 Goetze (1928: 50-53) long ago observed the rule that whenever “land” names were used in combination (in a genitival relationship) with other nouns, the heterogram KUR was dropped and the short form with the determinative URU was used. But see the note below.
63 Also written as URU.DIDLIḪI.A ŠA KUR URU Kaška (KUB 23.77 §47 ’13).
64 “Kaška gods” DINGIR.MEŠ URU Kaška is attested only once (KUB 36.115 ii 8); more frequent are references to “gods of Kaška Land,” DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA KUR URU Kaška, or ŠA KUR URU Kaška DINGIR.MEŠ, or DINGIR.MEŠ KUR URU Kaška.
‘land’, the uninflected stem form appears, but with some of the other nouns, such as ÉRIN.MEŠ and LÚ.KÚR, both the uninflected and the inflected forms may appear.⁶⁵

The most common ways of referring to the Kaška people are LÚ.MEŠ URU Kaška “Kaška men,” ŠA URU GN (geographic name) URU Kaška “the Kaška of GN,” or simply URU Kaška. In the royal annals, groups of Kaška may also be referred to as ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Kaška “Kaška troops,” or LÚ.KÚR URU Kaška “Kaška enemy.” Whereas LÚ.MEŠ URU Kaška is more frequently attested in Middle Hittite documents, in the Empire Period beginning with the Deeds of Šuppiuliuma, URU Kaška is frequently attested as shorthand for LÚ.MEŠ URU Kaška (and occasionally also for KUR URU Kaška). This can be seen in the following examples from the Ten Year Annals of Muršili II and the Apology of Ḥattušili III: 1) ŠA KUR URU Dur-mi-it-ta-mu URU Ga-aš-ga-aš ku-u-ri-ya-aḫ-ta “the Kaška of Durmitta became hostile to me” (KBo 3.4 i 30). 2) nam-ma URU Qa-aš-ga-aš ú-it-pát nu KUR URU Dur-mi-it-ta GUL-an-ni-iš-ki-u-an [da-a-aš] “furthermore the Kaška came, and [began] to attack the territory of Durmitta” (KBo 3.4 i 31). 3) URU Ga-aš-ga HLA in KUB 1.8 iv 12 was a variant of LÚ.MEŠ URU Ga-aš-ga HLA in KUB 4.27, both from the Apology of Ḥattušili III.

Aside from references to “Kaška men,” which are by far the most frequently attested, Hittite texts also refer to a “Kaška Land.” “Kaška Land,” too, was used primarily as a designation for the Kaška people, rather than a territory or polity. This can be seen in the following excerpts from the Ten Year Annals of Muršili II and Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A), where KUR URU Kaška can only be

⁶⁵ See the list provided by von Schuler (1965: 85-86). Goetze (1928) had suggested that in the phrases LÚ URU GN, and KUR URU GN, GN should be interpreted as a genitive without ending (so-called endunglosen Genitiv).
understood as the Kaška people: 1) [(ma-ḫ-h)][a-an-ma KUR ŪRuGa-aš-ga ŠA ŪRuHa-li-la Û ŠA ŪRuDu-ud-duš-ga ḫar-ni-in-ku-u-ar [(iš-t)]a-ma-aš-ta (KBo 3.4 i 36-37) “When the Kaška Land heard of the destruction of the towns ḫalila and Dduška.” 2) “Moreover, those lands which belong to ḫatti, the Kaška land—they were swineherds and weavers—Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka, and Pitašša, have declared themselves free from the Sun-goddess of Arinna.”

KUR ŪRuKaška could also denote a territory or region, as we see in the following example from the Mašat correspondence, though this usage is rare: ARAD mŠa-pár-ta-ya-kán ku-in I-NA KUR ŪRuGa-aš-ga pa-ra-a ne-ēḫ-ḫu-un “Šaparta’s servant whom I sent into the Kaška land” (HKM 66: 21). This “Kaška territory” was not a clearly defined region that can be pinpointed on a map. Rather, “Kaška land” refers to constantly fluctuating territories in which there was a significant Kaška population, or which at the time of reference were under Kaška control or beyond Hittite control.

I argue that the name Kaška was perceived and used in Hittite documents primarily as a name for the people (as opposed to a territory, polity, etc.). The attestations of ŪRuKaška or KUR ŪRuKaška can only be explained against the backdrop of the political world of Late Bronze Age Anatolia. The political world of the Hittite archives was made up, at the highest level, of “lands” (Hittite ūtnē, usually written with

---


67 There seems to have been considerable overlap between Kaška Land and the Land of ḫatti. Towns or territories which clearly were beyond the direct control of the Hittite state, such as those listed in the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375), or Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376. A), were still perceived as part of the Land of ḫatti (from a Hittite viewpoint).

68 How the Kaška name was used in Hittite sources was probably different from the way the name was used among the people designated as Kaška. The use of the element Kaška in personal names suggests that Kaška may have been perceived as a geographical name by the bearers of the names.
the sumerogram KUR). “Lands” in the Hittite world were not simply territories, though they unquestionably did have a geographical aspect.69 “Lands,” in most contexts, denoted “polities,”70 which were superimposed on a landscape consisting of “towns” (Hittite ḫappiriyā, written with the sumerogram URU).71 The town, on the other hand, was the principal political unit in (Late) Bronze Age Anatolia. In the Hittite archives “lands” and territories were usually named by their central towns, which resulted in the typical formula “land of town X.” This formula was sometimes applied inappropriately to polities that did not fit this naming pattern, such as KUR URU Mizri to refer to Egypt, and also to “populations” whose socio-political organization was of an entirely different variety than the large polities the Hittites usually dealt with. The best example of the latter usage is indeed KUR URU Kaška, “Kaška Land.”72 The Kaška people did not fit the traditional Hittite political categories “land” or “town.” KUR URU Kaška, “Kaška Land,” was not a large centralized polity, like other “lands” the Hittite state dealt with, and we cannot speak of a central Kaška town. “Kaška” in Hittite texts was a “people.”

---

69 Hittite ṭmē covered the meanings “polity,” “domain,” and “countryside.”
70 Beckman (1999).
71 Beckman (1999: 168) observes that Hittite imperial administration was organized around a “system of ḫappiriyâ-s.”
72 The political landscape of the Hittite world, as well as the principles of territorial administration, are relatively poorly researched. See Beckman’s “The City and the Country in Ḫatti” (1999). In my brief account, offered as background, I have relied on the ideas of Daniel Fleming (2004) on the “political world” of Old Babylonian Mari, which have much bearing on Mesopotamia and Ḫatti. Though not a Hittitologist himself, Fleming’s concise but helpful comments on the continuation of Mesopotamian political traditions in Hatti, visible in the use of the category “land,” refer to Beckman’s above-mentioned article and were aided by comments from Harry Hoffner.
Economic organization and way of life

In the following section I will look at Hittite descriptions of the economic activities and way of life of the Kaška in order to investigate whether Kaška denoted a specific economic organization and/or way of life.

Pastoral nomads in Hittite sources

Pastoralism was an important component of the Hittite economy and culture. It probably was not accompanied by nomadism, except in the case of certain populations on the peripheries of Ḫatti (Beckman 1988). In Ḫatti animals were kept in close proximity to or on the peripheries of the settled areas, what Beckman calls “close-in grazing.”\(^7\)

Hittites did not have a word for nomads or nomadic pastoralists.\(^7\) The only unambiguous reference to mobile populations is found in a Middle Hittite treaty between a Hittite king (opinions as to his identity differ\(^7\)) and Paddatiššu of Kizzuwatna (CTH 26). This parity treaty introduces a set of provisions that concern transhumant populations. §5 stipulates that if a “city,” meaning the population of a settlement or nomadic encampment (Beckman 1988), crosses over to the territory of the treaty partner

\(^7\) For the place of pastoralism in Hittite economy and culture see Beckman’s text-based study “Herding and Herdsmen in Hittite Anatolia” (1988). Beckman’s article predates the publishing of the Maşat Höyük texts (Alp 1990), which brought to light more evidence on pastoralism in Ḫatti. In his recent contributions to the study of Hittite economy, Klengel (2005, 2006, 2007; for animal husbandry see Klengel 2007) treats the place of animal husbandry and hunting within Hittite economy. His discussion revolves more around the types of animals kept, their uses, and their prices. His only remark on the question of mobility is that sometime in the 3rd millennium, an economic system similar to the yayla pattern was developed in Anatolia as a consequence of human impact on the natural environment, through which the forests and vegetation gave way to grasslands or steppes due to intensive use of forests.

\(^7\) Contra Puhvel, who, in the HED translates the word latti- as “nomad population” (Puhvel 2001: 64-67); see below.

\(^7\) See the introduction to the online edition of this treaty in the Hethitologie Portal by Gernot Wilhelm.
together with their “women.”76 goods, and animals, they must be returned to the treaty partner. The situation described in §6 is slightly different. Here, it is stipulated that if only part of the “women” have crossed over, but the goods, animals, and some of the population (busy with herding) remain, the “women” who crossed over must be returned. §§7-8 stipulate that in case of theft of oxherds in the border districts of the treaty partner, the thief must make restitution.

Kaška pastoralists

There are no descriptions of the Kaška as transhumant pastoralists comparable to the passage from the Paddatiššu Treaty discussed above. The only textual reference that seems to present pastoralism as a characteristic trait of the Kaška comes from year 7 of the Ten Year Annals of Muršili II (CTH 61.II) and seems to carry negative overtones. It is part of the Piḫḫuniya narrative, where the rise and territorial expansion of the Kaška ruler Piḫḫuniya (see below) is described. After entering Zazišša and taking control of the Upper Land, “he took the entire territory of Ištitina and turned it into his grazing grounds.”77

The Middle Hittite Kaška agreements (specifically CTH 138.1.A and CTH 138.3.A) and Mašat correspondence provide numerous references (mentioning herds, herders, military raids seeking livestock, etc.) that connect the Kaška to pastoralism.

76 Note that the translation “women” of MUNUS.NITA.MEŠ by Beckman (1996) is, according to Wilhelm (cited in the note above), erroneous: “MUNUS.NITA steht hier und im folgenden nicht für NITLAM₄ (ḫûrtu) (so implizit Meyer 1953, 117 “Frauen” und Beckman 1996, 12f. “women”), es handelt sich vielmehr um einen Kollektivbegriff für Frauen und Männer mit Sklavenstatus.”

77 KBo 3.4+ iii 71-72: KUR  العراقي 16-ti-ša-na-ma-za ḫu-ḫa-ḫa-ḫa da-a-ḫa / na-at-zu a-pê-ê-ê ū-i-ši-ya-u-wa-šê pé-e-da-an i-ya-a-ê. Von Schuler sees this passage as an indication that Kaška mobility was motivated by the search for pastures.
The emphasis laid on this topic in these documents demonstrates that pastoralism was a crucial component of the economy of north-central Anatolia, not only among the Kaška, but also in Hittite-controlled territories. Yet the available evidence does not imply a drastic difference between Kaška and Hittite communities, in either the economic significance of pastoralism or specific practices.

Most of our evidence, especially from the annals, concerns pillage and raids seeking livestock. It is evident that this was an important economic activity in the frontier region, carried out on a regular basis by both the Kaška and the Hittite state. Aside from the annals, which record numerous formulaic references to the Hittite king carrying off cattle, sheep, and deportees as booty in the wake of successful campaigns, the Maşat Höyük correspondence provides ample evidence for raids aiming at herds. In ABoT 60 (II. 9’-15’), a Hittite official, probably Kaššu (Hoffner 2009: 176), informs the king that the enemy, 7000 in number, has attacked Tarittarā, taking away shepherds, oxherds, and cattle. In HKM 10 it is reported that the enemy has taken 40 cattle and 100 sheep. In HKM 36, it is stated that the enemy is positioned near sheepfolds. Similarly, we find out from HKM 17 that Hittite officials are planning an attack on sheepfolds in the vicinity of the (enemy) city Marišta after a reconnaissance of the territory. The Kaška agreements, too, mention the possibility of such raids. For example, in CTH 138.3.A, §6 (II. 16’-20’), the allied Kaška are warned against mingling their own herds with those of the enemy,

---

78 Beckman (1988).
79 See HKM 25, 8, 10, 17, 36, and ABoT 60.
80 The consensus opinion is that “the enemy” frequently mentioned in the Maşat letters was groups of Kaška; see Giorgadze (2005).
since in the case of a Hittite raid the allies’ animals would be carried off along with those of the enemy (see also §§7-9 below).

Pastoralism was an important element in the peaceful interactions between the Hittite state and the allied Kaška who were bound by agreement. Corresponding paragraphs in the agreements CTH 138.1.A and CTH 138.3.A contain numerous provisions concerning herdsmen, grazing rights, and the movement of cattle and sheep. These passages demonstrate that the allied Kaška were not just given grazing rights in Hittite controlled territory, but appear to have been employed by the Hittite state as herdsmen. This can best be seen in CTH 138.3.A, §7:

Because you are allies, the cattle [and sheep] of Ḫatti [and your cattle] and sheep are mixed together, and the cowherds and shepherds [pasture] together. But if an enemy attacks, we shall hold you alone responsible. […] you indeed drive here. The cowherds and shepherds […] If they kill anyone, either one man, or one [ox, or one sheep], you shall replace them (i.e. the men) and [you shall replace the] cattle [and sheep] of Ḫatti as well. You shall give three men for one man, you shall also give [three oxen for one ox] and you shall give three [she]ep for one sheep. (CTH 138.3.A ii 21'-26’)

According to this passage, not only were the cattle and sheep of Ḫatti and allied Kaška grazing together but the allies were also held responsible for Hittite herds in the case of an enemy attack. That Kaška herdsmen were entrusted with Hittite herds can also be seen in §§8-9, in which the Kaška are warned against encouraging enemies to carry off animals or kill herdsmen and against dividing up the cattle among themselves (i.e., the allies and the Kaška who were not allies).

Hittite sources, especially the Kaška agreements (CTH 138.1.A and CTH 138.3.A), refer to Kaška herdsmen alongside Hittite herdsmen as a subgroup of specialists who were entrusted with the care of the animals. The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma
(BoTU 34+ l. 14’), too, contains an interesting reference to Kaška herdsmen: in Fragment 10, when the Hittite king is confronted by “the entirety of the enemy,” which probably meant very high numbers, it is noted that “the shepherds [had come to] help.”

The mention of sheepfolds in the Mašat documents near both Hittite-controlled and “enemy” towns indicates that the animals, at least for part of the year, were kept “enclosed” in the vicinity of settlements. At other times, probably in the warmer months, the animals were in the care of herdsmen, who sought pastures in the countryside outside the towns and at higher elevations.

“Swineherds and weavers”

In Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A) the Kaška are described as “swineherds and weavers of linen.” This oft-quoted remark has been interpreted as a derogatory “ethnic description” of the Kaška, aiming to mark them “barbarians.”\(^{81}\) Some scholars have offered a literal interpretation, concluding that the Kaška must have been raising pigs and cultivating flax for weaving (Glatz and Matthews 2005; et al.). These two interpretations are not mutually exclusive. Von Schuler suggests that while this description of the Kaška may have been derogatory, it nevertheless categorizes the Kaška in a more general way as “herdsmen and weavers.” He asserts that this is not an ethnic description and had instead to do with the social classification of the Kaška (1965: 79).

I suggest a different interpretation based on the narrative context of this reference to the Kaška: “Moreover, those lands which belong to Ḫatti, the Kaška land—they were

---

swineherds and weavers of linen—Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka, and Pitašša, have declared themselves free from the Sun-goddess of Arinna. They discontinued the payment of their tributes and began to attack Ḫatti. An ethnic description or an anthropological observation on the Kaška society seems out of place in this context. It seems more likely that this remark on the Kaška was intended to describe the role or importance of the Kaška for the Sun-goddess of Arinna, in order to illustrate how the Sun-goddess herself is affected by their defiance. In short, we may interpret this line as an indication that groups of Kaška were employed in the service of the Sun-goddess of Arinna as “swineherds and weavers,” or as von Schuler has suggested, simply as “herdsmen and weavers.”

Mobility

The assumption that the Kaška were transhumant or semi-nomadic has been accepted and reiterated uncritically in secondary literature without attempts to further substantiate it. The only argument for Kaška mobility was articulated by von Schuler (1965) and was based on the following points: 1) the Kaška simply abandoned their settlements when under attack rather than defend them and the destruction of their settlements did not have a significant effect on their livelihood; 2) their southward

---

83 Hittites adopted this rhetorical technique often in prayers, arguing that the disasters that afflicted them (i.e., the Hittites) had an effect on the cults and care of the gods themselves, in the hopes that the gods would show mercy and help the suppliants.
84 Yakar (2000) is a notable exception. Yakar’s view of Kaška economy and way of life is informed by ethnoarchaeological and ethnographic data.
85 One wonders if the claims of Hittite rulers to have “burnt down” or “destroyed” settlements or their territories are to be taken literally. Such claims appear often, but as was mentioned by von Schuler, the destruction does not appear to affect the Kaška. And moreover, the same towns appear to have been resettled shortly thereafter. We may compare the claims of having burnt down or destroyed towns to rare
expansion of territory throughout the history of documentation can, according to von Schuler, only be explained as “Wanderungen” necessitated by a pastoralist lifestyle; 3) the designation of Kaška troops as ÉRIN.MEŠ SUTU, a name originally referring to nomadic pastoralist groups from Syria (more on ÉRIN.MEŠ SUTU below).

There is an undeniable degree to which Hittite sources depict the Kaška as a mobile people. This is best illustrated in the Mašat correspondence and the annals. The “enemy” of the Mašat correspondence, generally understood to have been the Kaška (Giorgadze 2005), is constantly on the move, has superior knowledge of the terrain, and the ability to appear and vanish suddenly despite their large numbers. Numerous letters report that the enemy “has come,” “is going/on the move” or “has disappeared.” Consider the following examples: 86

Concerning what you wrote to me, saying: “The enemy has come. He pressed the city Ḥapara on that side and the city Kašepura on this side. But he himself passed through, and I don’t know where he went.” And was that enemy enchanted that you didn’t recognize him? (HKM 6: 3-14)

Because the enemy marches into the land at any moment, you should locate him somewhere and attack him. (HKM 8: 12-17)

The enemy is going to Marišta. (HKM 17: 15-16)

The enemy is moving en masse at night—sometimes six hundred, sometimes four hundred of the enemy—and is reaping crops. (HKM 25: 6-10)

Also relevant to the question of mobility is the following paragraph from CTH 138.1.A:

instances in which the Hittite king threatens to consecrate a certain town to a god. In the latter case, the threat of destruction seems much more real, which may suggest that “burning down” towns is only a literary motif. For example, in Year 2 of the Extensive Annals of Muršili II, Muršili II threatens the inhabitants of Kammama and a town whose name is broken that he will dedicate Palḫuišša to the Storm God and coerces them to do his bidding. Differently Ünal (1983: 164-80) on burning down towns.

86 Translations follow Hoffner (2009) with minor modifications.
[No] one shall settle in a city belonging to Ḫatti [on his own authority]. Now, a Kaška man who, within a territory, occupies a city on his own authority, [is] His Majesty’s en[emy...]. And he (His Majesty) will fight him. (CTH 138.1.A rev. 86’-87’)

The annals, too, corroborate this picture. There are numerous references to Kaška people—the entire population with their animals and presumably movable property—abandoning their towns and fleeing before the advancing Hittites to seek refuge on mountains or in other such places out of the reach of the Hittite army. Moreover, both the Mašat correspondence and the annals also make numerous references to Kaška groups mobilized in order to attack Hittite territory.

In both the annals and Mašat correspondence, the contexts in which we find instances of Kaška mobility seem to be raids, military campaigns, and situations where the Kaška were either attacking or retreating. Our sources do not yield an easy answer to the question of whether—and to what extent—pastoralism among the Kaška or in Ḫatti proper was accompanied by mobility, and to what extent mobility was a significant element of their lifestyle. It is difficult to find specific evidence linking Kaška mobility to pastoralist motivations or activities. The passages from the Kaška agreements discussed above do provide some information concerning the question of mobile pastoralism. §§7-9 of CTH 138.3.A, for example, indicates a distant-grazing pattern, whereby Kaška herdsmen were moving their animals in search of pasture. Beyond this, we cannot go.

Some scholars have argued recently that the Kaška (or groups thereof) were “largely sedentary.” This assertion is based on a literal interpretation of the

88 See years 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 of the Extensive Annals of Muršili II.
The abovementioned passage from Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A) stating that the Kaška were “swineherds and weavers.” It has been pointed out that pigs are not especially mobile animals and the cultivation of flax for linen-weaving requires a more sedentary lifestyle (Glatz and Matthews 2005).

**Agriculture**

Hittite sources frequently mention agricultural pursuits of the Kaška. The references in the Annals of Muršili II to Kaška gathering crops (unaware of the advancing Hittite army), destruction or plunder of Kaška crops by the Hittite army, and the delivery of wine and grain as tribute from Kaška territory have already been observed (von Schuler 1965: 77).89

The Mašat correspondence, too, presents a similar picture. To point out a few instances: In HKM 19, a Hittite official reports that Kaška crops have been devoured by locusts, and that they have started to seize the crops of Kašepura. ABoT 60 refers to the town of Tarittara as the “enemy’s granary.”90 HKM 47 refers to an oracular inquiry through which it was determined that the king’s attack on Taggašta will succeed and that he will reap its crops; the town, and the agricultural land, we may assume, were under Kaška control at the time of writing.

---

89 Von Schuler supposes that wine production among the Kaška is not to be generalized and was restricted to the eastern Kaška groups and those in the Nerik region, namely, among the Kaška who were settled in the old “Kulturboden.” I see no support for this supposition.

90 The Hittite word *arziyan* is interpreted by Hoffner as “granary” (2009: 176-77).
Kaška towns/settlements

In most types of Hittite documents dealing with the Kaška (e.g., the agreements, royal historiography, Mašat correspondence), Kaška groups or individuals are identified according to their “towns.” These towns ranged from small settlements that occur no more than once in Hittite texts to large “cities” that date back to the Old Assyrian Period in Anatolia; they could be “enemies” or “allies,” under Hittite control, or beyond the grasp of the Hittite state. However, the majority of the towns mentioned in relation to the Kaška, especially those attested in the agreements, are found but once. We have only a general idea about their location but know nothing further about their size or other characteristics.

There are a few references to “Kaška towns” (URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A ŠA KUR URU Kaška, URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A URU Kaška), but a clear distinction between “Hittite” and “Kaška” towns is hard to justify textually or archaeologically. In official Hittite discourse even “Kaška Land” or towns with significant Kaška presence could be described as being part of the “Land of Ḥatti.” Also, most textually attested towns in north-central Anatolia/the Black Sea Region probably comprised mixed populations of “Kaška men,” “men of Ḥatti” (Hittite subjects), and deportees (NAM.RA) from various parts of

---

91 For Kaška individuals identified by their towns, see the Kaška agreements CTH 137.A and CTH 139.1.A/B. In the annals, groups of Kaška were often identified as “Kaška of GN,” ŠA URU URU Kaška; see, for example, KBo 3.4+ i 30, 41, 43.

92 Von Schuler excludes the possibility that towns mentioned in connection with the Kaška were “towns/cities,” pointing to the ambiguity in the use of the Sumerogram URU (see above) and instead suggests that most of these were villages (1965: 71). Hoffner questions this suggestion on the grounds that some of these settlements bore old Hattic names (1967: 183, n. 14).

93 E.g., KBo 5.6 i 15, KUB 23.77 §47 rev. 13’.

94 We may refer again to Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, in which Kaška Land, Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka, and Pitašša are characterized as “lands that belong to Ḫatti” (see the section Kaška Name, “Kaška Men,” “Kaška Land” above).
Anatolia, even at times when they were under Hittite control.\(^95\) The political allegiance of these towns shifted constantly between Hittites and Kaška (and possibly independence) throughout the history of documentation. We may point to the important town and territory of Išḫupitta as an example, which the Hittites strove to control during the Early Empire period at the time of the Mašat correspondence. We cannot claim Išḫupitta to have been a Kaška town or territory, but the annals, the Kaška agreements, and Mašat letters mention “Kaška of Išḫupitta” as well as “troops of Išḫupitta,” which we understand to be Kaška men.\(^96\)

Though rarely, Hittite sources mention “towns” that were of special importance to the Kaška. In the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, the town Timuḫala, located probably in the northwest (Matthews and Glatz 2009), is described as “a place of pride for the Kaška.” In the first year of the Ten Year Annals of Muršili II, Muršili destroys the “towns” Ḫalila and Tutuška in the territory Turmitta, which are described as the “principal lands of the Kaška.”\(^97\) Upon hearing of the destruction of these towns, all the Kaška are reported to have come to the aid of the Kaška of Turmitta.

Descriptions of territories, towns, and the natural environment are rare in Hittite sources.\(^98\) We know little about the size, exact location, environment, or other such characteristics of the majority of the towns which had significant Kaška populations or

\(^{95}\) Ḫattušili III’s decree concerning the inhabitants of Tiliura (CTH 89) introduces a set of regulations hindering the access of Kaška people to the town Tiliura (ii 6’-17’, iii 29’-43’). This demonstrates that in other circumstances (i.e., at other towns or in earlier periods) the Kaška had free access to towns and may have been settled in towns. Note that the context of this decree is Ḫattušili’s successful establishment of Hittite control over north-central Anatolia and the Black Sea region.

\(^{96}\) Kaška of Išḫupitta are mentioned in KBo 3.4+ i 43 (CTH 61.1.A) and CTH 137.A iv 6’. The troops of Išḫupitta, mentioned alongside the troops of Karaḫna and Mt. Šaktunuwa, in the Mašat letter HKM 71 can only be understood as Kaška men. Other notable examples include Malazziya, Kašaša, Taggaša, Marišta, Kammama.

\(^{97}\) KBo 3.4+ i 32: SAG.DU.MEŠ KUR.KUR.ME[Ș].

\(^{98}\) Ullmann (2010).
which were otherwise associated with the Kaška. A rare description is found in the Annals of Tudḫaliya I/II (CTH 142): “Furthermore, I went into his territory (i.e., Kaška territory), in [mount]ains and difficult fortified towns, I defeated (lit. killed) them.”

A number of Kaška towns are described as “difficult” or “well protected” places, referring either to their location at high elevations or their fortifications. The following description of the town Timuḫala, “the pride of the Kaška,” comes from the Extensive Annals of Muršili II: “Timuḫala was [(located) in the mountains], the roads were difficult to climb, wooded, and it was defended with force.” But such descriptions are the exception rather than the norm and cannot substantiate generalizing statements about Kaška settlement patterns. According to del Monte (1993: 81, n. 25), the descriptions of mountains as difficult places is a literary topos used frequently in the annals to underline the courage and strength of the Hittite king.

Mountain dwellers?

Some scholars have characterized the Kaška as highlanders/mountain dwellers who inhabited the Pontic Mountains and whose settlements for the most part were located at higher elevations (Bryce 1986, Murat 1998, Glatz and Matthews 2005, Freu 2005, Yakar 2008). This supposed characteristic of the Kaška has more than once been offered as an explanation as to why the Hittite state could not, for so long, effectively control the Kaška. But in fact, there are only very few instances in which Hittite sources state clearly

99 KUB 23.11 iii 22-23.
101 Probably year 17, see del Monte (1993: 120, n. 172).
102 KUB 19. 37 ii 4-7.
that groups of Kaška inhabited towns located on mountains. More frequently attested are reports, mostly from the annals (e.g., years 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 of the Extensive Annals of Muršili II), of the Kaška retreating to the mountains under threat. Note, however, that it is not only the Kaška who are described as taking refuge in the mountains.

In HKM 46 Adad-bēlī reports to the king that he has sent scouts to the Ḫappiduini Mountains to ensure that “the mountain is clear of any trace of the enemy” before letting the cattle and sheep out of Tapikka. This, of course, implies a Kaška presence in the mountains surrounding the town. We may finally mention a badly damaged paragraph in the Kaška agreement CTH 138.1.A (§31’) that mentions mountains multiple times, in connection with the BĒL MADGALTI (1.92’).

Social structure and political organization

The primary mode of identifying social or political affiliations in the Hittite world was by place, mostly by “town” and in some contexts by “land.” Groups of Kaška, too, in Hittite documents were frequently identified by their towns, either collectively, as in “Kaška of Turmitta” or “men of Kammama” or individually, as we see in the agreements with the Kaška (e.g., “Nanaziti, Pikuryalli, man of Išḫupitta”

The Hittites viewed the Kaška as a people with a markedly different socio-political structure than their own. Our sources present the Kaška as a people who, throughout their interactions with the Hittite state, did not have a centralized authority.

---

103 One example is the town Timuḫala, which, as mentioned above, was located in mountainous territory.
104 See the description of a campaign against Mount Arinanda in year 3 of the Extensive Annals of Muršili II (del Monte 1993: 81, n. 25).
106 CTH 137.A iv 6’.
Those who produced the sources seem to have recognized that groups of Kaška dispersed across a wide geographic territory were bound together in a way that to us—the modern observers—indicates an underlying kinship structure. Moreover, later sources from the Empire Period indicate tendencies among the Kaška to form a more centralized political structure (see below).

The assertion that the Kaška were an egalitarian society, first articulated by von Schuler (1965: 71-73) and generally accepted in secondary literature, is hard to justify. On the contrary, it is evident that the Hittite state dealt with Kaška leaders on a regular basis and possibly also with collective socio-political institutions such as “elders.” It should also be noted, as was pointed out by Glatz and Matthews (2005), that the socio-political organization of groups of people with the ability to mobilize troops in the numbers described in the annals should not be underestimated.

During the Early Empire Period Kaška leaders are attested in the Kaška agreements as the oath-takers representing their “troops,” “men,” and perhaps also their communities.107 These individuals were listed by their personal names, hometowns, and occasionally by “onomastic epithets”/titles or patronyms. Although these individuals seem to have a predominantly military role in the agreements (see “Kaška Agreements”), this does not exclude the possibility that they may have been political leaders as well. In fact, if the tapariyalleš ‘commanders’ listed at the end of some versions of the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375) are indeed Kaška individuals, it confirms the existence of leaders among groups of Kaška. In the Mašat correspondence, too, we find

107 The oath-takers are mentioned only in the composite agreements CTH 137, 139, and various fragments assembled under CTH 140.
candidates for Kaška leaders, if the assumption that the ambiguous expression “the man from GN” may, in some contexts, be understood as “the ruler of GN.”

Von Schuler (1965: 72) asserts that there is no evidence for the institution of “elders” among the egalitarian Kaška. With the publishing of the Mašat correspondence, however, the question once again comes to the fore. In HKM 51, Kašturašeli (whose rank is unknown) entreats the king to treat the “elders of Pittalaššuwa” kindly. Hoffner notes that if this town is connected to Pittalašša (like Zalpa/Zalpuwa) it may be localized in “Kaška territory” (2009: 189). HKM 53 mentions the “elders of …-inarita,” who also may have been “Kaškaean” (Hoffner 2009: 197-98). Elders are mentioned also in HKM 80, where they are supposed to “protect the land” (Hoffner 2009: 239). Whether the elders in this last instance were Kaška or not cannot be discerned from the broken context.

Throughout the history of their interactions with the Hittite state, certain Kaška leaders appear to have gathered more power and become long-term opponents of the Hittite king, such as Piḫḫuniya, Pittagatalli, Pittaparra, and Dadilu. Hittite kings corresponded with these leaders and quote their exchanges in their annals, which has been interpreted as evidence that cuneiform may have been used among the Kaška as well (Klinger 2008: 287). The best-known example is Piḫḫuniya, “the man (ruler?) of Tipiya,” who in the seventh year of the reign of Muršili II assumed power as monarch. The Ten Year Annals of Muršili II narrates how this Piḫḫuniya gained control of the

---

108 See “Tippurrui, the man of Pittalaššuwa” (HKM 51: 3-4), “Marruwa, the man of Ḫimmuwa” (HKM 13: 3-4), “Marruwa, the man of Kakattuwa” (HKM 14: 8-9).
109 Beckman (1995: 26) suggests that all the elders attested in the Mašat correspondence are Kaška.
110 See most recently Klinger (2008: 287).
Upper Land, entered Zazišša, and turned the territory of Ištitina into his “grazing grounds.” The narrative continues in the following manner: “After that, Piḫḫuniya no longer ruled in the Kaška manner. Suddenly, when there was no rule of one (i.e., sole ruler) among the Kaška, that Piḫḫuniya began to rule like a king” (KBo 3.4+ iii 73-76). This statement illustrates awareness, on the Hittite side, of the changing socio-political structure of the Kaška, clearly as a consequence of their interactions with the centralized Hittite state.

The Hittite word for tribe?

The problem with the claim that the Kaška were a “tribally organized” society has to do with the definition of the term “tribe.” The term “tribe” has been used in two main ways in the social sciences: one usage refers to a non-hierarchical society on an evolutionary trajectory of political systems (emphasizing its political characteristics), and the other refers to groups bound by a kinship structure within or on the peripheries of states (Emberling 1995: 8). In secondary Hittitological literature the use of the term “tribe” in reference to the Kaška is not accompanied by any explanation. For von Schuler, the term seems to denote a non-hierarchical society, between bands and chiefdoms.

The argument for tribal organization among the Kaška has been suggested by reference to what is interpreted as a Hittite term that meant “tribe.” In the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma and the Annals of Muršili II, there are references to ÉRIN.MEŠ Š/S/ZUTE\(^\text{111}\) (“Š/S/ZUTU troops”) of the Kaška with whom the Hittite kings were engaged in battle. The logogram was first interpreted by Güterbock as Sutū, the name of

\footnote{111 In the Annals of Muršili, the form ÉRIN.MEŠ ŠUTI becomes the standardized form (Goetze 1933).}
nomadic pastoralists who appear most notably in Mari texts (Güterbock 1956: 62, n. c). Güterbock suggested that when this term was adopted by the Hittites, it no longer referred to the Sutû of northern Syria, but meant, more generally, “tribe” or “tribal group.” Later, it was shown by Alp that this logogram was to be equated with the Hittite word latti- (Alp 1977). Eventually, Hoffner (1979) brought together all the references to ÉRÍN.MEŠ Š/S/ZUTE and latti-, and concluded that this was the Hittite word for “tribe.”

According to the CHD latti- means “1. tribal troop(s). tribe(?) 2. (a feature of the Exta).” In HED, Puhvel has translated the word as “nomad population, nomad military (unit); nomad roaming ground, habitat; local region (in extispicy)” (2001: 64-67).

I find the evidence for the claim that latti- (and ÉRÍN.MEŠ SUTU) was the Hittite word for “tribe” inconclusive. A more probable interpretation has been offered by Beal, who suggests that the function of the SUTI was “doing one thing while the troops are doing something else” (1992: 104, 105). In my opinion, the significance of the SUTI was in their function as a light infantry, hence Beal’s “light troops” (1992: 108). The ÉRÍN.MEŠ SUTI, featured in the Annals of Muršili II were employed in the Hittite army, and although in fragmentary context the term seems to have been used in reference to troops of Arzawa as well. The SUTI employed by the enemy probably indicated “soldiers of a type who were armed, fought and/or dressed differently than other soldiers and also refers to the unit(s) composed of such soldiers” (Beal 1992: 107-08). Contrary

112 For a detailed analysis of this term and its possible Hittite equivalent, see Hoffner 1979.
113 Puhvel suggests, through elaborate phonological gymnastics, that latti- comes from the same root as Greek νουάδ- (2001: 66).
to Güterbock’s suggestion, Beal points out that this term, especially in a Hittite context, cannot mean “tribe/tribal troop” because the name does not refer to ethnic groups outside of military contexts, and because there was no tribal military structure in the Hittite army (1992: 107). We may also add that the term *latti-* does not appear in any of the Kaška agreements in which numerous groups of Kaška men or troops are listed. It appears but once in the Maṣat correspondence.\(^{115}\) There is, in fact, only a single context in all known Hittite texts in which the term *latti-* may perhaps have been used in a way that would identify its members: “They write down [on a document] (the name of?) his *latti*” (KUB 17. 18 iii 13ff. in Hoffner 1979: 265).

**Kinship terminology**

Nevertheless, we may still find possible references in Hittite documents to kinship structure or terminology among the Kaška. Two passages from the Extensive Annals of Muršili II may allow us to glimpse such terminology. In year 12/13 of the Extensive Annals, while Muršili II is planning an attack on Malazziya\(^{116}\) he is spotted by the men of Šunupašši, Ištupišta, and Pitakalaiša, who are described as the “brothers of the men of Malazziya.” Fortunately for Muršili II, these men are not able to carry message to Malazziya. In year 18 of the Extensive Annals, Muršili II campaigns against Timuḫala, which has recently been resettled. While the Kaška of Timuḫala, Tiyašša, and Zimumu are on a mountain whose name has not been preserved, Muršili II manages to ascend the mountain without being spotted by the “brothers” of the enemy. An underlying kinship

---

\(^{115}\) HKM 46: 3-7: *ka-a-ša-kán LŪ.KÜR pa-an-qa-ri-it / 2 AŠ-RA za-a-[iš] nu-kán 1-iš / la-at-ti-iš I-NA URU Iš-te-ru-wa / za-a-iš 1-iš-ma-kán la-at-ti-iš / I-NA URU Zi-iš-pa za-iš “This enemy has crossed in large numbers in two places, one *latti* at the town Išeruwa and one *latti* at the town Zišpa.”

\(^{116}\) Malazziya was a town with a continuous Kaška presence which often broke away from Hittite control.
structure may also be gleaned from various instances in royal annals where Kaška groups who “hear” about the Hittite attack on other Kaška groups rush to their aid (e.g., year 1 of the Ten Year Annals of Muršili II).  

Kaška culture

There have been various attempts, most notably by von Schuler (1965), to isolate elements of Kaška culture in Hittite sources, most importantly Kaška language and religion.

Kaška language

Von Schuler, who considered the “Kaška” an ethnic group distinct from the Hittites, did not question the existence of a Kaška language. In *Die Kaškäer*, in a chapter devoted to the Kaška language, von Schuler compiles personal names, geographic names, and “onomastic epithets”/titles from northern Anatolia (1965: 83-107). He assumes that when we eliminate various elements from pre-existing Anatolian languages (namely Hittite, Luwian, Hattic, Palaic) and names attested already in the Boğazköy or Kültepe archives, the linguistic elements that remain may be considered “Kaška” (p. 84). Von Schuler does not suggest any relationship between the putative Kaška language and any other ancient or modern language. Von Schuler’s approach and conclusions have to do with his assumption that the Kaška were not originally from northern Anatolia and came

---

117 Von Schuler (1965: 71-73) did not ascribe any political reality or significance to this phenomenon, which he refers to as “Kriegsverbündnisse.”

118 See Appendix for an updated list of PNs, GNs, and “onomastic epithets” attested in the Kaška agreements (CTH 137-140) and the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375).
into this region only sometime in the poorly documented period between the end of the Old Kingdom and the beginning of the Early Empire Period.\textsuperscript{119}

As with other Anatolian polities or population groups, the agreements concluded with Kaška groups were drafted in Hittite. The onomastic habits of Kaška groups, at least of those who were mentioned in Hittite documents, can hardly be distinguished from Hittite onomastic patterns. The names of people identifiable as Kaška display the same linguistic mixture (of Hittite, Luwian, Ḫattic) characteristic of Anatolia in the second millennium.\textsuperscript{120} A number of the geographical names of the Kaška territory are attested already in documents of the Old Assyrian period (Hoffner 1967: 183). Hittite sources present no decisive evidence to suggest that they spoke a different language than that spoken by the Hittites.\textsuperscript{121}

\textbf{Religion}

Hittite depictions of Kaška religion are limited to a few references to “Kaška Gods” (\texttt{ŠA KUR}\textsuperscript{121} Kaška DINGIR.MEŠ, DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA KUR\textsuperscript{121} Kaška, DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA\textsuperscript{121} Kaška) and to the names of Kaška deities mentioned in the Kaška agreements (CTH 138.1.A and CTH 140.1). If we look at the Kaška Agreement CTH 138.1.A and the Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory it seems that the Hittites conceived of the “Kaška Gods” (or the “Gods of Kaška Land”) as distinct from the Gods

\textsuperscript{119} A suggestion, originally proposed by Giorgadze and most recently reiterated by Singer (2007), proposes linguistic connections to Ḫattic.

\textsuperscript{120} Onomastic evidence is suspect as an indicator of ethnicity or language.

\textsuperscript{121} Hoffner (2009: 223) believes that the Kaška and Hittites spoke different languages. On the two messengers mentioned in HKM 66: 33, he writes, “There are two messengers identified by their towns. And since we know from other texts that exchanges between peoples speaking different languages (in this case, the Kaška and the Hittites) were carried on through the tandem movements of two messengers, one from each language group, it is likely that one of these two is a Kaškaean.”
of Ḥatti (DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA KUR URUḤatti). In CTH 138.1.A, Kaška gods are summoned and listed separately from the gods of Ḥatti. And in the Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory the conflicts between the Kaška and Hittite men are described as a divine conflict between the gods of Kaška Land and the gods of Ḥatti. But this distinction seems to blur when we look closely at the names of the Kaška deities. In the list of Kaška deities in CTH 138.1.A, mentioned alongside the unknown deities dU Ḥanupteni, dU Kutuppuruzi and dU Pazim[...]iš are deities worshipped in Ḥatti such as the Sun Goddess of the Earth, Ḥuwattašši, the “father” Sun God, Storm God of the Army, and Telipinu (see the Introduction to the Kaška Agreements).\footnote{Cf. von Schuler (1965: 127), who believes the Sun Goddess of the Earth, Ḥuwattašši, the “father” Sun God, Storm God of the Army, and Telipinu were not part of the Kaška divine list (see the Introduction to the Kaška Agreements).} Also, the prominence of the war-god ZABABA in the Kaška agreements, as well as a broken reference to Kaška troops swearing by ZABABA (in CTH 140.1 i 40) suggests that this deity was prominent among the Kaška.\footnote{Cf. von Schuler (1965: 79), who believes that references to temples for “Hittite” deities or their temples in Kaška territory must be the result of an “Interpretatio Hethitica einheimischer Götter.”} Finally, the use of the theophoric elementTarḫunt in two personal names that seem to have belonged to Kaška men (i.e., Tarḫuntaziti and Tarḫuntišša) seems to suggest closer cultural/religious ties than previously assumed.

**Barbarians?**

Numerous scholars have claimed that the Hittites viewed the Kaška as barbarians.\footnote{Von Schuler stresses that the Hittites did not display prejudice against foreigners like the Mesopotamians (1965: 5f.), a view that has been criticized by Hoffner (1967: 180).} The first and decisive argument comes from the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal. §§11- 32 are dedicated to the “Ravages of the Kaška” (Singer 2002: 41-43).
The Hittite king complains that the Kaška do not respect the Hittite gods, and that they destroy and rob their temples:

... the temples which you, O gods, had in these lands, the Kaška men have destroyed, and they have smashed your images, O gods.

They plundered silver and gold, rhyta and cups of silver, gold and copper, your objects of bronze, and your garments, and they divided them up among themselves. (§16 ii 26-27, §17 iii 1-3)

Another complaint (§§29-30) is that the Kaška do not remain loyal to their treaties:

We summon the Kaška men and give them gifts; we make them swear: “The offerings which we send to the Storm-god of Nerik, you keep watch over them and let no one attack them on their way!”

They come, take the gifts and swear, but when they return they break the oaths and they despise your words, O Gods, and they smash the seal of the Storm-god. (§29 iv 11-14, §30 iv 15-19)

While it is true that the Kaška are portrayed here as uncivilized people from a Hittite perspective, these remarks are clearly heavily biased and intended for the purpose of emphatically persuading the gods that only the Hittites were capable of properly caring for them (Singer 2002: 10-11). Scholars have contrasted this description of Kaška behavior towards the gods and their temples to the pious treatment of the gods of foreign countries by Hittite kings.¹²⁵ Šuppiluliuma I, after his conquest of Karkamiš, is reported to have left the citadel and temples untouched out of respect to its gods.¹²⁶

However, this type of description was not exclusive to the Kaška. The destructive and blasphemous treatment of the gods and their temples by the enemies of Ḫatti is a literary motif employed in other prayers as well, such as Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to

¹²⁵ Freu (2005: 90), for example, asserts: “Plus que tout le reste, l’attitude des Gasgas à cette occasion les a rangés aux yeux des Hittites, conscients quant à eux d’appartenir au monde civilisé, dans le monde des ‘Barbares.’”
¹²⁶ Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (CTH 40), KBo 5.6 iii 32-43.
the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A) and his Hymn and Prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377):\(^{127}\)

[Some] wish to burn down your temples; others wish to take away your rhyta, cups, and objects of silver and gold; others wish to lay waste your fields, your gardens and your groves; others wish to capture your plowmen, gardeners, and grinding-women. (CTH 376.A iii 1-8)

The enemy lands which are quarreling and at odds, some are not respectful to you, O Telipinu, or to the gods of Ḫatti; others wish to take away your rhyta, cups, and objects of silver and gold; others wish to lay waste your fallow lands, vineyards, gardens and groves; others wish to capture your plowmen, vinedressers, gardeners, and grinding-women. (CTH 377 iii 18-iv 8)

A second argument comes from the oft-cited line from Muršili II’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A in Singer 2002: 49-54):

Moreover, those lands which belong to Ḫatti, the Kaška land—they were swineherds and weavers—Arawanna, Kalašma, Lukka, and Pitašša have declared themselves free from the Sun-Goddess of Arinna. (§8 A ii 41-55)

This statement, as was mentioned above, has usually been interpreted as expressing a derogatory ethnic description (Singer 2002: 49, Hoffner 1967: 183, Beckman 1988: 38).\(^{128}\) The aforementioned passage may have been a statement about the culture of the Kaška in question, or, as I have argued above, a reference to the importance of the Kaška for the cult of the Sun-goddess of Arinna in order to emphasize how the goddess will be affected by the loss of Kaška-Land. In either case, “swineherds” and “weavers of linen” are not used elsewhere as pejoratives. De Martino (2004) suggests

\(^{127}\) Singer (2002: 11) refers to these as “beneficial arguments, by which the suppliant tries to demonstrate to his gods that it is in their best interest to put an end to the misery of the king and his people.” This type of argument is similar to the “‘only in Hatti’ motif, whereby the gods are persuaded that in no other land would they be so generously treated as in their own ‘homeland.’”

\(^{128}\) Von Schuler, however, argued that the terms “swineherds and weavers” were occupational in nature and are to be understood as “herdsmen and weavers” in a more general way (1965: 76-77). Based on this idea, Glatz and Matthews sought to prove that the Kaška were swineherds, by pointing to an increase in pig bones in the occupational layer following the sack of Ḫattuša, and that growing linen was an important part of their economy, by trying to document the history of flax cultivation in Anatolia (2005: 57-59).
that there were different approaches to pigs within the Hittite kingdom: there was a
central Anatolian tradition in which it was customary to rear and consume pigs, and a
Hurro-Kizzuwatnean one where pork was considered impure and forbidden.

Aside from the aforementioned, the Hittites did not employ pejorative terms for
the Kaška. In fact the Hittites did have a word, *dampupi*-i, that has been translated as
‘barbarian, uncivilized’. However, that word was not used in an ethnic sense and never
employed in reference to the Kaška (von Schuler 1965: 6). Based on the scant evidence
for such a claim, it is difficult to argue that the Hittites viewed the Kaška as barbarians.
One wonders, then, with what authority modern scholars should pronounce them so.

**Summary and conclusions**

As demonstrated in the present discussion, Hittite sources do not ascribe to the
Kaška a markedly different way of life, cultural traits, or (socio-)economic organization.
“Kaška” did not denote the inhabitants of a single, clearly defined territory. Rather,
groups of Kaška lived in very close proximity to Hittite territory, in the countryside
around or at times within Hittite-controlled towns in the contested frontier region. There
is no reason to assume that they were not indigenous to the Black Sea region. On the
contrary, it is possible to see linguistic and cultural ties between the Kaška and the
(presumed) Hattic population, who inhabited Anatolia before the establishment of the
Hittite state. I suggest that “Kaška” in Hittite sources denoted a category of outsiders
made up of diverse groups of people and comprising more than one type of economic or
socio-political organization, different lifestyles, and possibly diverse cultural traits.
People designated as Kaška were outsiders in the sense that throughout the history of
their interactions with the Hittite state, they remained outside of direct Hittite control.

The significance and relevance of the category “Kaška” for the Hittite state and administration become clearer when we look at the agreements concluded with them.

The contents, form, and structure of the Kaška agreements, as I will argue in the introduction to Chapter Four, suggest that the Kaška themselves, and the agreements the Hittites concluded with them, belonged neither to the realm of administration, nor to that of diplomacy. As a population with different, more varied levels of social organization and subsistence strategies than the Hittite state, they were neither completely external to nor part of the Hittite state. The Kaška groups who feature in the Kaška agreements (i.e., who were placed under oath) became “allies” (takšulaš) whereas all other Kaška groups were “enemies” (LÚ.KÚR). Like Hittite subjects, allied Kaška groups took loyalty oaths to the Hittite king.\(^\text{129}\) They supplied “troops” (fighting units or workforce) to the Hittite king and fought on his side, even against other Kaška groups. Nevertheless, despite their close interactions (economic and social; see Chapter Three) and status as allies, “Kaška territory” was, at least in theory if not in practice, treated as distinct and possibly independent from “Hittite territory.” The access of the allied Kaška to Hittite towns and territory was, at least in theory, restricted or regulated.\(^\text{130}\)

Ultimately, what seems to have differentiated the Kaška from a Hittite perspective was their ability and choice to remain outside of Hittite imperial control, especially in

---

\(^\text{129}\) Loyalty oaths (German Treueide) were characteristically sworn by Hittite subjects (i.e., bureaucrats, soldiers, etc.); see Giorgieri (1995, 2005). For examples of the loyalty oath in the Kaška agreements, see 140.1.A (KUB 26.66+) i 62', 140.2.A (KUB 26.20+) i 19'.

\(^\text{130}\) We may point to the stipulations concerning the movement of fugitives and settling in Hittite territory in the Kaška agreements (e.g., CTH 138.1.A §§24'–30'), and the conceptualization of Kaška territory in the Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory (CTH 422).
times of dynastic strife and political struggle. In this final respect, we may see parallels between the Kaška and the hapīru.
Chapter Three

Hittite-Kaška Interactions and the Northern Frontier of Ḫatti

Introduction

At no point in Hittite history was there a definitive border\textsuperscript{131} in the north separating the lands of Ḫatti and Kaška. In fact, as I have argued in the preceding chapter, Kaška Land was not a specific location beyond the frontier. In the few instances when “Kaška Land” was used in a territorial sense, it denoted areas in which Kaška groups were thought to live, or simply, enemy/hostile territory.\textsuperscript{132} In short, “Kaška Land” was a designation for parts of the northern peripheries of Ḫatti that were outside of effective Hittite control. In some contexts, Kaška Land was treated as if it were part of the Land of Ḫatti (see Chapter Two).

The political and geographical setting for the interactions of the Hittite state with Kaška groups is best approached as a frontier, a loosely defined “transitional zone of interaction” (Parker 2001: 11).\textsuperscript{133} The processes and dynamics characteristic of frontiers have been the focus of an ongoing interdisciplinary discourse, sometimes referred to as

\textsuperscript{131} I.e., a line of fortifications or a wall.
\textsuperscript{132} The semantic range of “Kaška Land” is similar to Michalowski’s recent description of how the term KUR MAR.TU was employed in Ur III documents (2011: 104).
\textsuperscript{133} A frontier approach to Hittite-Kaška interactions has been adopted recently by Glatz and Matthews (2005) and Zimansky (2007).
“frontier studies.” A frontier studies approach offers the most informative theoretical framework for the interpretation of Hittite-Kaška interactions.

The present chapter is a study of Hittite-Kaška interactions and the dynamics of the northern frontier of Ḫatti. It is not intended as a detailed political or military history, for such accounts (based mostly on the annals) already exist. I will focus instead on the types of interaction between the Hittite state and the Kaška, and the relationship of these interactions to the frontier management strategies adopted by Hittite kings.

**Historical overview**

The Hittite-Kaška conflict must have begun sometime in the poorly documented second half of the Old Kingdom (c. 1500-1450 BCE). By the time textual documentation picks up again during the reign of Tudḫaliya I/II—marking the beginning of the Early Empire Period—the conflict is well under way. Tudḫaliya I/II reports in his annals that while he was fighting in Aššuwa, the Kaška of Tiwara entered the Land of Ḫatti. He led two successive military campaigns and subdued the Kaška for a short while. But the situation seems to have gotten progressively worse during the reigns of his successors Arnuwanda I and Tudḫaliya III. Most of the Hittite territories in the Black sea region—including the holy city Nerik and the important coastal town Zalpa—were already lost during the reign of Arnuwanda I, but the sequence of events that led to this crisis is

---


135 In this work I accept the prevalent opinion that there was only one Tudḫaliya preceding Arnuwanda I, who was his father and predecessor. However, owing to recent attempts at reviving the possibility of the existence of Tudḫaliya I and Tudḫaliya II preceding Arnuwanda I by Freu (2007) and Carruba (2008), I adhere to the traditional designation of Tudḫaliya, the father and predecessor of Arnuwanda, as Tudḫaliya I/II; see for a summary and bibliography de Martino (2010).

136 KUB 23.11 (CTH 142.2.A) iii 9-15; KUB 23.12 (CTH 142.2.B) iii 10’-16’.
unknown. The historical introduction of a decree of Ḫattušili III\textsuperscript{137} depicts certain events that may have transpired during the time of Tudḫaliya III, generally known in Hittitological literature as the “concentric invasions.” According to the testimony of Ḫattušili III, enemies attacked the Land of Ḫatti from all directions.\textsuperscript{138} The Kaška, at this time, reached all the way to Nenašša in the southeast of Ḫatti.

Before he became king, Šuppiluliuma I (the first king of the Empire Period, c. 1350 BCE) fought in the north alongside his ailing father Tudḫaliya III, at times going on campaign alone when his father was unable. In this period, he initiated a frontier strategy that was continued by his successors Muršili II, Muwatalli II (at least during the earlier part of his reign), and Ḫattušili III: frequent military campaigns followed by the renovation, refortification, and repopulation of key frontier settlements. Though this strategy achieved episodes of stability and more effective Hittite control in the north, they were not long-lasting. Conflicts reemerged whenever the king was preoccupied for an extended period of time in another part of the Empire, or whenever the stability of the center was threatened by factors such as plague or dynastic struggles for succession.

During the seventh year of the reign of Muršili II, the Kaška opposition to Hittite authority took on a different, and from a Hittite point of view more alarming, character. Piḫḫuniya of Tipiya was able to consolidate his power and extend his territory to such an extent that Muršili II declared that he (i.e., Piḫḫuniya) “ruled like a king” and not in the

\textsuperscript{137} The decree concerns the ḫekur of Pirwa (CTH 88, KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48); see Goetze (1940: 21-26) and Imparati (1977: 39ff.).

\textsuperscript{138} KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48 (CTH 88) obv. 6-15. The enemies in question are Kaška, Arzawa, Arawanna, Azzi, Išuwa, Armatana, and Kizzuwatna. Ḫattušili III notes that even the capital Ḫattuša was burned down (obv. 14-15). Though this event is not clearly linked to Kaška aggression in Ḫattušili III’s narrative, the sack of Ḫattuša has often been ascribed to the Kaška in modern scholarship (e.g., Bryce 2005: 146)
“manner of the Kaška” (see Chapter Three). Nevertheless, Piḫḫuniya was defeated, captured, and taken to Ḫattuša as a prisoner.

At some point in his reign Muwatalli II (c. 1300) moved the capital of the state from Ḫattuša to Tarḫuntašša in the south (location still unknown). To deal with the issues in the north, he installed Ḫattušili III, his brother, as governor in that region, including the Upper Lands and the Hittite-Kaška frontier. Ḫattušili III’s appointment in the north enabled him to reassert Hittite control over much of the inner Black Sea region and the territories to the northeast of Ḫatti, by enforcing more rigorous repopulation policies and by imposing stricter regulations on Hittite-Kaška interactions. Ḫattušili III was able to maintain Hittite control over significant parts of the north, including Nerik, though the extent of the Empire never reached the Black Sea coast again. Hittite sources post-dating the reign of Ḫattušili III are silent on Hittite-Kaška interactions, unless they mention the Kaška in retrospect.139

Frontiers in theoretical perspective

Recent interdisciplinary scholarship on frontiers emphasizes that the term “frontier” denotes a region, a zone of transition to be distinguished from “border,” which indicates a “legally recognized line … meant to mark off one political or administrative unit from another,” and also from “boundary,” which is a general term denoting “the bounds or limits of anything” (Rodseth and Parker 2002: 9-10).140

139 E.g., KUB 25.21 (CTH 541) iii 2f. a text concerning the cult of Nerik from the time of Tudḫaliya IV.
140 For a concise history of the development of frontier studies in United States and Europe, and in different disciplines, see Rodseth and Parker (2005: 3-21), Whittaker (1994: 1-9) and Elton (1996: 1-10) also present clear and concise accounts. For frontiers in archaeology see also the essay by Lightfoot and Martinez (1995).
Frontiers are generally described as zones of “contact between previously distinct populations” (Rodseth and Parker 2005: 9). However, broader definitions emphasize that frontiers tend to develop in a variety of conditions: between two core areas, each with its own political and population center, or between a core area and a sparsely inhabited wilderness, or between societies of varying levels of political, economic, or ideological organization or technological achievement (p. 19-21). Moreover, the frontier has been viewed “not as a line or simple zone, but as a series of overlapping zones” (Elton 1996: 4). Elton distinguishes between political, social, ethnic, religious, linguistic, economic, and military boundaries, emphasizing that “not all types of activity can be bounded in the same way” (p. 113). Especially relevant for the study of Hittite-Kaška interactions is the observation that frontiers lead to “hybrid forms of culture and ambiguous identities composed of selected elements from each previously distinct cultural repertoire” (Rodseth and Parker 2005: 12).

Scholars have observed that frontiers tend to draw in previously dispersed populations on account of the economic and political opportunities they offer, such as trade, natural resources to be exploited, or distance from central authority.\(^{141}\)

**Frontiers in Hittitology**

One of the few works devoted to the study of the frontiers (more often called “borders”) of Ḫatti is Bryce’s article entitled “The Boundaries of Ḫatti and Hittite Border

---

Policy” (1986). Focusing only on the New Kingdom, 142 Bryce distinguishes between the borders of the vassal and protectorate states and the “frontiers” of the Hittite homeland corresponding to the territory within the Halys basin (Ḫatti). The frontiers of the homeland, according to Bryce, were “buffer zones” against various polities or population groups, including the Kaška in the north/northeast. 143 In his treatment, Bryce uses the terms “frontier,” “border,” and “boundary” interchangeably and without further discussion. More recently, Wazana (1999) has focused on the ideological aspects of “borders,” looking at border descriptions in Hittite treaties and comparing them to Biblical traditions.

Two recent articles focus specifically on Ḫatti’s northern frontier. Glatz and Matthews (2005) interpret Hittite-Kaška interactions in connection with the results of their archaeological survey in the modern Çankırı province (i.e., the western sector of the northern frontier of Ḫatti; see Chapter One). Zimansky (2007) applies Owen Lattimore’s model of the frontier to the northern frontier of Ḫatti. These two articles differ from previous treatments of Hittite-Kaška interactions by accentuating their frontier context, and by their “anthropological” approach to Kaška groups (Glatz and Matthews 2005: 55).

A note on the historical geography of the Black Sea Region

The geographical setting of Hittite-Kaška interactions cannot be mapped with precision. An approximate localization of the northern frontier of Ḫatti may be suggested

---

142 Bryce does not distinguish Early Empire and Empire Periods.
143 Bryce discusses three “buffer zones”: the “northeastern zone” in the north against the Kaška, Išuwa and Kizzuwatna in the east/southeast against Ḫurri/Mittanni, and the Lower Lands in the southwest against western polities (1986: 87; see map on p. 98, fig. 1).
based on the archaeological record, as the region to the south of the Taşköprü-Boyabat-Durağan-Vezirköprü-Havza line (see MAP), corresponding from west to east to parts of the modern provinces of Çankırı, Çorum, Samsun, Amasya, Sivas, and Tokat. However, textual sources suggest that at certain episodes of Hittite history, the Hittite-Kaška interface seems to have reached the southwest and east of Ḫatti (see below).

In terms of Hittite historical geography, the Hittite-Kaška frontier was the territory between Pala/Tumanna in the northwest and Azzi-Hayaša in the northeast/east of Ḫatti. A more detailed, text-based historical geography of this region presents a number of problems. First, the geographic extent of the Land of Ḫatti at any given point in Hittite history is difficult to determine and has been an issue of ongoing academic debate. At its largest, the extent of the Hittite homeland is thought to have reached roughly the Pontic Mountains to the north, the Mediterranean Sea to the south, the territory between the Anti-Taurus and the Euphrates River to the east, and the modern Sakarya watershed to the west.¹⁴⁴ Second, only a few of the numerous geographical names attested in Hittite records which we know to be in the north have been localized with any degree of certainty (e.g., Maṣat Höyük/Tapikka, Ortaköy/Šapinuwa). Most of the geographical names do not occur more than once or twice in these texts, as was mentioned in Chapter Three, and we can often only guess their rough geographical locations. There is no consensus on the locations even of key towns or territories, such as

¹⁴⁴ This geographic description is based on Ullmann, who takes the “natural features of the landscape of Anatolia” as the geographic boundaries of his study area (i.e., the Land of Ḫatti) (2010: 89, see also n. 167).
Zalpa, Nerik, or Turmitta.\textsuperscript{145} I will refer to the proposed localizations of important towns or territories throughout the discussion.

**The northern frontier of Ḫatti**

In this section I will discuss Hittite interests in the Black Sea region and certain prominent characteristics of the northern frontier.

**Hittite interests in the north**

Although the beginnings of the Hittite state and the origins of the ruling elite of Ḫattuša are not entirely clear, written traditions revolving around the northern towns Zalpa and Nerik suggest that these towns, and perhaps the north in general, had a special place in the Hittite ideology of kingship and were central to the legitimacy of the Hittite ruling elite.\textsuperscript{146} Zalpa was an important city-state during the Old Assyrian period and seems to have retained its importance into at least the Hittite Old kingdom.\textsuperscript{147} It is mentioned among the northern towns lost to the Kaška in the Prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal but disappears from Hittite documentation after that. Nerik, on the other hand, was one of the most important cult centers in the Hittite world. It was home of the Storm-God of Nerik, one of the most important deities of the Empire Period pantheon and the

\textsuperscript{145} There is a fair consensus on the localization of Zalpa at the mound of İkiztepe and of Nerik at Ozymaağaç (Klinger 2008: 278); but compare the suggestions of Forlanini (2008: 68-74) and Barjamovic (2011: 242-67) on the localization of Turmitta.

\textsuperscript{146} Texts that feature the town Zalpa include the Anitta Text (CTH 1 §8, ll. 30-32), the “Zalpa Text” (CTH 3.1), and the Totenrituale (CTH 450, IBoT 2.130). For a discussion of the importance of the northern periphery of the Hittite state, see Klinger (2008: 277-90).

\textsuperscript{147} It is probable that Ḫattušili I led a military campaign to Zalpa on the Black Sea coast, if the town in question is indeed the northern Zalpa and not the Zalpa in northern Syria; see Klinger (1996: 124; 2008: 279, n. 6).
personal deity of Ḫattušili III.\textsuperscript{148} Hittite kings strove to maintain the cultic traditions of Nerik even when they no longer had political control over the town (Klinger 2008: 281).

The economic interests of the Hittite state in the Black Sea region were no doubt an important factor in shaping the history of the northern frontier and Hittite-Kaška interactions. The extraction of agricultural and animal products from this region,\textsuperscript{149} the Hittite “bread basket” according to Hoffner (2009: 91), was crucial for the stability of the economy of Ḫatti, where famine was a perennial threat, “seldom more than a poor-yielding harvest away, as a result of a low seasonal rainfall, drought, or a devastating storm at harvest time” (Ullmann 2010: 42). This was a central concern in the letters from Maṣat Höyük/Tapikka, a town surrounded by vineyards and grazing lands (Hoffner 2009: 102), and the Hittite king was personally concerned for the condition of the crops and animals in this region:

\begin{quote}
Thus speaks His Majesty: Say to Kaššū:

Write to me soon concerning the condition of the vines, the cattle, and the sheep in that land! (HKM 4: 1-9)\textsuperscript{150}
\end{quote}

This region was also an important source of manpower for the Hittite state. Hittite sources indicate that the allied Kaška gave “troops” (ÈRIN.MEŠ) to the Hittite king.\textsuperscript{151} Several of the Maṣat letters concern the mobilization and movement of troops.\textsuperscript{152} These letters indicate that the manning of Hittite fortified towns and the deployment of troops were among the most important duties of the \textit{BĒL MADGALTILauriyaš išha-} (Beal 1992:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{148}] On Nerik, see Haas (1970) and (Klinger 2008: 281).
\item[\textsuperscript{149}] I.e., the northernmost fringes of the central Anatolian plateau, the fertile river valleys (Kızılırmak, Yeşilırmak, Kelkit) of the central Black Sea region, and the highland pastures of the Pontic ranges.
\item[\textsuperscript{150}] Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 102).
\item[\textsuperscript{151}] As noted in the introduction to the Kaška agreements, “troops” in some contexts could also mean “workforce.”
\item[\textsuperscript{152}] E.g., HKM 20, 21, 22, and 24, to mention just a few.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
431). And lastly, the failure to supply troops by northern towns or Kaška groups is often given in royal annals as grounds for Hittite military operations.  

Whereas there is some textual evidence for trade with Kaška groups (see below), we do not know if the opportunity for maritime trade in the Black Sea was an important consideration for the Hittite state.

An unusual aspect of the northern frontier of Ḫatti and one that distinguished it from other frontiers of the homeland was its proximity to the core—to the capital Ḫattuša. The security of the frontier, therefore, was of crucial strategic importance for the Hittite state. We may mention, in this connection, the hypotheses that the Kaška invaded the Hittite capital Ḫattuša more than once and that Muwatalli’s movement of the capital from Ḫattuša had to do with Kaška aggression.

The frontier in official discourse

It is not surprising, due to the significance of this region for the Hittite state, that the central Black Sea region was construed in official Hittite discourse as part of the Land of Ḫatti, even though this region seems to have been under direct or efficient control of the Hittite state only for a seemingly short period during the Old Kingdom.

However, starting in the Early Empire Period, when the central Black Sea region became difficult to access and at times out of the reach of Hittite kings, this region began

---

153 For instance, in years two and nine of the Annals of Muršili II, the towns Tipiya and Yaḫrišša begin hostilities by refusing to deliver troops (KBo 3.4+ ii. i 49-50, iv 24').
154 Matthews and Glatz (2009b: 56) note that the Hittite-Kaška frontier was situated merely c. 150 km away from the capital Ḫattuša.
155 Bryce (2006: 146), for instance, has no doubt that the Kaška were responsible for the sack of Ḫattuša mentioned in CTH 88.
156 Most recently Glatz and Matthews (2005: 53, table 1).
157 I discuss these depictions in the preceding chapter.
to be depicted in Hittite sources as “empty/desolate lands” (KUR.KUR.MEŠ dannatta),¹⁵⁸ “plundered” by Kaška men.¹⁵⁹ This official narrative concerning the condition of the Black Sea region and the frontier has been taken literally in Hittitological literature, with one notable exception. Klinger (2008, 2009) has demonstrated that cultic activities continued at some northern centers, such as Nerik, in the period between Arnuwanda I and Ḫattušili III, thus casting doubt on the literal accuracy of the notion of “empty/desolate lands” and the total inaccessibility of Hittite cult centers in the Black Sea region.

The frontier as a distinct administrative category

It has been suggested that Hittite territory consisted of three main administrative or “political-geographic” (Ullmann 2010: 39) components: Ḫatti proper, with the capital Ḫattuša at its center and the surrounding territories under the direct control of the Hittite king and his officials; 2) vassal states indirectly ruled by the Hittite king through local rulers/authorities; and 3) the viceregal kingdoms (Karkamiš and Aleppo) in northern Syria, beginning in the reign of Šuppiluliuma I (Bryce 2005: 44). Such a schematization of Hittite territorial administration may be accurate for the Empire Period, but does not accurately represent the conditions of the Old Kingdom and the Early Empire Period. Moreover, it does not take into account the frontiers of the Hittite homeland, which, beginning in the Early Empire Period, constituted a special administrative category in the structure of Hittite territorial administration, distinct from the rest of rural Ḫatti and subject to special regulations closely monitored by the king himself.

¹⁵⁹ Prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal, CTH 375.1.A ii 10’ff.
The Hittite word *arňa*-erňa-ırňa- ‘limit, line, boundary’, often written with the Sumerogram ZAG, seems in specific contexts to denote a region rather than a boundary and therefore is best rendered in English as “frontier” rather than border.\(^\text{160}\)

That frontiers constituted a specific administrative category, at least in the Early Empire and Empire Periods, rests on the following considerations: 1) Two high-ranking Hittite officials, the *auriyaš išňa-/BĔL MADGALTI* ‘lord of the watch(tower)\(^\text{161}\) and the EN KUR-\(TI\), literally ‘lord of a province’ had very similar administrative duties (both civic and military); what distinguished these two offices, at least during the Early Empire Period, was that whereas the *auriyaš išňa-/BĔL MADGALTI* was stationed in frontier regions, the EN KUR-\(TI\) seems to have operated in other parts of rural Ḫatti (Impararti 1999: 340).\(^\text{162}\) The instructions for the *auriyaš išňa-/BĔL MADGALTI* (dating to the reign of Arnuwanda I) and the Mašat correspondence demonstrate that frontier regions were subject to a specific set of regulations that prioritized issues of security, maintenance of structures in frontier towns, gathering intelligence concerning enemy activities, the regulation of movement of populations in the frontier region (fugitives, transhumant population groups, etc.), the extraction of goods and services, and the mobilization of “troops.”\(^\text{163}\)

\(^{160}\) See, for instance, Beckman’s (1996, 1999) translation of ZAG in Hittite treaties as “frontier.”

\(^{161}\) The official title *BĔL MADGALTI/auriyaš išňa-*, to whom the detailed instructions are directed, has been translated in various ways, such as “margrave” (McMahon 1997), “Commander of the Border Guards” (Goetze 1960), “Herr der Warte” (von Schuler 1957), “district governor” (Beckman 1995), “margrave” or “province governor” (Hoffner 2009: 93), “governatore di provincia” (Pecchioli Daddi 2003).

\(^{162}\) The “governor” of the town Tiliura, probably located on the frontier, was an EN KUR-\(TI\), which, as Beal (1992: 437-39) pointed out, does not quite fit a frontier/rural Ḫatti distinction between the *BĔL MADGALTI* and the EN.KUR-\(TI\).

\(^{163}\) For the duties of the *auriyaš išňa-/BĔL MADGALTI*, see Alp (1990), Beal (1992: 426-36), and Beckman (1995).
Also pertinent to the question of the administration of frontiers is the attestation in the Mašat documents of *ḥantezziš auriš* ‘primary watchpoint’, in a letter from “The Priest” (probably Kantuzzili) to Kaššû:

Concerning what you wrote to me as follows: “Your twenty people are in the environs(?) of the town Zikkaštā. And because (my district) is a primary watchpoint, I will not give them to you on my own authority. Report them to the palace.”

I am now in the process of reporting my (missing) servants to the palace. And because the land of Kizzuwatna is (also) a primary watchpoint, if your servants come down here (from Tapikka), neither will I give them back to you! (HKM 74: 3-19)\(^{164}\)

The formation and features of the Hittite-Kaška frontier

Frontiers have often been created by “social expansion”—not only military or political expansion, but also the expansion of “people, goods, and cultural forms” (Parker and Rodseth: 2005: 24). The processes that culminated in the loss of direct control of the Black Sea region and the formation of the Hittite-Kaška frontier somewhere on the southern fringes of the Pontic Mountains have not survived in either the textual or the archaeological record. During the Hittite Old Kingdom, the central Black Sea region seems to have been under Hittite control, possibly all the way up to Zalpa on the Black Sea coast, though the nature of Hittite control is not entirely clear (as I discuss below).

Sometime towards the end of the Old Kingdom and before the beginning of the Early Empire Period with the reign of Tudḫaliya I/II, much of this territory was no longer under the direct control of Ḫatti.

Von Schuler explained these processes as the result of a putative Kaška invasion (1965: 37) of the Black Sea region sometime during the reign of Arnuwanda I. Klinger

\(^{164}\) Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 235).
too, suggested in his earlier analysis of this issue that the Hittite-Kaška conflict arose not from Hittite expansion to the north but from Kaška incursions into the “hethitische Einflußsphäre” (2002: 451). Given that there is no textual or archaeological evidence indicating Kaška incursions originating outside of or elsewhere in Anatolia, there has been a tendency in more recent scholarship to view the Kaška as the indigenous populations of the Black Sea region (e.g., Singer 2007; Zimansky 2007), yet a coherent explanation for the beginning of the conflict has not been formulated. The genesis of the conflict between the Hittite state and the Kaška, the Hittite state’s loss of control over territories in the Black Sea region, and the formation of a frontier on the northern periphery of the Hittite homeland were no doubt complex processes that require more than a monocausal explanation. Nevertheless, these processes seem to be related more to the dynastic struggles among the Hittite royal family and the ensuing political instability during the later parts of the Old Kingdom, as well as the program of administrative reorganization and consolidation that characterize the Early Empire Period, than to putative Kaška incursions.

By the reign of Arnuwanda I, Hittite presence in the central Black Sea region was restricted to intermittent and irregular control over some towns and routes of communication, while the agricultural hinterlands surrounding the (mostly fortified) towns and grazing lands were even more difficult to control effectively. Shifting allegiances of frontier towns and constant movement of population was characteristic of this region. Hittite and non-Hittite (i.e., not under Hittite control) towns, territories, and

---

165 In his later treatments Klinger leaves the question of the beginnings of the Hittite-Kaška conflict open; e.g., Klinger (2008: 284).
population groups were not situated on either side of a presumed boundary line or *limes*, but were distributed in something resembling a checkerboard pattern across this permeable frontier region.\(^{166}\) This model of the Hittite-Kaška frontier finds support especially in letters from Maṣat Höyük, which clearly illustrate Kaška presence around Hittite-controlled towns, and furthermore, that towns in the frontier region could easily shift their allegiance (see below). Further support for this model may be found in a passage from the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I:\(^{167}\)

> Because all the Kaška were at peace, some of the population of Ḫatti had inns behind Kaška towns, and some had gone back into town. (KBo 5.6 i 14-17)\(^{168}\)

A question often ignored in discussions of Hittite-Kaška interactions is whether the Kaška were the only dissident elements in the Black Sea region.\(^{169}\) In other words, are we correct in assuming that the opponent (in some contexts referred to simply as “enemy”) in all reported conflicts in north-central Anatolia were the Kaška? Though this question is often not even brought up, most Hittitological literature ascribes all conflicts in the north to the Kaška, and in most instances, to Kaška aggression (more on this below). We may point to Zimansky’s (2007: 172) speculation on this question that “with their divided and shifting loyalties, the population of this zone was probably what provided the Kaška with the manpower to threaten the Hittite state in times of stress—not

\(^{166}\) It was already noted by Liverani (2001: 21) that even when the frontier area was under Hittite control, only the “*madgalta* itself, the fortified castle of the garrison” was a clearly defined unit.

\(^{167}\) HKM 17 (ll. 4-8) shows that Kaška groups could take control of the roads around Tapikka in the absence of the high-ranking officials. Also, as was mentioned in the preceding chapter, HKM 46 (l. 24) indicates Kaška presence in the surrounding mountains.


\(^{169}\) This question is brought up only in relation to the Maṣat correspondence where the enemy is always unnamed. Giorgadze (2005), for example, argues that the unnamed “enemy” of the Maṣat correspondence must be the Kaška.
people bred in some remote Kaska homeland.” We may in fact find some support for Zimansky’s suggestion in the Maṣat correspondence.

This capitulation (to the enemy) by Marruwa, the ruler of Ḫimmuwa, about which you wrote me, (adding): “I have dispatched him (to you).”

Hoffner interprets the passage in the following manner:

The king writes to Kaššu about Marruwa, who is described as the “man (i.e., ruler) of Ḫimmuwa,” a Hittite city. The king attaches great importance to winning over clan and tribal chiefs of the Kaškaeans who wish to make peace. Accords comparable to those ratified by Arnuwanda I were certainly negotiated by his successor. This Marruwa, also called “man of Kakkaduwa” [HKM 17], had capitulated (ḫaliya-) to the Kaškaeans. Since Ḫimmuwa is one of the cities that had fallen into the hands of the Kaškaeans according to the prayer of Arnuwanda I and Asmunikal (Singer 2002, 42), it was probably at that time that Marruwa defected to the Kaškaeans. We do not know how long he remained in alliance with the Kaška before he eventually fell into the hands of the Hittite military. His capture need not imply that Ḫimmuwa itself had been recovered. (Hoffner 2009: 119)

Although the central Black Sea region is depicted (especially in Empire Period sources) as “empty” (see above), this region was actually characterized by the constant entry and movement of people throughout its history—fugitives, slaves, scouts, spies, marching armies, raiding parties were in constant movement in this region. Though not at a great distance from the center, the northern frontier served as a place of refuge to those who, for whatever reason, strove to escape central authority. Regulations concerning the movement and return or exchange of fugitives are therefore one of the central concerns in the agreements with the Kaška. It is no coincidence that Ḫattušili III, who was appointed as governor (see below) in this region, mustered the necessary force to supplant his nephew Urḫi-Tešup from among its inhabitants.

170 Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 118).
The frontier must also have presented economic opportunities—new markets, the constant demand for goods and services, due to the presence of the Hittite military (probably in constant need of supplies), numerous ongoing fortification projects, and new opportunities for the exploitation of natural resources.

**Hittite-Kaška interactions in the Early Empire Period (c. 1400-1350 BCE)**

It is now fairly clear that the central Black Sea region was under Hittite control during most of the Old Kingdom, and that conflicts with the Kaška began shortly before the reign of Tudḫaliya I/II, considered to be the first king of the Early Empire Period, sometime during the final stages of the Old Kingdom (von Schuler 1965, Klinger 2002, 2008). The case, simply put, is that there is no evidence from the Old Kingdom that mentions the Kaška (or conflicts with them) in the Black Sea region. The Kaška are not mentioned in such important documents as the Annals of Ḫattušili I (CTH 4), the Ammuna Chronicle (CTH 18), or the Telipinu Edict (CTH 19).

This picture is complicated by later historical traditions which retroject the Hittite-Kaška conflict to the very beginning of the Old Kingdom. The historical introduction to the decree of Ḫattušili III concerning Tiliura (CTH 89) records in retrospect that Labarna and his successor Hattušili I could not pass the Kumešmaḫa river in the north, probably due to troubles with the Kaška.

---

171 The nature and extent of Hittite control over the central Black Sea region, however, is unclear.
172 KUB 21.29 (CTH 89.A) ii 4-5.
Another strand of this later historical tradition, and one which appears more plausible, attributes the beginning of the conflict to Ḫantili II.¹⁷³ Both the Apology of Ḫattušili III and a document from the reign of Tudḫaliya IV¹⁷⁴ attribute the loss of Nerik to Ḫantili II,¹⁷⁵ whereas the above-mentioned decree of Ḫattušili III states that the northern town Tiliura was lost during the reign of Ḫantili II.

Also indicating that the Hittite-Kaška conflict began sometime around the reign of Ḫantili II are 1) the mention of Ḫantili II’s “Vorposten” (parā ašatar)¹⁷⁶ and the fortification of Ḫattuša¹⁷⁷ (which are interpreted as defensive measures against the Kaška), and a possible mention of Muwatalli I fighting somewhere in the vicinity of Nerik against the Kaška.¹⁷⁸

A number of land donation documents (referred to as Landschenkungsurkunden in Hittitological literature) from the end of the Old Kingdom and the beginning of the Early Empire Period were issued in towns which in the Early Empire and Empire Periods became part of the zone of Hittite-Kaška conflict.¹⁷⁹

A land donation document of Ḫuzziya II to Attatta (CTH 221) is issued in Ḫanḫanna and includes fields in Tuḫupiya. Both Ḫanḫana and Tuḫupiya may be located in the frontier region, since both towns are mentioned in the context of Hittite-Kaška

¹⁷³ Klinger (1995: 84; 2002) has demonstrated that the Ḫantili in question must be the second king of this name and not Ḫantili I.
¹⁷⁴ KUB 25.21 (CTH 524.1) obv. iii 2ff.
¹⁷⁵ CTH 8 iii 46–49.
¹⁷⁶ KUB 21.29 + KBo 51.1 (CTH 89.A) ii 3.
¹⁷⁷ KBo 3.57(CTH 11.A).
¹⁷⁸ DŠ fragment 50, KUB 21.10 and duplicate KBo 22.9 obv.!, see Klinger (2002: 449).
¹⁷⁹ For Hittite Landschenkungsurkunden, see Riemschneider (1958), Güterbock (1940, 1942), and a recent article by Wilhelm (2005) on the dating of the older Landschenkungsurkunden without preserved kings’ names. A complete edition of the LSU, which will appear as StBoT Beiheft 4, is still in preparation (Wilhelm 2005: 272, n.1).
struggles. The town Tuḫuppiya is also mentioned in LS 15 (obv. 3’). Another land
donation document (LS 17), which may be dated to the reign of Ḥantili II (Klinger 1995:
84), was issued in Kammama, one of the towns central to the Hittite-Kaška conflict. It
is difficult to say whether we are to view the land donation documents as an indication of
effective Hittite control of the places which were donated or in which the donations were
issued, or conversely, whether these documents are to be understood as an attempt to
secure Hittite control in a region that was becoming more and more precarious, through
the installation of loyal subjects of the king.

The history of the Hittite-Kaška conflict, as recorded in Hittite sources, begins in medias res. The earliest reference to the Kaška in Hittite sources comes from the
fragmentary Annals of Tudḫaliya I/II (CTH 142), from which we gather that he had to
march in two consecutive campaigns against the Kaška of Tiwara after they had entered
Hittite territory while the king was in Aššuwa. The situation seems to have gotten
progressively worse during the reigns of his two successors Arnuwanda I and Tudḫaliya
III, with the loss of Nerik and other important towns during the reign of Arnuwanda I
(dramatically narrated in the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal [CTH 375] and the
southward spread of the conflict. Unsurprisingly, most of our sources on the Hittite-
Kaška conflict and the administration of the northern frontier of Ḫatti come from this
period.

180 In the Apology of Ḫattušili (CTH 81), Ḫanḫanna is mentioned among the “empty lands” given by
Muwatalli II to Ḫattušili II to govern (ii 56-63). For further attestations see del Monte and Tischler
(1978:76-77).
181 E.g., CTH 137.1 i 10’-11’.
The main geographical arena of the Early Empire Period interactions with the Kaška seems to have been the eastern/northeastern, and to some extent, the central parts of the frontier. A number of the geographical names attested in the Kaška agreements correspond to those in the Mašat Höyük/Tapikka area.\(^{182}\) But interestingly, none of the place names Matthews and Glatz (2009b) assign to the western part of the frontier in their recent work on the historical geography of the Çankırı region appear in the Kaška agreements. The list of places lost to the Kaška\(^{183}\) and those listed as the hometowns of the “governors” (\(^{184}\)) also correspond to the central and eastern parts of the frontier (Forlanini 1992: 284-92). Tudḫaliya III and Šuppiluliuma I’s military operations against the Kaška were led from the town Šamuḫa in the Upper Land, where the ailing king Tudḫaliya III resided during the later part of his reign.\(^{185}\) They too seem to have been concerned primarily with the eastern and central parts of the frontier.

The success of the military operations against the Kaška seems to have been of short duration. Even when Tudḫaliya III and/or Šuppiluliuma I were successful in their confrontations with the Kaška, their work was undone as soon as the king or his son were involved elsewhere.\(^{186}\)

\(^{182}\) See Klinger (1995) for some of the corresponding geographical names.
\(^{183}\) CTH 375.1.A ii 26'-31’.
\(^{184}\) CTH 375.1.B ii 5'- iv 11, C. iv 5'-11’, D i 1-23.
\(^{185}\) DŠ fragment 10, fragment 13 i 8. Šamuḫa, the capital of the Upper Land, was located somewhere on the upper course of the Kızılırmak River, perhaps at the mound at Kayalınpınar (Wilhelm 2002).
\(^{186}\) E.g., in DŠ fragment 13 (E i 15-19), when Tudḫaliya III attacks Maša and Kamalla in the west, the Kaška take up arms and attack again the “empty” territory Šuppiluliuma I had fortified.
Early Empire Period frontier policy

At the heart of the new frontier policy adopted during the Early Empire Period are the agreements with peripheral populations and the treatment of the frontier as a distinct territory whose administration was overseen personally by the king (as is evidenced by the instructions for the auriyaš išha- and the Mašat correspondence). It is very likely that this policy was initiated by Arnuwanda I, since some of the key documents (instructions and probably most of the agreements) can be dated to his reign.

As was discussed in the introduction to the Kaška agreements, the Early Empire Period saw the development of what are considered to be “special types” of treaties—the Kaška agreements, the Išmerikka treaty (CTH 133), the so-called Mita of Paḥhuwa text (CTH 146), and Arnuwanda I’s treaty with the elders of Ura (CTH 144), with the possible addition of the Ḫukkana Treaty, which preserves parts of an earlier agreement. What these unilateral accords had in common was that they were concluded with representatives of communities of varying levels of social organization, rather than a single vassal king. The communities involved inhabited the peripheries of the Hittite heartland, on the fringes of the area where the Hittites exercised direct rule. With one exception, these agreements lack historical introductions and do not include descriptions of borders. Adding their varying structures to the picture, they indicate that the Hittites exercised considerable flexibility, adaptability, even experimentation, in the way they drafted agreements with populations on frontiers in this period.

Although each frontier undoubtedly had different conditions and dynamics, we can generalize about some of the main concerns of the Early Empire kings as regards their management. With these agreements, the Hittite king engaged the efforts of the
local authorities in peripheral regions, sometimes referred to as “elders.”\textsuperscript{187} These local authorities were employed to control the traffic of fugitives across the frontiers to prevent Hittite subjects from crossing over to the enemy, and to discourage a single individual from assuming too much power and becoming a minor king on his own authority.\textsuperscript{188} In matters of reporting enemy activity or sedition among Hittite subjects, local authorities had to contact the Hittite king directly, but in other matters, they often had dealings with the \textit{auriyaš išha/- BËL MADGALTI}, the district governor.\textsuperscript{189} The security of the peripheries was an important concern in all of these agreements. In the Išmerikka treaty, for example, we see that the Hittite king assigned troops who were loyal to him to newly conquered or regained towns, to police those territories.\textsuperscript{190}

These agreements with peripheral communities of Ḫatti, especially those with the Kaška, force us to reconsider some of our prevalent notions concerning not only the dynamics of the Hittite-Kaška frontier, but also Hittite statecraft in general. Some scholars have referred to Hittite border traditions, and have overemphasized the Hittite preoccupation with and dependence on carefully defining their borders with neighboring polities.\textsuperscript{191} Others have pointed out that these agreements reflect ineffective practices by which the Hittites tried to apply their diplomatic methods indiscriminately in territories for which they were not suitable. I believe these agreements point to a completely different tradition, or rather to different practices developed during the Early Empire

\textsuperscript{187} E.g., in CTH 144, 146.
\textsuperscript{188} We see an example of the last point in the Mita of Paḫḫuwa (CTH 146) text, in which the Hittite king recounts the misconduct of the self-proclaimed king Mita and asks the elders of Paḫḫuwa to extradite the culprit (KUB 23.72+ obv. 6-40, 41-48).
\textsuperscript{189} E.g., CTH 138.1.A obv. 39’, rev. 91’-95’, 98’-100’; KUB 26.41+ (CTH 133) obv. 21’.
\textsuperscript{190} The identity of the men of Išmerikka has been interpreted in a variety of ways: cf. Goetze (1940: 45), Garstang and Gurney (1959: 33), Kempinski and Košak (1970: 215-16).
\textsuperscript{191} Bryce (1986) and Wazana (1999), for instance.
Period for dealing with peripheral communities at varying levels of social organization.

In the frontier regions precisely defined borders were neither possible nor feasible.

**War and peace**

Most interactions with the Kaška recorded in Hittite documents were, unsurprisingly, hostile. But not all accounts of Hittite-Kaška conflicts can be characterized as warfare. Most of the conflicts described in the Mašat correspondence for, instance, seem better to be described as banditry. On the conflicts recorded in the Mašat documents Hoffner notes:

“They were razzias, raids on villages, rather than large-scale pitched battles. One sees here too the typical size of the losses: 30 oxen and 10 men (text 14, line 10). What was most troublesome to the Hittite king and his officials was the frustrating situation that these enemies could appear at a moment’s notice, do damage, and then escape (text 12, lines 3-14). The damage done to the crops was probably more serious than the small number of small animals because this attacked the future food supply not only of Tapikka itself, but of the capital city, which received supplies from towns like Tapikka located in the Hittite “bread basket.” (Hoffner 2009: 91)

However, some situations seem to have been more serious. In ABoT 60 (see below), the number of the enemy attacking the town Tarittarä, if not exaggerated, is reported as 7000.

Although the Mašat documents do not provide much information on the scale of Hittite operations against the Kaška during the later parts of the Early Empire Period, some of the military operations of Tudḫaliya III and Šuppiluliuma I recorded in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I seem to have involved large numbers on both sides.¹¹² In fragment 10, in order to emphasize the impressive size of the enemy host it is reported

¹¹² E.g., DŠ fragment 10, D i 11’-17’.
that “… and the shepherds [came to] help.” In fragment 14, the enemy forces, probably under the leadership of Piyapili (mentioned in the preceding paragraph ll. 3’-7’), consisted of twelve *SUTU* troops/units. The number of enemy fighting units was no doubt mentioned here to emphasize their multitude.

We see from the Maṣat letters that the Kaška were well informed about the goings on in Hittite-controlled towns and planned their own operations accordingly—in the absence of high-ranking officials (“lords”), for example, or before the Hittites are about to fortify a certain place. Hittite military operations were preceded by reconnaissance (carried out by scouts) and oracular inquiries. When the king did not personally lead an attack, the officials at Maṣat consulted the king on matters of strategy.

Peaceful interactions between the Hittite state and the Kaška are recorded less frequently in Hittite documents. The most important sources in this regard are the agreements. A number of Maṣat letters illustrate how such alliances were formed.

Concerning the matter of Piḫapzuppi and Kaškanu about which you wrote me: “They have already made peace with us.” I received that message.

Concerning what you wrote me: “Kaška men are coming here in large numbers to make peace. What instructions does Your Majesty have for me?” Keep sending to My Majesty the Kaška men who are coming to make peace.

---

193 DŠ fragment 10 ll. 14’; LUM.MES SIPA.UDU-ya an-da wa-ar-r[i-…].
194 DŠ fragment 14 F iii 15’-16’.
195 HKM 17: 4-12; HKM 46: 15-17.
196 ABoT 60: 15’-19’.
197 HKM 17: 16-17.
199 HKM 17: 24-32.
Concerning what you wrote me: “Until you, Your Majesty, write me about this matter of the Kaška men coming to make peace I will be awaiting word in the land of Išḫupitta.” (HKM 10: 14-16, 17-22, 23-27)\textsuperscript{200}

In another letter, quoting a previous letter by Kaššū, the Commander of the Chariot-warriors, writes:

Lord, if only you would drive down here! The Kaška men keep saying: “If only the Commander of the Chariot-warriors would drive here, we would make peace!” (HKM 71: 4-7)

I believe that in these contexts the verb takšulai- ‘to make peace, be friendly’ refers specifically to the agreements made with the Kaška. The significance of these agreements was that allied Kaška were obliged to deliver “troops” to the Hittite king, who then led them on campaigns or used them as a workforce. That connection between allied Kaška and the mobilization of troops is clear in HKM 71, where Ḫulla, the Commander of the Chariot-warriors, responds to the claim of Kaššū that his (i.e., Ḫulla’s) presence is required in order for the Kaška to make peace (i.e., to make agreements):

Why have you actually deferred to me? Why have you not met with their (i.e., of the Kaška men) envoys/messengers?\textsuperscript{201}

Are you not a great lord? If you don’t bring me the troops of Karaḫna, Išḫupitta, and Mt. Šaktunuwa to Ninišankuwa, the men of Ḫatti will see how I come to you and … you! (HKM 71: 12-23)\textsuperscript{202}

The allied Kaška had to repel the attacks of hostile Kaška when they could and send His Majesty or the auriyaš išha-/BĒL MADGALTI messages on the movements of the enemy.\textsuperscript{203} We find an actual instance of Hittite-Kaška alliance in ABoT 60 (possibly

\textsuperscript{200} Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 112-13).
\textsuperscript{201} For the translation of parkiyattat as “deferred” see Hoffner’s (2009: 229) commentary to l. 13.
\textsuperscript{202} Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 228).
\textsuperscript{203} CTH 138.1.A §§12‘-20’.
from Kaššū to the King). In the context of an enemy attack (7000 in number, as mentioned above), Kaššū writes:

The Kaška men who used to come in to me do not come with me anymore.
(ABoT 60: 5-7)

Hostages

All the better-preserved Kaška agreements (CTH 137, 138, 139), as well as a number of fragments (CTH 140), document the practice of taking hostages. Though the context is often fragmentary, it seems that this practice was unilateral. In other words, we only have evidence for the Hittite king demanding or taking hostages from the Kaška. The hostages delivered under peaceful circumstances, namely, those attested in the Kaška agreements, are mostly designated as DUMU.MEŠ šulleš ‘boy hostages’. These were probably the children of the Kaška leaders who swore the oaths. HKM 102, an administrative document from Maşat Höyük, lists prisoners of war and their ransom prices. The ransom price for six of the nine Kaška prisoners of war was some combination of men (LÚ), women/girls (MUNUS/DUMU.MUNUS), oxen (GU₄), and goats (MÁŠ). Three Kaška prisoners, however, had to give one or more boy or girl hostages (DUMU/DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ šullaš).

Hostages were used as leverage by the Hittite state in their dealings with the Kaška. ABoT 60, probably from Kaššū to the King, demonstrates that not having hostages could prove dangerous:

---

204 The practice of taking hostages is an understudied area in ancient Near Eastern studies.
205 On šulla- see commentary to CTH 137.1 i 7’.
206 That they are prisoners of war is evident from their description as “blind” (IGLNU.GÁL); see commentary to CTH 137.1 ii 16’.

88
Early the following morning, Nerikkaili, the man from Taphallu, awoke me and brought me the message: “What do I have in the way of hostages? The enemy who has already invaded Tarittarâ number 7000!” (ABoT 60: 7'-12’).

Economic interactions

What little documentation of economic interactions between the Hittite state and the Kaška there is comes from the Kaška agreements (CTH 138.1.A and CTH 138.2.A). There is practically no information on economic interactions with the Kaška from the Mašat correspondence.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Kaška herdsmen were employed by the Hittite state and were responsible for the protection of Hittite herds from possible attacks by other Kaška groups. The Kaška agreements also mention that Kaška groups were to conduct trade in towns specified by the *auriyaš išha-|BÊL MADGALTI*.

Hittite-Kaška interactions and frontier policy during the Empire Period (1350-1200 BCE)

Conflicts with the Kaška appear to have increased in intensity during the Empire Period. To maintain stability and protect Hittite interests in the frontier region, Empire Period rulers repeatedly carried out military campaigns in the north and resorted to increasingly defensive and dramatic measures (see below). Their endeavors are nevertheless considered to have met with only short-term success (e.g., Bryce 2005: 223). It was not until the appointment of Ḫattušili III that some degree of stability was achieved in the north.

---

207 Translation follows Hoffner (2009: 177-78).
209 This small piece of information does not warrant Bryce’s assumption that “trading concessions were strictly controlled and very limited in their application” (1986: 92-93).
The geographical interface of the Hittite-Kaška conflicts, which seems to have been confined to the central and northeastern parts of the frontier in the Early Empire Period, spreads to the west in the direction of Pala and Tummana, and eventually to the southeast, all the way to Kaneš.

The majority of our Empire Period sources being annals, we have very limited information on interactions other than warfare between the Hittite state and the Kaška. With very few exceptions, Hittite annals depict conflicts with the Kaška as the result of Kaška aggression; Hittite military operations are always depicted as *reactions* to Kaška hostilities. Aside from incursions of hostile Kaška groups into Hittite territory or attacks on Hittite towns, which are by far the most frequently attested events, the causes given for conflicts with the Kaška are 1) their failure or refusal to deliver troops and/or other forms of tribute to the Hittite king, and 2) their harboring of Hittite fugitives.\(^2\text{10}\) But Hittite military operations were no doubt also motivated by the potential for booty (including deportees), though this is never stated as a reason for military campaigns but solely as their consequence, and by desire for territorial expansion.

Ḫattušili III’s decree for the town Tiliura (CTH 89) gives us further clues as to the nature of interactions with the Kaška during his reign. This decree is part of Ḫattušili III’s policy of exclusion against the Kaška in the frontier region and brings a series of restrictions to the interactions between the province governor (EN KUR-\(TI\)) and the population of the town on one side, and the Kaška on the other. We may assume that the types of interactions Ḫattušili II sought to hinder were commonplace in the frontier.

\(^2\text{10}\) For instance, in his second year, Muršili II marches north in pursuit of his subjects Pazzanna and Nunutta (KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.25 i 53ff.). The Piḫuniya affair too (Muršili II’s seventh year) begins with Muršili II’s demand for the return of his subjects (KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.25 ii 76ff.).
region during the Empire Period. The principal aim of the decree is to restrict Kaška access to the town Tiliura. Lines ii 6-13 specify that armed Kaška men or Kaška charioteers are not to enter the town, even if they are in the company of (i.e., working for) the EN KUR-TI. Kaška men are not to enter the town for the resolution of legal cases; they are to seek justice outside the town (ii 14-16). Kaška men found in the town are to be punished (iii 30-36). Even slaves brought from Kaška Land are to remain outside the town (iii 36-39). The decree further stipulates that herdsmen and farmers are not allowed to summon (anda weriya-) Kaška people (iii 44-48). This indicates that economic interactions between Kaška people and the populations of Hittite-controlled towns still continued.

Empire Period frontier policy

Early Empire period rulers, especially Šuppiluliuma I, followed a policy of refortification and repopulation in the northern frontier region, as a defensive measure against the Kaška.211 This program of frontier fortification is generally viewed as a defensive strategy against increasing Kaška aggression (e.g., Glatz and Matthews 2005: 55).212 However, the approach of the Hittite king to the fortification of frontier settlements in treaties urges us to reconsider their strategic purpose. For example, the section concerning the reorganization of the frontier region in the Šunaššura treaty specifies which towns in the frontier region may or may not be fortified.213 Similarly, in his treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta, Muršili II institutes restrictions on the founding of new

---

211 E.g., Bryce (2005: 223); Glatz and Matthews (2005: 55).
212 This strategy was not entirely new. Fortifications and resettlements are already attested in the Mašat correspondence.
213 KBo 1.5 (CTH 41.1) iv 43-51.
towns in the frontier region. These examples indicate that such structures in the frontier regions were viewed as offensive in nature and considered a threat.

Muwatalli II’s movement of the capital from Ḫattuša to Tarḫuntašša in the Lower Land and his appointment of Ḫattušili III as governor in Ḫakmiš constituted a turning point in the history of the northern frontier. Muwatalli II’s movement of the capital has been interpreted as a consequence of increasing Kaška aggression from the north. There is, however, no evidence to indicate that the conflicts with the Kaška had intensified during this period. Singer (2006: 38) suggests that there was “nothing exceptionally critical” in the activities of the Kaška during Muwatalli’s reign, and sees the movement of the capital as “the apex of a religious reform promoting the cult of the Storm-god of Lightning” (Singer 2006: 37).

It is interesting to remember that there are no agreements with the Kaška from the Empire Period. Although the Middle Hittite agreements with the Kaška were still kept in the Hittite archives during the Empire Period, there are no New Hittite copies save for three small New Hittite fragments (see the introduction to the Kaška Agreements). This stands in contrast to the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal I, of which several well-preserved New Hittite copies exist. It seems that the practice of making agreements with the Kaška was abandoned after the period of the Maṣat correspondence.

214 KBo 5.13 (CTH 68) i 29’-35’.
215 Most recently, Glatz and Matthews (2005: 53, table 1).
216 The decree for the town Tiliura does concern the Kaška as well as the Hittite population and the EN KUR-ŢI ‘province governor’, but it has little in common with the Middle Hittite Kaška agreements. The decree includes regulations concerning the province governor and the population of the town in their interactions with the Kaška, but does not address the Kaška themselves.
Ḫattušili III

Ḫattušili III’s appointment as governor in the north—the Upper Lands and the Hittite-Kaška frontier—dramatically altered Hittite-Kaška interactions in the frontier region; the previous administration of this frontier region was supplanted and for the first time some degree of control and stability was achieved on the northern frontier. Whatever the reasons for his appointment—and maintaining stability in the north and the security of the Land of Ḫatti while the center of the empire shifted must have been an important consideration—it was a highly successful appointment. According to Ḫattušili III, Muwatalli II’s move to Tarḫuntašša occasioned widespread Kaška uprisings that reached as far as Kaneš in the southeast. But Ḫattušili III successfully regained territories in the north, including Nerik, which had been lost to the Hittite kings for many years. Ḫattušili III appears to have been able to maintain effective Hittite control in the north for longer than his predecessors and even gain the support of Kaška in his conflict with Urḫi-Tešup over the Hittite throne.

Ḫattušili III himself saw his success in the north as a consequence of 1) his appointment as governor/king there, and 2) his new approach to the repopulation of frontier towns. Whereas his predecessors had resettled frontier towns with deported people from various parts of the empire (a practice attested already in the Mašat correspondence), Ḫattušili III claims to have brought the original inhabitants back to northern towns. The traditional interpretation of Ḫattušili III’s claim, based on the assumption of an inherent and clear distinction between Hittite and Kaška populations in

---

217 CTH 81 ii 1-14.
218 CTH 81 iv 26-27.
the north, is that these “original inhabitants” were the Hittite populations settled there before these towns were “sacked” by the Kaška. But this boast probably meant that Ḫattušili III brought to these towns populations with a stronger allegiance and loyalty to himself.

Ḫattušili III’s decree for the town Tiliura (discussed above) demonstrates that he brought strict regulations to Hittite-Kaška relations, hindering Kaška access to the town and forbidding interactions between “Hittite” herdsman, farmers, and the Kaška. We do not know if this was Ḫattušili III’s general frontier policy or measures special to Tiliura (on account of that town’s specific circumstances, such as a significant Kaška presence in or around the town).

Conclusion

Why were Hittite kings unable to regain and maintain control over the Black Sea region and the Kaška for so long? Hittite supremacy over territories in Anatolia and beyond constantly needed to be reasserted by repeated military operations and there was a tendency towards political fragmentation into “lands” and “towns,” to use Hittite terminology. However, when we consider the empire’s successful control over parts of northern Syria and over other regions in Anatolia, the seeming helplessness of Hittite kings in the north (at least until the efforts of Ḫattušili III) appears perplexing.

Two kinds of explanation have been put forward for this historical phenomenon, and they are often mentioned in combination. The first claims that the formidable topography of the mountainous central Black Sea region and the brevity of the

---

219 KUB 21.19 + KBo 51.1 (CTH 89) i 11-19.
campaigning season were not suitable for the way the Hittite army operated;\textsuperscript{220} and second, the politically fragmented and transhumant Kaška populations rendered Hittite methods of political control, namely diplomacy and military action, ineffective.

Though geography and climate must surely have had an effect on Hittite-Kaška interactions, they do not fully explain why Hittite military operations failed. The Hittites fought under difficult geographic/climatic conditions in other parts of Anatolia as well, especially in the east, south, and southwest, where they seem to have had more success. The second explanation, on the other hand, rests on a generalizing and somewhat inaccurate description (see preceding chapter) of the Kaška as universally politically fragmented and nomadic.

Zimansky (2007) has put forward an attractive alternative. Applying the principles of Owen Lattimore’s analysis of the Inner Asian frontiers of China, Zimansky suggests that the northern frontier of Ḫatti may have marked the point beyond which the costs of control and maintenance would have exceeded the benefits for the state. Simply put, to gain and maintain direct imperial control over the northern periphery and the Black Sea region was not worth the necessary effort. In fact, Empire Period sources (such as the Annals of Muršili II) do suggest that Hittite kings were mainly interested in this region for booty and tribute (in the form of manpower and agricultural or animal products), which could be acquired by recurring military campaigns but did not require direct imperial control. However, given the ideological and cultural importance of the region (discussed above), as well as the emphasis laid by Ḫattušili III on his successful recapture of Nerik, this alternative interpretation remains speculative.

\textsuperscript{220} Recently Glatz and Matthews (2005: 54).
Did the Kaška contribute to the downfall of the Hittite state? We simply do not know. The appearance of the Kaška in southeastern Anatolia in later Assyrian sources indicates only that Kaška groups had moved southwards.\textsuperscript{221} They do not shed light on the role the Kaška may have played in the final collapse of the Hittite empire.

\textsuperscript{221} See Grayson (1976: 6-7, 9).
Chapter Four

The Kaška Agreements

Introduction

The Kaška agreements were a collection of accords between the Hittite king and the Kaška, the primary function of which was to regulate the interaction of transhumant and settled populations on the northern frontier of Ḫatti and to ensure the loyalty of the Kaška to the Hittite king. These documents had the following principal constituents: 1) provisions imposed by the Hittite king, and 2) oaths taken by Kaška representatives to ensure their loyalty and their adherence to the provisions.

In the following discussion and text edition, I consider as part of the Kaška agreements documents that have conventionally been labeled in secondary Hittitological literature as the “Kaška treaties” (CTH 137-140) and a number of fragments that have been classified as “Lists of Men” / “Lists of Men and Soldiers/Troops” (CTH 234, 236, respectively). The agreements with the Kaška and the so-called lists have traditionally been treated as two separate genres and have thus previously not been studied together. Such a classification, as I shall discuss in more detail below, is artificial. The fragments assigned to CTH 234 and 236 are in fact very similar to those assigned to CTH 140, in that they do not consist solely of lists of men and troops from various localities, but, as I shall demonstrate below, also include provisions for the oath-takers and oath-statements.
That the fragments assigned to CTH 234, 236 and those assigned to CTH 140 belonged to
the same type of administrative/juridical document is confirmed by a recent join between
the large fragment KUB 26.62 + KUB 19.17 (formerly CTH 236.1, “List of Men and
Soldiers”) and KBo 50.63+ (CTH 140.1.A).

Another document that fits in with those in this collection and which could have
been included in the present edition is CTH 270, “the Oath of Ašḫapala,” a short
document of 21 lines bearing significant contextual, functional, and formal similarities to
the Kaška agreements. This document has been left out of the present text edition due to
the existence of previous editions by Otten (1960) and Giorgieri (1995: 234-36), but will
be included in the discussion.

I have opted, in this study, to refer to this collection of documents with the more
neutral designation “agreements” rather than using their conventional designations
“treaty” and “list,” or others such as “oath” or “instructions”—documents that are
thought to be related to the Kaška agreements—which force this diverse and
heterogeneous collection of documents into our modern and somewhat artificial generic
categories.

A brief history of scholarship

The list of previous scholarship on this topic being rather short, the contributions
will be discussed in chronological, rather than thematic, order.

Accords between the Hittite king and the Kaška have been known since the earlier
days of Hittitology and were identified from the outset as “treaties with the Kaška

222 F. Fuscagni, e-mail message to author (04/19/2011).
people.” However, despite their early discovery these documents have been excluded from most editions and compendia of Hittite treaties and diplomatic texts, as well as from studies of juridical/administrative documents such as oaths (German Treueide, Italian giuramenti) and instructions (German Dienstanweisungen, Italian vincolo) to which they are generally thought to be akin. This is to some extent due to the fragmentary condition of the texts, but also to the fact that their unusual form, structure, and subject matter render them difficult to place in our modern generic categories.

The first and only systematic study of the textual evidence pertaining to the Kaška is Einar von Schuler’s Die Kaškäer (1965a), in which most of the sources, including what von Schuler referred to as “treaties” with the Kaška, were presented in the last chapter (i.e., Chapter V, pp. 109-87). This work, however, was not intended to be a comprehensive philological edition of the texts. Von Schuler edited only a selection, some only in translation or without a detailed philological commentary, and excluded some of the variants. The dating of the texts, too, was problematic (see below).

In Die Kaškäer, von Schuler did not include an analysis of the structural or formal features of the Kaška agreements or discuss their development and relationship to other
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223 The first Kaška agreement (CTH138.1.A) was published by A. Goetze in 1929 in KUB 23; by 1968, most of the best-preserved manuscripts (CTH 137-139) had been published in hand-copies.
224 This is true for the pioneering works of Friedrich (1926, 1930) and Korošec (1931), as well as more recent works such as Beckman (1996, 1999), and Altman (2004: 479), who actually considers the “so-called Kaška treaties” to have been loyalty oaths.
226 This is not specific to the Kaška agreements; von Schuler (1965b) explains that the group of documents he refers to as “Sonderformen” (i.e., “special types” of treaties, for which see below), including the Kaška treaties, had often been overlooked or purposefully excluded from studies concerning the Hittite treaty tradition because they were different, in their form and structure, from the majority of Hittite treaties, and also because of their relatively poor state of preservation. Korošec (1931: 3), for example, left out a group of documents, among them the only Kaška agreement then known (CTH 138.1.A/ KUB 23.77a), from his pioneering monograph on Hittite treaties, on the grounds that these documents constituted what he called “Verleihung des Stadtsrechts,” that is, the granting of “municipal law” to subject territories. Another reason for their exclusion was that there was no proper edition of these documents at the time.
administrative or diplomatic documents. He took up some of these topics in another important contribution he published within the same year (as Die Kaškäer):

“Sonderformen der hethitischen Staatsverträge” (1965b). In this seminal article, von Schuler drew attention to a group of documents including the Kaška agreements, which he referred to as “Sonderformen” (i.e., “special types” of treaties). These documents were special in two respects: Firstly, the treaty partner in these accords was not a monarch, but a group of people who took the binding oath as representatives of their communities, what von Schuler called “Kontrahentenmehrheit.” Secondly, as a result of the plurality of the participants (i.e., “Kontrahentenmehrheit”), which manifested itself in the texts as a list of oath-takers, these documents bore significant structural and formal differences from the majority of Hittite treaties. By contrast, they were similar in certain respects to administrative documents such as the oaths for Hittite subjects (Diensteide or Treueide) (1965b: 453).

Despite their similarity to the (loyalty) oaths,

---

227 In this article von Schuler discussed the Kaška agreement KBo 8.35 (CTH 139.1.B), the so-called Mita of Paḫšuwa text (CTH 146), the Išmerikka treaty (CTH 133), the treaty with the “Elders” of Ura (CTH 144), and the Hukkana treaty (CTH 42). A second group of documents von Schuler analyzed consists of treaties that also incorporate lists of persons, in these cases, witnesses to the treaty: treaty between Ḫattušili III and Ulmi-Teššap of Tarḫuntašša (CTH 106.B.2), treaty between Muršili II and Talmi-Šarruma of Aleppo (CTH 75), and a document we may refer to, following Beckman (1996: 155, 176), as the Arbitration of Syrian Disputes by Muršili II (CTH 63).

228 On this topic von Schuler (1965b: 450) wrote: “Eine Vereidigtenliste ist ein so gewichtiger Zusatz zum herkömmlichen Formular daß dieses ein anderes Aussehen gewinnt. Auch ändert sich durch sie das Wesen eines Vertrags insoweit, als der Kreis der Kontrahenten viel weiter gefaßt ist als bei den regulären und häufiger auftretenden Vertragsschlüssen zwischen dem Großkönig und einem anderen Herrscher. Eine solche Abwandlung des Normalformulars, die nicht nur dessen äußere Form umgestaltet, sondern zugleich der Ausdruck ungewöhnlicher Praktiken beim Vertragsschluß ist, muß besondere Gründe haben.”

229 Von Schuler’s analysis was based on two specific features of these documents: 1) the placement of the list of divine witnesses, and 2) the presence of the list of treaty partners/oath-takers, in which the oath-takers were characteristically listed by their personal names and hometowns. As regards the list of divine witnesses, von Schuler demonstrated that their placement differed from treaties concluded with a single monarch. The list, according to von Schuler, was “das gegebene Mittel, Länder von oligarchischem oder egalitarem Gesellschaftsgefüge vertraglich zu binden”; he stressed that this feature was not to be found in “classical” Anatolian or ancient Near Eastern treaties, but in the Hittite documents he referred to as the “Diensteid” (1965b: 452-53, see also n. 30).
however, von Schuler concluded that the Sonderformen must be considered “vassal treaties”:


The references in CTH 139.1.A to “gods of Kaška-Land” in addition to those of Hatti-Land were, according to von Schuler, further proof of “die Partnerschaft zweier Nationen” (1965: 455). He thus concluded that the Sonderformen (at least the Kaška agreements) were not of “halbvölkerrechtliches Charakter” but should be treated as vassal treaties.

Both Die Kaškäer and “Sonderformen” were published before the development of reliable methods of dating Hittite cuneiform tablets. In Die Kaškäer von Schuler’s chronological ordering of the texts was based on the now discredited notion that some texts of the Empire Period contained “archaizing” elements. He dated the majority of the Kaška agreements to the later Empire Period, rather than the Middle Hittite period where we now know they belong, and thus overlooked the Early Empire period context of these documents, along with that of the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375) and the so-called “Lists of Men and Troops” (CTH 234, 236). Von Schuler’s analysis in “Sonderformen,” too, lacked a chronological approach to the material.
The breakthrough in the dating of Kaška agreements was Erich Neu’s article “Überlieferung und Datierung der Kaškäer-Verträge” (1983); through a detailed paleographic analysis, Neu demonstrated that the Kaška agreements, as well as the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375), dated to the Early Empire period.

The most recent contribution to the study of the Kaška agreements is Klinger’s “Das Corpus der Kaškäer-Texte” (2005). In this article, Klinger put forward the idea that the Kaška agreements, the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375), and possibly the Empire Period/NH Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory (CTH 422), which Klinger believes to have been based on a Middle Hittite original (2005: 350-53), are documents that are intertextually linked to one another and can be dated, more or less, to the reign of Arnuwanda I in the Early Empire period. Klinger suggested that the origins of the Kaška agreements are to be sought among internally developed Hittite administrative documents such as the oaths, in contrast to “classical” Hittite treaties which developed under Syro-Mesopotamian influence (pp. 357-59). In conclusion, Klinger questioned the conventional classification of the texts CTH 137-140 as “treaties,” favoring the designations “agreements” (Vereinbarungen) or “oaths” (Eide) (pp. 358-59).

A more complete philological edition of the Kaška agreements (or of other documents pertaining to the Kaška) has not been attempted since von Schuler’s Die Kaškäer.230 A thorough discussion of their formal and structural properties, their development in relation to contemporary administrative or diplomatic texts, or their subject matter, does not yet exist.

---

230 See Klinger’s account of previous attempts at preparing an edition of the Kaška treaties (2005: 348-49).
The fragments of Kaška agreements listed under CTH 234 and 236 (the so-called “Lists of Men” and “Lists of Men and Soldiers/Troops”) have characteristically been left out of discussions of the Kaška agreements. Von Schuler did include transliterations of KUB 26.62+ (CTH 236.1), KBo 16.66 (CTH 234.2), KUB 31.74 (CTH 236.3), and KUB 31.33 (CTH 140.1.A), in Die Kaškaer under “Namenlisten and Truppeneide” (1965: 141-45), but there was neither commentary nor discussion of how they relate to the rest of the Kaška agreements. Neu (1983: 393) excluded these documents from his work on the dating of the Kaška agreements, noting that they may have been part of the Kaška agreements, and that the texts transliterated by von Schuler in Die Kaškaer displayed the Middle Hittite script and features. Klinger (2005), on the other hand, did not take them into consideration at all.

**Texts and their selection criteria**

The documents edited in this work have been selected on the basis of internal criteria (i.e., structure, form, and contents). 231

The documents listed below are first of all related functionally and thematically, in that they all concern the regulation of the relationship between the Hittite state and groups of individuals referred to (in the aggregate) as “men of Kaška,” with the ultimate aim of ensuring the security and stability of the northern frontier of Hatti. They have in common a number of diagnostic characteristics, including: 1) references to “men of Kaška” (LÚ.MES.URU Kaška) and “Land of Kaška” (KUR URU Kaška, henceforth Kaška-

---

231 We do not know how Hittite scribes classified the Kaška agreements—colophons, where we would expect to find such information, have not been preserved except in one instance (CTH 140.1.A), where it is fragmentary. For Hittite terminology applied to oaths, treaties, and instructions, and further bibliography see Giorgieri (1995: 19-29, nn. 45, 46).
Land) and provisions prescribed for men of Kaška; 2) the presence of lists of individuals or troops whose personal names, titles, or hometowns may be identified as “Kaškaean”; 3) presence of the oath-formula linkiya kattan dai; and 4) presence of double paragraph lines dividing each document into smaller sections.

The majority of the Kaška agreements have been dated to the Early Empire period (c. 1450-1400 BCE), corresponding to the reigns of Tudḫaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, and Tudḫaliya III. Only three fragments have been dated to the Empire Period.232

There are very few duplicates among the Kaška agreements: 139.1.A, and B, both of which were Middle Hittite copies, and 140.2.A and B, of which the latter is New Hittite.233

The Kaška agreements appear to have been located in three different places/archives in Hattuša: Temple I, Büyükkale Gebäude A, and a few fragments from Büyükkale Gebäude D.234

The better-preserved Kaška agreements are listed in the Catalogue des Textes Hittites235 (CTH) under CTH 137-139 (“Treaties with the Kaška”) with their duplicates and parallels. Smaller fragments belonging to the Kaška agreements are listed under CTH

---

232 These fragments are KBo 43.1 (ascribed tentatively to CTH 138 in the Online Konkordanz), KUB 40.21 (CTH 140.3), and KUB 40.14 (CTH 140.2.B).

233 This may be contrasted to the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375), of which there are multiple duplicates/parallels, both contemporary MH and NH; see Klinger (2005: 350).

234 The provenance of each tablet — if recorded — is available in the Online Konkordanz. It is worth noting that of the duplicate pair CTH 139.1.A and B, the former was found in Temple I, the latter in Büyükkale A, which may suggest, although tentatively, that contemporary duplicates were created for storage in different archives.

235 Laroche (1971); I follow the up-to-date online version available through the Hethitologie Portal (www.hethiter.net).
140 (“Fragments of Treaties with the Kaška”), and under CTH 234 (“Lists of Men”) and
CTH 236 (“Lists of Men and Soldiers”).

On account of recent joins and collations, the following list differs in some respects from the *Online Konkordanz* on the entries for CTH 137-140, 234, 236.

**CTH 137**

CTH 137 (KUB 16.27\(^{237}\) + KBo 40.330) has no published parallel or duplicate.\(^{238}\)

The fragments comprising this four-column tablet were found in or around Büyükkale A.

This document is the only one among the Kaška agreements that preserves the name of a king. Line i 21’ reads: “thus (speaks) His Majesty Arnuwanda, Great King.” Like the majority of the Kaška agreements, it is divided into smaller sections by double paragraph lines, includes provisions for the inhabitants of towns on the Hittite-Kaška frontier, and incorporates lists of oath-takers and troops, also from towns on the northern frontier.

“Men of Kaška” and “Kaška-Land” are mentioned frequently in this text (especially §§6’ and 8’-10’); also mentioned are the “gods of Kaška-Land” (ii 5’ and ii 8’-9’).

An interesting feature of this text, which it shares with a few other Kaška agreements, is the paragraphs dealing with the obligations of the Kaška to give hostages to Hittite authorities (§§1’-4’).

\(^{236}\) Klinger (2005: 349) mentions c. 50 fragments belonging to what he called the “Kaškäer-Korpus” (including CTH 375, “The Prayer of Arnuwanda and Asmunikal”). Some of these fragments still remain unpublished.

\(^{237}\) KBo 16.27 was published also as KUB 36.115; see *Online Konkordanz*.

\(^{238}\) The *Online Konkordanz* lists the unpublished fragment Bo 10285 under CTH 137; its relationship to CTH 137.1 is, as of yet, unclear.
CTH 138

CTH 138.1.A (KUB 23.77 + KUB 23.77a + KUB 26.40 + KUB 13.27), the best-preserved Kaška agreement, is a single-column tablet of unknown provenance. As will be discussed in more detail below, this document has a unique place among the Kaška agreements on account of the unusual organization of the text on the obverse of the document, as well as the absence of lists of oath-takers and references to specific Kaška towns. Instead, this document addresses “men of Kaška” and “Kaška-Land” collectively.

CTH 138.2.A (KUB 31.105) is a smaller fragment (with 23 partially-preserved lines), which appears to be a parallel of 138.1.A. In contrast to CTH 138.1, it mentions a specific town (Tapaunwa, l. 2’). It was found in Büyükkale Gebäude A.

CTH 138.3.A (KUB 26.19) is a fairly well preserved, four-column tablet of unknown provenance. It is clearly related to CTH 138.1.A in terms of the subject matter of its extant paragraphs. It is not, however, an especially close parallel, as the arrangement of the paragraphs and contents are somewhat different. Like CTH 138.1.A, it doesn’t appear to have been divided into smaller subsections and does not address specific individuals or towns.

Also listed under CTH 138 in the Online Konkordanz are the fragments KBo 50.69 and KBo 43.1. On what grounds these fragments were assigned to CTH 138 rather than to CTH 140 with the rest of the fragments is unclear to me. KBo 50.69 has little more than two pl. verb endings (ll. 2’, 3’) and mentions ²²⁴ ⁴²₄ ²⁴² "Ga-aš-ga (l. 4’); KUB 43.1 mentions the GN ²²⁴ ⁴²₄ ²⁴² "Ka-pi-pi-š-ta (l. 6’) and DUMU.MEŠ šu-ul-<ši>-in-na (l. 7’). Although these

²³⁹ See von Schuler (1965a: 133) for the correspondence of the extant paragraphs of CTH 138.3.A to those of CTH 138.1.A.
²⁴¹ Online Konkordanz cites von Schuler (1965: 114), although the latter merely mentions the fragment without commenting on its relationship to another document/Kaška agreement.
²⁴² KBo 50.69 has little more than two pl. verb endings (ll. 2’, 3’) and mentions "Ga-aš-ga (l. 4’); KUB 43.1 mentions the GN "Ka-pi-pi-š-ta (l. 6’) and DUMU.MEŠ šu-ul-<ši>-in-na (l. 7’). Although these
one of the three fragments dated to the Empire Period, and was found in Büyükkale Gebäude D. KBo 50.69, on the other hand, is of unknown provenance.

CTH 139

As was mentioned above, CTH 139.1.A (KUB 23.78b + KUB 26.6 + KUB 40.36 + KBo 50.67\textsuperscript{243}) and B (KBo 8.35) are among the few duplicates within the corpus of Kaška agreements. They display the same diagnostic characteristics as CTH 137.1, namely provisions for specific localities on the Hittite-Kaška frontier, lists of oath-takers and troops, and the division of the document into smaller sections. All fragments of 139.1.A were found in Temple I. 139.1.B, on the other hand, was found in Büyükkale Gebäude A.

CTH 139.2.A (KUB 31.104 (+) KBo 16.29)\textsuperscript{244} is not a duplicate of CTH 139.1.A and B, but a parallel, as is evident from the different personal and geographic names in corresponding paragraphs.\textsuperscript{245} Both fragments were found in Büyükkale Gebäude A.

Two further fragments are listed under CTH 139 in the Online Konkordanz, though their relationship to CTH 139.1 and CTH 139.2 is not clear: KBo 60.242 and FHL 66. The small fragment KBo 60.242 appears to be a parallel or duplicate of CTH 138.1.A (KUB 26.6+ Vs. ii 20’ff.) or B (KBo 8.35 Vs. 22’ff.). It was found in Temple I. FHL 66, clues make it clear that these fragments belong to the Kaška agreements, they do not constitute, in my opinion, sufficient evidence for their assignment to CTH 138.

\textsuperscript{243} Also belonging to CTH 139.1.A are the unpublished fragments Bo 5899 and Bo 8668.

\textsuperscript{244} Based on the following note by Neu (1983: 397, n. 19), these two fragments were formerly listed in the Online Konkordanz as CTH 139.2.A and B respectively: “Nach E. von Schuler, a.O. 41, 81 gehören die Fragmente KBo XVI 29 (51/a) und KUB XXXI 104 verschiedenen Exemplaren an, deren Verhältnis Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate als Parallelversionen bestimmt.” Laroche (1971: 20), however, listed them as CTH 139.C. Collation confirmed that these two fragments do indeed belong to the same tablet (henceforth CTH 139.2.A).

\textsuperscript{245} Compare the personal and geographic names in CTH 139.1.A and B §12 and CTH 139.2.A §4.
also a small fragment, is a parallel of CTH 139.1.B (KBo 8.35 Vs. ii 10’-11’). Its provenance is unknown.

**CTH 140**

CTH 140 comprises fragments that have been identified as belonging to the Kaška agreements, whose relationship to the better-preserved agreements (CTH 137-139) as well as to one another is, due to their fragmentary condition, often unclear. Since most of these fragments incorporate lists of oath-takers and troops, they bear more resemblance to CTH 137.1 and CTH 139 (1.A, B, and 2.A), than to CTH 138 (especially 1.A and 2.A).

CTH 140.1.A (KBo 50.63 + KUB 57.22 + KUB 26.62 + KUB 19.17. KUB 26.62 + KUB 19.17) is the best-preserved text among the fragments collected under CTH 140. KUB 26.62 was formerly assigned to CTH 236 (“Lists of Men and Soldiers”), but the direct join with KBo 50.63 confirms that it belongs with the Kaška agreements.²⁴⁶ KBo 50.63+ was found in Temple I. KUB 26.62’s provenance is determined through join.

This document, too, consists of smaller sections (divided by double paragraph lines) and lists of oath-takers and troops. The towns and personal names attested in this document are comparable to those in CTH 137, 139, and 140. The majority of this text (judging from what remains of two columns) consists of lists of troops, sometimes accompanied by their leaders, which led to its assignment to CTH 236. It does, however, include provisions and oath-formulas (e.g., §§10’, 14’, and 15’).

The smaller fragments KBo 50.219 + KUB 31.33 and KBo 50.64 were grouped with CTH 140.1.A on account of their identical script and surface color/texture. All of

---

²⁴⁶ F. Fuscagni, e-mail message to author; see above, n.54.
these fragments were found in Temple I, except KUB 31.33, whose provenance is determined through the join.

The *Online Konkordanz* assigns the very small fragment KBo 59.171 to CTH 140.2.A as an indirect join for reasons unspecified. Collation, however, suggests that it too belonged with CTH 140.1.A, on account of its identical script and its surface color/texture. This fragment, too, was found in Temple I.

CTH 140.2 is preserved on two fragmentary duplicates (A: KUB 26.20 + KUB 40.31 + KBo 22.132, B: KUB 40.14). Giorgieri (1995: 90ff.), had identified KUB 40.31 (CTH 140.2.A) as an Old Hittite/Old Kingdom (loyalty) oath fragment, yet recent joins revealed that these fragments were part of an agreement with the Kaška. CTH 140.2.A was found in Temple I, but CTH 140.2.B has no provenance.

KUB 40.14 is one of the three NH fragments of the Kaška agreements and a duplicate of CTH 140.2.A.

KUB 40.21 is a late NH fragment with no provenance. Very little is preserved on it except the name Kaška and 2 pl. verb forms.

The small fragment CTH 140.3.A (KBo 50.61 + KBo 50.68) was found in Temple I.

Also listed under CTH 140 are the following, stand-alone fragments which have not been assigned their own numbers and letters (that is, unique identifiers): KBo 50.70, KBo 50.71, and KBo 57.2. KBo 50.70 is a small fragment whose script and surface color/texture is very similar to that of CTH 137.1. Also like CTH 137.1, it was found in Büyükkale A. KBo 50.71 was probably assigned to CTH 140 on account of the

247 The *Online Konkordanz* also lists the unpublished fragment Bo 8766.
attestation of 'URU Gašga (l. 13’) and the 2 pl. pronoun źimaš (l. 16’); it was found in Büyükkale D. KBo 57.2 is a small fragment found in Temple I; it mentions mŠunaili, a very commonly attested personal name in the Kaška agreements, in the context of a list of personal names.

CTH 234, CTH 236

The following fragments, though they were assigned by Laroche (1971) and on the Online Konkordanz to CTH 234 and 236, certainly belong with the Kaška agreements.

CTH 236.3 (KBo 31.74 [+] KBo 47.193) may be added to the Kaška agreements on account of the presence of personal and geographic names commonly attested in other Kaška agreements, and sentences with the structure “PN, TITLE, with him N men.” Of the two fragments, KBo 47.193 was found in Büyükkale Gebäude D.

CTH 234.2 (KBo 16.66) has the appearance of a smaller tablet (judging from the narrow columns), and was found in Büyükkale Gebäude A. What remains of this document are lists of men. The personal and geographic names attested, as well as the use of the sentence structure “PN, with him N men” shows beyond doubt that it belongs with the Kaška agreements.

Structural and formal characteristics of the Kaška agreements

In the following section I will analyze the structure, principal components, and formal/stylistic elements of the Kaška agreements. Due to the fragmentary nature of the texts, some conclusions must remain speculative. The analysis is based, for the most part
and for obvious reasons, on the better-preserved texts CTH 137.1, CTH 138.1.A, CTH 139.1.A and B, CTH 139.2, and CTH 140.1.A.

Although there is considerable diversity in the structure, form, and contents of individual Kaška agreements, they seem to fall into two typological/structural subcategories. On the one hand we have the vast majority of the documents, which display a particular structure and a diagnostic component. These include CTH 137.1, 139.1.A, 139.1.B, 139.2.A, 140.1.A, and most of the small fragments under CTH 140, 234, and 236. On the other hand we have CTH 138.1.A and the two parallel documents CTH 138.2.A and CTH 138.3.A, which, as will be discussed in more detail below, diverge from the rest of the Kaška agreements in significant respects.

The majority of the Kaška agreements were composite documents, consisting of smaller sections that were marked at the beginning and end by double paragraph lines, a feature characteristic of Sammeltafeln. However, unlike Sammeltafeln, in which each section of the tablet represents different, often unrelated texts, the Kaška agreements can be said to represent a textual unity. In the Kaška agreements, each section marked by double paragraph lines seems to concern a specific group of Kaška individuals. That is to say, each subsection of the agreement corresponds to the agreement with a specific group of Kaška. Nevertheless, these sections were altogether part of the same agreement and were probably placed under oath during the same occasion/event, in which multiple

---

248 For Sammeltafeln, see Mascheroni (1988: 131-45); note, however, that Mascheroni does not treat any of the Kaška agreements in her work.
249 That each section concerned different groups of Kaška is evident from the personal and geographic names.
groups of Kaška were placed under oath. I will henceforth refer to the documents that have this composite structure as “composite agreements.”

The structure and components of each section of a given composite agreement show considerable variation, and due to the fragmentary condition of most of the composite agreements, it is difficult to conclusively demonstrate the structure and contents of each subsection, especially the longer ones. In its most basic form a section of a composite agreement often consisted of the following elements: a list of oath-takers and troops\textsuperscript{250} introduced or concluded by the oath-formula (“they thus placed themselves under oath”; see below, oath-formula). In most cases, brief provisions concerning the individuals and towns mentioned in that section were also present.\textsuperscript{251}

Some sections, by contrast, were longer and more formalized; these could begin with a proper preamble and incorporate (aside from the abovementioned basic elements) longer sections of provisions, lists of divine witnesses, and curses/blessings.\textsuperscript{252}

Composite agreements are best characterized as the proceedings or minutes of the actual “oath-taking” event/occasion, during which multiple groups of Kaška leaders, along with their men and troops, were placed under oath.\textsuperscript{253}

CTH 138.1.A diverges from the majority of the Kaška agreements (i.e., the composite agreements) in some important respects: this document is not divided into

\textsuperscript{250} Though some sections concerned a single individual, e.g., CTH 137.1 §§24’, 25’.
\textsuperscript{251} E.g., CTH 139.1.A §§12’-15’.
\textsuperscript{252} E.g., CTH 137.1 §§5’-6’ CTH 139.1.A and B §§7’-11’. Due to the fragmentary condition of the texts, the beginning or end of many (sub)sections are broken/missing.
\textsuperscript{253} Perhaps Laroche (1971: 20) had a similar notion in mind when he employed the designation “traité ou protocole” in reference to the Kaška agreements CTH 138 and CTH 140; note, however, that I do not consider the agreements under CTH 138 as a composite-agreement or protocol, but a “model treaty” as I will discuss in more detail below.
smaller sections and does not incorporate a list of oath-takers. Although provisions take up most of the text (§§8’-47’), they address the “men of Kaška” (rather than specific groups of individuals or towns) and are styled in plural/singular 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} person (imperative or prohibitive). Moreover, a unique and most peculiar aspect of this tablet is that parts of the list of divine witnesses are divided into two sections by vertical lines (see List of Divine Witnesses below).

These characteristics of CTH 138.1.A, which set it clearly apart from the rest of the Kaška agreements, coupled with the high number of scribal errors and corrections in the text, point to the conclusion that this document reflects a different stage of redaction compared to other Kaška agreements. CTH 138.1.A gives the impression of a model document from which new (Kaška) agreements could be generated.

CTH 138.2.A and CTH 138.3.A appear to have been based—though somewhat loosely—on the model document CTH 138.1.A. However, CTH 138.2.A concerns a specific town, as we can see from the mention of [LÚ.ME]Š Tapaunwa (CTH 138.2.A 2’). Unfortunately, little of CTH 138.2.A and 138.3.A survive, so that we cannot reach any conclusions about their structure, form, and components.

**Characteristic features of the Kaška agreements**

The following is a discussion of the characteristic components of the Kaška agreements. Although these elements are present in most of the Kaška agreements, their

---

\[254\] Unless, of course, they were appended in a second tablet.

\[255\] Cf. von Schuler (1965a: 124-26), who suggested that CTH 138.1.A was a “draft” (“Entwurf”); note however, that his argument differs in some respects from mine.
Preamble

Among the Kaška agreements, the preamble has been preserved only in two instances: a) CTH 138.1.A (obv. 1-2) and b) CTH 137.1 (i 21’-23’).

a) [...]and the men of Kaška have thus plac[ed] [themselves (-za)] under oath [...] / [yo]u (pl.) [...]. [We] have hereby [summoned] the Thousand Gods to ass[embly].256 (CTH 138.1.A obv. 1-2)

b) [...]hus (speaks) My/His Majesty Arnuwanda, Great King: hereby [...] / And [we'] have placed] you (pl.) thus under oath [...] / and you (pl.) sinned. Now, furthermore, from this mom[ent on …], (CTH 137.1 i 21’-23’)257

The missing first half of the first line of a), which contained c. 15 signs (see commentary to CTH 138.1.A) may be restored on the basis of b) (CTH 137), as was suggested by von Schuler (1965: 126). After this concise preamble, CTH 138.1.A moves on straightaway to the evocation and list of divine witnesses.

The original context of b) is not the beginning of the tablet, but the beginning of a section. It may thus be considered as the preamble of that section, which begins with §5’ i 21’.258

Both extant preambles are very concise and they draw attention to the oath-formula characteristic of the Kaška agreements (i.e., linkiya kattan dai-, see below, oath-formula). In both respects, the preambles of the Kaška agreements are similar to that of

---

258 That this is the beginning of a new agreement is signaled by the double paragraph line that precedes §5’.
the contemporary Išmerikka treaty (KUB 26.41 obv. 1-4; CTH 133, Arnuwanda I) and to those of Empire Period documents such as the Ḫukkana treaty (KBo 5.3 (+) i 1; CTH 42.A)\textsuperscript{259} from the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, and an Empire Period oath of Tudḫaliya IV (KUB 26.1 + obv. i 1; CTH 255.2). Other contemporary oaths, which are comparable to the Kaška agreements (Giorgieri 2005), such as CTH 270 (the Oath of Ašḫapala) and CTH 260 (“Instructions” of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal for the “Würdenträger”) begin \textit{in medias res}, without preamble.

Although the Kaška agreements do not incorporate historical introductions characteristic of Hittite diplomatic texts, b) does seem to make a reference to the past, \textsl{waštatenn a} “and you have sinned,” contrasting it with the future (which this agreement will affect) “now, furthermore, from this moment on …\textbf{].}”\textsuperscript{260}

List of divine witnesses

Lists of divine witnesses are preserved only in CTH 138.1.A (obv. 2-20), 139.1.A (ii 5’-13’), 139.1.B (ii 8’-13’), and 139.2 (i 1’-3’).\textsuperscript{261} CTH 137.1 does not seem to have incorporated a list of divine witnesses, unless it was located somewhere in the breaks. The majority of Hittite oaths and treaties incorporated lists of divine witnesses. However, the existence of documents such as the Oath of Ašḫapala (CTH 270)—a short promissory oath very similar to some Kaška agreements that does not have a list of divine witnesses.

\textsuperscript{259} The Ḫukkana treaty does not, however, refer to the oath in the preamble.
\textsuperscript{260} On the historical introduction—or prologue—see Altman 2004.
\textsuperscript{261} In CTH 139.2 (i 1’-3’) only a few words from the last three lines of the list of divine witnesses have been preserved.
witnesses—suggests that they may have been omitted in (at least) some Kaška agreements.\textsuperscript{262}

The evocation and ensuing list of divine witnesses in CTH 138.1.A (§§1-6) is most unusual, and has a unique place in Hittite documentation.\textsuperscript{263} Whereas §§1-2 list Hittite deities, §§4-5 appear to have been reserved for Kaška deities, introduced by the evocation in the single-line §3. §§4-5 of the list of Kaška deities are each divided into two unequal parts by a vertical line. The organizational principles behind this arrangement are not entirely clear, since the left-hand section of each paragraph is broken, but it is nevertheless safe to assume that §§4-5 were reserved for Kaška deities. §4b (the right-hand section of §4) contains three otherwise unattested Storm Gods: dU Ḫanupteni, dU Kutuppuruзи, and dU Pazim[...]iš. The deities listed in §3b, on the other hand, are part of the Hittite pantheon: the Sun Goddess of the Earth, dḪuwattašši, the “father” Sun God, Storm God of the Army, and Telipinu.\textsuperscript{264}

The lists in CTH 139.1.A and B, and perhaps also in CTH 139.2 (assuming that the list of divine witnesses, like the curse formula, was parallel to CTH 139.1.A and B), are more concise compared to that of CTH 138.1.A. Kaška deities are summoned also in CTH 139.1.A and B, although individual deities are not listed as we see in CTH 138.1.A.

\textsuperscript{262} For CTH 270 see Otten (1960: 121-27) and more recently Giorgieri (1995: 234-36). For a discussion of the possible motivations behind the omission of the list of divine witnesses in some other oath documents, see Giorgieri (1995: 49-51).

\textsuperscript{263} For a detailed discussion of the list of divine witnesses in CTH 138.1.A, see Singer (2007: 174-78).

\textsuperscript{264} Von Schuler’s (1965: 127) original interpretation (followed by Yoshida 1996: 36) of the arrangement of §§4-5 was that §4 alone listed Kaška deities, and that the list of Hittite deities continued with §5. Singer rejects this interpretation on the following valid grounds: Firstly, there is no parallel among Hittite lists of divine witnesses of such a “stitching back and forth between Hittite and the foreign deities,” and secondly there’s no reason to assume deities of Hattic origin such as the Sun Goddess of the Earth and Telipinu were not venerated by the Kaška as well (2007: 176-77).
Although CTH 137 does not have a list of divine witnesses, the gods of Hatti and the gods of Kaška are mentioned together (ii 8’-12’) in a context that appears to be a curse formula (see below, Curses and Blessings).

A peculiar feature of the divine witnesses of the Kaška agreements is the prominence of the war god ZABABA. In both copies of CTH 139.1, ZABABA features at the beginning of the list, along with the primary deities (listed without their epithets): the Sun God, the Storm God, and the Protective Deity. ZABABA has a special place also in the extant curse formulas of CTH 139.1 A (ii 16’-19’) and B (ii 19’-21’): “And if you come to attack the land of Hatti, ZABABA shall turn back your weapons, and eat your own flesh! He shall turn back your arrows, and keep piercing your own hearts!” Finally, ZABABA appears also in KUB 26.62, i 40’ (CTH 140.1), in a fragmentary context mentioning ḍIttašišli (i 39’). ZABABA is mentioned together with the word for oath (li-in-ga-[]). Due to the fragmentary condition of the texts, we cannot discern the context in which these deities were mentioned, though it is possible, due to their attestation at the end of the paragraph, that they were part of a curse formula.

The placement of the list of divine witnesses within individual Kaška agreements is variable. In CTH 138.1.A it is at the very beginning of the document, following upon the concise preamble. In 139.1.A and B it is located in the middle of the document, somewhere in column ii, where it coincides with the end of a section of the agreement, which, as was argued above, was a composite agreement. In CTH 139.2, the very fragmentary list of divine witnesses appears to be located nearer the beginning of the document, in the first column. As in CTH 139.1.A and B, the list of divine witnesses and

---

265 Singer (2007) does not refer to this document.
the following paragraph of curses are located at the end of a subsection of the
document.266

The evocatio introducing the list of divine witnesses is preserved in the duplicates
CTH 139.1.A (ii 5’-6’) and B (ii 8’-9’) and partially preserved in two instances in CTH
138.1.A (obv. 2, 11). In both instances the evocatio is slightly different from the
characteristic evocatio we find in treaties and oaths (i.e., “We/I have summoned the
Thousand Gods/all the gods to assembly…They shall be witnesses [to this
treaty/oath]”). In CTH 139.1.A and B the evocatio uses the verb dai- ‘to place’ rather
than the characteristic halzai- ‘to call, summon’: “We have now made the oath, and we
have placed all the gods in assembly.”268 The unusual aspect of CTH 138.1.A is that both
Hittite and Kaška gods are invoked and listed separately (obv. 2, 11 respectively).269

Curses and blessings

Passages in which the gods are invoked to destroy transgressors of the oath and
reward its keepers are preserved in the agreements CTH 137.1 (§§9’-10’, ii 8’-17’), CTH
139.1.A (ii 11’-22’) and B (ii 14’-24’), CTH 139.2 (i 7’ 4’-12’), CTH 138.3.A (ii 40’-
45’). In CTH 138.1.A, a short curse formula appears at the end of §44’ as the apodosis of
a series of conditionals. CTH 138.1.A does not appear to have a separate section of

266 See von Schuler (1965b) on the placement of the lists of divine witnesses in the group of documents he
refers to as “Sonderformen.”
267 See Beckman (1999) for various examples.
268 This was already noted by von Schuler (1965: 115).
269 See commentary to CTH 138.1.A obv, 3 and 11 for restorations of these fragmentary lines.
270 In some Hittite treaties with Hurrian or Syrian polities, the foreign gods are counted in the list of divine
witnesses. However, foreign deities in these documents are not summoned with a separate evocatio; e.g.,
CTH 51 between Ṣuppiluliuma I and Ṣattiwaza of Mittanni, CTH 52 between Ṣattiwaza of Mittanni and
Ṣuppiluliuma of Hatti, CTH 53 between Ṣuppiluliuma I and Tette of Nuhašše, CTH 62 between Muršili II
and Duppi-Teššup of Amurru, CTH 66 between Muršili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit.
curses/blessings, unless it was located somewhere in the break following the list of divine witnesses, as we see in CTH 139.1.A, B, and CTH 139.2, or in the break following §42’ (with provisions concerning the herding of cattle and sheep) as we see in CTH 138.3.A.271

In the Kaška agreement the curses/blessings section seems to appear once throughout the document, in contrast to some (contemporary) oaths, treaties, and instructions, which instead have recurring oath/curse formulas.272 The placement and form of extant curses and blessings, however, are variable.

In CTH 137, the curse and blessing formula follows upon a fragmentary passage difficult to interpret, in which Hittite and Kaška deities are somehow set against each other:273

§9’ […] the gods of Kaška […] against the gods of Ḥatti. […]and the gods of Ḥatti […]against’ the gods of Kaška[.] […] they shall [seize’]. And [let] them (the oath breakers) [be] unclean/polluted before them (the gods). [And] let them eat uncle[an bread?]. And wine (and) beer […] on which day they transgress the oath of the gods.”

§10’ [They shall] avenge it on the men of Kaška themselves […]Together with] their wives, their children, together with their oxen, sheep […] their vineyards, they shall destroy! Whoever [Whoever respects these [oaths…] [with respect to/against the gods of] Ḥatti [him…together with his wives [his children, together with] his cattle[e], his sheep, together with [his] fields, [his vineyards, they shall…] (CTH 137.1 ii 9’-17’)

271 In CTH 138.3.A the curse formula follows upon §7’, which in CTH 138.1.A roughly corresponds to §§41’-42’, as was already noted by von Schuler (1965: 133). In CTH 138.1.A, there’s a break beginning after the first two lines of §42’. It is possible that there was a curses/blessings section here.

272 Contra Oettinger (1976: 77-81), who generalizes that the “special form” of the curse-formula (see below), which he believes the Kaška agreement CTH 139.1.B had, is a recurring form. For the recurring curse-formula, which in some oaths and contemporary treaties concluded each paragraph, see Oettinger (1976: 76-82) and Giorgieri (1995: 52-53).

273 This passage is reminiscent of a passage in CTH 422, the Ritual on the Border of Enemy Territory, where the conflict between people of Kaška and Ḥatti is expressed in terms of strife between the gods of Kaška and Ḥatti (KUB 4.1, ii 7-14).
In CTH 139.1.A, B, and their parallel CTH 139.2\textsuperscript{274} the vivid blessing and curse formulas follow upon the list of divine witnesses and feature the war-god ZABABA:\textsuperscript{275}

§9’’ And if you protect these oaths, the gods shall protect you too! You shall thrive and prosper in the hand of the king! And if you transgress these oaths, all the oath-deities shall destroy your lands, your towns, your wives, your children, your fields, your vineyards, your cattle, your sheep!

§10’’ And when you come to attack the land of Ḫatti, the War-god shall turn back your weapons, and they shall eat your own flesh! He shall turn back your arrows, and they shall pierce your own hearts!

§11’’ And when you transgress the oath, your cattle, your sheep and your people shall not beget children! And the oath-deities shall devour your children even inside you! (CTH 139.1.B ii 14’’-24’’, A ii 11’’-22’’)

The curse-formula in CTH 138.3.A is not freestanding or part of the invocation and list of divine witnesses, but appears rather to conclude the section concerning (the movement of) cattle and sheep:

[And if] you, (as) allies, go back, and (for) your[elves... (and) d[ivide up] the cattle and sheep [of] Ḫatti together among yourselves [...]you do not observe] the matter of the oath, and the [...] of the oath, the oath-deities shall seize [him] and destroy him [together with his] his w[ife], his cattle, his sheep, his goats, [...] his w[i]ne, his fields, his vineyards, [...]with the animals of the [field], with the mountains [...] (CTH 138.3.A ii 38’’-45’’)

The inclusion of wine and animals in the list of things the oath-deities are invoked to destroy is somewhat unusual. The form of this curse-formula as well as its placement at the conclusion of a paragraph (of provisions) are similar to the use of curse-formulas in some oaths, where it appears as a recurring formula at the end of each paragraph.\textsuperscript{276}

\textsuperscript{274} CTH 139.2 omits the blessing formula.
\textsuperscript{275} The enforcers of the oath (i.e., the oath-deities) traditionally are Išhara and the Moon God if named, and linkiyanteš if not named; see CHD L-N (s.v. lingai- 2 a-d, p. 67-68). Oettinger (1976: 74) suggests the possibility that the linkiyanteš (too) were Išhara and the Moon God.
In his discussion of the extant curses in the Military Oaths (CTH 427), Oettinger (1976: 78-81) considers the Kaška agreements\(^{277}\) as part of a group of treaties whose curse-formulas were similar to those we see in the Military Oaths.\(^{278}\) This characteristic curse-formula, which he refers to as “spezielle Form,” appears only in documents where the treaty-partner was a collectivity (Partner-Kollektiv) not of equal rank with Hittite king. In these cases, Oettinger argues, the “spezielle Form” was employed out of the necessity to threaten and frighten the collective partner of the treaty in order for the treaty and the oath to remain effective—what Oettinger refers to as “Abschreckungs-Notwendigkeit” (1976: 78-81). Oettinger contrasts the treaties with the “spezielle Form” (the Ḫapiru Treaty [CTH 27], the Išmerikka Treaty [CTH 144], and CTH 139.1.B of the Kaška agreements), all of which date to the Old Kingdom and the Early Empire Period, to contemporary treaties (Treaty with Pilliya of Kizzuwanta, the Mita of Paḥḫuwa text, and the Šunaššura treaty), which did not have the curse-formula, and to Empire Period treaties in which the curse-formula appears only once. These treaties, according to Oettinger, did not have the “spezielle Form” of the curse-formula since they were concluded with a single, known partner (1976: 78-81). Oettinger’s classification, however, is problematic. First, in the Kaška agreements the curse/blessing formula occurs only once, as far as we can tell. Second, one of his examples of treaties which do not have the “spezielle Form,” the Mita of Paḥḫuwa text (CTH 146), was actually not concluded with a single partner but with a collectivity (i.e., the men of Paḥḫuwa),\(^{279}\) and,

\(^{277}\) Oettinger only discusses KBo 8.35 (CTH 139.1.B), leaving out the relevant curse formulas in CTH 137.1 and CTH 138.3.A.

\(^{278}\) The similarity of the curses and blessings in CTH 139.1.A and B to those in the military oaths was already noted by von Schuler (1965: 113).

\(^{279}\) With von Schuler (1965b).
as was already noted by von Schuler (1965b), is in many respects similar to the Ismerikka treaty and the Kaska agreements.

Provisions

In analyzing the provisions of the Kaska agreements, we need to distinguish between the “model” agreement CTH 138.1.A and the documents characterized (above) as “composite agreements.” In the former, provisions are the predominant feature and take up the majority of the document, from the break after the list of divine witnesses to the end of the document. The provisions in this document are styled in the 2nd person plural (and to a lesser extent 3rd person singular) and are not directed towards specific individuals/groups of individuals, but toward the “men of Kaska.” In the composite agreements, by contrast, each agreement section could contain provisions of varying length and detail, styled in either the 2nd/3rd person singular or plural (impositions), or in the 1st person singular or plural (promissory statements). These provisions were specifically for the individuals and troops listed in that section of the agreement.

We may distinguish between impositions of provisions and promissory statements. Imposed provisions were dictated (presumably by the Hittite king) and were styled in the 2nd person. For example:

If a man from Ḫatti comes from Kaska in the manner of a fugitive, and arrives back at an allied city, you (pl.) shall set him on the way to Ḫattuša, but you (sg.) shall not seize him and send him back to Kaska or sell him in Ḫatti. (CTH 138.1.A rev. 73’-75’)

Promissory statements, attested only in composite agreements, were uttered by the oath takers and styled in the 1st person singular or plural. These promissory statements in
the 1st person could appear with or without the quotation particle -wa. In composite agreements, it is often difficult to discern in fragmentary contexts whether the subject/referent of a 1st person plural or singular verb is the “oath-taker(s)” (i.e., the Kaška), or the Hittites. But in the expression “we have hereby made the oath and have summoned all the gods into assembly,”280 we can assume that the 1st person plural refers to the Hittites, or the Hittites and the Kaška together.281 The following better-preserved examples may safely be attributed to the oath-takers/Kaška:282

The men of Kaška [placed the following under] oath for themselves: “[…] we will protect the person of His Majesty […] we will continuously listen.” (CTH 140.1.A i 61’-63’)

“I will protect Our Majesty” (CTH 140.2.A i 19’)

Most of the provisions in the Kaška agreements (impositions or promissory statements) are unilateral—that is, they only concern the obligations and rights of the Kaška. In rare cases, however, they may be bilateral:

If from Ḫatti a fugitive comes into Kaška, into an allied city […]if he is a slave7 and he] brings the goods of his master here, or (if) he is a craftsman7, and brings the goods of his partner here, you shall gi[ve back the goods]. But that one shall be your fugitive. If an ally from there [come]s [into Ḫatti], if he is [a slave’] and brings the goods of his master here, or (if) he is a free man and [brings the goods] of his partner [here, the g]oods [we] will give back, but the fugitive we will not give back to you. (CTH 138.1.A rev. 58’-62)

I will not give Šapallina back to you. Where you bring […]. I will give him back to you only there. (CTH 139.1.A ii 2’-4’, B ii 6’-7’)

280 E.g., CTH 139.1.A ii 5’-6’, B ii 8’-9’.
281 Contra Altman (2004: 497, n. 68), who supposes the subject of the 1st person plural evocatio is the Kaška.
282 See also CTH 137.1 i 11’-15’, ii 3’, iii 9’-10’, iii 16’; CTH 139.1.B iii 5’-8’.
CTH 138.1.A, the best-preserved of the Kaška agreements, gives us a clear view of what the provisions of the Kaška agreements concerned: 283 1) non-hostility against Hatti, 2) reporting of hostile activities to the king, 3) return of fugitives, 4) settling in Hittite territory, 5) conducting trade in Hittite territory, 6) herding/grazing of cattle and sheep.

An especially important and seemingly unique aspect of the Kaška agreements was a set of provisions concerning hostages, particularly boy hostages. 284 Neither the solemn oath taken in the presence of the gods, nor the threat of the Hittite army appear to have been effective in ensuring that the Kaška stood by their oaths, so that the Hittite king saw the necessity to take hostages from the Kaška. 285

The provisions in some of the Kaška agreements do include, though in fragmentary context, the sending of troops, and the leading of Kaška men on campaigns: 286

283 The provisions of the Kaška agreements and their implications for the administration of the northern frontier of Hatti will be further discussed in Chapter Five. For summaries of the provisions of the Kaška agreements see also Klinger (2005) and Bryce (1986).

284 See commentary to CTH 137.1 i 7’. Apart from one attestation of ḫul-ul-ulš pé-eš-tén “you shall give hostages” in KUB 26.29+ obv. 15, the Treaty with the Elders of Ura (CTH 144), the Kaška agreements seem to have been the only group among both administrative and diplomatic documents which mention hostages in the provisions.

285 It is difficult to tell, due to the fragmentary condition of the relevant passages (mostly in CTH 137.1), if the provisions concerning hostages were unilateral (i.e., only the Kaška being obliged to give hostages), or bilateral (both the Hittite king and the Kaška being obliged to give hostages). Documents from Mašat Höyük provide us with further information on Kaška hostages. HKM 102 is a list of Kaška hostages, that is, “men captured in battle and held for ransom by their people/families” (Hoffner 2009: 120). The hostages in HKM 102—thought to be people of importance, possibly Kaška leaders—were listed along with the price for their ransom. Hoffner (2009: 118-21) furthermore deduces from HKM 13 and 14 that some important hostages, such as a man named Marruwa, “ruler/man of Ḫimmuwa,” were sent to Ḫattuša to avoid Kaška “rescue raids.”

On whatever campaign His Majesty [will lead] you, [whe]n His Majesty turns back from the campaign, he will [let] the troops (go) home. (CTH 138.1.A rev. 101’-103’)

Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, the troops listed alongside Kaška leaders were very likely levied into the Hittite army, probably when the Hittite king was about to go on campaign (see below, list of oath-takers).

Finally, it is significant that the Kaška agreements do not incorporate two important elements we see in treaties, namely, historical prologues and descriptions/setting of borders.

Oath-formula

The oath formula most often used in the Kaška agreements was linkiya kattan dai- ‘to place under oath’. Much less frequently attested are linkiya kattan ki- ‘to be placed under oath’, and lingain iya- ‘to make the oath’.

*linkiya kattan dai-*

The oath-formula *linkiya kattan dai-* ‘to place under oath’ is one of the most characteristic features of the Kaška agreements. Although this formula appears in a few other documents (contemporary or later), most examples come from the Kaška agreements, and in no other document or genre is it so frequently attested as in the Kaška agreements. As was noted by Giorgieri (1995: 53, n.126), this expression is always active (as opposed to the passive form *linkiya kattan ki*-, see below) and descriptive (it

Regelung des Zusammenlebens von Hethitern mit den im von ihnen beanspruchten Territorium lebenden friedlichen Kaškäern und solchen, die sich gegenüber den Hethitern feindlich verhalten.”

287 This oath-formula is also attested in two contemporary texts—the Madduwatta text (CTH 147) and a fragmentary MH treaty (CTH 28)—and the treaty of Šuppiluliuma with Ḫukkana of Ḫayaša (see n. 65 below). Otten (1969:13) notes that this expression is not attested in Empire Period treaties (aside from the abovementioned treaty with Ḫukkana of Ḫayaša).
describes the act of oath-taking in the preterit indicative). In the Kaška agreements, the expression *linkiya kattan dai-* is always used reflexively (with the reflexive particle *-za* or the appropriate enclitic pronoun). That is to say, Kaška men either place troops/words (*ÉRIN.MEŠ/iuddär*) under oath to themselves, or place themselves under oath. This may be compared to other examples where it is His Majesty who places people or words under oath.288 Listed below are the different ways in which the expression *linkiya kattan dai-* is used in the Kaška agreements, following the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary:*289

a) Reflexively, with the “word/matter of the treaty” as the object of the verb *dai-*: 

\[
\begin{align*}
nu-za & \text{ li-in-ki-ya tāk-šu-la-aš ut-tar kat-ta-an QA-TAM-MA-pát da-i-e-er (139.1.B ii 31’-32’), “they placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves (-za) in the very same manner.”}
\end{align*}
\]

b) Reflexively, with “troops” or “men” as the object of the verb *dai-*: 

\[
\begin{align*}
nu-za & \text{ li-in-}k[i-y]a \text{ kat-ta-an ÉRIN.MEŠ-an da-}l\text{-}a\text{-}i\text{-}e\text{-}er (CTH 137.1 iii 9’), “they placed troops under oath to themselves (-za).”}
\end{align*}
\]

c) Reflexively, with the subjects placing themselves (-za) under oath: 

\[
\begin{align*}
nu-za & \text{ li-in-}k\text{-}i\text{-}ya \text{ kat-ta-an QA-TAM-M[A] da-i-e-er (CTH 139.1.B ii 28’-29’), “they placed themselves (-za) under oath in the same manner.” In sentences where the transitive verb does not have an accusative direct object, the reflexive particle *-za* can “indicate that the}
\end{align*}
\]

288 Cf. the following examples where the subject of the expression is His Majesty: 1) *nu-[ut-ta li-in-]ga-nu-ut nu-ut-[ta] li-in-ki-ia / [ka]r-ta-an ki-e ud-da-a-ar da-iš, “he (i.e., My Majesty’s father, l. 13’) made you swear, and he placed these words under oath for you;” (KUB 14.1 obv. 13-14; CTH 147, the Madduwatta text) 2) *nu-ut-ta ka-a-sa ke-e ud-da-a-ar ŠA-PAL NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM / tel-eḫ-ḫu-un, “I have just now placed these words under oath for you” (KBo 5.3 i 38-39; CTH 42, Hukkana treaty). In a MH treaty fragment (CTH 28, a MH treaty with a certain Ḫuḫazalma) the subject of the verb *dai-* appears to be the Hittite king and the treaty partner Ḫuḫazalma: *an-da-ma-ḫän UDÜ-un ku-wa-a-pī ku-e-u-e-en nu li-in-ki-ya / [ka]t-ta-an ki-iš-ša-an da-i-ū-en “When we killed a sheep, we placed the following (words) under oath” (KBo 16.47 rev. 15’-16’).

289 This list follows CHD L-N (s.v. *lingai* 1b 2’, p. 65).
direct object of the verb is the same person as its subject” (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 358). However, it is also possible that the direct object of the verb (uddār ‘words’) was simply in ellipsis. Support for the latter alternative comes from the following example where the reflexive particle is not used (KBo 16.47 15’-16’): nu linkiya kattan kiššan daiwen “we put the following (words) under oath.” In this example the direct object of daiwen is in ellipsis, but it is clear from the following direct quotation that the direct object should be “words.”

Occasionally, linkiya kattan dai-, with or without an explicit accusative direct object, introduces the word/matter (uttar) to be placed under oath (which could be a direct quotation or a provision). In CTH 140.1.A i 61’-62’ and CTH 137.1 iii 9’-10’, for example, the oath-formula introduces the direct quotation/promissory statement of the oath-takers. In both CTH 137.1 iv 19’-20’ and iv 24’-25’, the oath-formula introduces the provisions specified for the individual mentioned before the oath.

The following well-preserved sections from CTH 139.1.A and B (separated from one another by the use of double paragraph lines) demonstrate the three different usages of oath-formula linkiya kattan dai- in context:

§12’ Ḥatipta, Śunupašši, Qanu, Pizzizzi, Pirwi, Kuri[ya]lli, Timitti, Tuttu, Dada, Kaška[ili?, T]uttu, (and with them) nine men (of) Tešenippa; these too swore, and placed themselves in the same manner under oath.

§13’ Piya, Śunupašši, (and) five men with them of Talmaliya placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner. Fifty troops they placed (under oath for themselves).

Note that in CHD L-N (s.v. lingai- 1b 2b’, p. 65) the English translation of this sentence erroneously leaves out the brackets; cf. the translation by de Martino (1996: 72).
§14” Hatipta (and) five men with him (of) Yaḥrīšša placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner. Twenty troops they placed (under oath for themselves). (CTH 139.1.B ii 25’-34’, A ii 23’-33’)

linkiya kattan ki-

linkiya kattan ki- is more commonly attested in oaths and treaties, where it may conclude all (or some) paragraphs of provisions.²⁹¹ In the Kaška agreements it is attested twice, both times in broken context (CTH 137.1 ii 18’): A-NA² LÛ.MEŠ¹ URU² Qa-a]š-qa‘ 

ki-i-ya ut-tar kí-it-[a-ru, “let this matter be placed (under oath) [for the Kaška]men.”

In CTH 140.2.A and its duplicate CTH 140.2.B, though the latter is more fragmentary, the two oath-formulas mentioned above are used together, followed by a third, broken oath-formula:

Let this matter/word be placed (under oath) [for the men of Kaška]. The [word] of the treaty they placed under [oath] for themselves in the following manner. Oath (dat.) in the following manner […].²⁹² (CTH 140.2.A KUB 26.20+ i’ 9’-10’)

lingain iya-

The last oath-formula employed in the Kaška agreements is lingain iya- ‘to make/draft an oath’.²⁹³ The only attestation comes from CTH 139.1.A ii 5’ and B ii 8’, although we may also restore it in CTH 137.1 ii 4’, in the break before i-ya-u-en: “We have now made the oath!” The subject of the verb here must be the Hittite king and the

²⁹¹ In both MH and Empire Period oaths linkiya kattan ki- appears in some oaths as one of the different types of recurring oath-formulas concluding each paragraph; for these different types of the recurring oath-formula and the texts in which they appear see Giorgieri (1995: 52-53). See Otten (1969: 13, n. 3.) for treaties that feature linkiya kattan ki-.


²⁹³ CHD L-N (s.v. lingai- 1b, p. 64).
Kaška men with whom he concluded the oath. As such, this oath formula is different from linkiya kattan dai-, in which the subject is most often (if not always) the Kaška themselves, and linkiya kattan ki-, which is passive.

In the “model agreement” CTH 138.1.A, although the oath-formula occurs only once, it occurs as part of the incipit of the document (obv. 1). By contrast, the oath-formula is a predominant and recurring feature of the composite agreements (CTH 137, 139, 140, 234, 236, including parallels and duplicates). In these documents each individual oath section probably contained the oath-statement, though the placement of the oath-formula differs from section to section, and from document to document. It could be at the beginning, end, or middle of a section.

A peculiar aspect of CTH 137.A is that it refers to two scribes who made the Kaška swear, rather than the Hittite king, as we would normally expect.295

The centrality of the oath in the Kaška agreements is evident not only from the very frequent attestation of the oath formula within the agreements, but also from the placement of the oath-formula at the beginning of the document (e.g., CTH 138.1.A).

Lists of oath takers, men, and troops

Lists of “oath-takers” (i.e., participants in the agreement) were an integral component of the majority of the Kaška agreements. They are attested in all the

294 Altman (2004: 497, n. 68) erroneously assumes that this line was spoken by the Kaška. Although we can attribute some of the 1st person plural clauses in the composite agreements (CTH 137, 139, and most of the fragments under CTH 140) to the Kaška as their promissory utterances, this particular instance is not one of them. This clause is part of the evocation of the divine witnesses to the oath, which in Hittite treaties and oaths was often expressed in the 1st person plural, possibly in reference to the Hittite ruler and the oath/treaty partner(s).
295 See CTH 137.1 iii 12’, iv 32’.
296 On this theme, see also Klinger (2005: 357).
documents identified above as composite agreements. As was argued above, in composite agreements, each smaller section marked by double paragraph lines corresponded to the agreement/oath of a specific group of Kaška and consisted, in its most basic form, of a list of oath-takers and a set of provisions. The lists of oath-takers recorded the participants in the agreement and the number of “troops” each Kaška group (or rather, Kaška leaders) contributed to the Hittite army (see below).

Lists of oath-takers in the Kaška agreements were not confined to a specific part of the text but were present throughout the document, probably in each section of the composite agreement. They do not have a specific form. The basic information they convey is the identification of Kaška leaders and the number of “men” and/or “soldiers” they had. They were (often) introduced or were concluded by an oath-formula, and occasionally also included summary provisions. The following better preserved examples illustrate the form/structure of some of the different types of lists of oath-takers:

Piya, Šunupašši, (and) five men with them of Talmaliya placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner. Fifty troops they placed (under oath for themselves). (CTH 139.1.B ii 30’-31’, 139.1.A ii 28’-30’)

In some cases, Kaška leaders were listed with their patronymics:

Šunaili, Paldu son of Atitta son of Kazzipirru, Šunaili son of Pipelu, Šunaili son of Piggapazzui, Ḥazzina, Ḥimuili son of Datili, Kippuruwa—men of Šadduppa. They thus placed themselves under oath. (CTH 139.1 B iii 1’-5’)

A number of paragraphs from CTH 140.1.A list varying numbers of troops from various cities, along with their leaders:

298 Cf. CTH 140.1.A iv 57’-60’.
299 CTH 140.1.A §§2’-4’, and 6’ seem to have have the structure N ÉRIN.MEŠ URUX, peran (n)ja nºPN huwaš, “N (number of) troops (of) the city GN, and PN leads (them)”; see CHD P s.v. peran 2 a 2’, p.
10 troops (of) the city Taḫpašarr[...], and Ḥap[... leads (them) ...] and Gala[... leads (them)], and Piš[... leads (them)...], and Śazina leads (them). (CTH 140.1.A i 13'-17')

Some of the lists in CTH 140.1.A were introduced by the Akkadogram UMMA, which in letters and other historical texts introduces the (quoted) speech of the speaker. UMMA is attested in a similar function in the Oath of Aššapala (CTH 270) and the Oaths of the UGULA LĪM ṢĒRI and the LŪ.MES DUGUD (CTH 260). In the Kaška agreements, the fragmentary condition of the paragraphs in which it is attested does not allow us to discern the exact function of UMMA (i.e., whether it was indeed followed by the direct speech/promissory statement of the oath-takers).

The oath-takers listed in the Kaška agreements were 1) Kaška leaders, 2) the “men” (LŪ.MEŠ) “with them” (katti = (š)ši, katti = šmi), and 3) the “troops” (ĒRIN.MEŠ), whom they (i.e., the leaders) ‘place under oath (to themselves)’, ‘lead’, or ‘give’ (linkiya kattan dai-, uwat-, pai-).

Certain individuals/groups of oath-takers were listed by their personal names, their hometowns, and occasionally also with “onomastic epithets” or patronymics. These individuals may best be understood as the leaders or representatives of groups of Kaška—that is, the leaders of the “men” (LŪ.MEŠ) and “troops” (ĒRIN.MEŠ) alongside them. Although these individuals listed by their personal names are often considered in secondary literature to have been tribal leaders, chieftains, or elders, they seem to me to...

---

300 CTH 140.1.A §§7'-9' seem to have a similar structure, though the verb in these instances is uwat- rather than peran huwā-. 300 CTH 140.1.A §§20'-23', 25'-26'. 301 For these documents see Giorgieri (1995: 212-30, 233-36). 302 E.g., pikuryalli, pippalala, pitahuštiš, etc. That they are “titles” is, of course, an assumption; we do not know the meaning or function of these words. For more examples see Appendix Two (under “Personal names”), but also von Schuler (1965a: 94); and CHD P (s.v. pišdumul[...])x, p. 330.)
have a predominantly military role in the lists of oath-takers, which, admittedly, does not necessarily exclude the other assumptions. This is best illustrated by CTH 140.1.A, where the individuals/Kaška leaders are said to “lead” (peran huwai-, literally ‘run before’, and uwate- ‘lead here’) the troops (e.g., iv 13’-22’, 26’), and to “[lead] the troops on campaign” (iv 9’).  

The Kaška leaders are often listed with varying numbers of “men” (LÚ.MEŠ) from various towns. The term LÚ.MEŠ, in these cases, is certainly not synonymous with ÉRIN.MEŠ, “troops,” and probably refers to other high-ranking Kaška men who took the oath “with” (katti z(š)i, katti zšmi) the Kaška leaders mentioned by name. The following two sections from the composite agreement CTH 139.1.A and B, in which LÚ.MEŠ and ÉRIN.MEŠ are juxtaposed, support this assumption:

§13” Piya, Šunupašši, (and) five men with them of Talmaliya placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner. Fifty troops they placed (under oath for themselves).

§14” Ḥatipta (and) five men with him (of) Yahrišša placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner. Twenty troops they placed (under oath for themselves). (CTH 139.1.B ii 30’-34’, A ii 28’-33’)

As we see in the example cited above, Kaška leaders placed, as part of their agreement, varying numbers of “troops” (ÉRIN.MEŠ) under oath (to themselves) as

---

303 See, for example, von Schuler (1965b: 451). Beckman (1995) suggested that the “elders” mentioned in Mašat letters may be identified with the people who may have been part of Kaška delegations suing for peace (e.g. HKM 10).

304 For the restoration, see commentary to CTH 140.1.A.

305 In all examples except one, it is LÚ.MEŠ who are ‘with’ (katti z(š)i, katti zšmi) the Kaška leaders. The only exception is CTH 137.1 iii 13’-15’: mKa-a-an-x[...]/kat-ti-išši-ya 1 ME 90 ÉRIN.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ URU[...] / mša-a-uš-x[ kat-ti]-šši-ya 2 ME 16 ÉRIN.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ URU[...] / nu-za li-[in-ki-ya ... kat-ti-a-an da-i-e-er.
their contribution to the Hittite military. Although I have employed the conventional translation of ÉRIN.MEŠ as “troops,” there is no indication in the Kaška agreements as to whether ÉRIN.MEŠ (often preceded by a number) actually meant “soldiers” or “troops.”

Although most of the composite agreements include a count of the “troops” placed under oath, this seems to be the predominant feature of CTH 140.1.A. The colophon of this document (the only one preserved, albeit very poorly), records the sum (ŠU.NÍGIN) of the men and troops listed in that document.

The presence of the lists of troops in these agreements raises a few questions. Did the term ÉRIN.MEŠ refer to actual “troops” (i.e., military units) or were they the Hittite rendering of social units/categories of the Kaška, who are generally assumed to have had a tribally organized society? If the former is the case, were these troops then levied into the Hittite (standing) army or were they left/stationed in the provinces to be mobilized when the Hittite king went on campaign? CTH 140.1.A and CTH 138.1.A suggest that the term ÉRIN.MEŠ did in fact refer to actual “troops” (military units) and that troops were levied from the Kaška when the Hittite king went on campaign, as opposed to

306 We do not know if the “troops” mentioned in the Kaška agreements were levies for the Hittite standing army, as we see in the Išmerikka treaty (Beal 1992), or whether these troops were to be conscripted into the Hittite army when the necessity arose (as we see in a number of vassal treaties).

307 The translation and interpretation of ÉRIN.MEŠ is not consistent in secondary literature. In his authoritative work on the Hittite military, Beal (1992) translates ÉRIN.MEŠ as “troops” (i.e., as a collective singular meaning “a body of soldiers”), but he interprets ÉRIN.MEŠ preceded by a number as “N number of soldiers” as opposed to “N number of units/troops.” Compare, for example Beal’s translation of 8 ÉRIN.MEŠ (CTH 7 rev. 26) as “8 soldiers” (1992: 278, and n. 1033) with Beckman’s “eight armies” (1995: 26). Beal (1992: 295) does not specifically deal with the lists of oath-takers in the Kaška agreements, but he translates ÉRIN.MEŠ in CTH 140.1.A (KUB 26.62) as “men” (meaning “soldiers”), without further discussion.

308 See di Cosmo (2002).
troops being levied into the Hittite standing army (UKU.Ūš). In CTH 140.1.A these troops are listed with their “leaders,” who are reported to lead the troops on campaign (CTH 140.1.A iv 9’). CTH 138.1.A shows that that troops were levied from the Kaška when the Hittite king went on campaign, and were returned when the campaign was over:

In addition, when I, My Majesty, summon troops, and a man [does not com]e, the man’s slave shall not come (in his stead). The man (himself) shall come! On whatever campaign His Majesty [leads] you, [whe]n His Majesty returns from the campaign he will let the troops (go) home. (CTH 138.1.A rev.: 101’-103’)

As was already noted by von Schuler (1965b), the list of oath-takers was not specific to the Kaška agreements, but was a characteristic of the group of documents he referred to as the “Sonderformen”—that is, the special types of treaties—and oaths: the Išmerikka treaty (CTH 133), the Mita of Paḫḫuwa (CTH 146) text, and a treaty of Arnuwanda with the Elders of Ura (CTH 144). However, whereas in these documents the list of oath-takers is a relatively concise and clearly defined segment of the document, in the Kaška agreements, lists of oath-takers are not confined to a specific part of the document. Lists of oath-takers are present throughout the document, and are part of most, if not all, extant sections of the composite agreements. In addition, the lists of oath-takers in the Kaška agreements occupy a much larger proportion of the text and contain records of the troops.

The individuals mentioned by name, were, according to von Schuler, “clan/tribe leaders” or councils of elders (1965b: 451), and the inclusion of lists of oath-takers,

309 The latter possibility should not be completely ruled out, however. Beal (1992) notes that in the Empire Period, under Hattušili III, Kaška soldiers were indeed taken into the Hittite standing army (UKU.Ūš). Moreover, the contemporary Išmerikka treaty (CTH 133), which is quite similar to the Kaška agreements in terms of its historical context as well as structure, form, and contents, mentions soldiers to be taken from that peripheral region into the Hittite standing army.

310 It is also significant that the colophon of this text records the sum of the troops.
accordingly, was a means of binding by treaty societies in which there was no “monarchical form of government.”

The lists of oath-takers may have also included lists of “witnesses.” The Sumerogram IGI.ḪI.A is attested in two fragmentary contexts in CTH 140.1.A iv 22’, 37’.

**Historical background and praxis**

The Kaška agreements unfortunately do not have historical prologues that illuminate their broader historical contexts or the specific historical circumstances that culminated in their creation. Of the actual praxis, that is, how, where, and on which occasions the agreements with the Kaška were concluded, we have little information. To answer these questions, we must review the few clues in the Kaška agreements in conjunction with other contemporary sources.

A MH letter from Mašt Höyük (HKM 10), a letter from the king to Kaššu, the “Chief of the Army Inspectors” (UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ), and the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375) shed some light on the background of the Kaška agreements:

Concerning the matter of the (Kaška leaders) Piḫapzuppi and Kaškanu about which you wrote me: “They have already made peace (with us),” I received that message (too).

Concerning what you wrote me: “Kaška men are coming here in large numbers to make peace. What instructions does Your Majesty have from me?”—Keep sending to My Majesty the Kaškaean men who are coming to make peace.

---

311 This approach has found widespread acceptance in secondary Hittitological literature; e.g., Beckman (2006).
Concerning what you wrote me: “Until you, Your Majesty, write me about this matter of the Kaškaean men coming to make peace I will be awaiting word in the land of Išḫupitta.” Just because the gods already …, should you keep wearing me out with queries, and keep writing me the same things? 

But we summon the men of Kaška, we give them gifts, and we furthermore make them swear. (CTH 375.1.A iv 11-12)

The Kaška men “coming here in large numbers to make peace” were presumably like the groups of Kaška placed under oath in the Kaška agreements or, as was noted by Beckman (1995: 27), like the group of people led by Ašḫapala in the Oath of Ašḫapala (CTH 270). These excerpts indicate that the Kaška agreements did not necessarily come about as a consequence of Hittite military conquest of territories (co)inhabited by the Kaška, and that the initiative for peace could be taken by either the Kaška or the Hittites.

HKM 10 clearly indicates that the Kaška were placed under oath in Ḫattuša in the presence of the king, and not in the provinces. However, as was mentioned above, it did not have to be the king himself who made the Kaška swear (linganu-); in CTH 137.1 two scribes undertook this task. That witnesses were present at the oath-taking ceremony/event is indicated by the attestation of IGI.ḪI.A “witnesses” twice in CTH 140.1.A. We do not, however, know whether the individuals listed in the same context were the witnesses themselves.

Finally, the Kaška treaties themselves include no information on the ritual accompanying the agreement/oath-taking.

---

313 See the editions by Otten (1960) and Giorgieri (1995: 234-36).
314 See also Hoffner’s (2009: 118-21) translation and commentary of HKM 13 and 14 concerning the delivery to the king in Ḫattuša of a certain Marruwa, guilty of “capitulation (to the enemy).”
315 For the rituals accompanying the oath, see Giorgieri (2001; 2005: 338-42).
Summary and conclusions

The Kaška agreements are a collection of documents that are diverse in terms of their structure, form, and contents. These documents do not fit easily into our modern textual/generic classifications such as “treaty” or “oath,” or into modern categories such as “administrative” or “diplomatic,” “internal” or “external.” Indeed there is no consensus in secondary Hittitological literature as to the designation and classification of these documents (e.g., “treaty” or “oath?”). Most scholars, following von Schuler (1965a; 1965b), have considered the Kaška agreements to be, in essence, “subordination” or “vassal” treaties, or a special form thereof (see History of Scholarship above). They have therefore been considered, from a juridical point of view, to belong to the realm of international law and politics, rather than that of “internal” state administration. Other scholars have employed more neutral terminology, such as “protocole” (Laroche 1971: 20) or more recently “Vereinbarung” (Klinger 2005: 357-59), “eidliche Abmachung” (Giorgieri 2005).

When compared to contemporary oaths and instructions, Kaška agreements display an array of common characteristics such as the plurality of the participants.

---

316 The usefulness or validity of the application of modern categories such as “diplomatic” and “administrative,” or, in a similar vein, “international/external” and “internal” to Hittite documents is questionable. This is especially true for MH documents, which were characterized by diversity, experimentation, and innovation; see the articles presented at the Conference on Middle Hittite Documentation and Chronology (June 2004, Trieste), published as AoF 32 (2005); see also Arčhi (2005).

317 According to Korošec (1931:3), a group of documents—including the only Kaška agreement known then (CTH 138.1.A)—did not belong to the realm of “Völkerrecht” but involved the “Verleihung des Stadtsrechts”; von Schuler argued the opposite, namely, that the special types of treaties he referred to as “Sonderformen” were proper “vassal” treaties and were thus documents of international political/juridical relevance (1965b: 454). Giorgieri (1995: 29) considers the Kaška agreements as documents of “external” political relevance; contrasting the Ḫapiru attested in the OH/MH document “the Ḫapiru treaty” (CTH 27), he concludes that the Ḫapiru were not a separate political or ethnic entity, like the Kaška.

318 Klinger (2005) argues against the use of the designation “treaty” for the Kaška agreements in favor of “oath” or “agreement.”
variability in the structure and form of the documents (reflecting, perhaps, the circumstances of their creation), the alteration between imposition of provisions and promissory statements, the centrality of the oath, and formal similarities in curses and oath-statements, and in terms of their provisions, the lack of historical introductions and the absence of arrangements concerning borders and boundaries.

In terms of their provisions, on the other hand, the Kaška agreements are closer to subordination treaties. The most significant among these are provisions concerning fugitives, alliance against enemies, and the supply of troops.\textsuperscript{319}

As was discussed briefly above, the Kaška agreements are often considered to be part of a group of “special types” of treaties characterized by the multiplicity of the participants (i.e., a collectivity rather than a monarch of “equal” rank as we see in subordination treaties), and a series of related structural/formal peculiarities, such as the presence of lists of the participants, the lack of historical introductions, etc. These documents are:

1) The Išmerikka treaty (CTH 133) between the Hittite king and the armed troops of Išmerikka, who were assigned to new towns in the recently (re)conquered Kizzuwatna in the southeast.

2) The so-called Mita of Paḥḫuwa text (CTH 146), an agreement between the Hittite king and the elders from various towns in the east in or close to Paḥḫuwa and Išuwa, a contested territory between Ḫatti and the Hurrians.

\textsuperscript{319} Contra Klinger (2005: 357), who claims that the Kaška agreements do not have provisions concerning the obligation to give troops or to participate in campaigns.
3) A treaty between the Hittite king Arnuwanda I and the elders of Ura (CTH 144), a town probably in the south of Hatti.

We may perhaps also add the treaty of Šuppiluliuma I and Ḫukkanana of Ḫayaša (CTH 42), which preserves parts of an earlier accord with a certain Mariya and the “men of Ḫayaša.”

Like the Kaška agreements, the structure, form, and contents of these documents place them somewhere between the categories “treaties” and “oaths,” between so-called administrative and diplomatic documents.

The Kaška agreements nevertheless display a number of unique features that set them apart from contemporary administrative and diplomatic texts. These features include the division of the majority of the Kaška agreements into smaller subsections, the centrality of the lists of oath-takers (and troops), the mention of scribes making the Kaška swear, as well as certain types of provisions, most conspicuously those regarding hostages.

We may conclude, with Klinger (2005: 357-59), that Kaška agreements, along with the so-called “special” types of treaties, were ultimately closer to the “oaths,” which developed as a more genuinely “Hittite” tradition beginning in the Old Kingdom, as opposed to/rather than contemporary or “classical” Empire Period treaties, which were much more influenced by Syrian/Mesopotamian prototypes/traditions.

---

320 See Beckman (1999: 27).
321 Some of the common elements these documents share with “oaths” on the one hand and treaties on the other, have been noted by previous scholars: see von Schuler (1965b) and Giorgieri (1995; 2005).
322 Including the so-called “special types/Sonderformen.”
The structural and formal diversity of the Kaška agreements may be explained as a reflection the specific circumstances of their creation. The composite agreements, with their various subsections dealing with specific groups of Kaška, may best be characterized as the transcripts or minutes of the occasion/event during which multiple groups of Kaška leaders, along with their men and troops, were placed under oath. The document CTH 138.1.A, on the other hand, was probably a model document, from which new agreements could be generated.

The juridical/administrative documents of the Early Empire Period, including texts we label “oaths,” “instructions,” and “treaties,” are best approached as a continuum rather than distinct categories. These types of documents (i.e., “treaties,” “oaths,” “instructions”), although they are distinct enough to justify their treatment as different types of documents, and although they possibly have quite different developmental trajectories, nevertheless share a number of common structural and formal features, as well as component elements (such as the curse/blessing formulas, lists of divine witnesses, etc.). Indeed, the Hittite terms applied to these documents reflect their common (functional) characteristics: the terms išhiul- ‘binding’ and lengai- ‘oath’ were, as was noted by Beckman (2006: 283), metonyms accentuating/highlighting the most important elements of these documents. The Kaška agreements, as was demonstrated above, share a number of characteristics with administrative and diplomatic documents.

323 Confronted with a similarly diverse body of texts — the oaths — Giorgieri (1995: 63-64) finds it more profitable to analyze these documents on the basis of the “different historical circumstances in which they came to light”; Giorgieri distinguishes oaths styled in the first person (i.e., promissory oaths) from oaths styled in the 2nd or 3rd person singular or plural (i.e., impositions or requests for oaths), in which the redactional style was determined by/adapted to the different circumstances of composition and the persons involved in the oath.
but belong to neither realm. They are situated somewhere in the middle of this continuum.

The diversity of the Kaška agreements, their unique features, and their position among the administrative and diplomatic documents of the Early Empire Period were ultimately the consequence of the unique conditions of the Hittite-Kaška frontier, which I discuss in Chapters Two and Three of the present work.
CTH 137.1
KBo 16.27 + KBo 40.330


Transliteration

Col. i

§1’

x+1 [ ] x ꞌ x ꞌ 1 [ ]

2’ [ ] x LU UR U ka ꞌ a ꞌ am ꞌ ma ⫹ ma

§2’

4’ [ ] A-N]A dUTU-ŠI li-in-[i-ya

5’ [ ] ku-[u-ru-ur e-epe-te-e[n

6’ [ ] x-x-[o]-le-ni ma-a-na-[27]

7’ [ ] a-p]el-ma šu-me-e-ša da ꞌ ma-a-ú-uš DUMU.MEŠ

šu-[ul-lu-uš7]

324 The fragment KBo 40.330 was not available to von Schuler when he edited CTH 137 in Die Kaškäer (1965). The Online Konkordanz also lists the unpublished fragment Bo 10285 as CTH 137.2, whose relationship to CTH 137.A is as of yet unclear.

325 See i 10’-11’.


327 Coll. supports the copied -Ie ꞌ -ni. The signs preceding -Ie ꞌ -ni on the joined fragment KBo 40.330 (2392/c) are not legible. In the break before -Ie ꞌ -ni there is space enough for one sign, and before that, what looks like the beginning of a w[a or u[d (i.e., two Winkelhaken followed by a vertical).

328 The traces on the copy and photo could pass for a-p]el-ma or an-z]i-el-ma—see von Schuler’s (1965: 135) …-[e]-ma. See commentary for further discussion.
This is a very tentative reading and restoration. Although the expected verb is indeed *dai* - ‘to place’, coll. revealed that there is very little space for [D]A after *ki-iš-ša-an* (unless it was written over erasure, which usually is smaller than normal), and that the next sign hardly passes for I ([I][a]31-[i]-[e]-en) or AT ([I][a]-[a-te-en]). An alternative reading (based on coll.) is [u][d]-[I][a]-[e]-en *‘word, matter’, but the placement of the direct object between the adverb and the verb would be unusual.
23' wa-aš-ta-at-te-en-na ki-nu-na nam-ma ki-it-pa-an-da-[la-az]

§6'

24' [A]-NA KUR URU Ha-at-ti-kán LÚ URU Ka-aš-ka k[u-u]-ru-ur [le-e e-ep-ziʔ]

25' [ o ] x x [ o o ] [KUR URU Ha-at-ti-ya ku-iš URU-a[š]

26' [ ] -]-riʔ nu A-INA1 LÚ [](gap of uncertain length)

Col. ii'

§7''

x+1 ] x ku-u-ru-ur [  

§8''

4' [nu NI-IŠ DINGIR-LI]M i-ya-u-en nu [LÚ.MEŠ1 URU Ša-1-a-at-tu-up-pa1 [  
5' [ -t]i li-ik-ten DIN[GIR.M]ES331 URU Qa-aš-ga i+332  
6' [ ku-e-d]a-ni-ma-kán UD-ti LÚ[.MEŠ URE] Ša-a-ad-du-pa  
7' [na-aš-ta ŠA7 KUR URU Ha-at-t]i333 me-na-aš-ša-an-da NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM  
    šar-ra-an-z[i

331 The traces on the copy look like K]UR, which would not leave enough space for DIN[GIR.MEŠ K]UR in the break. Photo and coll., however, favor the reading DIN[GIR.M]ES URU, which does not pose a problem since DINGIR.MEŠ KUR URU and DINGIR.MEŠ URU seem interchangeable, as we see in ii 8' and 9'.
332 Von Schuler (1965: 136, n. 3) reads it-[t][e'-en, which makes little sense here.
333 With CHD L-N (s.v., menahhanda 3d, p. 282). However, [... DINGIR.MEŠ URU Ha-at-t]i is also possible, as in l. 9'. See also l. 16'.
§9"

8’ [nu-uš-ša-an$^7$] DINGIR.MEŠ $^\text{URU}$ Qa$^1$-aš-ga A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ KUR $^\text{URU}$ Ḥa-at-ti
me-na-ah-ḥa-[a[n-da]

9’ [n]u-uš-ša-an DINGIR.MEŠ $^\text{URU}$ Ḥa-at-ti A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ KUR
$^\text{URU}$ Qa-aš$^8$-[a me-na-ah-ḥa-an-da$^7$]

10’ [ap]-pa-an-du na-at-ša-ma-aš pé-ra-an pa-ap-ra-an-te-[š a-ša-an-du

11’ [nu NINDA$^7$ pa-ap-r]a-an-da-an$^{334}$ az-zi-ik-kán-du nu GEŠTIN ši-i-eš-šar

12’ [x] ku-e-da-ni-kán UD-ti NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM šar-ra-an -z[i

§10”

13’ [n]a$^2$-at-kán an-da A-NA LÚ.MEŠ $^\text{URU}$ Qa-aš-ga-pát ša-an-ḥa-[a[n-du$^7$]

14’ [nu-uš Q]A-DU DAM.MEŠ-$ŠU$-NU DUMU.MEŠ-$ŠU$-NU $^\text{QA-DU}$
GU$_4$ HI.A-$ŠU$-NU UDU[$\text{HI.A-ŠU}$-NU


[NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM

16’ [A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ $^\text{URU}$] Ḥa-at-ti$^{335}$ me-na-ah-ḥa-an-da pa-ah-ša-[r[i na-an$^7$

$^\text{QA-DU}$ DAM.MEŠ-$ŠU$ -an-du

A.ŠÄ.HI.A[-$ŠU$ $^\text{GIS}$]KIRI$_6$.GEŠTIN.HI.A-$ŠU$

$^{334}$ Von Schuler (1965: 136) reads -r]a(−)an-da-an. CHD-P (s.v. paprant- 1, p. 103) restores papranṭe[š ...

$^{335}$ andu nu NINDA(?)-an pa-ap-r]a-an-da-an azzikandu.

Cf. ii 7’ and 9’.

145
Although the sign preceding QA does not appear to be AÅ, we may still restore $^\text{URU}Qa-a$ $^\text{š}-qa$, since the name Kaška does not have a consistent spelling in this document, and was misspelled twice (ii 8', 9').

§15''

9'  nu-za li-in-[i-y]a  kat-ta-an  ÉRIN.MEŠ-an  da-[a]-i-e-er  [A]-[N]A  d'UTU-Š[I

10’  pi-u-e-ni  ma-[a-n]a-an-ma  pi-an-zî  na-aš-ta  ÉRIN.MEŠ-an  GÜB-x[338]

11’  ša-ra-a  Ú-UL  [ o ] (-)x-ši-ir

§16''

12’  li-in-ga-nu-[t-ma-at][339]  mA]-ma-LÚ-iš  LÚD.SAR-ax  URU  Ha-at-[tu]-š[t[340]

§17''

13’  mKa-a-an-x[ ]  xkat-ti-iš-ši-ya  1  ME  90  ÉRIN.MEŠ  LÚ.MEŠ  URU[

14’  mša-a-uš-x[341]  [kat-ti-i]š-ši-ya  2  ME  16  ÉRIN.MEŠ  LÚ.MEŠ  URU[

15’  nu-za  li-[i-n-kI]a-an  da-i-e-er  ku-it-na-aš  a-[n]

16’  iš-ḫi-ū-[ul][342]  x  pa-aḫ-šu-wa-aš-ta  nu  ÉRIN.MEŠ-an  [ pi-u-e-ni

17’  x  x[ ]  x  ÉRIN.MEŠ-ti  an-da  Ú-UL  ku'-[n]

18’  Ú-UL[ ]  [k]u-iš-ki  ú-wa-te-ez-[zi

§18''

19’  [  (-)a][š]-ta  nu  A-NA  PA-NI  DINGIR[.]MEŠ

---

338 Von Schuler (1965: 137) suggests GÜB-[i]n?]. The traces in the handcopy and on the photo do support the reading i]n, but GÜB-[i]n is very unlikely; the Hittite word behind the ideogram GÜB ‘left, unfavorable, bad’ is not known, but the forms GÜB-laš, GÜB-lan, GÜB-laz, GÜB-li suggest that its stem ends in -la, which would exclude the form GÜB-[i]n.

339 Von Schuler (1965: 137) reads li-in-ga-nu-[t-ma, but coll. indicates there may be space for one more sign after the restored -ma.


341 Von Schuler (1965: 137) reads k]a, but QA with a Winkelhaken is a late form. GA or KA would be more likely, but the traces (as they appear in the copy and photo) do not allow either reading.

342 Although the trace of a Winkelhaken (the beginning of the UL sign) is visible on the copy, it is not visible on the photo, and was not visible when the tablet was collated in December 2010.
[\(x^{343} za{-}ah{-}hi{-}ya{-}x{-}x^{344}\)]

\(\text{(gap of uncertain length)}\)

**Col. iv**

§19''''

\(x+1\) x x

§20''''

2' \(ma{-}a{-}1-an{-}ká[n] x x-u^\prime{-}pa{-}a\tilde{s} (-)x[\]

3' \(pé-e-da-an{-}zi ú{-}x[- \]

4' \([I]\Š-TU Žl{-}ya Ú{-}U[L] x{-}l^1URU Há{-}a{-}it{-}t[a\]

5' \([k]a{-}ru{-}ú nu{-}wa{-}a\tilde{s}{-}x\tilde{a}^{345}[- -] \]

§21''''

6' \([\text{[0]Na-n]}a{-}zi{-}ti{-}iš pí{-}[ku{-}ur{-}ya{-}al{-}l]^{346} \text{LÚ}^{URU} Iš{-}hu{-}pí{-}it{-}ta [\]

7' \([\text{kat{-}ti{-}i}]Š{-}ši{-}ya 5\tilde{t} \text{LÚ}^{MES}^{URU} o o o o{-}x{-}pa{-}ah{-}tu{-}na \text{ mHi{-}mu{-}i{-}li} \text{ l[m]}\]

8' \([\text{[0]} \text{N LÚ MEŠ}^{URU} \text{ Ka{-}a{-}kad{-}du} {-}[wa^{348}\]

§22''''

9' \([nu{-}za li{-}in{-}ki{-}ya kat{-}ta{-}an \text{[i{-}iš{-}ša{-}an da{-}a{-}i{-}e{-}er ka{-}a{-}š]}a\]

---

343 Šl or ME?
344 The traces in the hand copy and the photo in the *Online Konkordanz* suggest *za{-}ah{-}hi{-}ya{-}te{-}ni* (these traces were not visible when the tablet was collated in December 2010). After YA, we see two Winkelhaken (rather than the horizontals at the beginning of a MS TE sign) and the trace of a vertical. We may also read, though tentatively, *za{-}ah{-}hi{-}ya{-}ah{-}x[.]
345 Von Schuler (1965: 137) reads *ka{-}ru{-}ú{-}nu{-}wa{-}a\tilde{s}{-}x[\]
346 Von Schuler (1965: 137) and CHD P (s.v. *pikuryalli*-, p. 264) restores *[Na-n]a{-}zi{-}ti{-}iš pí{-}[ku{-}úr{-}ja{-}al{-}l[i.]
347 Von Schuler (1965: 137) reads *[…]\tilde{t}i; cf. iii 17.
348 With RGTC 6, p. 162.
Von Schuler (1965: 137) reads $d\, a^3$.

See iv 25'.
§25***


kat-ta-an

25' [ki-iš]-šà-an da-iš ap-pa-an-za 1 DUMU šu-ul-la-an p[à-a-š] GU₅ḪIA

u-un-na-i


ḪYa-at-tu-šì-ya me-na-ah-hà-an-da

27' [ku-u-ru-u]r le-e e-ep-šì me-mi-ya-nu-šà-kàn kat-ta-[n] d[a-a-i]

§26***


ki]-iš-šà-an da-iš


dUTU-ŠI

30' [₃₃⁻x-ya-at-ta NA-AP-ŠÀ-TÉMES pí-x-[ na'-a]t-ta pí-iḥ-hì

31' [₃₃⁻nu nam-ma I-NA Ḫiš-tu-mi-[ś-ta -a]n le-e

kar-ap-šì

32' [₃₃⁻x pa-aḥ-šì ku-u-uš Ḥa-at[-tu-šì]

₃₃⁻Wa-za-za-aš li-in-ga-nu-ut

§27***

33' [₃₃⁻x-pa] ḤMu-u-wa-at-ta[-] x-da

34′ [ $m...-x-it-ti-l[i ]-x-pî [ ]x x[ ]

(text breaks off)
Translation

Col. i

§1’

1’ [ ]

2’ [ ] man of K[ammama? …

3’ [ ]

§2’

4’ [ ] to My/His Majesty, oath[…

5’ [ ] you (pl.) have started war […]

6’ [ ] we [ ]. If […]

7’ [ ] But [ (is) his. But you [ ] other hostages (acc.) […]

8’ [ ] hostage(s), and afterwards, 5 hostages (acc.) […]

9’ [ ] and [after]wards, you (pl.) shall give 10 hostages. An[d’ …

§3’

10’ [ ] men of Kammama, hostages […

11’ [ ] you (pl.) [ ]. We, men of the city of Kammama, NAM.R[A” people…

12’ [ ] the hostages which […]

13’ [ ] And] if to/for those hostages […]

14’ We will give (the) hostage[s]. If […]

15’ we (will) give. And [ ] them back.
§4’

16’ The blind men [. . .

17’ And he [for/to us [. . .

18’ they brought here. [ And [t [. . .

19’ If My/His Majesty [. . .

20’ Do not c[ome] to help!

§5’

21’ [T]hus (speaks) His Majesty Arnuwanda, Great King: hereby [. . .

22’ And [we’ have] pl[aced] you (pl.) under oath as follows [. . .

23’ and you (pl.) sinned. Now, furthermore, from this mom[ent on [. . .

§6’

24’ Against Ḫatti the man of Kaška [shall not start] w[a]r [. . .

25’ [. . .] And the city which [. . . to/against] Ḫatti [. . .

26’ [. . .] and to the man/men [. . .

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. ii

§7’’

1’ [. . .] enemy [. . .

2’ [. . .] ”’on the day [on whic]h His Majesty goes to battle [. . .

3’ [we will st]and [by the oath?”]”352 And they swore. And [they placed]

themselves [under oath].

352 Or: “we will st]and [by the oath.]”
§8’

[we made [the oath]. And the men of Šāttuppa […]

§9’

[the gods of Kaška against/in front of/opposite the gods of Ḥatti.

§10’

[they shall [seize’]. And [let] them (the oath breakers) [be] unclean/polluted before them (the gods).

[And] let them eat uncle[an bread’]. And [let them drink unclean] wine (and) beer […]

[on which day they transgress the oath of the gods.

§10’

[They shall] avenge it on the Kaška men themselves […]

[together w]ith their wives, their children, together with their cattle, [their] sheep,

[their fields,] their vineyards, they shall destroy [them]! Whoever respects these [oaths…
[with respect to/against the gods of] Ḫatti [him] together with his wives

[his children, together with] his cattle, his sheep, together with [his] fields, [his
vineyards], they shall...

§ 11’’’

18’ [For] the men of Kaška, let this matter be placed...

19’ [we [...]

§ 12’’’

20’ ...

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. iii

§ 13’’’’

1’ [and the men of [...

2’ [they have [ ]. “To His Majesty [...

3’ [we will give [hostages]. To/for the

fugitive’ …

4’ [w]e [...

§ 14’’’’

5’ […-]kaela, and with him 2 [men] of [T]ara[-...

6’ […](-)piduddu, and together with him (N+)1

m[en of…

7’ [T]atili, and with him, 2 men [of…
§15***
9’ And they placed the troops under oath to themselves.\textsuperscript{353} To His Majesty […]
10’ we will give. But if they give them, the troops […]
11’ [th]ey have not […] up.

§16***
12’ Armaziti, the scribe, made [them²] swear t[o³] Ḥattuša […]

§17***
13’ Kān[-…] and together with him 190 troops, (that is) men of […]
14’ Šāuš[-…] and [to]gether with him 216 troops, (that is) men of […]
15’ And they placed themselves […] under oath. Because (to) us […]
16’ the reg[ulation] […] we will respect. And troops (acc.)
17’ […] to the troops […] does not\textsuperscript{354} […]
18’ […] no one will lead here […]

§18****
19’ […] And before the god[s…
20’ […] battle […]

\textit{(gap of uncertain length)}

\textsuperscript{353} With CHD L-N (s.v. \textit{lingai}- 1b 2’, p. 65).
\textsuperscript{354} Or “no one.”
§19

1' ... 

§20

2' If [...] 
3' they (will) carry off [...] 
4' And [b]y himself will/does no[t] the city Ḥāitt[a... 
5' [f]ormerly and still [ the]y [...] 

§21

6' [Nama]ziti, the pikuryalli, man of Iš̄upitta [...] 
7' [to]gether with him 5' men [of ...](-)paḥtuna. Ḥimuili [...] 
8' [...]ziti [ N] men of Kākaddu[wa...] 

§22

9' [And] they thus placed [themselves under oath.] Here[by...] 
10' [ you (pl.) shall be [...]s! And My/His Maje[sty... 
11' [ ma]tter'. And each shall hast[en! 
12' [ ] no one shall start [war]. And [each(?)... 
13' [ ] you (pl.) shall truly fig[ht! 

§23

14' [ ] when with the troops, camp[aign... 
15' [ ] From subjects, troop[s...
no one shall start war...

But if evil ...

you (pl.) shall not hide. And him...

§24***

and [---]ara, the captive. And

he has placed [himself under oath] as follows. He will drive 100 [cattle] here.

I hostage...

[N]anaziti, too, [ ] will come back. From the city ...

[ ] he will lead down here. The cattle of Hatti [ ] for battle...

you shall not come [to] the land of Hatti, to the hinterland! A human (acc.) [of]

Hatti [shall not ] anywhere/anytime...

§25***

[Š]unaili, pikuryalli, man of Halmat[-...

He has [th]us placed [himself under oath]. The captured man [will] give 1

hostage [ ] will drive the cattle here.

And he [will] lead/you shall lead Narikkaili, the father, back here355 [ ]

Against [H]attuša

you shall not start [war]. And he places the words (under oath).356

§26***

[...], man of the city of Iš]tumišta, a fugitive. And he thus placed himself under

355 Or: “And [---]-rikkaili leads/[will] lead the ‘father’ back here.”
356 Or: “You (sg.) shall place the words (under oath).”
oath.

29’ [ ] from [the city of ] in the manner of a fugitive to Ḫat[uša ]

My/His Majesty

30’ [ ] themselves [ ] I will [no]t give.

31’ [ ] Furthermore in the city Ḫtumi[šta ] you (sg.) shall not remove!

32’ [ ] you (sg.) protect. [The scribe’s] Wazaza made these (persons) swear [to] Ḫat[uša].

§27****

33’ [ ] Muwatta[...]

34’ ...

35’ ...

(text breaks off)
Commentary

Col. i

2’ LÚ URUGammama may be a mistake for LÚ.MEŠURUregamma; cf. l. 10’.

7’ The topicalizing/contrasting enclitic (-a/-ma) indicates that a-p]é-el-ma was a nominal sentence (‘But […are/is h]is’), and that šu-me-e-ša is the beginning of a new clause.


With one exception (LÚ.MEŠ šu-ú-ul-lu-ša in CTH 139.B ii 17’), all hostages in the Kaška agreements are characterized as “boy (DUMU.MEŠ) hostages.” Boy hostages attested in the Kaška agreements were taken from the Kaška as a means of ensuring their adherence to the stipulations of the treaty—a practice not very well documented outside of the Kaška agreements.357 The Kaška gave hostages also to ransom prisoners of war held by Hittite authorities, as we see in the administrative text HKM 103 from Mašat Höyük, which lists the price of various prisoners that may be identified as Kaška (see del Monte 1995: 103-11).

For the end of l. i 7’ both šulluš (see i 14’) and šullan (see i 9’) are equally plausible restorations, as they are both attested in CTH 137 as pl. acc. forms of šulla-

357 Hostages, boy hostages, and girl hostages are mentioned in the Early Empire period in letters and administrative texts from Mašat Höyük (the letters HKM 34 and HKM 89, and the administrative text HKM 102), and the treaty with the Elders of Ura (KUB 26.26 + KUB 31.55 obv. 14-15). In the Empire Period, the word(s) “hostage/boy hostage” are attested in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (Fragment 28; KBo 14.12 iv 9-12) in reference to the Hittite prince to be sent to Egypt; in the Extensive Annals of Muršili (KUB 19.39 iii 9-10) and in the treaty with Manapa-Tarḫunta (KUB 19.49 i 68-70); see CHD S3 (forthcoming).
/šulli- ‘hostage’. Note that the Kaška texts show a preference for the older, a-stem form šulla- (Rieken 1994: 45).

11’ The referent or function of the 1st pl. nom. independent personal pronoun ú-e-eš ‘we’ is not clear in this broken context: if weš is in apposition to LÚ.MEŠ URU Kammama, we would need to attribute this clause (and perhaps the following clauses with 1st pl. verbs) to “the men of Kammama” who swear an oath to the Hittite king (see i 4’). Alternatively, though it seems less likely, LÚ.MEŠ URU Kammama may have functioned as the direct object of the missing verb of the sentence, in which case the referent of weš would be His Majesty, representing the Hittite side of the treaty; note that the stipulations of the treaty/agreement to be fulfilled by His Majesty/the Hittite state may be expressed both in sg. (e.g., CTH 137.A iv 30’) or 1st pl. (e.g. CTH 138.1.A rev. 65’-67’), though the latter is less frequently attested.

16’ LÚ.MEŠ IGI.NÚ.GAL, ‘blind men’, refers to the condition of some of the Kaška prisoners of war or hostages held by Hittite authorities. On the blind men attested in the Mašat Letters HKM 58 and 59, Hoffner writes:

The blind men referred to in this letter and HKM 59 (text 62) were prisoners of war, who had been blinded after their capture, because they had broken their oaths to the Hittite king (so correctly Siegelová 2002, 736). Some of them were held for ransom by their homelands, as we learn from HKM 102 ... While awaiting ransom, they were put to use as temporary labor. (2009: 208)


18’ ú-e-te-ir can be parsed as either the 3rd pl. preterit of wida- ‘to bring here’ used of “living things capable of self-propulsion” (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 33, n. 57), or 3rd pl. preterit of wete- ‘to build’. Although the context of this fragmentary paragraph is not
clearly discernible, we may suggest on the basis of the preceding paragraphs (§§2’-3’) concerning the exchange of hostages that the verb here was *wida-* ‘to bring here’, probably referring to LÚ.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL.

20’ For *uwa*-, cf. KUB 13.27 obv. 13. Contra von Schuler, who tentatively restores *ú-[a]-ši* (1965: 135, n.3), the verb should be 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. prohibitive *uwatteni*, in accordance with other imperatives/prohibitives in this section of the text (see i 5’, 9’).

21’ A possible restoration for the end of the line may be suggested on the basis of KBo 8.35 ii 8’ (CTH 139.1.B), KUB 40.36+ ii 5’ (CTH 139.1.A): *ka-a-ša l*[i-in-ga-en i-ya-u-en], “we have hereby made the oath.”

22’ We may restore the verb as *da-i-u-e-en*, 1\textsuperscript{st} pl. preterit, “[we have] thus placed you (pl.) under oath.” Contra von Schuler (1965: 135, n.3), 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. preterit or present seems less likely since “placing oneself under oath” (or “placing … under oath for oneself”) was usually expressed through the use of the reflexive particle *-za*.

23’ The little sentence *waštattennz-a*, “And you (pl.) sinned” was most likely connected to a previous clause (in the missing second half of 22’), which probably also had a pret. 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. verb, describing past actions of the oath-takers.

24’ Although the designation “man of GN” (LÚ \textsuperscript{URU}GN) may in some contexts mean “ruler of GN” (see, for example, the translations of HKM 13 and 14 in Hoffner 2009: 118-21), there is nothing in this context to justify such an interpretation. In this case, it makes more sense to emend LÚ \textsuperscript{URU}Kaška to LÚ<.MEŠ> \textsuperscript{URU}Kaška. Similarly, LÚ \textsuperscript{URU}Išḫupitta in iv 6’ and LÚ \textsuperscript{URU}Išḫupitta-[…] in iv 24’ seem to imply “man from Išḫupitta/Halmati-…,” as opposed to “ruler of Išḫupitta/Halmati-…”

Col ii
2’ It is difficult to decide whether the relative pronoun ku-e-da-ni-ká\n or the
demonstrative pronoun a-pé-da-ni-ká\n would make more sense here. If we restore the
relative pronoun, we may interpret this clause as a promissory statement uttered by the
oath-takers: “On [whic]h day His Majesty [goes] to battle, we will stand […],” and
accordingly restore the quotative particle -wa (ku-e-da-ni-wa-ká\n). If we restore the
demonstrative pronoun, we may interpret this clause as a continuation of the preceding,
unfortunately badly damaged clause mentioning the “enemy.” See below for a possible
restoration of ii 3’.

3’ We may restore: […]-wa linkiya] arwašta, “We hereby stand by the oath,” which
would have been spoken by the oath-takers. For linkiya ar-, see CHD L-N (s.v. lingai- 1b
5’). For the restoration of the rest of the line, see KBo 8.35 ii 28’-29’.

4’ For the restored [nu … NI-IŠ DINGIR-LI]\n i-ya-u-en see nu kāša lingai[n]
iyawen in KBo 8.35 ii 8’ (CTH 139.1.B), KUB 40.36+ ii 5’ (CTH 139.1.A).

§9’ ii 10’-12’ list punishments in case the oath is broken (ii 7’). The meaning
and function of ll. ii 8’-9’ are not entirely clear; absent the verb, we can only discern that
the gods of Kaška and Ḫatti are doing something to each other, or are situated
against/opposite each other (the meaning of menahhanda depends on the verb here). A
somewhat similar passage is to be found in CTH 422, the Ritual on the Border of Enemy
Territory, where the conflict between people of Kaška and Ḫatti is expressed in terms of
strife between the gods of Kaška and Ḫatti (KUB 4.1 ii 7-14).

12’ The relative clause in l. 12’ is not preposed but instead follows the main clause;
for other examples see Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 425-26).
13′ For the interpretation of šanḫ- ‘to seek’ with anda and -kān as ‘to avenge, punish’, see CHD Š1 (sv. šanḫ- 5, p. 167f.)

Col. iii

12′ Unlike in iv 32’ (ku-uš ... li-in-ga-nu-ut), linganu- does not appear to have a direct object in this sentence—unless it is to be restored at the very end of the sentence or in the break, instead of the li-in-ga-nu-ut[ta] suggested by von Schuler (1965: 137). The people whom the scribe Armaziti made swear may be the ones listed in the succeeding paragraph.

The scribe Armaziti of CTH 137.A is very likely the same person attested in ABoT 65, obv. 6, 9 and the Ortaköy letter Çorum 21-9-90 obv. 18’ (de Martino 2005: 207-8, cited in Hoffner 2009: 243), and perhaps also in HKM 84 l. 16’.

14′ (-)p]št-du-ud-du may be interpreted as part of PN or a title following a PN.

Col. iv

§§ 24-26**** display the following structure: 1) an initial oath-statement in 3rd sg. preterit (“PN, title, Man of GN. He has placed himself under oath as follows”), 2) a number of present indicative clauses (3rd sg.), and 3) further stipulations styled in 2nd sg. imperative/prohibitive.

It is difficult to decide whether the 3rd sg. present indicatives (e.g., iv 20’, 21’, 22’, 25’) describe the conditions at the time of the conclusion of the agreement, or whether they indicate future actions (i.e., as stipulations of the treaty, which normally would be expressed with imperatives/prohibitives).

19′ I take (-)a-ra-aš-ša as the second half of a broken PN in the nominative, plus geminating -a/ya (m…-arašız(š)a), rather than ara- ‘friend’ plus a-fya-.
23’ The morpheme -ya may be the enclitic conjunction (-a/-ya), or much less likely, a phonetic complement indicating the allative utniya.

26’ at-ta-an, ‘father’, may be the title of Narikkaili and thus the direct object of uwate/uwate[zi], (“And he leads/he will lead/you (sg.) shall lead Narikkaili, the father, here”). Alternatively, "Narikkaili may be the subject of the verb and attan the direct object (Narikkaili leads/will lead ‘the father’ here).

It is not at all clear if uwate should be parsed as a 2nd sg. imperative (uwate), or rather restored as a sg. 3 present indicative (uwate[zi]).

32’ That wa-za-za-aš may be a PN was suggested by von Schuler (1965: 94, 138). There still seems to be space for two or three more signs before [Wa-za-za-aš]. We may suggest restoring [LÚ DUB.ŠAR-aš] based on iii 12’, but note that the title would normally follow the PN, as in iii 12’.
CTH 138.1.A

KUB 23.77a (+) KUB 13.27 + KUB 23.77 + KUB 26.40


Transliteration

Obv.

§1

1 [ nu-za LÚ.MEŠ URU Ka-aš]-ga\textsuperscript{358} li-in-ya kat-ta-an ki-iš-ša-an
   da-[a-i-e-er]

2 [ c.15-20 signs ]-x-te-ni nu ka-a-ša LI-IM DINGIR.MEŠ tu-li-[ya
   ḫal-zi-ya-u-en]

   dUTU dIM dLAMMA [  

4 [ dIM URU Zi-ip-pa]-la-an-da dIM URU Pît-ī-ya-ri-ga dLAMMA
   URU Ka-ra-ah-na [  

5 [ dIš-ḥa-ra-aš\textsuperscript{c} li-in-ki]-ya-<aš> LUGAL-uš dLe-el-wa-ni-iš dIŠTAR
   dZA-BA\textsubscript{4a}-BA\textsubscript{4} [  

6 [ URU Ḥur-ma-aš] [ dI Ḥa-an-ti-ta-aš-šu-uš URU Ša-mu-u-ḥa-aš
   dA-pa-Ira-aš\textsuperscript{1} x[  

7 [ URU An-ku-w]a-aš dKa-at-taḥ-ḥa-aš URU Ka-ta-pa-aš
   MUNUS.LUGA[L-aš

\textsuperscript{358} The photo available in the Online Konkordanz is unclear, but coll. confirms the reading Ka-aš]-ga, with von Schuler (1965: 117). What appears on the copy to be the final vertical of the broken sign preceding GA is actually a scratch.
DINGIR.ME]Š Lu-u-la-ḫe-e-eš DINGIR.MEŠ Ḥa-pī-ri-e-[eš

§2

9 [ ] x.ḪI.A ták-na-aš dUTU-uš GAL-iš a-ru-na-aš

[DINGIR.MEŠ] [ ] aš LI-IM [DINGIR.MEŠ]

10 [ ] li-in-ki-ya ku-ut-ru-e-ni-eš a-ša-[an-du

nu uš-kán-du iš-t]a-ma-aš-kán-du-y[a]

§3

11 [ ] DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA URU Ka-aš-g]a-ya tu-li-ya ḫal-zī-e-xŠ59-[ ]

§4 (a-b)

12 [ ] dU Ḥa-nu-up-te-ni

13 [ ] dU Ku-tup-pur-ru-[i

14 [ ] dU Pa-zī-im[-…]- iš

§5 (a-b)

15 [ ] ták-na-aš dUTU-u[š ] Ḥu-wa-at-ta-aš-ši-[iš

16 [ ] x x[ ] x-te-na at-ta-aš dUTU-uš

17 [ ] ru-i tu-uzi-zī-aš d[M-aš]

18 [ ] x dTe-li-pī-nu-u[š]

Š59. x[š]. Collation confirms the trace of a Winkelhaken visible on both the copy and the photo; for restoration and discussion, see commentary.
According to von Schuler (1965: 118) the Winkelhaken clearly visible on both copy and photo functioned as a “Zeilentrenner,” comparable to KBo 5.4 rev. 56.
8’ an-[a-ma-kán]  [IA1-NA dUTU-ŠI me-na-[a]-h-a]-[an-ta]361
9’ ma-[a]-[an ku-u-ru]-ra ku-wa-pí [e]-ep-zi [x]
10’ ku-[t-] ma-[a]-an ki-iš-ša-an tar-te-ni [IA1-[NA]
11’ pé-[l-e]-[te]-ni nu šu-me-en-za-an ÉRIN.MEŠ A-NA
                  É[RIN.MEŠ-YA

§11’
12’ m[a-a-an] x DUMU.MEŠ šu-ul-lu-uš-ma Ú-UL
                  pl-[iš-te-ni?]  ]x-[l]-di/[i]-l-x362 [...
14’ [nu ]  L-NA É-KU-NU [ ]-  en

§12’
15’ [m]a-a-an LÜKÚR-ma ku-iš šA dUTU-ŠI URU-x[  LÜ]KÚR
              šu-me-en-za-an Aššak-[a]
16’ ū-da-i šu-me-ša-aš-ši pé-ra-an ša-[l-ra]-[a] t[i]-ya-at-te-ni363
                 ma-[a-na-an-za []

361 Photo and coll. support this reading; contra von Schuler’s (1965: 118) tentative reading na-[a]-h-x-[ , which can be gleaned from his translation “er [fürchtig (?)].”
362 ša]-[l]-di/[i]-l-x? a?
363 With CHD S2 (s.v. šara-  B 1 a 52’ a’, p. 219); note, however, that there actually seems to be more space in the break between KUB 13.27 and KUB 23.77 (i.e., between ša-[l-ra]-[a and t[i]-ya-at-te-ni) than indicated in the restoration in CHD S2 (šumeš a šši peran ša-ra[-a tiy]atenni).
17' nu A-NA ḫUTU-ŠI ḫa-lu-kān ū-da-at-te-[en'] p]i-š-te-ni nu
   šu-me-en-zā-[an]

18' ḪU KUR tāk-ša-an
   [ -e] ni

§13'

19' an-da-ma-az IT-TI KUR Ḫa-at-ti ẗāk'[-ša-an'] A-NA KUR
   Ḫa-at-ti AN-x[]

20' nu URU-aš ku-iš ar-ḫa la-a-an-za x[ ]-ya-at-ta-ri ẗšu-me1-e[š

21' ma-a-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma EGIR-pa I-NA KUR x[ ] Ḫa-aš-ga
   x[ ]x[ ]

22' ke-e-da-ni-wa ke-e-da-ni-y[a n]a-aš-ma-wa
   [ n]a-aš-1ma-wa ḫa-a1-[li]

23' Ū-UL SIGs-in uš-kān-zī n[u -y]a' an-da

24' ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A NU.GĀL
   k[i- ]x-[ši1]-ya-at-ta-ri

25' nu-wa i-it-te-en wa-la-[ p]i-š-tén

§14'

26' ma-a-an Ū-UL-ma nu MEŠNĪ.ZU-TIM
   [ši'-ya1-an-ta-ri šu-me-ša-aš a-ush-te-ni

27' nu-uš-ma-aš NINDA-an pī-š-te-[e-ni -i]š-te-ni
   za-aḫ-ḫi-ya-at-te-ni-ma-aš Ū-UL na-aš-ša-an KAŠKAL-an
28'  im-ma ti-it-[ta]1-[nu-ut-te-ni] [x wa-la-ah-te-en nu
  ma-a-an \textsuperscript{LU,MEŠ} NÍ.ZU-TIM

29'  ta-ma-i-iš(-)x\textsuperscript{364} x[ n]u-1ušš-ši
  pé-ra-an ša-ra-a KAŠKAL-ši i-it-te-en

30'  na-an za-ah-ši-[ya[-at-te-en]] na-an Ú-UL/le-e mu-u]n-na-at-te-ni
  šu-me-en-za-na-an-za-an I-NA URU-KU-NU

31'  EGIR-pa le-e [tar-na-at-te-ni\textsuperscript{(3)}] nu-uš-ši NINDA-an l]e-e
  pi-iš-te-ni

\textsuperscript{364} The traces on the copy or photo do not fit von Schuler's implied tamaiš-ša; see commentary.

37'   [                        ] pa-ît-te-ni na-aš-ta¹[t] BE-EL MA-AD-GAL₄₉-TI
              ud-da-a-na-[az³]
38'   [                        ] nu¹[t] KUR ku-e-da-ni pé-e-di ú-iz-zi nu-uš-ši
              a-pa-a-at [pé-e-da-an(?)] x[ ] x x
39'   [                        ] x im-ma pé-e-da-an me-mi-îš-te-ni nu¹[t] BE-EL
              MA-AD-GAL₄₉-T[I ÉRIN].MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.[RA].ḤI.A
40'   [                        ] ta-ma-i pé-e-da-an wa-la-aḥ-zi ma-a-ah-ḥa-an-ma
              ḫUR wa-[la-a]ḥ-zi [ṣu-]me-ša
              URU Ha-át-ti-wa kar-[ṣ[i KAŠKAL³]-ši-ya-aḥ-ḫu-e-en
42'   [                        ] pa-îš-te- en

§17'
              x [ o ]-ma
44'   [                        ] ták-šu]-ú-ul³⁶⁶ šu-ma-a-ša-aš ták-šu-ú-[ul] e-eš-tu

§18'
45'   [                        ] x-li kat-ta-an i-ya-[at]-ta-ri šu-me-ša-an-kán
              EGI[R] n]a-îš-te-ni
46'   [                        ] me-mi-i]š-te-ni ta-aš-ša-nu-uh-ḫu-ut-wa-az nu-wa le-e [  

³⁶⁶ Since this is the last line of the paragraph, it is very likely that there was nothing preceding ták-šu-ú-ul, as we see in KUB 13.27 obv. 14'.
§19’

   pé-ra-an p[a-ra-a’] šu-me]-ša

48’ [ na]-at₃⁶⁷ A-NA dUTU-ŠI me-mi-iš-te-[en]

§20’

49’ [ ku³-iš³-]ki³ ẖar-ra-at-ta-ri šu-ma-a-ša-aš-kán
   AN-[ ]x an-da

50’ [ -ši]a-an nu ku-it İŞ-TU gišTUKUL a-ki
   ku-x[ ]x-x-te-ni

51’ [ nu-uš]-ši EGIR-pa pa-iš-te-[en]
   ]

§21’

52’ [ -z]i nam-ma-kán UR[U ]-z]i

53’ [ -y]a-an i[i]-[ ]-zi

54’ [ ]

§22’

55’ [ EG]IR-pa

56’ [ -n]i³

57’ [ ]

₃⁶⁷ It is possible that there was nothing preceding na]-at in obv. 48’.
Lower edge

§23'

58' [ ] x ku-iš-\(^{1}\)ki\(^{1}\) za-am-mu-ra-a-iz-zi nam-ma-aš-kán I-NA

KUR\(^{\text{URU}}\) Ka-aš-ga

59' [piú-te-ya-an-te-li ú-i]z-zi na-aš-ša-an' ma-a-an šu-me-en-z\(\text{a}\)-an t\(\text{a}\)-kšu-la-aš

URU-ya ú-i-z-zi na-a[n']

60' [e-ep-tén'] ki-i]š-ša-an-na-aš-ši\(^{368}\) le-e tar-te-ni ú-e-eš-wa-az

li-in-\(^{1}\)ki-ya\(^{1}\)

61' [kat-ta-an] ta-me\(^{1}\)e1-da-n\(^{1}\) URU-ya i-it ú-e-ša\(^{1}\) šu-ma-aš-pát

ḥar-ru-wa-ni nu a-pu-u-un

62' [ ] an-du-uḫ-ša-an\(^{370}\) \(\text{EGIR}1\)-pa šu-me-eš pi-iš-te-ni

Reverse

§24'\(^{371}\)

63' [ ] KUR\(^{\text{URU}}\) Ha-at-\(\text{a}\)l]i piú-te-ya-an-za I-NA KUR\(^{\text{URU}}\) Ka-aš-ga t\(\text{a}\)-kšu-la-aš

URU-ya ú-iz-\(\text{i}\)-zi\(^{1}\)

64' [ ] ŠA \(\text{IBE}1\)-L[Í-Š]U\(^{372}\) a-aš-šu-u ú-da-i na-aš-ma-aš LÚ

\(\text{GIS}^{\text{TUKUL}}\) nu ŠA \(\text{LÜ}^{\text{TAP-PÍ-ŠU}}\) a-aš-šu-u ú-da-<i>

\(^{368}\) Cf. von Schuler (1965: 120).

\(^{369}\) Cf. von Schuler (1965: 120).

\(^{370}\) As in obv. 44' and 48' an-du-uḫ-ša-an was probably the first word in the line.

\(^{371}\) Extensive restorations, suggested by Sommer (1938: 129-30), despite their probable accuracy, have been left out of the transliteration; for the restorations and their translations, see translation and commentary.

\(^{372}\) Cf. obv. 55'.
65′ [\(\text{pî-iš-tén a-pa-a-š[a} \ \text{LÚ})\text{p}]t-te-ya-an-za šu-ma-a-š e-eš-tu
ma-a-an-kán a-pé-e-ez-zi-ya ták-šu-la-aš

66′ [I-NÁ KUR \text{UrU} \text{Ha-at-ti ú-iz-z}i \text{i\text{7 na-aš ma-a-an x x nu ŠA BE-LÍ-ŠU Ú-NU-TE}_{\text{MEŠ}}
ú-da-i na-aš ma-aš \text{LÚ EL-LUM} \text{nu ŠA LÚ TAP-PÍ-ŠU}

67′ [\text{I]\text{1-NU-TE}_{\text{MEŠ}} \text{EGR-}pa pî-iš-ti[1\text{-u-e-mi} \text{LÚ})\text{373}}
pî-te-an-da-an-na-aš-ma-aš \text{EGR-}pa Ú-UL pî-i-u-e-ni

§25′

68′ [o o o]x\text{374} [o o]x šu-me-en-za-an DUMU.MEŠ \text{[šu1-u[l-lu]-l}u\text{ši} \text{1 x-}\text{Išta1}
ma-a-an šu-wa-a-i ku-iš-ki

69′ [na-aš E]GIR-}pa a-pád-da ú-iz-zi na-an le-[e m]ū-un-na-at-te-ni \text{1EGIR\text{1-an}
pî-iš-te-en

§26′

70′ an-da-ma-kán ma-a-an \text{UrU} \text{Ha-at-tu-ša-až} \text{LÚ pî-te-ya-an-za ú-iz-zi na-aš}
ták-šu-[\text{I}a-aš \text{URU} \text{ya a-ri na-aš-ma-za-kán}

71′ \text{LÚ ták-šu-la-aš-páti a-pé-en-za-an }\text{AŠ\text{1 ku-e-Jri1} an-da ú-e-mi-e-iz-zi na-an
\text{1e1-\text{Ie}}p-zi \text{Ú-UL-ma-na-an EGR-}pa

72′ \text{UrU} \text{Ha-at-tu-ši pî-iš-te-ni na-an-\text{1kán1 pa-ra-a I-NÁ KUR \text{LÚ} KÚR im-ma na-a-i
n[an-an]-za}\text{375 1 LÚ URU-aš šu-u-ma-an-za wa-aš-túl-li e-e[p-zi]}

\text{373 There doesn’t seem to be enough space for all four signs.}
\text{374 š\text{a}?}
\text{375 With CHD L-N (s.v. natta g 2′, p. 417).}
§27′

73′ ma-a-an-kán IŠ-TU KUR \textsuperscript{URU} Ka-aš-ga \textsuperscript{ILÚ} [\textsuperscript{URU} Ha-at-ti pīt-te} an-ti-li ú-iz-zi

[na-aš EGI]Ra ták-šu-la-aš URU-ya a-ri

74′ \textsuperscript{URU} Ha-at-tu-ša\textsuperscript{1}aš KAŠKAL-ši ti-it-ta-nu-ut-te-en e-ep-ši-ma-an

[le-e] n EGI\textsuperscript{R} pa I-NA KUR \textsuperscript{URU} Qa-aš-ga

75′ [na]-it-ti na-aš-ma-an-za I-NA KUR \textsuperscript{URU} Ha-at-ti ḫa-ap-pi-ra-a -š[i]

§28′

76′ [ma-a-an] \textsuperscript{dUTU-ŠI} ma \textsuperscript{LÚ} KAŠ₄,E I-NA KUR \textsuperscript{URU} Ka-aš-ga pī-i-ya-mi nu-uš-ši

AR[AD\textsuperscript{er} c. 6-7 signs ]-iš-ši na-an-za \textsuperscript{LÚ} ták-šu-la-aš

77′ [le]-\textsuperscript{1}mu-ga-a-ši nu-uš-ši ki-iš-ša-an le-e te-ši ma-a-ah-ḫa-an-[w]a I-NA KUR

\textsuperscript{URU} Ha-at-ti] ša-ra-a a-ar-ti

78′ [ o ]x-wa-kán ḫu-wa-a-i nu-wa EGI\textsuperscript{R} pa am-mu-uk kat-ta-an [

§29′

79′ [ A-NA\textsuperscript{M}A-ḪAR ]\textsuperscript{dUTU-ŠI} \textsuperscript{LÚ} it-ta-ra-an-ni ú-iš-\textsuperscript{1}ki\textsuperscript{1}-it-te-ni nu-za IŠ-TU

[ an-tu-\textsuperscript{u}] h-šu-uṣ\textsuperscript{e} le-e

80′ [ ]\textsuperscript{-}x-te-ni na-aš \textsuperscript{I1}NA KUR \textsuperscript{URU} Qa-aš-ga ú-i-ta-at-te-ni

ku-u-ru[-ur l]e-e ú-i-ta-at-te-ni

81′ [ n]a-an-ma ku-[w]a-pí ú-wa-te-it-ta-ni na-an A-NA

\textsuperscript{dUTU-ŠI} \textsuperscript{ṣ}a-a-ak-ku

176
§30’

82’ [LÚ.MEŠ/Š-TU’ KUR |K/Qa-aš-k]a [376] ku-i-[e]-š I-NA KUR |H-a-at-ti

pit-te-an-ti-li uth-[wa-an-zi’ na-at’] [H-a-at-tu-sa-az

83’ [EGIR-pa’ I-NA KUR |Qa-aš-ga |pit-te-an-ti-li pa-iš-kán-ta nu-za


84’ [úl-i-1ta-at-te-ni LÚ.M[ES KUR |Qa-aš-ga k]u-i-[e]-š URU |H-a-at-tu-si

pit-te-an-ti-[i ú-wa-an-te]-eš

85’ na-aš EGIR-pa I-NA K[UR |Qa-aš-ga le-e] mu-u-ki-iš-kán-z[í [378]]

§31’

86’ ŠA KUR |H-a-at-ti-ya-az |URU1-a[n ZI-it le-e k]u-iš-ki e-ša-r[i]

|ki-nu-un-zá-[kán] ku-iš |ku-e[rí] an-da

87’ LÚ |Qa-aš-ga ZI-it URU-an [e-ša-rí’ na-aš A-NA379] dUTU-ŠI |LÚ.K[ÚR]-x

|na-l-an za-ah-hi-e-iz-zi

§32’

88’ an-da-ma |LÚ.KÚR ku-wa-pí ħu-[wa-a-i na-an LÚ.]MEŠ ták-šu-la-aš EGIR’-pa

URU-ya le-e tar-na-at-te-[ní]

89’ NINDA-an-na-aš-ši wa-a-tar le-e [pl-iš-kat-te-ní’ -]an-na-az-za-an URU-ri

EGIR-pa le[e]-e pé-e-ħu-te-it-te-ní

---

[376] The traces on the copy favor the reading |KA, though it should be noted that in other instances the last syllable of the name Kaška is written with the GA sign; e.g. rev. 63’, 74’, 80’.
[377] KUB 13.27 (Bo 4932) starts here.
90'  

\[ URU Ha-at-tu-ša-an-na PA-NI \text{[}LUKÚR}^{380} \text{le-e} \] e'-ni wa-al-uš-ki-it-te-na-an

\[ \text{im-ma} \]

\[ §33' \]

91'  

\[ an-da-ma-kán \text{[} Ł/ták-šu-la-aš I-N[ A KUR \text{[}URU Ha-at-ti ZI-i]\text{] } \text{an-da le-e ú-iz-zi} \]

\[ ma-a-na-aš ú-iz-zi-ma \]

92'  

\[ na-aš A-NA \text{[} Ł/BE-EL MA-AD-GAL₉-TI p[a'-iz-zi'] } \text{]-x-an an-da} \]

\[ an-du-uhš-a-an tu-u-ri-e-ez-zi \]

93'  

\[ na-aš-kán ku-it-ma-an \text{[} HUR.SAG-i a[n-da²} \]

\[ ]₁e₁-aš ku-wa-pí pa-iz-zi \]

\[ na-aš a-pí-ya-ya \]

94'  

\[ A-NA \text{[} Ł/BE-EL MA-AD-GAL₉-TI pa-ra-la¹} \]

\[ ZI-i\text{]} t pa-iz-zi \]

\[ \text{HUR.SAG-aš-kán an-da} \]

95'  

\[ ZI-it pa-iz-zi na-aš-ta x[ \]

\[ ]-ta \]

\[ §34' \]

96'  

\[ an-da-ma ma-a-an ku-u-ru-ra-aš ták-šu-la[-aš-ša²} \text{[} A-NA² \text{ÉRIN}'] .MEŠ \]

\[ \text{URU Ha-at-ti-ma ši-na-ah-ša-an ḥar-zi} \]

97'  

\[ nu-uš wa-la-ah-zi nu ku-u-ru-ra-aš-ša x[ \]

\[ ]-ki \]

\[ §35' \]

98'  

\[ an-da-ma-kán ma-a-an ták-šu-la-aš \text{[}URU Ha-at-ti[u-ši ú-]iz-zi nu-uš-ši ku-in} \]

\[ URU-an \text{[} Ł/BE-EL MA-AD-GAL₉-TI} \]

\[ 380 \text{With von Schuler (1965: 122).} \]

\[ 381 \text{Restoration with von Schuler (1965: 123).} \]
99' ma-ni-ya-ah-zi nu-za ḫa-ap-pár a-pí-ya i-[e]-[d]-du nu-za ta-me]-[e]-[d]-da-ni

URU-ri ḫa-ap-pár ZI-it le-e i-e-[e]-ez-zi

100' [1]KŪR-ya-az ku-u-ru-ri le-e [Ḫa-ap-pár77 i-e-ez]-zi

§36'


102' ú-it-tú nu-uš-ma-aš dUTU-ŠI ku-e-da-ni la-ah-[hi pé-ḫu-te-ìz-zi ma-a]n-ma

dUTU-ŠI la-ah-Ḫa-az EGIR-pa ne-ya-[r]i

103' ÉRIN.MEŠ-ma ar-Ḫa 1-NA É-ŠU [ tar-na-] i

§37'


105' ú-iz-zi šu-me-[ša]-an-za ḫa-aš-ti-i-it Û-UL [ta-ra-ah-te-ni na-an EGIR-p]a

Û-UL na-iš-te-ni nu-[uš]-ši-kán ta-pu-uš-za


URUḪa-at-t[i-m]a pa-ra-a ḫa-lu-ku-uš


URUḪa-at-ti pé-ra-an pa-ra-a ḫa-lu-ku-[uš]

108' [ pīd-da-a-at-[e]-en

---

77 With CHD L-N (s.v. laḫḫa- 1e, p. 5); von Schuler (1965: 122 and n. 22) prefers “geht.”
78 Ibid.
80 TĀK or URU are among the possibilities.
§38’

109’ ma-a-an ŠA KUR URU[K/Q]a-aš-ga-ma ku-iš-<ki>\textsuperscript{386} ku-u-ru-ra-aš

\[\text{Hu-at-tu-ši?}\]\textsuperscript{387} ú-iz-zi šu-me-ša-aš-ši-kán ták-šu-la-aš

110’ URU\textit{Hu-at-tu-ši} za-[ah-ḥi]-ya an-da le-e ú-[wa-at-te-ni I-NA

KUR-KA’]-ya-an-zα-kán

EGIR-pa le-e tar-na-at-te-[ni]

111’ NINDA-an-na-aš-ši le-e [pī]-iš-te-ni na-an-ša-an [KAŠKAL-ši le-e

\textit{ti-it-ta]}-nu-ut-te-ni

§39’

112’ an-da-ma-zα-kán ku-u-ru-ra-aš GU₄,_HI.A UDU,_HI.A š[u-me-en-zα-an,\textsuperscript{387} ku-e-ri

an]-da\textsuperscript{388} le-e tar-na-at-te-ni ma-a-na-an-za-kán

113’ an-da-ma tar-na-at-te-ni ku-wa-pí-ma ÉRIN.MEŠ URU\textit{H}[a-at-ti ku-u-ru-ra-aš

GU₄,_HI.A UDU]._HI.A wa-la-ah-zi šu-me-en-zα-an-na GU₄,_HI.A

UDU,_HI.A wa-[la-ah-zi]

§40’

114’ \textit{an-da-ma} šu-me-en-zα-an,\textsuperscript{387} ták-šu-la-aš GU₄,_HI.A [A UDU,_HI.A ŠA URU\textit{Ha-at-ti

GU₄,_HI.A] UDU,_HI.A an-da i-mi-ya-an-za ku-u-ru-ra-ša-za-k[án]

115’ GU₄,_HI.A UDU,_HI.A le-e u-lun1-ni-iš-te-ni ma-a-n[a-an un-ni-iš(?)-r]e-ni

iš-tar-na-ma-an-kán ú-e-mi-ya-an-zi

\textsuperscript{386} Added later, written above ku-u-ru-ra-aš.

\textsuperscript{387} The break is long enough to accommodate a few more signs.

\textsuperscript{388} With von Schuler (1965: 123).
116’  nu-šša-š wa-š-du-ú-ši ap-pa-a-an-zi  nu[-uš-ma-š GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A

ar-ḫa da-an-zi

§41’

117’  ]x GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A š[ur₄.u³⁸⁹-]¹a¹ an-da

i-mi-ya-an-te-es¹ LÜ.KUR-ma ú-iz-z[i]

118’  ] GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A wa-al-ḫa-a[n-zi na-an ar-ḫa

pe-en(?)-n]a-an-zi dUTU-ŠI-ma [šu-ma¹-aš-pát

119’  ] GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A

LÚ.ME[Š ša]r-ni-ik-te-n[i]

§42’

120’  ] GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A

x[ w]a-la-ah-z[i ]x[

121’  ] LÚ.MEŠSI.PA.UDU x[

(gap of uncertain length)

KUB 23.77a

§43’

1’³⁹⁰  E[GIR-an x³⁹¹[  

2’  ME[š/-e]š ku-it-ma-an x[

³⁸⁹  š[ur-], as in rev. 112’, but L[Ú.MEŠ, as in rev. 119’, is not to be excluded.
³⁹⁰  Line numbering follows KUB 23.77a, Rev.
³⁹¹  š(-e-?)
3
\[x-it-te-en nu-uš-ma-aš dUTU-Š\]

§44
4
\[hî-ip-pa-r\]a-aš ḥa-ap-pâr ar-ha da-a-i nu[(-)

5
\[nu-za ḥa-ap-pâr da-a-i na-an NI-IŠ DINGIR.M[EŠ
\[ḥar-ni-in-kán-du^{392}]\]

§45
6
\[ku-u-ru-ur nu-uš-ši ma-a-an dUTU-ŠI za-aḥ-[hi

7
l[e-e ku-iš-ki pa-iz-zi 1 LÚ-ya le-e ú-[]

8
\[EGIR-an le-e da-it- [te-ni]

§46
9
\[a-aḥ-ḫa pé-e-ḫu-te-mi nu-uš-ma-aš-kán ma-a-an A-NA
\[ÉRIN.MEŠ x[\]

10
\[na-aš-ma šu-ma-a-aš-pât ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Qa-aš-ga
wa-al-ḫu-wa-an-zi x[\]

11
\[n\]u\[wa-al-ḫu-wa-an-zi pa-it-te-ni^{393} pé-ra-an-ma pa-iz-zi ma-an
a-pa-a-aš [\]

12
\[nu-u\]š-ši-iš-ša-an^{394} i-da-a-šu le-e ták-ki-iš-te-ni na-an l[e-e

\[-------------------------\]

393 The verb was added later, written above pé-ra-an-ma.
394 With CHD S1 (s.v. -šan B 2 h 7', p.149).
§47

13' $\text{ku]}^{-1}^{1}e-e\tilde{s} \text{ t\acute{a}k-\tilde{s}u-la-a\tilde{s}} \text{ URU.DIDLI.\tilde{H}I.A \tilde{S}A \text{ KUR}^{\text{URU}}Qa-a\tilde{s}-\text{ga}}$  

$A^{-1}\text{NA K}[\text{UR}}$

14' $\text{]-na-an-zi nu ú-iz-\tilde{I}zi}^{1}\tilde{S}A \text{ KUR}^{\text{URU}}\text{Ha-at-ti URU-an ku-}^{[n-ki}$

15' $\text{\hat{h}a-an-t\text{e}}\text{-ez-zi-in-p\tilde{a}t a-ú-ri-ya-a\tilde{s}} \text{ URU-an wa-al-\text{\hat{h}}u-wa-ni ma-a-an [}$

16' $\text{]}x-a\tilde{h}-zi ú-e-\tilde{s}a \text{ IEGIR}\text{-pa t\acute{a}k-\text{\hat{s}u-la-a\tilde{s}}-p\tilde{a}t [UR]}^{?-an wa-al-\text{\hat{h}}[u-wa-ni}$
CTH 138.2.A: KUB 31.105

1’ ]x x[

§2’

2 LÚMEŠ[U]RUTa-pa-un-wa ]x x ]

3 [U]RUTHa-at]-1tuškat-ta uš-kat-te-ni nu A-NA x[

4 ] SIG5-in uš-kán-zi GU₄-uš UDU-u[š

5 -r]i nu pa-it-te-ni A-NA LÚ.MEŠ[U]RKa-aš-[ga

6 -l]š-ki-it-te-ni URU BÂD-wa ki-e-it-l[a

7 l̄a-a-l]³⁹⁵ Ú-UL SIG₅-in uš-kán-zi GU₄.HI₂A[l


9 -l]e-en nam-ma-wa ma-a-ah-ḫa-an EGIR-pa ú-w[a-

10 ](-)er-za-a-aš-saer pa-iš-te- en

§3’

11 ]x ŠA KUR LÚKÜR ku-wa-pr¹LÚNÍ.ZU I-NA KUR [U]RUTHa-at-ti

12 šu-me-ša-a]³⁹⁶ a-uš-te-ni nu-uš-ši NINDA-an le-e pl⁴-e¹-[eš-te-ni

13 ]x le-e ti-it-ta-nu-ut-te-ni Aš₃₄ku-e[-ri-

14 ] ar-ḫa le-e tar-na-at-te- ni

§4’

§5’

m[a-a-an ^LÖKÚR pa-an-ga-ri-it ni-ni]-[

nu-uš-ši-kán ta-pu-ú-ša ne-ya-an-te-e[š e-eš-te-en

]-ša-an ša-ra-a ta-aš-ku-p[i-

A-NA BE -E]L MA-AD-GALö-TI pa-ra-a ḫa-lu-[a-lu-

§6’

-t]i-it-ma na-an x[ o ]x[

]x[
CTH 138 (FRAGMENTS)

KBo 50.69

x+1  ]-[a1-i[  
2’  ]-te-ni x[  
3’  ]-id-du-ma-a[t  
4’  ] URU Ga-aš-ga [  
5’  ]x x x[  

KBo 43.1

x+1  ]x[  
2’  ]-[t]e"-ni x[  

§2’

3’  ]-[e1 ka-a-ša ku-]ma’1-[  
4’  ]x 1’ KUR-e-až2 ša-ra-a [  
5’  n]a’-aš-kán ka-a-ša [  
6’  ] UR] Ka-pi-pi-iš-ta [  
7’  ]-[i]r DUMU.MEŠ šu-ul-<li>-in-na [  
8’  ]-[u]š-ša-an-kán ar-ḥa a[p’-  
9’  ]| x-pa-an 1\m pšiš-šu-x[  

Lower edge

10’  ]x-ir2 nu-x[  
11’  ]x ša’-a[r’-
12' ]x-wa'ra-[  
13' ]x x[  

Translation

Obverse

1. [The men of Kaška have] placed themselves under oath as follows […]

2. [you (pl.)]. [We have] hereby summoned the thousand Gods to assembly.

3. [And] they shall be witnesses to the oath! The gods of Ḥatti, the Sun God, the Storm God, the Protective God […]

4. [the Storm God of Zippa] landa, the Storm God of Pittiyariga, the Protective God of Karaḫna […]

5. [Iš̱ara] the queen of the oath, Leļwani, Ištar, ZABABA […]

6. [Ḥantitaššu] of Ḫurma, Apara of Šamuḫa […]

7. [of Kattaḫa] of Ankuwa, the Queen of the city Kattappa […]

8. [the Lulaḫḫi gods] and the Ḫapiri gods […]

§2

9. [s, Sun Goddess of the Earth, the great sea, the gods of] the thousand [gods…

10. [and they shall be witnesses to the oath, and they shall watch and listen!]

§3

11. [the gods of Kaška] we have also summoned to assembly […]

188
§4a

12 [ ]

13 [ ]

14 [ ]

§4b

12 The Storm God Ḫanupteni

13 The Storm God Katuppuruζi

14 The Storm God Pazim[...]iš

§5a

15 [ ] Sun Goddess of the Earth [ ]

16 [ ]-tēna

17 [ ]-rui

18 [ ]

§5b

15 Ḫuwatašši

16 The Father Sun God

17 The Sto[rm] God of the Army

18 Telipinu

§6

19 [ ] And, now/herby the thousand god[s…
[we have summoned to assembly. They shall be witnesses to the oath. And they shall see and listen]

§7

21 [you (pl.) shall speak]

22 [oath]

(gap of uncertain length)

§8'

1’ And in front of […]

2’ human

3’ And the gods themselves/indeed […]

4’ Too fragmentary for translation

§9’

5’ And the men […]

6’ From […]

7’ And the enemy […]

§10’

8’ In addition against My/His Majesty […]

9’ [If] he starts hostilities somewhere/someplace […]

10’ [If you (pl.) speak thus: “To…

11’ [you (pl.) […]. And your (pl.) troops, to [my] troops …
§11’
12’ If you do not give hostages […]
13’ you shall not come to the enemy to help. […] cut […]
14’ [And ] in your (pl.) house w[e/y]o[u […]

§12’
15’ [If the enemy who [ My Majesty’s city en]emy, your (pl.) terr[itory…
16’ brings here. You (pl.) [ r]ise up before him. If [ ] him […]
17’ you shall bring a message here to My Majesty! You [g]ive [. And you[r…
18’ We [will ] the enemy together.

§13’
19’” In addition, with Ḫatti to[gether” ] to Ḫatti [
20’ And the city which is released [ ] he [. You (pl.) […]
21’ but when [ ] back in(to) the land [ ] Kaška […]
22’ “To this an[d] to this [ ] or [ o]r they
23’ do not keep the w[atch] well [ ] within […]
24’ there is no infantry and chariotry [ ] he […]
25’ you shall go to stri[ke/attack” ] you shall give!”

§14’
26’ But if not, (if) the [scouts” ] they go. And you
see/observe them,
and you give them bread and you [ ], but you do not fight them, and
you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
and you actually set them on their way, [ ] Attack! And if another [sends’ ] scouts [ ] Go up before him on the road,
you shall indeed tell the place! And the province governor, the [troops] and the chariotry.

he attacks another place. But when the enemy attacks, [if you] and you speak to him thus: “To Ḫatti we really [dis]patch”

give!”

§17’

[He who is] an enemy [of My Majesty] shall be your enemy! But he who is an ally [of My Majesty] shall be your ally.

§18’

goes down with/in the manner of (-li) [ ] and you send him [ ] back you say: “Strengthen yourself! And do not […]”

§19’

to] some [pr]ovince governor, an evil word before […]

tell it to My Majesty!

§20’

someone destroys [ ]. (To) you, he/it [ ] in
50’ [ ] And what dies (is destroyed) by weapon, what you shall […]
51’ [ ] you shall not give [them] back to him?!

§21’ Too fragmentary for translation

§22’ Too fragmentary for translation

Lower edge

§23’
58’ [ ] someone oppresses [ ], and furthermore
59’ [comes into Kaška [in the manner of a fugitive], and if he comes into (an) allied city of yours,
60’ [seize him ] Do not say to him as follow[s]: “We are [ under] oath.
61’ [ ] Go to [an]other city.” And we will hold you (responsible). And
62’ [ ] you (will) give back that man.

Reverse

§24’\footnote{397}{See commentary for the restoration of this paragraph.}
63’ [If from Ḫatti a f]ugitive comes into Kaška, an allied city,
64’ [if he is a slave? and he] brings the goods of his master here, or (if) he is a craftsman?, and brings the goods of his equal partner here,
65’ gi[ve back the goods], but that one shall be your fugitive.\textsuperscript{395} If an ally from there
66’ [come]s [into Ḫatti], if he is [a slave?'] and brings the goods of his master here, or
   (if) he is a free man and
67’ [brings the goods] of his partner [here, the g]oods [we will give
   back, and the fugitive we will not give back to you.

\section*{§25’}

68’ [ ] your host[ages ], if anyone flees
69’ [and] comes back to that place, you shall not hide him! You shall him back!

\section*{§26’}

70’ In addition, if a fugitive comes from Ḫattuša and arrives at an allied city, or
71’ even an ally finds (him) in their (sic) own territory and seizes him, and if you’
   (pl.) do not
72’ give him back to Ḫattuša, (but) if he (sic) actually sends him into enemy
territory, the entire city will se[ize] him, the one man, \textit{in delicto}.\textsuperscript{399}

\section*{§27’}

73’ If a man from Ḫatti comes from Kaška in the manner of a fugitive, and arrives
   back at an allied city,
74’ you (pl.) shall set him on the way to Ḫattuša. But you (sg.) [shall not] seize him
   [and s]end [hi]m back to Kaška
75’ or sell him in Ḫatti.

\textsuperscript{398} Lit. “that one shall be a fugitive to you.”
\textsuperscript{399} See commentary for an alternative interpretation.
§28’
76’ [If I, My Majesty, send a messenger to Kaška and you ] sl[ave] him/to him,
77’ as an ally, [do no]t entreat him and speak to him as follows: “When you
arrive up [in Ḫatti]
78’ [ ] run, and [ ] back to me.”

§29’
79’ [ ] send a messenger [to] My Majesty! Fro
80’ you shall not [ ] [the pe]ople and bring them to Kaška. You shall not bring
hostil[e ].
81’ [ ] A]nd where/when you bring him here, [ ] him to My Majesty
[ ] let him k]now.

§30’
82’ [The men of Kaš]a who c[ome] to Ḫatti in the manner of a fugitive, [and] from
Ḥattuša
83’ [they] go [back to K]aška in the manner of a fugitive. [From/to] Ḫattuša you shall
not bring to [y]our [ ] for yourselves.
84’ The [Kaška] men who have c[ome] to Ḫattuša in the manner of a fugitive,
85’ they (sic) shall [not] entreat them (to go) back to K[aška].
§31’

86’ [No] one shall occupy a city belonging to Ḥatti [on his own authority]. Now, a Kaška man who, within a territory,

87’ occupies a city on his own authority, [is] His Majesty’s enemy. And he (His Majesty) will fight him.

§32’

88’ In addition, when the enemy flees, you (as) allies shall not let [him] back in the city.

89’ And [do] not give him bread (or) water. [ ] do not lead him from [ ] back to the city.

90’ And do not Ḫattuša before the enemy. Rather, praise it (i.e. Ḫattuša)!

§33’

91’ In addition, an ally shall not come in[to Ḫatti on his own authority]. But if he comes,

92’ (and) he will go to the Province Governor, [ ] he harnesses (the) man in […]

93’ While/until/as long as he [ ] on the mountain [ ] when he goes. And even then(/there)

94’ he [ ] goes forth to the Province Governor [ ] on his own authority, (and) he goes

95’ on his own authority to the mountains, he […]

197
§34’

96’ In addition, if the enemy [and] allie[s], and sets a trap [for the troops] of Ḫatti and attacks them, then the enemy too […]

§35’

98’ In addition, if an ally comes [ ] into Ḫattuša, the city which the Province governor assigns to him, he [shall] conduct trade there. In [an]other city he shall not conduct trade on his own authority.

100’ The/an enemy (sic) shall not [ ] to/with the enemy.

§36’

101’ In addition, when I, My Majesty, summon troops, and a man [does not com]e, the man’s slave shall not come (in his stead). The man (himself)

102’ shall come! On whatever campaign His Majesty [leads] you, [whe]n His Majesty returns from the campaign

103’ he will let the troops (go) home.401

§37’

104’ In addition, when the enemy [comes] to Ḫattuša/Ḫatti en mas[se and he]

comes through your territory

---

400 See commentary.
401 Translation follows CHD L-N (s.v. laḫḫa- 1 e, p. 5).
and you cannot (lit. do not) [overcome] him with force, and you cannot turn [him back],

keep your distance to (lit. “be turned away from) him! And [ ] to him. [And] bring news to Ḫatti!

So long as the enemy [ ] to Ḫatti [bring] news!

§38’

If some enemy from Kaška comes [to Ḫattuša ],
you shall not come to Ḫattuša allied to him for battle! And do not let him [into your own land].

You shall not give him bread, and [you shall not set him on his way]!

§39’

In addition, do not let the cattle and sheep of the enemy into y[our territory]! If you let them in, when the troops [of Ḫatti] attack the [enemy’s cattle and sheep], they will at[tack] your cattle and sheep too.

§40’

In addition, your—the allies’—cat[tle and sheep] (are) mixed in (with) [the cattle and] sheep [of Ḫatti].

Do not herd here the cattle and sheep of the enemy! If y[ou herd them], but they find them in the midst,

and they seize you in delicto, they will take away [your cattle and sheep].
§41’

117’ [ cattle and sheep ] are mixed in. But the enemy come[s]

118’ [ attack[s’ the cattle] and sheep [and driv]es [them off]. But My Majesty, you indeed

119’ [ cattle, sheep, me[n ] you shall[1 com]pensat[e].

§42’

120’ [ cattle and sheep ] attack[s…

121’ [ sh]epherd[s…

(gap of uncertain length)

§43’”

1’402 [ b]ack […]

2’ [ ] while […]

3’ [ ] you shall [ ]. (To/) you, My Majesty [

§44’

4’ [ ] if he receives (lit. takes away) payment of a [hippar]a man, and […]

5’ [ ] and he receives payment for himself, the oath gods [shall destroy] him.

402 Line numbering follows KUB 23.77a, rev.
§45’

6’ [ \(\text{is} \) an enemy. If My/His Majesty in/to battle…

7’ [ no one shall go. Not a single man shall […]

8’ [ you shall] not put back […]

§46’

9’ [ I lead [ ] on [ca]mpaign. If you/to you, to/for the troops […]

10’ [ or if the Kaška troops [come?] to attack even you\(^{403}\)

11’ [ you go to attack [ ]! But if that one goes in front […]

12’ [ do not contrive harm against him. Do n[ot ] him.

§47’

13’ [ wh]ich allied cities of KašKa for/to the l[and…

14’ [ they [ ]. He proceeds to [ ] whic[ever] city of Ḥatti

\(^{403}\) See commentary.
we will attack even a first-rank border city. If [...] we will also counterattack even an allied city [...] (end of text)
Commentary

Obv.

1 CTH 138.1.A is the only one among the Kaška texts whose preamble has survived—albeit partially. Von Schuler (1965: 126) has suggested restoring its missing first half based on KBo 16.27 i 21’ (CTH 137.A): [U]M-MA ṢI Ar-nu-wa-an-da LUGAL.GAL ka-a-ša.\(^4\) As restored, such a preamble would be in line with that of the Išmerikka treaty (KUB 26.41, obv. 1-4; CTH 133, Arnuwanda I), the Ḫuqqana treaty (KBo 5.3(+) i 1; CTH 42.A, Šuppiluliuma I), and an oath of Tudhaliya IV (KUB 26.1+ i 1, CTH 255.2), to which the Kaška texts are generally thought to bear structural and formal similarities (Giorgieri 2005).

Restoration of the second half of obv. 1 with von Schuler (1965: 117), who translates: “die Kaškä[er haben sich folgendermaßen unter Eid gelegt”; see KBo 50.63 + KUB 57.22 (CHT 140.1.A) i 13’: LÚ.MEŠ \(^{URU}\) Ka-aš-ka-az li-in-ki[-ya kat-ta-an … da-i-e-er, where the reflexive particle -z(a) suggests that LÚ.MEŠ \(^{URU}\) Ka-aš-ka ‘the men of Kaška’ was the subject of the restored verb dai-. In the Kaška agreements, the oath-formula linkiya kattan (kiššan) dai- is predominantly reflexive (expressed by the use of -za or the appropriate enclitic pronoun) with the oath-taker(s) as the subject of the verb dai-. Nevertheless, the 1\(^{st}\) pl. pret. da[-a-i-u-e-en] is not to be ruled out, in which case the beginning of the sentence would have to be restored differently: nu-uš-ma-aš LÚ.MEŠ \(^{URU}\) Ka-aš-]ga li-in-ki-ya kat-ta-an ki-iš-ša-an da[-a-i-u-e-en] “[We have] placed [you,

2-3  By comparison with obv. 11 below, we may restore *haḫ-zi-ya-u-en*\(^{405}\) at the end of obv. 2, or at the beginning of obv. 3; see commentary for obv. 11 below. Note, however, that although the Hittites normally ‘summoned’ (*haḫzai-*/*haḫziya-* ) their gods to assembly (von Schuler 1965: 115), both mss. of CTH 139.A have *tuliya dai-* ‘to place in assembly’ (KUB 40.36(+) ii 5-6; KBo 8.35 ii 8-9; see commentary to CTH 139.1). The verb *dai-* is therefore not to be ruled out definitively.

Assuming, with von Schuler (1965: 24), that there was space enough for approximately 15-20 signs in the break, we may suggest the following restorations:

\[\ldots\] nu kāša *LIM DINGIR.MEŠ tuli*[ya haḫ-zi-ya-u-en] / [nu li-in-ki-ya ku-ut-ru-e-ni-eš a-ša-an]-du (cf. i 10, 20): “we have hereby summoned the thousand gods to assembly, and they shall be witnesses to the oath!” This restoration would require 16-17 signs. Or,

\[\ldots\] nu kāša *LIM DINGIR.MEŠ tuli*[ya] / [a-pé-e-da-ni me-mi-ni haḫ-zi-ya-u-en nu iš-ta-ma-aš-kán]-du (cf. KBo 4.10 obv. 50; KBo 10.12(+) 13) or [ke-e-da-ni ud-da-ni haḫ-zi-ya-u-en nu iš-ta-ma-aš-kán]-du (cf. KBo 5.3 (+) i 39f.): “We have hereby summoned the thousand gods to assembly regarding this/that matter/word (i.e. the Kaška being placed under oath) and let them listen!” Both restorations would require about 18-19 signs.

5  *li-in-ki-ya-aš> LUGAL-uš was *Išhara, who often bears the epithet MUNUS.LUGAL *NI-EŠ DINGIR-LIM* (KUB 21.1 iv 14) or *li-in-ki-aš iš-ḫa-a-aš* (KUB

\(^{405}\) The spelling *haḫ-zi-ya-u-en* is more frequently attested than *haḫ-zi-ya-ú-en* according to HW2/H2 (s.v. *haḫzai-* I, p. 93).
40.36(+ ii 7; KBo 8.35 ii 10, CTH 139.1); see CHD (L-N, s.v., lingai- 2d, p. 68). The lack of the feminine determinative MUNUS does not necessarily pose a problem, as we can see from the abovementioned masculine form linkiyaš išḫāš, which Kümmel (1967: 38) emends to “Herr<in> des Eides.” For the named oath deities see Kümmel (1967: 38f.), Oettinger (1976: 41f.).


10 Mirroring obv. 2-3, where Hittite deities were summoned to assembly to serve as divine witnesses to the oath, we have here the evocation of the Kaška deities; see von Schuler (1965: 117) and Singer (2007: 175). There seems to be space for more or less 10 more signs in the break before DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA .URU Kaš]-ga.

The verb ḫalzai- was most likely 1st pl. pret.; see von Schuler’s translation “Auch [die Götter des Kaška-Landes haben wir] zur Ratsversammlung gerufen” (1965: 117). HW2/H2 (s.v. ḫalzai-, 94-95, 103) restores the verb as ḫal-zi-e-[š-ša-u-en⁷]. Singer’s ḫal-zi-ša-u-[en] (2007: 175) is wrong, since the photo confirms the reading ḫal-zi-e-x[]. The reading ḫal-zi-e-[š-ša-u-en⁷] is probable on account of the objects being plural, though not unproblematic, since this would be the only instance in which the marked imperfective ḫalzišša- (ḫalzai-+šša-) is used in the expression tuliya ḫalzai-, and the only instance where it is written plene (ḫal-zi-e-[š-ša-u-en⁷]).

Other forms of the verb ḫalzai- which may fit ḫal-zi-e-x[] are: 1) 1st pl. pret. ḫal-zi-e-ú-en, which however, is normally written with the Ú sign;⁴⁰⁶ and 2) the 3rd pl. preterit

⁴⁰⁶ *ḫal-zi-e-u-en is not listed among the attested pl. 1 pret. forms of ḫalzai- in HW2 H2 (s.v. ḫalzai-, p. 93).
\( \text{\textit{halzi(y)er}} \) (see HW2, H2 s.v. \( \text{\textit{halzai-}} \), 94-95): “…they (i.e. the Kaška) have summoned the gods of the land of Kaška as well (-a/-ya) to assembly.” The latter would also be problematic, since the sign traces do not seem to fit the IR sign, and since there are no other instances where the partners of the treaty or oath summon their own divine witnesses.

12-18 §§4-5 are organized in a peculiar manner. Each paragraph is divided into two sections of unequal width by a vertical line (§4a-b, §5a-b). The left-hand section of each paragraph is broken, but the right hand paragraphs contain divine names. Due to the fragmentary nature of these paragraphs, the organizational principle(s) underlying their arrangement remain obscure.\(^{407}\) Von Schuler’s assumption (followed by Yoshida 2006) was that while obv. 12-14 (§§4a-b) listed Kaška deities, obv. 15-18 (§§5a-b) continued the list of Hittite deities like an appendix. But as Singer (2007: 175-76) points out, there is no reason to assume that obv. 15-18 were an addition to the Hittite divine witnesses; there are no parallels to such a “switching back and forth” between Hittite and foreign deities, and no reason to repeat the name of the Sun Goddess of the Earth—unless it was mistake (as per von Schuler 1965: 127). It seems that §§4-5 represented the divine witnesses of the Kaška, who were summoned to assembly in obv. 11. For the individual deities see Singer (2007: 176-77).

19 \( \text{\textit{ka-a-aš}} \) seems to be a mistake for \( \text{\textit{ka-a-ša}} \), as in obv. 2; hence von Schuler’s translation (1965: 118) “Siehe!”

20 For restoration see commentary for obv. 3.

\(^{407}\) According to von Schuler, the arrangement of the paragraphs had nothing to do with want of space (1965: 127). Singer (2007:176) notes that §5a might have contained more “conventional” names of the deities in §5b, i.e. the storm gods Ḫanupteni, Kutuppurruzi, and Pazim[...]iš.
For šulla-/šulli-, ‘hostage’, see commentary to KBo 16.27+ (CTH 137.A) i 7’.

This fragmentary word may be the verb ḫatta- ‘to cut, slash, prick’; see von Schuler’s translation (1965: 118) “…hau[t(?)]” (3rd sg. present). It is difficult to determine its particulars (person, number, tense, voice); 2nd pl. imperative/prohibitive (as in the preceding and succeeding paragraphs), a conditional with a 3rd sg. present verb (see §10’ obv. 9’) or a participle are possible.

This attestation of arña lānza (from la- ‘to unbind, untwine, release, relieve’) has been overlooked in CHD, HEG, and HED. Von Schuler’s translation (1965: 119, 127) “losgelöst” follows Zuntz (1936: 29) and HW (s.v. lā-, pp. 123-24). I believe in this context URU-aš ku-iš ar-ḥa la-a-an-za refers to a city that has been released, in the sense that it is no longer bound by treaty to Ḫatti.

Obv. 22’-25’ actually represent a series of direct quotes separated by našma, which functions here on the clausal level enumerating alternative statements (see CHD L-N, s.v. našma b1’-6’, pp. 403-05). Cf. von Schuler (1965: 119), who takes obv. 22’-25’ as a block quotation, rendering našma as “oder (wenn)” (which would require a preceding mān to remain in force throughout the series of sentences with našma; see CHD L-N s.v. našma b 4’, p. 404). In other words, this is a list of information allies are not allowed to provide cities no longer allied to Ḫatti.


nu-wa i-it-te-en wa-la-. What we have here seems to be the serial/phrasal use of the verb uwa-.
The relationship of *mān ŪḺ-ma*, which is used here as a fixed idiom rather than a negative conditional clause (see CHD L-N, s.v. *mān* 7h, p. 156), to the preceding paragraph is not entirely clear.

That *LÚ.NÍ.ZU* should be plural is evident from the 3rd pl. verb form and *šu-me-ša-aš*, where *-aš* must be the 3rd pl. acc. (MH/NH) enclitic pronoun. In the parallel text KUB 31.105 l. 11, *LÚ.NÍ.ZU* is singular, and accordingly, the enclitic pronominal object of *aušteni* in l. 12 should be singular: *šu-me-ša-aš*, as opposed to *šu-me-ša-aš*.

According to CHD (S, s.v. *-šan B 1 b* 25', p. 137) *KAŠKAL-an* here “is accusative of the way, not dat.-loc., although the particle *-šan* justifies translating it as ‘on.’”

*nu ma-a-an* *LÚ.MES*-NÍ.ZU-*TIM* ta-*ma-i-iš(-)x x[. It is not clear if *tamai*- modifies *LÚ.MES*-NÍ.ZU-*TIM* or a noun in the break. *tamai*- could theoretically modify the noun it follows if the latter is written logographically and without phonetic complement, but in this case *LÚ.MES*-NÍ.ZU-*TIM* and *ta-*ma-i-iš clearly do not agree in number. Von Schuler (1965: 119) considers *tamaiš* a substantivized adjective and supplies “(oder)” in his translation: “Wenn Späher, (oder) aber ein anderer.” Note, however, that von Schuler’s reading *ta-*ma-i-iš-*ma* (implied by his translation “(oder) aber ein anderer”; 1965: 119) is problematic. First of all, the traces visible on the copy or photo do not quite fit *ta-*ma-i-iš-*ma*. And furthermore the contrastive (-a/-)*-ma* cannot be attached to *tamaiš* unless the latter is the first word of a new clause. One solution would be to attribute the incongruence of the plural noun and the singular adjective to scribal error (especially since the parallel had a singular noun in this passage—see above).

---

408 See Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 395-96) on the position of *-ma.*
30’ šu-me-en-za-na-an-za-an is may be interpreted as šumenzan za an za šan, although the spelling -za-an of the particles -za and -šan is an OH phenomenon (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 374). As an alternative interpretation, the repetition of the nom.acc., (sg. or pl.) enclitic pronoun after a dat./-loc. enclitic pronoun or the reflexive particle -za is unlikely, since according to Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 411-12) this is a late New Hittite phenomenon, first attested in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, written by Muršili II (where it might be attributed to the later scribe who copied the text). This instance would thus be the earliest attestation of this phenomenon, preceding the next attestation by almost a century.

40’ wally-, if restored correctly, has no direct object in this clause.


43’ Although this restoration—with von Schuler, who translates “Wer aber der Sonne” (1965: 119)—makes the most sense and fits the space as well as the sign traces, it is problematical grammatically. According to Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 395, 397), the non-geminating topicalizing/contrastive marker -a(/-ma) still appears in the MS/MH period, but only “extremely rarely” after anything other than independent personal pronouns. ⁴⁰⁹ Even if we consider kuiš-za a one of the extremely rare examples, -ma in dUTU-Šl-ma, if this restoration were correct, would be redundant.


59’ na-aš-ša-na, according to von Schuler, represents nu zāš zāšan za a, and regards this as “nicht eben häufiger” evidence that nu and -a/-ya are not mutually exclusive. Hoffner ⁴⁰⁹ This example is not cited by Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 395).
and Melchert (2008: 410-11), however, assert that “if the sentence starts begins with nu, šu, or ta . . . neither -a/-ma nor -a/-ya can follow.” We may therefore emend na-aš-ša-na to na-aš-ša-an’.

60’ ú-e-eš-wa-az li-in-ki-ya. Among the terminology used to describe taking or being under oath that take the dative linkiya, linkiya kattan da- is the most commonly used in the Kaška texts, used most of the time with -za. We may therefore restore [kattan daiwen] at the beginning of l. 61’: “we have placed ourselves (-z) under oath” or “we have placed (it) under oath for ourselves (-z).”\(^{410}\) Note however that linkiya ar- ‘to stand by the oath’, is also possible. linkiya kattan ki- is to be excluded, since it only has the obligation/command as its subject (CHD L-N, s.v. lingai- 1b 4’, p. 65; and with von Schuler 1965: 128).

61’ ḥar-ru-wa-ni (1st pl. pres. of ḥark-) is an uncommon MH form.

ú-e-ša šu-ma-a-aš-pát ḥar-ru-wa-ni and in a different context KUB 26.19 ii 23’ (CTH 138.3.A): ma-a-an LÚ KÚR-ma wa-al-aḥ-zi ú-e-ša šu-me-eš-pát ḥar-ú-e-ni have been interpreted in two different ways. Von Schuler suggested (1965: 128) that the verb ḥar(k)- was used idiomatically in both instances, with the meaning “wir nehmen für euch Partei/wir und ihr halten zusammen.” He thus translates (respectively): “Und wir halten nur zu euch!” and “so(?) werden wir nur zu euch halten” (1965: 120, 132). According to von Schuler šumaš and šumeš are datives rather than accusatives. HW2/H4 (s.v. ḥar(k)-, VI 3.6, p. 289) cites these two examples (among others), and follows von Schuler’s suggestion as to their meaning and case (i.e., dative).

\(^{410}\) It appears that linkiya was the last word in obv. 60’.
CHD S2 translates KUB 26.19 ii 23’ differently (s.v. šarni(n)k-, to provide context for ii 25’-28’): “Since you are friends, cattle (and) sheep of Ḩatti and Gašga are mixed and cowherds and shepherds work together. But if an enemy attacks, we will hold you alone responsible.” CHD’s translation of KUB 29.19 ii 23’ is more appropriate, since it is determined later in that paragraph that the recipients of the treaty are responsible for making restitution in the instance of an enemy attack. Furthermore, the use of the independent personal pronoun šumeš (originally 2nd pl. nom.) for the 2nd pl. oblique (acc., dat.-loc.), which would be the case in KUB 26.19 ii 23’, is a “late” phenomenon according to Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 134). My interpretation of obv. 61’ follows CHD S2. We may take the lack of the quotative particle -wa as a further indication that û-e-ša šu-ma-aš-pát ḥar-ru-wa-ni was not part of the preceding quoted speech of the partners of the agreement.

Reverse

Von Schuler’s (1965: 120) translation of §24’ follows Sommer (1938: 129-30), in the context of the latter’s discussion of the legal status of the GIŠTUKUL people (128f.)


Note that Sommer’s line numbering has been changed to match the numbering in the present edition.

64’ uda- at the end of the line should be emended to ū-da-<i>; see. rev. 64’, 66’.

The subject of the sentence (the person who brings the goods of his master) is unfortunately broken here, as well as in rev. 66’. The restored ARAD ‘slave’ in rev. 64’ and 66’ is based on Sommer (see above); the occurrence of BE-LI-ŠU here and in rev. 64’ indicates, according to Sommer, that the agent/subject should be ARAD. Sommer further suggested that the GIŠTUKUL-man from Ḫatti (l. 64’) corresponded to the LÚ ELLUM from Kaška (that is, if we understand apezzïya ‘from there’ correctly). He further suggests that “primitive” Kaška society did not possess “die feinere ständische Differenzierung” of the Hittites (Sommer 1938: 129).

65’ a-pé-e-ez-zi-ya = apezzïya, according to HW2 A, (s.v. apa⁻² 5. 6. d, p. 143), and means “von dort.”

ták-šu-la-aš here is most probably a free-standing genitive (“he of the oath”) contra von Schuler (1965: 128), who takes it as a nominative, instead of the customary genitive construction LÚ takšulaš (rev. 71’, 76’).

66’ The parallel CTH 138.3.A (KUB 26.19 i 18’) confirms the restoration of I-NA KUR URU Ha-at-ti in the break at the beginning of this line, but since there seems to be barely enough space for these signs, Sommer’s addition of ku-iš-ki (see above) may be disregarded.

⁴¹² There doesn’t seem to be enough space for all five signs.
Von Schuler’s restoration and translation, though tentative as he himself confesses (1965: 121), make sense; we may assume that hostages from Kaška should be in Ḫatti.

*apadda* functioned as a local adverb (‘there, thither, to that place’) as opposed to a causal one (‘for that reason’).

The transitive verb lacks an accusative object in the clause *na-aš-ma-za-kán / LÚták-šu-la-aš-pát a-pé-en-za-an Ûku-e-ri an-da ú-e-mi-e-iz-zi*. The lack of an accusative in the clause when the verb is transitive, plus the occurrence of the reflexive particle *-za* may indeed indicate that the subject of the transitive verb was also the direct object (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 358). But since “or even an allied man finds himself in his territory, and he seizes him” is nonsensical, the understood direct object of the transitive verb (*wemiya-*) must be the *LÚpít-te-ya-an-za* mentioned in rev. 70’, which should have been resumed by a 3rd sg. acc. enclitic pronoun, as we see in the following clause. We may interpret the omission of the acc. object as ellipsis or a mistake. The function of *-za* in this scenario is to identify the possessor (*a-pé-en-za-an*) with the grammatical subject of the clause (*LÚták-šu-la-aš-pát*): “or even (*-pat*) an allied man finds (him) in his own (*-za*) territory, and seizes him.”

We may translate *LÚták-šu-la-aš-pát* simply as ‘ally’—a free-standing genitive like *linkiyaš* ‘man of the oath, sworn man’; contra von Schuler (1965: 121), who translates “Einwohner selbiger verbündeten (Stadt).”

*ep-* could also be an imperative, “the entire city shall seize the one man,” contra CHD L-N (s.v. *natta* g2’, p. 417). It is not clear if the acc. enclitic pronoun *-an* (and 1
LÚ if it is in apposition to -an) refers to\[pít-te-ya-an-za\] ‘fugitive’ (rev. 70’) or \[Lú-ták-šu-la-aš\] ‘ally’ (rev. 71).

We may offer a slightly different interpretation by restoring na-aš-ma in rev. 72’ between 1 LÚ and URU-aš: n[a-an]-za\[413\] 1 LÚ <na-aš-ma”> URU-aš ḫu-u-ma-an-za wa-aš-túl-li e-e[p-zí], “and (the) one man (the ally) <or> the entire city shall seize him (the fugitive), in delicto.”

73’ The “man of Ḫatti” who comes “from Kaška Land” to an allied city “in the manner of a fugitive” was probably a Hittite fugitive trying to return to Ḫatti from Kaška.

74-75’ The restored imperatival negative le-e in e-ep-ši-ma-an [le-e] remains in force in the following two clauses: e-ep-ši-ma-an [le-e na-a]n EGIR-pa I-NA KUR\[414\] URU Qa-aš-ga / [na]-it-ti na-aš-ma-an-za I-NA KUR \[URU Ḫa-at-ti Ḫa-ap-pi-ra-a ś[i], “you (sg.) [shall not] seize him and [s]end [h]im back to Kaška, or sell him in Ḫatti.”

We may interpret Ḫappariya- ‘sell’ as ‘ransom.’ That Kaška people sought to ransom Kaška individuals who were held hostage by the Hittite authorities is evident from HKM 102, an administrative document from Mašat Höyük that lists the ransom prices of Kaška hostages.\[414\]

76’ In nu-uš-ši xʷ\[…]-iš-ši the present ending -ši indicates that this clause is either the continuation of the conditional clause “If I, My Majesty, send a messenger to Kaška and you […] him (/to him),” or a prohibitive “If I, My Majesty, send a messenger to Kaška, you shall [not…] to him.”

\[413\] With CHD L-N (s.v. natta g 2’, p. 417).
\[414\] See the edition by del Monte (1995: 103-11)
76’-77’ Since “you shall not treat him like an ally” does not make much sense here, we may translate na-an-za LÚ ták-šu-la-aš / [le]-I-e1 mu-ga-a-ši nu-uš-ši ki-iš-ša-an le-e te-ši as follows: “as an ally, do not entreat him and say to him as follows”; with CHD (L-N, s.v. mugai- b1’, p. 322).

78’ CHD (L-N, s.v. mugai- b1’, p. 319) restores and translates rev. 78’ as “when you arrive up [in Ḫatti], run away and [come(?)] back to me.”

79’ Von Schuler (1965: 129) notes that the usual spelling for uišk- ‘to send’ is with U, and that the spelling with Ú is often the iterative of wišk- ‘to come’.


80’ See von Schuler’s (1965: 121) translation: “[Aber (auch) ins] feind[liche Land(?)] dürft ihr (sie) nicht bringen.”

81’ The 3rd sg. imperative š]a-a-ak-ku “let him know, take note” seems more likely than an adverbial form ending in -akku or d]a-a-ak-ku (suggested by Otten, cited in von Schuler [1965: 129]). The same verb form appears also in KUB 26.19 i 7’ (CTH 138.3.A), in a fragmentary context. The grammatical subject of the imperative verb may then be dUTU-ŠI.

Von Schuler’s restoration of §30’, so far as we can glean from his translation, makes some sense, but raises a number of questions. First, how do we interpret the relative clause beginning in rev. 82”? In his translation von Schuler (1965: 121) takes nu-

---

415 Die, die [aus dem Kaška-Land] ins Ḫattuša als Flüchtlinge zu ko[mmen und wieder (?)] aus Ḫattuša
73 bringen. Die [Kaškija]er, die nach Ḫattuša als Flüchtlinge [gekomm]en (?) (sind)
74 darf man [nicht (?)] ins [Kaška-Land] zurück bitten.
za \textsuperscript{URU}Ha-at-[u-ša-az]/\textsuperscript{URU}Ha-at-[u-ši...-i]š-mi le-e / \textsuperscript{Irči}št-ma-at-te-ni (rev. 83’-84’) as the apodosis of the relative clause, interpreting \textit{[...-i]š-mi} as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. dat.-loc. possessive pronoun accompanying \textit{utnē}/\textit{KUR} (see his translation “dürft ihr nicht [aus] Hattuša in euer [Land(?)] bringen”). However, in this scenario, the relative pronoun \textit{kuiēš} (rev. 82’) is not resumed in the apodosis. If, as another option, we restore \textit{na-at} in the break towards the end of rev. 82’ to resume \textit{kuiēš}, then the stipulations in this paragraph are rendered somewhat meaningless.\textsuperscript{416}

A second issue is that the transitive verb \textit{wida-} ‘to bring’ in rev. 84’ does not seem to have a direct object. Although it does not solve the problem of the lack of a direct object, an alternative to von Schuler’s restoration of \textit{[...-i]š-mi} as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. dat.-loc. possessive pronoun accompanying \textit{utnē}/\textit{KUR}, we may restore \textit{[kat-ti-i]š-mi} ‘with you’: “You shall not bring (them) [with y]ou from/to] Ḫattuša.”

83’ The choice of the iterative medio-passive (\textit{pa-iš-kán-ta}) form of \textit{pai-} probably had to do with the regularity of the action (i.e., “he keeps/will keep going”) and/or the plurality of the agent/subject of the intransitive verb of motion.

86’ For the restoration see the similar passage in KUB 26.19 ii 13’, 14’ (CTH 138.3.A), with von Schuler (1965: 122). There may, however, be space for more signs in the break. The restoration \textit{[ku-e]-ri(?) an-da} is very tentative (see von Schuler 1965: 122).

90’ The verb in the break should be the opposite of \textit{walla-} ‘praise’ with the approximate meaning ‘to insult, degrade’; with von Schuler (1965: 122), who restores “herabsetzen(?)”.

\textsuperscript{416}“Who(ever) comes from Kaška (or: “The men who come from Kaška,” or: “The men of Kaška who come”) into Ḫatti in the manner of a fugitive, goes back to Kaška as a fugitive.”
For a recent discussion of šinah₇a-, see HEG S2, (s.v. sina₇ha, sina₇₇uwar, p. 1045-48).

HW1, 190 lists šenah₇a- as a possible neuter (“n.?”) meaning “Hinterhalt.”

Goetze (AM 251) restores the break in the middle of rev. 96’ as ta-ak-šu-la-[a-i: “In addition, if you (sg.) are at peace (with) the enemy.” Von Schuler (1965: 130), too, understands this passage as a warning against a possible alliance between hostile and allied Ka₇ka. According to his restorations, in the instance of Hittite military action both the enemy (ku-u-ra-ra-aš-ša) and the allies (a-[ra-aš-ša) will die (a-[ki). The use of ara- instead of the customary takšulaš (rev. 96’), however, needs further explanation.

The restorations suggested here differ slightly from previous attempts. First, kūruraš and the restored takšula[šša] are best understood as free-standing genitives (for which see Yakubovich 2006: 45-47). Secondly, [ÉRIN’.MEÅ URU Ñatti does not have to be the subject of ši-na-ah-ha-an ḫar-zi in the second clause (contra von Schuler 1965: 122); it could also be the indirect object of šinah₇an ḫarta. The person (or people) for whom a trap is set appears in the dat.-loc. with ANA or peran (see van den Hout 2010: 5); therefore we may restore ANA ÉRIN’.MEŠ URU Ḥatti = ma šinah₇an ḫarta: “In addition, if the enemy [and?] allie[s…], and they (lit. he) set a trap [for the troop]s’ of Ḥatti, and attack them.”

Von Schuler (1965: 122, 130) suggests restoring ḫappar iya- (‘Handel treiben mit jemandem’), which would take the dative. Note, however, that ḫappar would precede lē in a negative clause; see rev. 99’. Instead, what we have here may be the ellipsis of ḫappar. On the other hand, one wonders if LÚ KÜR is an error for takšulaš ( “the ally shall not […] with/to the enemy.”)
104’ We may restore nini(n)k ‘to muster (troops)’, as in KUB 31.105, l. 18’, or uwa-‘to come’ in the break. The problem remains, however, that the break here in rev. 104’ does not seem to be long enough to accommodate both the end of pa-an-ga-[ri-it, the verb (nini(n)k/-uwa-) of the first clause, and the beginning of the second clause (probably na-aš-kā]n).418

KUB 23.77a

9’ ḥa pé-e-hu-te-mi. The frequent form is laḥḥi peḫute, with dat. laḥḥi, rather than the allative laḥḥa used here; see CHD L-N (s.v. laḥḥa-, p. 4-6).

10’ The broken context makes it difficult to decide whether šu-ma-a-aš-pát and ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Qa-aš-ga were accusatives in apposition (as per von Schuler 1965: 124), or whether ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Qa-aš-ga was actually the subject of the verb (which we may restore as uwa- or pai- accordingly).

11’ For peranžma paizzi see von Schuler’s commentary (1965: 130), Zuntz (1936: 86, 95, cited by von Schuler), and lastly CHD P (s.v. pai- A 1 j 24’ a’, p. 34).

---

417 In KUB 31.105, l. 18’ we have, in a similar context, ḾUR pa-an-ga-ri-it ni-ni-[, where the broken verb seems to have been nini(n)k-.

418 Von Schuler’s (1965: 123) translation “und wen]n er” does not take the subject clitic into account, which would have been obligatory due to the intransitive verb of motion.
CTH 138.3.A
KUB 26.19


Transliteration

Col. i

§1

1’ [ ] x-zi

2’ [ ]

3’ [ ]

4’ [ ] lx1 e-eš-zi

5’ [ ] x x x

6’ [ ] x-zi(-)x-ma(-)a(-)x x x-zi?

7’ [ ] n]a²-an ša-¹ak¹-ku

8’ [ ] a-pé-e¹da¹-ni-ya-aš-kán

9’ [ ] ši a-ki

§2

10’ [ ] pity-te-y]a-an-te-li ú-iz-zi

11’ [ ] -er-an-ma-an-za LÛ

12’ [ ] pity-te-y]a-an-te-li ú-iz-zi

13’ [ ] ur1 Ha-at-ti
14’ [ ] MUNUS ]x-$iz$-zi A-NA $\mid$ LÚ $\mid$ MU-TI $\mid$ ŠU $\mid$
15’ [ ] ḫa-ap-pár pa-a-i

§3’
16’ [ ] $\mid$ ú-$iz$-zi
17’ [ ] $\mid$ Ú-NU-T]E$^{ME5419}$ EGR-pa pa-iš-tén
18’ [ ] $\mid$ LÚ-ták-]šu-la-aš I-NA KUR $^{URU}$ Ha-at-ti
19’ [ ] $^{URU}$ Ha-at-ti $^{erasure}$
20’ [ ] tī-it-ta-nu]ut-tén
21’ [ ] ]x x x ]x-$iz$-zi$^1$

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. ii

§4”

x+1 [ ] ]x[
2’ [ ] ]lx x](a)-ši x x[
3’ [ ] ]lx nu-uš-ma-aš$^{(7)}$ dUTU-ŠI ku[-
4’ [ ] ]lx-$zi$ LÚ ku-u-ru-ra-aš-$\mid$ma$^7$ $\mid$ za$^7$-a$h^{420}$-]
5’ [ ] ]x x$^{421}$ le-e ú-wa-te-it-te-ni $\mid$ x[
6’ [ ] ]l$^{7}$-IN A$^{7}$ KUR-$^{1}$KU-NU$^{1}$ pé-$^{1}$e-da$^{1}$-at-te-ni nu-za ARAD$^7$[
7’ [ ] KUR $^{URU^G}$]a-aš-ga le-e ḫa-$^{1}$ap$^{1}$-pí-ri-iš-kat-te-ni [

$^{419}$ Von Schuler (1965: 131); KUB 23.77 rev. 55’, 56’.
$^{421}$ $a|n-\dot{a}da$ or ]x-\dot{a}ir\?
8'  [ ]  [x[  ]x[  ] er-ša-ap-pár ar-ša le-er[e

da-at-te-n(n)

9'  [ ]  [-g]a'-ni  ururu  ha-at-tu-ši  ḥa-ap-pár  le-e  i-ya-a[te-ni

10'  [ ]  [x-ya-at-te-ni  nu  er-a-ú-ri-ya-aš er  iš-ši-[i]-

11'  [ ]  nu-ša-ša ku-i]t  pé-e-da-an  a-er-ú-ri-ya-aš er  EN-aš  t[e422

12'  [nu-za]  ha-ša-ap-pár1  [a-pí-ya  i-y]a-at-te-ni  ZI-it-ma-az  ḥa-ap-pár  le-1e1

[i-ya-at-te-ni

§5"


14'  [ma-an-a]  ša-an-1  [o o o]x  uru-an  ZI-it  e-ša-ri


§6"

16'  an-da-ma-az  luš-taš[u-la-aš]  x  x  x423  [nu-za1-kán  lušku-u-ru-ra-aš  GU₄.HI.A

[UDU.HI.A]

17'  an-da  le-1e1  tar-na-at[te]-ni  ma-a-an  lušku-u-ru-r[a-aš  o]x  luš-taš-ša-la-aš-ša

[lúšu]sipagu₄  lušu]sipagudu]

18'  taš-ša-an  ū-e-si-ya-an-[d]a-ri  ÉRIN.MEŠ  ururu  ha-at-ti-ya[a-aš-kán  w]a-al-ah-z[i

19'  nu  ma-ah-ša-an  lušku-u-ru-ra-aš  GU₄.HI.A  UDU.HI.A  u-un-ni-ya-an-zi

20'  šu-me-en-za-an-na  QA-TAM-MA  u-un-ni-ya-an-zi  nu-ša-ma-er-ša-an-er

d[u-un-me-ni]424

422  See commentary for restoration.
423  The traces here may be compared to ii 21*: luš-taš-ša-la-aš-za  ku-it  šu-meš.
§7''

21'  LÚ. ták-šu-la-aš-za ku-it šu-meš nu ŠA KUR²⁰⁹ Ha-at-ti GU₄.ḪI. A [DU.ḪI. A
    šu-me-en-za-an-na GU₄.ḪI. A]

22'  UDU.ḪI. A an-da i-[mi]-ya-an-za er-nu LÛ. MEŠ SIPA. GU₄⁻er LÛ. MEŠ SIPA.UDU
ták-ša-an [n ú-e-ši-ya-an-da-ri]

23'  ma-a-an LÚ.KÚR-ma w[a-a]l-ah-zi ú-e-ša šu-me-eš-pát ḫar-ú-e-ni []

24'  šu-me-eš-pát u-un-n[a]-at-te-ni LÛ. MEŠ SIPA. GU₄⁻ya LÛ. MEŠ SIPA.UDU x[

25'  ma-a-na⁻er-aš-ta⁻er ku-na-an-zí-ya ku-in-ki na-aš-šu 1 LÚ na-aš-ma 111
    [GU₄ na-aš-ma² 1 UDU]

26'  nu a-pu-u-uš-ša šar-ni-ik-te-ni ŠA KUR²⁰⁹ Ha-at-ti-ya G[U₄.ḪI. A UDU.ḪI. A
    šar-ni-ik-te-ni]

27'  A-NA erasure 1 LÚ. EGIR-an 3 LÛ. MEŠ pí-iš-kát-te-ni A-NA 1 GU₄⁻ya [3 GU₄
    pí-iš-kát-te-ni]

28'  IŠ-TU 1 UDU 3 [UD]U-pát pí-iš-te-ni

§8''

29'  na-aš-ma ma-a-an⁻er-ki-iš-ša-an i-ya-at-te-ni⁻er nu šu-me-en-za-an GU₄.ḪI. A
    UDU.ḪI. A [ -te-ni]

30'  nam-ma ku-ku-pa-la-a-tar i-ya-at-te-ni nu A-NA GU₄.ḪI. A-KU-NU
    UDU.ḪI. A-KU-NU[

31'  LÛ. MEŠ er-x⁻er-[r]-i-ya-ḫi-uš⁻er ti-it-ta-nu-ut-te-ni⁻er erasure x[

x[ o-te]-ni nu ku-u-ru-ra-āš A-NA LÚ.MEŠ URUGa-āš-ga tar-te-nī šA [KUR

URU Ha-at-tī]

[nu-wa-r]a-at GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A tāk-ša-an ū-e-ši-ya-at-ta-ri [ ]


LÚ.MEŠ SIPA.U[DU ku-en-tēn]

[nu-wa-z]a URU Ha-at-tī ḫa-an-ni-eš-ni-it tar-ah-ḫu-un k[i]-

[GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A] pé-en-nir LÚ.MEŠ[GU₄-ya-wa LÚ.MEŠ SIPA.UDU-ya ku-[i-eš

[nu-wa-]aš-kān ku-en-nir ] erasure

§9’’

[ma-a-na š]u-meš LÚ.MEŠ tāk-šu-la-aš EGIR-an-da pa-it-te-nī nu-[z[a

[o šA KUR URU] ḫa-at-tī-ya-az GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A tāk-ša-an š[ar-ra-at-te-nī


[na-an L]I-IM NI-IŠ DINIR.MEŠ ap-pa-an-du na-an Q[A’-DU DAM-ŠU

DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU

[E75.MEŠ-ŠU GU₄.HI.A-ŠU UDU.HI.A-ŠU UZ₄.HI.A-ŠU [ ]

[GE]ŠTIN-it A.ŠA.[HI].A-ŠU OŠI[KIRI₆ GEŠTIN.HI.A-ŠU [ ]

[gi-im-r]a-āš ḫu-it-ni-it ḪUR.SAG.DIDL.HI.A-it [ ]

[ ] Ḫar-ni-in[,]kān-du na-āš-ta a-]

[text breaks off]
Translation

Col i

§1’

1’ [ ] he […]s.

2’ [ ]

3’ [ ]

4’ [ ] he is/will be.

5’ [ ] ...

6’ [ ] ...

7’ [ ] let him know/recognize it/him.

8’ [ ] And to/for that/him, he

9’ [ ] he dies/will die.

§2’

10’ [ ] comes in the manner of a [fug]itive

11’ [ ] man of Kaška

12’ [ ] comes in the manner of a [fug]itive

13’ [ ] man’s of] Ḫatti

14’ [ woman ….-]s(?). To her (lit. his) husband

15’ [ ] gives/will give payment.
§3’

16’ [ ] comes.

17’ [ ] give back [ the goo]ds!

18’ [ allyed [man] (in)to Ḫatti

19’ [ ] Ḫatti

20’ [ ] you shall [pla]ce.

21’ [ ] he […]-s.

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. ii

§4’

1’ Too fragmentary for translation

2’ Too fragmentary for translation

3’ [ ] And you/to you, My Majesty […

4’ [ ] he […]-s. But the enemy, ba[ttle” …

5’ [ ] do not lead here […

6’ [ ] you take into your land. And slave […

7’ [ K]aška, do not conduct trade! […]

8’ [ ] [do] no[t receive] payment! […]

9’ [ ] in’ Ḫattuša [do] not con[duct] trade! […]

10’ [ ] you […]. T[o] the province governor […

11’ [ ] the place [whic]h the Province Governor [tells² you,
§5”

12’ [co]nduct [trade there]! But on your own authority [do] not [conduct] trade!

§6”

13’ An ally shall not inhabit a city [of Ḫatti] on his own authority!

14’ If [     ] inhabits a city on his own authority,

15’ he (will be) an [enemy] of My Majesty, and he will fight him.

§7”

16’ In addition, an ally – Do not let in the cattle [and sheep] of the enemy!

17’ And if the [cowherds and shepherds] of the enemy[my     ] and the ally

18’ pasture together, (and) the troops of Ḫatti attack[k them],

19’ and when they drive the cattle and sheep of the enemy here

20’ they will drive your (cattle and sheep) here as well in the same manner. [We will] take them from you.

§8”

21’ Because you are allies, the cattle [and sheep] of Ḫatti [and your cattle]

22’ and sheep are mixed together, and the cowherds and shepherds [pasture] together.

23’ But if an enemy attacks, we shall hold you alone responsible […]

24’ you indeed drive here. The cowherds and shepherds […]

25’ If they kill anyone, either one man, or one [ox, or one sheep,]

26’ you shall make restitution them (i.e. the men) and [you shall replace the] cattle [and sheep] of Ḫatti as well.
27’ You shall give three men for one man, you shall also give [three oxen for one ox] and you shall give three [she]ep for one sheep.

§8’’

29’ Or if you do the following and [you …] your cattle and sheep,

30’ (and if) furthermore you take part in sedition,

31’ and you establish … -riasius men -to/for your cattle and sheep […

32’ and you …, and (if) you say to hostile Kaška men: “[ …] of Ḫatti]

33’ [ …he (sic) pastures them, (namely) the cattle and sheep, together […

34’ You shall drive away [the cattle (and)] sheep! And you [shall kill] the cowherds and shepherds!

35’ [ …] I have defeated the men of Ḫatti(?) by means of a legal case [

36’ they drove away [the cattle and shee]p. And the cowherds and shepherds too, w[ho”…

37’ they killed [t]hem.”

§9’’

38’ [And if] you, (as) allies, go back, and (for) your[selves…

39’ (and) d[ivide up] the cattle and sheep [of] Ḫatti together among yourselves […

40’ [ …you do not observe] the matter of the oath, and the [ …] of the oath,

41’ [the th]ousand gods of the oath shall seize [him], and they shall destroy him t[ogether with his wife, his children,

42’ his [hou]se?, his cattle, his sheep, his goats, […

43’ [ …] with wi[ne], his fields, his vineyards […]
with the animals of the [field], with the mountains […] 
And […] (text breaks off)
Commentary

Col. ii

8' Cf. KUB. 23.77a 4'-5' for the reconstruction ḫappar arḫa da- ‘to receive (lit. take away) payment’.

11’ Based on the sense of the sentence and the evidence from CTH 138.1.A (KUB 23.77 rev. 87’-88’: nu-uš-ši ku-in URU-an ḫỤ-EL MA-AT-GAL₉₈-TI ma-ni-yà-aḫ-zì), we would expect the verb maniyahḫē- ‘to administer, govern’ (with the meaning ‘to assign’ here) or pai- ‘to give’. However, the verb here (138.3.A, ii 11’) does not appear to be maniyāḫzi or pā since collation confirms that the last sign before the break looks more like t[ē] than m[a or p[a]. We may tentatively restore the missing verb as t[ezzi: “and which place the Province Governor tells you.”

12’ An imperative verb form would have been more appropriate here, as in KUB 23.77 rev. 88’ nu-za ḫa-ap-par a-pí-ya i-[e₁][ed-du].

13'-15’ §5’ (ii 13’-15’) is similar to 138.1.A §31’, but does not mention the Kaška men like the latter.

14’ Von Schuler (1965: 131) translates: “Wenn er a[uf dieser Seite (?) eine Stadt eigenmächtig besetzte.”

23’ See commentary for CTH 138.1.A rev. 61’ for the interpretation of weš ṣa šumeš ṣpat ḫarweni.

24’ As the object of šu-me-eš-pāt u-un-na-at-te-ni, we may restore GU₄,ḪI.A UDU,ḪI.A ŠA URU Hatti in the break at the end of the previous line (ii. 23’).
30'-31* LÚ.MEŠ x[-r]i-ya-ḫi-uš. The meaning of this title is not clear. The allied men were not supposed to entrust their cattle and sheep to them.

33' The n.-a. 3rd sg. enclitic pronoun -at, if the restored [nu-wa-r]a-at is correct, is in apposition with GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A. Together, they may have functioned as the object of wešiya- ‘to graze, pasture’, which would be transitive in this instance:425 “He (sic) pastures them, the cattle and sheep, together.” Or, they may have functioned as the subject of intransitive wešiya-: “They’, the cattle and sheep, graze together.” In the latter case, however, a sg. verb may be more likely. It is not, however, possible for -at to be the subject and GU₄.HI.A UDU.HI.A the object, since third person enclitic subject pronouns never appear in clauses with transitive verbs; see Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 280) with further literature. Contra von Schuler (1965: 132) and Neu (1968: 201) who translate: “[und] sie” weiden die Rinder (und) Schafe gemeinsam.”

32'-37’ The quotation which begins on ii 32’ continues till the end of the paragraph, as we can see from the use of the quotative particle -wa in ii 34’, 36’.

36'-37’ Following the remark in ii 35’, “I have defeated the men of Ḫatti by means of a legal case,” ii 36’-37’ describe the past actions of the men of Ḫatti, on account of which the speaker feels legally justified to urge the hostile Kaška men to do the same (ii 34’).

The gist of the passage is that the allied men are not supposed to encourage hostile Kaška people to drive away cattle and sheep of Ḫatti, or kill their shepherds and cowherds, even if they may feel justified (ii 37’: LÚ.MEŠ URU Ha-at-ti Ḫa-an-ni-eš-ni-it tar-ah-ḫu-un) after the men of Ḫatti have done the same (ii 36’-37’). With von Schuler

425 The verb wešiya- can be transitive or intransitive; see Neu (1968: 201) and Kloekhorst (2008: 1164). Note that wešiya- is intransitive in l. 18’, where it is restored.
The curse formula in §9’, ii 41’f concludes the series of conditionals in §§7’-9’, which concern (the movement of) cattle and sheep. Its position and function within the overall structure of the document is different from that of free-standing curse formulas attested in the Kaška agreements and “international treaties,” and from recurring curse/blessing formulas attested frequently in oaths and instructions, and also in some “international treaties.”

The inclusion of GE]ŠTIN-it ‘(together) with wine’ in this list (i.e, list of things that will be destroyed if the oath is broken) is unusual. Cf. von Schuler’s remarks on this topic (1965: 134).

426 As has been noted by von Schuler (1965: 133), such a transition from a series of conditionals (2nd pl.) to a curse formula (3rd sg.) is not uncommon. Von Schuler cites KUB 26.12 ii 10 (CTH 255.1.A), KUB 26.42 iii 2 (CTH 275), and KBo 5.3+ iv 32 (CTH 42).

427 CTH 137.A [ii 8’-17’], CTH 139.1 A [ii 11’-15’], B [ii 14’-18’], 139.2.A.

428 For attempts at classifying the curse/blessing formulas in Hittite documents, see Oettinger (1976: 76-82) and Giorgieri (1995: 52-53).
CTH 139.1

A: KUB 40.36 + KUB 23.78 + KUB 26.6 + KBo 50.67  
B: KBo 8.35  


Transliteration

Col. i

§1’

A1’ 

x+1 [ ]-iz-zi

A2’ [ ] -k]án EGIR-pa

A3’ [ ] LÚ.MEŠ IGI].NU.GÁL ú-ga-an

A4’ [ ] ]x pí-ih-ği

A5’ [ ] n]e-eh-ği

§2’

A6’ [ ] ku]-u-ru-ra-aš GUD.ḪI.A-un UDU.ḪI.A-un

Bix+1 [ ] -u]n

A7’ [ ] ]-aš’ dUTU-šI LÚ.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL

Bi2’ [ ] ] LÚ.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL

A8’ [ ] ]l-e1-ni LÚ URU Ha-at-ti-na-aš-kán

Bi3’ [ ] URU Ha-a]l-ti-na-aš-kán


Bi4’ [ ] URU Q/Ka]-a-aš-ka

A10’ [ ] -d]u KUR URU Ka-a-aš-ka-ma-an

Bi5’ [ ] ]x-du
Bi22’ [ ]-x-ₐ₄²⁹ an-da ḏUTU-Šl-ma DI-NAM
Bi23’ [ ]-p][i-ip-pí-pa nu ku-u-ru-ur
Bi24’ [ ] a-pí-y[a-ak-ku e-ep

§6’
Bi25’ [ ] za-a][m-mu-ra-e-ez-zi nu-uš-ši
Bi26’ [ ] x-na-aš a-ra-ah-zé-na-aš
Bi27’ [ ] a]r-du-ma-at

(gap of uncertain length at the beginning of col. ii)

Col. ii

§7’’
Bii1’ [ ] ]ɪhɑ][
Bii2’ [ ] x ták-[ʃ]u-la-aš [ ]
Bii3’ [ ] -i]z-[zi] nu e-eš-ḫar ki-ša-r[i₄³⁰]
Bii4’ [ ] x an-da Ū-UL tar-na-at-te-ni x[

Aii+x-I₄³¹ [ ] x x [ ] x x [ ] ] x x [ ] x x [
Bii5’ nu [ o o ] x x ɪyɑ][a]n-da-ma 4 URU.DIDL.Ḫ.A šu-me-eš nu-mu 40
ÉRI[N.MEŠ

Aii2’ [ ] ]x x x[ ] x x x[ ] x x x[ ] ] x x x[ ] x x x[ ] x x x[ ]

Aii3’ ku-wa-pí-[i(t )] ú-wa-te-et-ta-ni [(na-an-ša-ma-a)]š a-ap-pa
Bii6’f. ku-wa-pí-it x[ ] / ú-wa-te-et-ta-ni na-an-ša-ma-aš a-ap-pa

Aii4’ a-pí-y[a-(ak-k)]u pī-iḥ -ḥi
Aii7’ a-pí-y[a-ak-ku pī-iḥ-h[ɪ]]
Aii5' nu ka-aš[(a  li)]-in-ga-en i-ya-u-en nu DINGIR.MEŠ-[(mu-u)]š
ḥu-u-ma-an-du-uš

Bii8' nu ka-aša li-in-ga-[n] i1-ya-u-en nu DINGIR.MEŠ-mu-uš
ḥu-u-ma-an-du-uš

Aii6' tu-li-ya [(d)]a-i-u-e-en dUTU-un d1IM-an dZA-BA₂-BA₂ dLAMMA
Bii9' tu-li-ya da-i₁ u₁-en dUTU-un dIM-an dZA-BA₂-BA₂ dLAMMA-aš

Aii7' 4EN.ZU [(qŠT)]AR-in 4lš-ḫa-ra-an li-in-ki-ya-<aš> iš-ḫa-aš ne-piša-an

Aii8' DINGIR.MEŠ tāk-na-[(aš)] DINGIR.MEŠ ka-ru-ú-i-[l(i)]e-eš DINGIR.MEŠ
ŠA [(KU)]] UR[H]a-at-tī DINGIR.[(M)]EŠ
Bii10'f. DINGIR.MEŠ-e[433]/ tāk-na-aš DINGIR.MEŠ ka-ru-ú-i-[l]i-aš DINGIR.MEŠ
ŠA KUR UR[H]a-at-tī DINGIR.MEŠ-eš

Aii9' ŠA KUR UR[H]K[(a)]-a-aš-ka DINGIR.MEŠ 1ne₁-piš-te-e-kān
H[(UR)].SAG.HI.A-eš 1[(D)].MEŠ
Bii12' ŠA KUR UR[H]ka-aš-ka DINGIR.MEŠ 1ne₁-piš-te-e-kān
HUR.SAG.HI.A-eš ID.HI.A-eš

Aii10' na-at ki₁-e₁-da-ni li-i-[n(n)]-ki-ya ku-tar-ú-e-ni-er-eš a-erša-an-du

§9’’

Aii11' nu ma-a-an k[(u)]=u-uš li-in-ga-a-uš pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-du-ma-[at434] šu-ma-aš[(a
DINGIR.MEŠ-eš)]
Bii14' nu ma-a-an ku-u-uš li-in'-ga-a-uš pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-du-ma šu-ma-aša
DINGIR.MEŠ-eš

Aii12' pa-aḫ-ša-an-ta-ru n[(a-aš-ta)]435 QA-TI LUGAL-i ma-a-ú436 ši-iš-[(te)]=en
ma-a-n[(a-aš-ta)]
ma-a-na-aš-ta

432 Von Schuler suggests dZithariya here (1965: 110), but A 6’ has 4EN.ZU.
433 Cf. B ii 11’.
434 The duplicate KBo 8.35 ii 14’ has pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-du-ma, but in 26.6 the trace of a final vertical right
before šu-ma-aš[a] is visible, which suggests the preterit form (perhaps a mistake) pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-du-ma-at.
435 The duplicate KBo 8.35 has na-aš-ta, of which the TA sign seems to have been added later. Although
this is not sufficient evidence by itself, this may indicate that B was copied from A.
436 The use of imp. sg. 3 must be a mistake.

Aii14' DINGIR.MEŠ [Hu-u-ma-an-[(e-e)]š KUR.HI.A-KU-NU
URU.DIDLI.HI.A-KU-NU DAM.MI[(E)]Š-KU-NU
DUMU.MI[(EŠ-KU-NU)]
Bii17't. DINGIR.MEŠ-eš [Hu-u-ma-an-te-eš KUR.HI.A-KU-NU
URU.DIDLI.HI.A-KU-NU DAM.MES-KU-NU /
DUMU.MEŠ-KU-NU

Aii15' A.ŠÀ.HI.A-KU-NU GÎŠKIRI₆.GEŠTIN.HI.A-KU-NU GU₆.HI.A-KU-NU
UDU.HI.A-KU-NU har-ni-in-[(án-du)]
Bii18' A.ŠÀ.HI.A-KU-NU GÎŠKIRI₆.GEŠTIN.HI.A-KU-NU GU₆.HI.A-KU-NU
UDU.HI.A-KU-NU har-ni-in-kán-du

§10''

Aii16' nu ma-a-an Ṽ[(A)](NA) Ṽ[(UR)]Ru Ḥa-at-ti pár-[u]-wa-an-zi ú-wa-[u][(i)]t-te-ni
nu-uš-[(ma-aš-kán)]
Bii19' nu ma-a-an A-NA KUR URU₆ Ḥa-a[t-t]i pár-[u]-wa-an-zi ú-wa-at-te-ni
nu₆-uš-ma-aš-kán

Aii17' [(dZA-BA₆-BA₆-aš GÎȘ)]TUkul.HI.A-KU-NU a-ap-pa na-a-ù nu
šu-me-[(t)][n-za-an-pât UZ][U]
Bii20' dZA-er-BA₆-BA₆-aš-er GÎŠTUkul.HI.A-KU-NU N[U] l[(a)]1-ap-pa na-a-ù nu
šu-me-in-za-an-pât UZ[1]

Aii18' [(e-ez-za-aš-du GI.HI.A)]-KU-NU-ma-kán a-ap-pa na-a-ù nu
šu-me-in-za-an-pât
Bii20' e-ez-za-aš-du / GI.HI.A-KU-NU-ma-kán a-ap-pa na-ù l[(a)]1-ù nu
šu-me-in-za-an-pât

Aii19' [(ki-ir-še-mi-it iš)]-kar-ra-an-ni-ya-an
Bii21't. ki-ir-še-mi-it iš-kar-ra-an-ni-an[[-du]

§11''

UDU.HI.A-KU-NU
Aii20'f. [ x x x ] x GUD.HI.A-KU-NU /
Bii23' \( an-du-uḫ-še-eš \) le-e ūa-\( ū \)-[\( ša-an-z \)]1\( \text{a}^{437} \) nu-uš-\( [\text{m}] \text{a}^{438} \)-aš-kán NI-IŠ
DINGIR.MEŠ DUMU.ḪI.A-KU-NU
Aii21' f. [ ]-ma-aš-kán NI-IŠ
DINGIR.MEŠ / [ ]

Bii24' \( an-da-an \) kar-di-iš-mi-pā[t]\( \text{a}^{439} \)a-z-zi-\( iki \)-kán-du
Aii22' [ ]- du

§12''

Bii25' \( mHa-ti-ip-ta-aš \) mšu-u-nu-pa[-aš-ši-u]\( \text{a}^{440} \)mQa-a-\( \text{nu} \)-uš \( m \) Pî-iz-zi-zi-uš
Aii23' [ mPî-iz-z\]=zi-\( u \)-uš

Bii26' \( mPî-ru-ū-i-iš \) mKu-ri[-\( ya-a \)]-\( li-iš \) \( mTî- mi-it-ti-iš \) \( mTû-u-ut-tu-uš \)
Aii24' f. \[
\text{Aii25'} \text{f. } \text{mD}[\text{a-}]
-\( i \)=\( š \) [ ]-x [ ] t\( u \)-uš
\]

Bii27' \( mDa-a-da-aš \) mKa-a-aš-qa-[aš \( mT\)u-u-ut-tu-uš \( 9 \) LÛ.MEŠ \( \text{URU}^{9} \)Te-šê-ni-ip-pa
Aii25' f. \( mD[\text{a-}]
-x [ ] [ ]

Bii28' \( nu \) ke-e-a QA-TAM-MA \( [\text{li-i} \)n-ki-ir nu-za li-in-ki-ya
Aii26' f. \( ] / \) nu-za\( ^{1} \) li-in-ki-ya

Bii28 \( \) kat-ta-an QA-TAM-M[A ] dâ-i-e-\( \text{er} \)
Aii27' [ ]

§13''

Bii30' \( mPî-\text{ya-aš} \) mšu-nu-pa-aš-ši-iš \( 5 \) LÛ.MEŠ kat-ti-iš-mi \( \text{URU}^{9} \) Tal-ma-li-ya-aš\( ^{er} \)
Aii28' \( mPî-\text{ya-aš} \) mšu-u-nu-pa-[aš-ši-\( i \)š \( 5 \) L]\Û.MEŠ [ ]

Bii31' \( ^{\text{er}.} \)nu-za li-in-ki-ya tâk-šù-la-aš ut-tar kat-ta-an\( ^{\text{er}} \)
Aii29' nu-za li-in-ki-aš tâk-šù-la-aš ut-\( t\)ar kat-ta\( ^{1} \)-[an]

\( ^{437} \) There may not have been enough space for ūa-\( ū \)-[\( ša-an-z \)]1\( \text{a}^{437} \) in the break.
\( ^{438} \) The copy only shows two horizontals of the three of the sign MA. In the photograph, however, one can see the trace of the top horizontal. NOTE: the top horizontal of the MA sign seems to be shorter on this tablet.
\( ^{439} \) Cf. 139.2 i 11'.
\( ^{440} \) It is clear from the hand copy and the photograph that this sign had a single vertical at the end. The spelling \( mšu-u-nu-pa[-aš-ši-u] \) was probably a mistake since the PN ūumapāššu ends in -iš in the nominative on l. 30' of this tablet and on the duplicate KBo 50.67 ii 28'. Compare the PN Pizzizi(\( u \)), which in the nominative is written \( mPî-iz-zi-zi-uš \) in KBo 8.35 ii 25', KUB 26.6 ii 23', and \( mPî-iz-zi-iz-zi-iš \) in KBo 16.29 i 19'.
\( ^{441} \) KBo 50.67 ii 24' ff.
\( ^{442} \) Bo 5899 and Bo 8668 are unpublished.
Biii31' er-QA-TAM-MA-pát -er da-i-e-er 50 ÉRIN.MEŠ kat-ta-an da-i-e-er443
Aiii30' a-pé-ni-ša-an-pát da-a-i-er 50

§14’’

Biii32' mHa-te-ep-ta-aš l51 L[(Ú)].MEŠ kat-ti-iš-ši [ut-444]
Aiii31' f. mHa-ti-ip-ta-aš 5 LÚ.MEŠ kat-ti-iš-š[i ] / [nu]-za rāk-šu-[l]-aš

Biii33' l[li-li]([n-ki-ya]) [kat-ta-an] QA-TAM-MA-pát da-i-e-er444
Aiii32' f. li-in-ki-y[a ] / [d]a-a-i-e-er

Biii34' [ ]x] kat-t[a-an da-i-e-er
Aiii33’ 20 ÉRIN.MEŠ [kat-ta-an]d[a-]

§15’’

Biii35’ [ QA-TAM-M]A-pát

Aii35’ 20 ÉRIN.MEŠ kat-ta-an d[(a-i-e-er)]
Bii35’ f. 20 ÉRIN.MEŠ kat-ta-an da-i-e-er1 [ / ]

Aii36’ KUR [URU]Ha-ak-lml-š[i ]
Bii36’ f. [ URU Ha-ak]-mi-ša-ya’-wa’ az-za-an-za445

Col. iii

§16’’

Bii1’ ml Šu-na-i-li-iš mPa-al-du-ú lDUMU mAl-er-ti-it-ta-er-aš

Bii2’ DUMU mK[l]-a-zí-pí-ir-ri mŠu-na-i-li DUMU mPí-i-pé-el-lu-luš1

Bii3’ ml Šu-n[a-li] lDUMU mPí-ig-ga-pa-az-uz-u-i mHa-az-zi-na-aš

Bii4’ mlHi-mu-[i-l]i-[i]š DUMU mlD[a-l]-ti-i-li mKi-ip-pu-wa-aš LÚ.MEŠ

URUK Ša-ad-du-up-pa

443 da-i-e-er is written right below kat-ta-an, above the paragraph line.
444 There are traces of erased signs between B ii 32’ and 33’.
445 Von Schuler leaves B ii 36’ unread (1969: 111); see commentary and translation for a possible interpretation.
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Biii5’  nu-[i-za]1 l[i-in-ki-ya] kat-ta-an ki-iš-ša-an da-i-e-er AŠ-ŠUM ÉRIN.MEŠ-na-aš

Biii6’ [ ]x-ta nu-un-na-aš túh-ḫu-in da-an-du

Biii7’ [ ]x-zi-ya ki-iš-šar ta-ma-an(-)x-[ša]-1-an

Biii8’ [ ]-ni

§17’

Biii9’ [ ]x(-)pi-[lu]-7-x-aš2 an-zi-el-[la]-an1-na-aš

Biii10’ [ ]x446-te-ni nu-[u]n-na-aš

Biii11’[ n]a-aš-kán ë[ku]-iš1 ke-e-[z2]


Biii13’ [ ]x-en ma-an-kán

Biii14’[ ]ú-e-ez-zi

Biii15’ [ ]-e2]-ni

§18’

Biii16’ [ ]x-[a]-UR] ḫa-at-tu]-ša-az ú-e-ez-zi na-an ku-iš

Biii17’ [ ]-[e]-1-ni na-[an EGI]R-pa A-NA dUTU-ŠI x-[ú]-e-aš

Biii18’ [ ]x [k][a]-1-ta-an ar-ḫa pa-iz-zi na-an VU-[UL]-1 ku-iš-ki

Biii19’ [ ]w[a]-aš-túl li-in-ki-ya-at

Biii20’ [ ]x

§19’

| Biíi22’ | ]x a-ap-pa-ma [ ]x-zi |
| Biíi23’ | ]x e-eš l[u- |
| Biíi24’ | ]-lzi1 [ |
| Biíi25’ | ]-ši |

(gap of uncertain length)

**Col. iv**

§20’’’

| Biv1’ | ]x(-)nu[ ]x[ ] |
| Biv2’ | ]x-i-[Ta-at1 ]l[a-ah-hi-ma ú-e-mi-ya-mi |
| Biv3’ | n]a-a-i² |

§21’’’

| Biv4’ | ]x-ša-zu-wa LÚ URU Ta-ka-aš-tu-ri-ya |
| Biv5’ | ]x da-ma-iš m[Tu-u1-ud-du |
| Biv6’ | -p[í-ya-ri-iš-ša [ o o ]-li |
| Biv7’ | ]x LÚ URU Te-e-p[a o o ]x-laz1 x[ ] |
| Biv8’ | ]l[ya-aš-ša1 [ ] |

(text breaks off)

447 Or p[a-iz-zi].
Translation

Col. i

§1’ (A i x+1-5’)

A i 1’ [ ] he [...]-s.
A i 2’ [ ] back
A i 3’ [ ] the blind [men ]. But I
[ ] him/it.
A i 4’ [ ] I (will) give.
A i 5’ [ ] I (will) [t]urn.

§2’ (A i 6’-13’)

A i 6’ [ ] the oxen and sheep (acc.) of the [e]nemy
A i 7’ [ ] My/His Majesty, the blind men
A i 8’ [ ] we [ ]. (To?) us, a/the man of Ḫatti
A i 9’ [ ] we will continuously give [t]roops of

Kaška

A i 10’ [ ] let him/them [ ]! But the land of

Kaška

A i 11’ [ ] But troops [ ] comes back.
A i 12’ [ ] back [ ] humans (acc.) [ ] further/forth
A i 13’ [ ] let them be [ ]!

§3’ (B i 9’-14’)

B i 9’-11’ Too fragmentary for translation
§4’ (Bi 15’18’)

B i 12’ releases only there/then.
B i 13’ after two (or) three months
B i 14’ he shall go to his house.

§4’ (Bi 15’18’)

B i 15’ comes to fight
B i 16’ But to My/His Majesty, for help
B i 17’ we [ ]. And hostages (acc.)
B i 18’ we[e ].

§5’ (Bi 19’-24’)

B i 19’ the province [governor] does not provide.
B i 20’ he shall come. But hostility [ ]
B i 21’ he/they [ ]. But you [ ]
B i 22’ in [ ]. But My/His Majesty

[ ] the legal case.
B i 23’ (-)pippipa. And hostility [ ]
B i 24’ seize him on[ly there/then]!

§6’ (Bi 25’-27’)

B i 25’ he [opp]resses. And to him
B i 26’ the surrounding […]-s
B i 27’ you (pl.) shall stand!

(gap of uncertain length at the beginning of col. ii)
§7”’ (B ii 1’-6’)

B ii 1’ Too fragmentary for translation

B ii 2’ [ ally [...

B ii 3’ [ he […-]s, a bloody deed will occ[ur...

B ii 4’ [ you (pl.) do not let inside [...

B ii 5’ And [...]. But within, you have four cities. And to me, 40 troops [...

B ii 6’ And I will not give Šapallina back to you. Where you bring [...], I will give him back to you

B ii 7’ only there.

§8”’ (B ii 8’-13’, A ii 5’-10’)

B ii 8’ We have hereby made an oath. We have placed all the gods

B ii 9’ in assembly: the Sun God, the Storm God, ZABABA, the Protective Deity,

the Moon God,

B ii 10’ Ištar, Išhara, the Lady’ of the Oath, the deities of the heaven(s),

B ii 11’ the deities of the earth, the primeval deities, deities of the Land of Ḫatti,

B ii 12’ deities of the Land of Kaška, the sky, the earth, the mountains, the rivers.

B ii 13’ Let them be witnesses to this oath!

§9”’ (B ii 14’-18’, A ii 11’-15’)

B ii 14’ And if you respect these oaths, the gods

B ii 15’ shall protect you too! You shall thrive and prosper in the hand of the king!

B ii 16’ And if you transgress these oaths,
B ii 17’ all the oath deities shall destroy your lands, your towns, your wives,
B ii 18’ your children, your fields, your vineyards, your cattle, your sheep!

§10’ (B ii 19’-21’, A ii 16’-19’)
B ii 19’ And if you come to chase off the land of Ḫatti,
B ii 20’ The War-god shall turn back your weapons, and devour your own flesh!
B ii 21’ He shall turn back your arrows, and they shall pierce your own hearts!

§11’ (B ii 22’-24’, A ii 20’-22’)
B ii 22’ And when you transgress the oath, your cattle, your sheep
B ii 23’ and your people shall not beget children! And the oath deities
B ii 24’ shall devour your children even inside you!

§12’ (B ii 25’-29’, A ii 23’-27’)
B ii 25’ Ḫatipta, Šunupašši, Qānu, Pizzizi,
B ii 26’ Pirwi, Kuri[ya]lli, Timitti, Tūttu,
B ii 27’ Dāda, Kāška[-…, T]ūttu, (with them) nine men (from) the city Tešenippa.
B ii 28’ These swore likewise, and placed themselves
B ii 29’ in the same manner under oath.

§13’ (B ii 30’-31’, A ii 28’-30’)
B ii 30’ Piya, Šunupašši, five men with them (of) Talmaliya
B ii 31’ They placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same
manner. Fifty troops they placed (under oath for themselves).
§14’’ (B ii 32’-34’, A ii 31’-33’)

B ii 32’ Ḥatipta, with him five men of Yaḥrišša.

B ii 33’ And they placed the word of the treaty under oath for themselves in the very same manner.

B ii 34’ Twenty troops they placed (under oath for themselves).

§15’’ (B ii 35’-36’, A ii 34’-36’)

B ii 35’ The city Kapiruḥa, the city of T[a-…] they placed twenty troops under oath in the very [same manner].

B ii 36’ [ “And the land of Ḥakmiš is […”

Col. iii

§16’’ (B iii 1’-8’)

B iii 1’ Šunaili, Paldū son of Atitta?,

B iii 2’ son of Kazzipirri, Šunaili son of Pïpellu,

B iii 3’ Šunaili son of Piggapazzū, Ḥazzina,

B iii 4’ Ḥimuili son of Datīli, Kippurūwa, men of Šadduppa.

B iii 5’ They thus placed themselves [under] oath. Concerning the troops, to us

B iii 6’ [ And (to?/for?) us they shall “take smoke.”

B iii 7’ [ ]

B iii 8’ [ we [ ].

§17’’ (B iii 9’-15’)

B iii 9’ [ ] of us, to us

B iii 10’ [ ] you (pl.) [ ]. And to/for us
§18’’ (B iii 16’-20’)

B iii 16’] comes from [Ḫattuša. And who [ ] him
B iii 17’] we [ ]. And [ him] to/for

My Majesty
B iii 18’] goes away. Whoever [ ] him
B iii 19’] sin. To the oath, it
B iii 20’] ]

§19’’ (B iii 21’-25’)

B iii 21’] comes into the land of Kaška
B iii 22’] back
B iii 23’] be (imp. 2nd sg.)! […
B iii 24’ Too fragmentary for translation
B iii 25’ Too fragmentary for translation

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. iv
§20’’’ (B iv 1’-3’)

B iv 1’ Too fragmentary for translation
B iv 2’ [ ] But I will find on a [ca]mpaign.

B iv 3’ [ ] he t]urns.

§21’’’ (B iv 4’-8’)

B iv 4’ [ ] …-[šazuwa, man of Takašturiya,

B iv 5’ [ ] (an)other Tūddu

B iv 6’ [ ] …-[yarišša, […]li

B iv 7’ [ ] man of Tēpa[-…

B iv 8’ Too fragmentary for translation

(text breaks off)
Commentary

Col. i

We may assume that the referent of the sg. 1 pronoun and verbs in §1’ is the Hittite king.

B i 12’ a-p[i]-ya-ak-ku tar-na-i. The adverb *apiyakku* is attested three times in 139.1 (B i 12’, 24’, ii 7’; A ii 2’). It is translated as “ebendort” by von Schuler (1965: 109ff.), as “dort; dann; dabei” in HW2 (184-85), and as “even then” in HED (I: 89). Although it is not clear whether *apiyakku* functions as a local or temporal adverb in this context, following Hoffner’s suggestion (1995: 194) it is translated here as “only/just there/then.” Note, however, that Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 412) translate *apiyakku* in KBo 8.35 ii 7’ simply as “there” which would actually be synonymous to *apiya*. Hoffner’s earlier suggestion seems more likely, especially when we consider B ii 6’-7’ below, where *apiyakku*, with the meaning ‘only there/then’, seems more appropriate.

B i 21’ zi-ga-az-za-an = zig az za ŝan.

B i 23’ The meaning of (~p[i]-ip-pí-pa) is unclear. It may be a personal name, similar to the personal name Pi(p)pa(p)pa attested four times in the Maṣat Letters; see Alp (1991: 86-87) and Hoffner (2009: 96).

Col. ii

B ii 5’ *nu* [ ] x x lya[1]n-da-ma 4 URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A šu-me-eš. Von Schuler’s (1965:115) suggestion, namely that *anda ṣma* functioned here as a free-standing local adverb with the meaning “in addition, furthermore” (which is well-attested in MH/MS texts, especially the Kaška texts) is not very likely, since *anda ṣma* used in the abovementioned manner is paragraph initial, connecting the new paragraph to the
preceding one (CHD L-N s.v., -ma 2’a’, p. 96; HW2 s.v. andan IV 1 c, p. 102). Nor is there enough space for Otten’s suggestion [EGIR-a]n-da-ma (cit. in von Schuler 1965: 115). The simplest solution would be to translate “But (there are) four cities of yours within,” and assume that andama refers to something in the preceding, unfortunately broken, clause.

Was šumeš simply an error for (genitive) šumaš, or a dative of possession? The latter is somewhat problematic since the use of šumeš as a d.-l. pl. is a “late” phenomenon (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 134) and thus excludes the MH period.

A ii 2’-3’, B ii 6’-7’ The major difficulties here are:

1) The verb uwatettani in the first part of the clause lacks a direct object (cf. KUB 23.77 rev. 70’: …n]a-an-ma ku-wa-plí ú-wa-te-it-ta-ni na-an A-NA dUTU-Š[I …]. The object of uwatettani might have been in the break after kuwapit in B ii 6’, and in the small break between kuwapit and uwatettani Aii 3’. The latter could accommodate only one or two signs, however.

2) Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 412) translate this clause as a negative rhetorical question “whither will you escort him, that I shall give him back to you there?” so that it agrees in meaning with the preceding negative statement in B ii 6’ “I shall not give Šapallina back to you.” However, if apiyakku has a different, more restrictive meaning than apiya ‘there’, namely ‘only then/there’, a more accurate translation would be: “I will not give Šapallina back to you. Where you bring…, only there will I give him back to you.”

Note also that the dat.-loc. pl. 3 enclitic pronoun -š(a)maš comes after the acc. 3rd sg. enclitic pronoun. Normally the dat.-loc. 3rd pl. enclitic pronoun comes before the
nom.-acc.-comm./neut. 3rd sg. enclitic pronoun, while the dat.-loc. 3rd sg./pl. comes after them. The exceptional cases where the dat.-loc. pl. 3 comes after the nom. or acc. comm./neut. 3rd sg./pl. enclitic are from documents composed originally in the OH or MH periods (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 412).

A ii 6’-B ii 9’ As was already noted by von Schuler (1965: 115), tuliya da- ‘to place in assembly’ is an unusual expression; Hittites normally “summoned” (ḥalzai-) their deities to assembly. Note that HEG (T, D/3 429) does not mention tuliya da-.

Aii7’, Bii 10’ For ḫišaraš linkiyaš išhaš, see commentary to 138.1.A, obv. 5.

A ii 7’ nepišan may be the older form of the genitive plural, with von Schuler (1965: 115), or a simple mistake due to the chain of accusative endings preceding nepišan.

B ii 11’ ka-ru-i-li-aš seems to be a mistake; see the correct form in A ii 8’.

B ii 25’-27’ Since the number of PNs listed here are eleven, 9 LÚ.MEŠ URU Tešenippa following them must be in addition to them (i.e., to the eleven men who are listed by their names). We may thus supply “with them” (Hittite kattišmi, which, perhaps, was erroneously omitted) in the translation; see B ii 30’, B ii 32’.

A ii 29’ li-in-ki-aš in A ii 29’ should be emended to li-in-ki-ya (cf. B ii 31’).

A ii 36’, B ii 36’ The reading and meaning of the series of damaged signs are unclear. Although we do not understand az-za-an-za or the role of the quotative particle ṣwa, we may tentatively translate “and the land of Hakmiš is x-ant.”

Col. iii
B iii 5’ I agree with Beal (1992: 1, n. 1) that ÉRIN.MEŠ-na-aš is the first word in the sentence, to be analyzed as ÉRIN.MEŠ + 1st pl. enclitic pronoun -naš. The Akkadian AŠŠUM preceding ÉRIN.MEŠ-na-aš indicates a Hittite postposition or case marker.

B iii 6’ tuḫḫuin dandu, literally “they shall take smoke,” was probably used idiomatically. Its meaning is unclear.

B iii 19 wašдуl here is most likely the predicate of a nominal sentence and linkiya = (a)t the beginning of a new clause.
The better-preserved paragraphs of CTH 139.2 (§§1’-3’) are parallel to CTH 139.1.A and B §§8’-11’.

A separate translation and commentary was therefore not deemed necessary.

This paragraph seems to correspond to CTH 139.1.A and B §8’, containing the list of divine witnesses.

See CTH 139.1.A ii 13’.

See CTH 139.1.A ii 13’-15’ and 139.1.B ii 16’-18’; note however, that both 139.1A and B have the blessing formula, which is omitted in 139.1.

See CTH 139.1.A ii 16’-22’ and 139.1.B ii 19’-24’.
Manuscript 139.1.B (KBo 8.35 ii 24’) and partially 139.1.A (KUB 40.36+ ii 22’) have kar-di-iš-mi-pāt[t a]z-zi-ik-lā-kān-du. In 139.2 however, there doesn’t seem to be enough space between l.11’ and the paragraph line to allow the restoration of a final line containing the verb az-zi-ik-lā-kān-du. But since the lines were written with an upward slant, there seems to be more space for an extra line in KUB 31.104, and we may therefore assume that there was enough space for az-zi-ik-lā-kān-du in the break between KBo 16.29 and KUB 31.104, probably written smaller than the rest of the paragraph. The alternative is that the verb az-zi-ik-lā-kān-du was omitted erroneously.

454 ¹MEŠ¹?
§6’

19’ ṁx x-ax₃? mmapP-[l-iz-zi-iš mmap

20’ ták₃-šu-la-ax₃ ut-[tar] kat-ta-an QA-TAM-MAP₃-p₃

21’ [l]i-in-1k]₁-y[a N ÉRIN.MEŠ da-i-[e]₃-er

§7’

22’ [ ]x x[ ]x x[ ]

(gap of uncertain length)

Col. ii

§5”

x+1 ₁na₃]-[  

2’ na-x[  

3’ ša-r[a-a  

4’ ḫal-zi-iš-  

5’ za-ah-ḫi-ya [  

6’ LÚKÚR EGIR[  

7’ A-NA KUR UR₃ ḫa]-at-ti  

§6”

8’ šu-me-ša-an [  

9’ ₁na₁]-an ÉRIN.MEŠ K[UR  

10’ nu li-in-[gai/ki-  

11’ ták-šu-la-ša [ut-tar kat-ta-an QA-TAM-MA-p₃
12’  da-i-e-er [  

§§7’’  

13’  mP[ -x[  

14’  mT[u-  

15’  4 É[RIN.MEŠ  

§§8’’  

16’  x[  

(gap)  

Col. iv  

x+1  URU]  

2’  KUR [RU?  

3’  A-NA[  

4’  na-x[  

5’  IM-M[A  

6’  [o] x x[  

7’  [o] x[  

(text breaks off)
CTH 140.1.A

KBo 50.64 (+) KBo 50.171 + KBo 50.63 + KBo 50.219 + KBo 57.22 + KUB 26.62 + KUB 19.17\(^{455}\) (+) 31.33


Col. i

1’ [ ] x[ ]

§2

2’ N+3 [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^1\)\(^{URU}\) Kat-[a]

3’ 6 [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) Hal-

4’ 5 [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) K[a]

5’ 5’ [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) ]x[

§3

6’ [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) K[a-

7’ [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) T[a- / G[a-] ] x [x[

§4

8’ [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) Tah-x-[ o o -m]i \(\tilde{p}\) é-ra-an-ma \(\tilde{m}T\)-\(\tilde{a}-t\)-\(\tilde{i}-i\)

9’ 5 [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) Ka-[ o o -y]\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{m}\) é-ra-an-ma \(\tilde{m}T\)-\(u\)-\(d\)-\(d\)-\(u\)

10’ 20 [ÉRIN.MEŠ\(^{URU}\) Ták-ku-\(\tilde{u}\)p]-\(\tilde{s}\)a é-ra-an-ma \(\tilde{m}P\)-\(\tilde{a}\)-\(\tilde{i}-\(\tilde{s}\)

\(^{455}\) Of KUB 57.22 (Bo 807) Košák (1988: 311) wrote: “Wohl sicher Truppenvereidigung. Es gibt keine späten Zeichenformen, daher handelt es sich wahrscheinlich um einen Kaškäervertrag.” The join KBo 50.63 + KUB 57.22 confirms Košák’s attribution of this fragment to the Kaška agreements.

\(^{456}\) Contra von Schuler (1965: 142), who reads \(\tilde{U}T\)[Ł].

\(^{457}\) Coll.
11’ [401 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Da-x[ o o ]x pé-ra-an-ma mŠe-me-ti-li-i[š

12’ 20 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ku-u458.-ri-x[ o o ] pé-ra-an-ma mŠu-na-i-li-iš1

§5

13’ 10 fÉRIN1.MEŠ URU Taḥ-pa-šar-r[a(-)]]-î-an’1 mTa-ti1,i-li-iš LÚ x[ 14’ pé-ra-an-na1 mHš-ap-[ ]x 50 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ga-[459
15’ pé-ra-an-na1 mGa-la-[ ]l-an mIš1-

16’ pé-ra-an-na mPí-x460.-[

17’ mŠa-zi-na-aš ḫu-wa-a-x461[

§6

18’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ta-pu-ra-a-ni pé-[ra-an-na mʔ

19’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Up-pa-aš-ši-it-ta p[é-ra-an-na mʔ

20’ pé-ra-an-na mḤi-mu-i-li-[š

21’ pé-ra-an-na mŠu-na-i-

22’ pé-ra-an-na mŠe-me-ti-[l]462.-iš7

§7

23’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ta-pu463.-[

24’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ta-r[a]464-

458 Appears clear on photo.

459 Groddek (2008: 57) reads URU Ga-[aš-ga. Note, however, that in other instances in CTH 140.1.A, the name Kaška is written with the initial KA sign; see KBo 50.63 + KUB 57.22.

460 Cf. von Schuler (1965: 143), who reads mKaš-š[i](-).

461 Cf. von Schuler (1965: 143), who reads ḫu-wa-a-i[š.

462 Photo confirms mŠe1-me-ti-[l; contra von Schuler (1965: 143): mTe2.-ti-[l]-iš7.

463 Confirmed by photo.
§8
25’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU[
26’ ú-wa-te-[e]z][-[z]_\textsuperscript{465}

§9
27’ 10 ÉRIN.MEŠ URU[x]
28’ [N] IÉRIN.MEŠ URU[Ti-i]p\textsuperscript{1}[-
29’ [N ÉRIN.MEŠ URU[Ti-i-l[a-
30’ [N ÉRIN.ME]Š URU[Da-ri-i[t-ta-ra]_\textsuperscript{466}
31’ [N ÉRIN.M]EŠ URU[Iš-ku-u-x[}

§10
32’ [o o ÉRIN.]MEŠ ú-wa-da-a[n-zi
33’ [mŠu-n]a-i-li-iš-š[a
35’ [ú-w]a-te-ez-zi 1 ME ÉRIN.M[EŠ

\textsuperscript{464} Cf. von Schuler (1965: 143): URU[Ta-][u\textsuperscript{2}].
\textsuperscript{465} With von Schuler (1965: 143).
\textsuperscript{466} With von Schuler (1965: 143, n. 5).
\textsuperscript{467} With von Schuler (1965: 143).
\textsuperscript{468} Von Schuler (1965: 143, n. 6) tentatively reads [k]at-ş[a].
§11
41’ [URES] Ka-am-ma-am-ma-š x
42’ šar-ra-at-ta-ri m[i-u]-x/o [i][i]
43’ [URES] Iš-ka-ḫa-aš-š[a k]u-i[t

§12
45’ [URES] a-am-ma-am-ma x x [i-
46’ [o o] an-da-an wa-š-t]úl x]
47’ [o Û-SAL]-LUM wa-ḫ[i]z(-)x[
48’ [o o o]-[a]1 / -y]a-u-e-nilu-wa-x[
49’ [o o o]-[e]1-nilu Û-SAL-LUM [o] x[
50’ [o o o]-ru LÚ.MEŠ [URES] Kaš-ka [URES] x x[

§13
51’ [o o o o o o] Ipi1-ti-ḫu-nu-ma-š m x[
52’ [o o ]x-ri1-ya1 x [o o -i]2 qa-mi-na-š m Pí-x[
53’ 1kat-ti1-iš-ši-ya 14 LÍ Û.MEŠ1 nu-za li-in-ki-[ya da-i-e-er’

§14
54’ mHi-mu-i-li-iš pí-ta1ḫu1-uš-ti-iš m x[

469 Û?
470 This broken sign looks more like a TU in the photo, though a badly written LI is also possible.
55’  kat-ti-iš-mi-ya 12 LÚ.MEŠ [lî]-in-ki-ya [a] da-i-e-e(r²
57’  kat-ta-an 30 ÉRIN.MEŠ da-i-e-e(r mŠ[i-
58’  nu-za li-in-ki-ya kat-ta-an N [ÉRIN.MEŠ472 da-i-e-e(r
59’  kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 9 LÚ.MEŠ nu-za [l][i-in-ki-ya] da-i-e-e(r²
60’  li-in-ki-ya-az ku-in kat-ta-[n] da-i-e-e(r²

§15

61’  LÚ.MEŠ URU Ka-aš-ka-az li-in-ki]-ya kat-ta-an da-i-e-e(r²
62’  SAG.DU dUTU-Šl-pát pa-ah-ḫa-aš-šu-wa-aš-[t[a
63’  iš-ta-ma-aš-ga-u-e-ni ku-iš-kán x[
64’  e-ep-zi na-aš-šu-wa-aš DUMU URU Ha-[t-ti
65’  LÚ[MEŠ URU Ka-aš-ka-ma-az GİŞ TUKUL-[-[n

§16

66’  an-da-ma ma-an LÚ URU Ka-aš-[k[a
67’  LÚ URU Ka-aš-ka le-e t[e²-
68’  [t][i]-lî-ya nu MA-ḪAR dUTU-Šl x[

§17

69’  [ ] x [ ] x [ ] x[

471 Or pî-i-ḫu-luš471? 
472 Grodek (2008: 56) reads the two verticals before the break as m[x], but based on the structure of i 6’, it is more likely that the two verticals represented the number of the troops that took the oath, i.e. the numbers 2 or 3.
Col. iv

§18’

x+1  [LÚ?1]\[RU?

2’  nu la-a-aḫ-ḫi [a]-pa-a-aš x[

3’  mTa-ḫa-aš-ša-aš LÚ URU x[

4’  ÉRIN.MEŠ-TI pé-ra-an ḫu-[i-

§19’

5’  mŠe-me-ti-li LÚ URU Ha-a-[a-

6’  LÚ URU Ti-i-pí-ya mTa-a-ti-[i LÚ URU

7’  mTa-me-et-ti LÚ URU Ti-ya-ri-eš(-)[

8’  mTa-ti-li LÚ URU Ka-pi-ru-\[1-[ha

9’  ke-e la-a-aḫ-ḫi ÉRIN.MEŠ-TI pé-ra-an [

§20’

10’  UM-MA mTu-ut-tu LÚ URU Ha-a-x[

11’  ma-ni-ya-aḫ-du nu-un-na-aš ták-š[a-an

§21’

12’  UM-MA mTu-ut-tu LÚ URU Ku-wa-ti [

13’  URU Ki-li-mu-na ku-wa-pi tu-u[z-zi

14’  \[ku]-wa-pí LÚ KÚR ḫu-ul-li-e-er [
15’ nu-un-na-ša-aš dUTU-ŠI a-ap-pa [  
16’ LÚ [URU]Pl-in-ta-la-aš-ša I-N[A’]  

---

§22’  
17’ [UM-M]A mHi-mu-i-li ša-ra-az’[-  
18’ [ o o ]-l-a[-1] Ú-UL e-eš-lta[-1] nu dUTU-ŠI k[u’-  
19’ [ o  ха]-r-ta nu x-x[-1]e[-1]-eš a-ša-an-z[i  
20’ [mHa’-a]n[-1]-ti-li[1] [ o o ti/š]a-ха-az-z[i  

---

§23’  
22’ e-ep-tén na-aš-lta[-1] IGI.HI.A-it [  
23’ [URU]Še-ri-iš-ša x[ o o M]EŠ I-NA [URU]Ši-x]  
24’ ú-me-e-ni nu 5 L[Ú’.MEŠ p][i]-iḥ-hi 12 ÉRIN.MEŠ [URU’]  
26’ mNa-ah-ḫu-wa-aš-ki x[ o ] I12’1 ÉRIN.MEŠ [URU]Ta-x[  

---

§24’  
27’ [URU]Ha-i-ši-iḥ-li-[Í]<sup>473</sup> o o ] x x[  
28’ [URU]Za-aš-pí-ya-aš mš[Í]<sup>e’-</sup>  
29’ [URU]Ta-aš-ta-ri-iš-š[a  
30’ A-NA x.HI.A ú-e-er na-x[  

---

<sup>473</sup> Іš is suggested by the nominative/genitive GN on iv 28’.

262
§25'
31'  \( \text{UM-MA} \text{ mNa-ah-\( \text{hu}-wa \)} \text{ L[Ú}^{474} \)
32'  \( \text{ša-an-}\text{hi-iš-kán-zi} \text{ URU[} \)
33'  \( \text{mTar-\( \text{hu-uḥ-ti-iš-ša-aš} \)} \text{ L[Ú}^{7} \)
34'  \( \text{[m]}\text{ši-me-ti-li-iš} \text{ MU } \text{H[I/KAM} \)
35'  \( \text{[I]}\text{Š-TU URU An-ku-ru-wa}^{7-x[} \)
36'  \( \text{[U]}\text{M-MA} \text{ mTu-ut-tu LÚ URU[U} \)
37'  \( \text{[n]}\text{u ma-a-an ku-u-uš IGI.HI.A[} \)

§26'
38'  \( \text{[U]}\text{M-MA mIš-ka-ri-x[} \)
39'  \( \text{[N+2]} \text{ LÚ.MEŠ I-NA URU Ka-ta[p}^{7-} \)
40'  \( \text{[a]}\text{n-da-ma I-NA URU[} \)
41'  \( \text{[m]}\text{Zi-pi-li-iš m[} \)
42'  \( \text{ú-e-ša-aš-ša-an x[} \)
43'  \( \text{mNa-ri-iq-qa-i-l[i} \)
44'  \( \text{A-NA GAL LÚ.MEŠ GEŠTIN x[} \)

§27'
45'  \( 50 \text{ ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Mu-ut-\( \text{ха}-l[i-} \)
46'  \( 50 \text{ ÉRIN.MEŠ URU Ta-at-x}^{475}[} \)

---

\(^{474}\) The traces on the photo look more like L[Ú than von Schuler's DU[MU (1965: 144).

\(^{475}\) von Schuler (1965: 145) reads: \( \text{URU Ta-at-\( \text{ṭa}?-} \).
47' ŠU-ŠI ÉRIN.MESŠ ÚRU Ki-i[l-
48' 1 ME ÉRIN.MESŠ ÚRU Tā]-x[
49' 10 ÉRIN.MESŠ ÚRU Aš-du-he-še-l-ra
50' ŠU.NÍGIN 6 ME 35 ÉRIN.MESŠ KUR ÚRU

§28'
51' mWa-al-ta-hi-iš LÚ ÚRU Ha-m[i-
52' mKu-ú-wa-aš LÚ ÚRU Ša-a-la k[ar'-
53' LÚ ÚRU E-er-ḫi-ta nu-za li-in-k[i-ya
54' LÚ ÚRU Li-it-ta nu-za li-in-k[ar]-[ya
55' [mHī]-i-[m]i-iš LÚ ÚRU Te-mi-ya Ú-U[L
56' [L]Ú DUB SAR I-NA ÚRU Ha-at-ti

§29'
57' mKa-ši-ya-ra 476 DUMU mTā-ra-aš-ku-il DUMU m[ar’-
58' mPāt-tal-li-ya DUMU mU-ra-wa-al-ku-[il(-)][
59' DUMU mPa-a-ta mKal-ma-ḫa-zī-ti DUM[U
60' mTa-ra-hu-un-da-zī-ti DUMU mKu-uk-ku(-)[

Colophon

61' x
62' [ŠU.NÍGIN 6’][+N

476 RA was added later on above line.
KUB 31.33 (Bo 8740) + KBo 50.219 (734/w)

§1’
  x+1       ]x x x[

§2’
  2’       ]x-аš’ tu-li-ya’[ ]
  3’       ]x-pa m|Ta-ti|-li |8’ LÚ.MI[EŠ
  4’       ]x 8 LÚ.MEŠ kat-ti-iš-mi URU x[ ]
  5’     kat-ti]-iš-mi URU Ta-[a’m]-bi-ir-ri-y[a’]
  6’       ] A-NA m Tu-ut-tu |3’1 LÚ.MEŠ x[

§3’
  7’     kat-ti]-š-ši URU Ha-ta-mi-[g’-ga’
  8’       ]x m Tu-ut-tu |8’1 L[ÚMEŠ
  9’     kat-ti-iš-i]š-ši URU Du-[ ]
  10’     ] [m]šu-na-[1]-l[i
  11’     ]x x x[

477 Or URU Ha-ta-mi-g[a.
KBo 50.171

x+1 \[x-zîl-m[a

\rule{\textwidth}{0.4pt}

\S2'

2' \[-an za-ah-ḫi-ya-at-d[u-ma-at\textsuperscript{478}

3' \[x-\text{ru}1-ut-ma x[\]

\rule{\textwidth}{0.4pt}

\S3'

4' \[x-ma-az ták-šu-[a-

5' \[x-ša x[\]

6' \[x[\]

\textsuperscript{478} Groddek 2008: 19.
CTH 140.2

A: KUB 26.20 + KBo 22.132 + KUB 40.31

B: KUB 40.14

Col. i

§1’

Aix+1  ]x[ ]x[  

Ai2’  -te'-e]n pa-ra-a [šu”]-x[  

Ai3’  -te'-e]n pé-ra-an a-ú-wa-[ri]4791-x[  

Bix+1  -te-en] pé-ra-an a-ú-[wa-ri  

Ai4’  -du-]ma-at ku-it-ma-an ÉRIN.MEŠ [KUR]4RU H[a-at-ti]111x1[  

Bi2’  ]k]u-it-ma-an ÉRIN.MEŠ[  


Bi3’  -te]-en na-aš ú-i-z-i-ma[  

Ai6’  a-pé-e-d]a-ni KUR-ya wa-al-ḫa-an-ni-[w]a-an-zi ta-aš-ki-[e]1-[  

Bi4’  a-pé-e-da]-ni KUR-ya wa-al-ḫa-an-ni-][u]x[  

§2’


Bi6’  ]x-ta ták-ša-an za-ar-ḫ[ī-[  


Bi7’  ke]-1e1 ut-tar ki-it-ta-ru x[  

479 Correctly restored, at the time, by von Schuler (1965: 140): a-ú-wa-[ri].
Ai10’  
li-in-ki-ya\(^{480}\) k\[at-ta-an QA-TAM-MA da-a-i[\(r l\)]\(^{31}\)-in-ki-ya\(^{31}\)

QA-TAM-M\[A

Bi8’  
QA-TAM-\[MA-p\(\)\]a\(^{481}\) da-a-i-e-er x[

§3’

Ai11’  
\(\text{URU}\)H\]a-at-mi-ig-ga m\(\text{Šu-na-i-li} [\text{LÚ}\ \text{URU}H\]a-at-mi-ig-g[a

Ai12’  
\(\text{URU}\)H-a-a\]l-mi-ig-ga m\(\text{Ša-uš-ši-li} [\text{LÚ}\ \text{URU}H\]a-at-mi-ig-g\(1\)-g[a

Ai13’  
\(\text{URU}\)H-a-at-m\]i-ig-ga  ŚUM-ŚU\(^{482}\) [ ] x x[

§4

Ai14’  
]x m\(\text{Ku-na-al-li} \ \text{LÚ} \ \text{URU} A-aš-ta l\(\text{nam-ma\(m\)}\)a 1 x[

Ai15’  
-y]a-li-ya-am-ma ŠU.NÍGIN l\(40\)1 + 3 LÚ.MEŠ 8\(^{483}\)

URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A

Ai16’  
]-a-aš KUR \(\text{URU}\)Ku/Ma-ḫa-[\(uš\)š]-\(š\)l\(\text{ni\(m\)}\)l-ša

§5’

Ai17’  
l\(\text{li-in\(\)l-\[k]\}\)i-ya k\(\text{at-ta-an} ki-iš-ša-an

Ai18’  
[da-a-i-\(r\)\]  
]x me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da tāk-\(š\)ul\(1\)-ul

Ai19’  
] [\(d\)l\(\text{UTU}\)-š\(\text{um-mi-in-n\(a\)}\)\(^{484}\) pa-ah-ḫa-[\(aš\)l-ḫa

Ai20’  
]x ki-e-z\(\text{m\(a\)}\)a-mu  \(\text{erasure}

Ai21’  
i]š-tar-na ar-ḫa Û-lUL1

Ai22’  
w]a-la-ah- zi

\(^{480}\) This being the last line of the paragraph, it is very likely that there was nothing preceding \(\text{li-in-ki-ya}\) on this line.

\(^{481}\) Cf. KUB 26.20 (Bo 7304) l. 10’.

\(^{482}\) “So-and-so.”

\(^{483}\) Giorgieri (1995: 90) reads 9, but both the copy and coll. support 9.

\(^{484}\) Giorgieri (2005: 325) suggests restoring \(\text{š-ta-wa-na-an-na-an}\) in the break right before \(\text{UTU}\). Note, however, that he considers KUB 40.31 an OH fragment.
\[\text{§6'}\]

\text{Ai23'} [ ]x-zi na-aš A-NA KUR [URT]H-a-at-ti

\text{Ai24'} [ ]-ša-an 2 L[U]ÉR[IN.MEŠ

\text{Ai25'} [ ]x[

\text{Col. iv}

\[\text{§7'}\]

\text{Aiii1'} [ ]x URU-an

\text{Aiii2'} [ n]a-aš\textsuperscript{485}

\text{Aiii3'} [ ] na-at NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM

\text{Aiii4'} [ ]li-i\textsuperscript{486} -te-en

\text{Aiii5'} [ ]-a[n²]-ni-an-zi

\textsuperscript{485} Giorgieri (1995: 90) reads ]ŠI.

\textsuperscript{486} With Giorgieri (1995: 90).
CTH 140.3.A

KBo 50.61 (88/w) + KBo 50.68

§1'

x+1  \[ x[ \\
2'  \] kat-t[i-iš-ši \\
3'  \] kat-t[i-[iš-ši

§2'

4'  \[-i]u'-ši-li[(-) \\
5'  \[ k]at-ti-iš-ši \[x[ \\
6'  \] x 2 ME ÉRIN.ME[Š] \[x[ \\
7'  \]-1u'$  13$1 [ \\

§3'

8'  \[ x-aš \[mPš-iš-tu-[ \\
9'  \[-h]a-aš-ta-aš LŪ.MEŠ$^\text{URU}$ \[x[ \\
10' \]-ši-ni kat-ti-iš-š[i \\
11' \[x \[LŪ \[mŠa-me-ti-\[l[i \\
12' \[ mŠa-ḫa-[ra]-l-a \[x[ \\
13' \]$^{\text{URU}}Ta-pa-a-[l[u-pa$^{487}$ \\
14' \[-r]u-wa$^{488}$ \[k[at-ti-iš-ši

### CTH 140.3

**KUB 40.21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§1’</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x+1</td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td></td>
<td>URU</td>
<td>a-aš-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td></td>
<td>x-du</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§2’</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td></td>
<td>URU</td>
<td>Ga-aš-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td></td>
<td>x-at-te-en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’</td>
<td></td>
<td>x-at-te-en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9’</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

489 This fragment seems to have belonged to a large tablet, or comes from the middle/edge part of the tablet. The script is large and the space between the lines is greater in comparison to the other fragments assembled under CTH 140.
CTH 140 (further fragments)

KBo 50.71 (1898/u)

§1’

x+1  [            t]a x[  
2’   [            ]x-ši pa-x[  
3’   [            ] ka-aš-ma pa-[  

§2’

4’   [            B]E-LÍ-YA LÚ.MEŠ [  
5’   [            ]x-ah-ta na-an ]  
6’   [            ]x-ša-tar za-pí-[  
7’   [            L]Ú.MEŠ ÚRUGa-ti-[  
8’   [            ÚRU]Iš-da-lha]-[ra  
9’   [            ]-l]i-iš x[    ]x x x[  
10’  [            an-]tu-uḫ-ša-a[n] A-NA KUR-TI  
11’  [            ]x m]š-ta-ta-za  
12’  [            LUG]AL²-TIM¹ x.ḪI.A-ya  
13’  [            ]x ÚRUGa-aš-ga pîd-da-a[n-  
14’  [            ]x an-tu-uḥ-šu-uš  
15’  [            p]é-ra-an-ma LÚ ÚRUx[  
16’  [            ]x nu-uš-ma-ša-a[n  
17’  [            ]x lḫu¹ x[  

The color, surface texture and line size/spacing of this small fragment are similar to KBo 16.27 (CTH 137.A).

P[U] (coll.); might be part of a PN or a Kaška title.
CTH 236.3
KBo 31.74 (+) KBo 47.193

Obv. i'

x+1 ] x x [  
2' ] x (-) a-ri[  
3' ] x x 1ta-l-ḫa-ra 1katl- [  
4' ] x kat-ti-iš-ši-ya [  
5' ] kat-ti-iš-ši-ya [  
6' ] x-ar kat-ti<-iš>-ši-ya 5 LÚ.MEŠ URU La/At-[  

§2'

7' L]Ú.MEŠ URU La-pḫi-na [  
8' (-)l|a-abḫ-še-pí-ra mAr-du-u-ul pí-šu-[  
9' -]|píl-li kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 4 LÚ.MEŠ tu-u-x₄⁹₃-[  
10' ] mTu-u-tu pí-ip-pa-la-la kat-ti-i[š-ši-ya  
11' kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 6 LÚ.MEŠ URU Ka-a-az-[i-  
12' ] KUR URU Ku-ḫa-aš-uš-ša ŠA KUR URU [  
13' ]  

§3'

14' ] x a[  

₄⁹₃ LI, ŠE, or HI?
KBo 47.193

§1'
1' (-)at-ti x[
2' ka]t-ti-iš-ši-ya [
3' ]-it-pa mŠi-me-[i-li
4' ] NÍG-i-iš LÚ URUTa-x[
5' mT[a-ti-li pí-du-pí-[a
6' ]x LÚ URU Pí-iš-ka-[a
7' ]

§2'
8' ] lī1-x [
Note that the column and line numbering here differs from KBo 16.66 and von Schuler (1965: 141).

We may read [ú, but then the question arises whether a 2nd sg. preterit is likely in this context.

See KBo 16.27 (CTH 137.1) iii 8'.
12’ kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 19 LÚ.[MEŠ]

§5’

13’ ](-)a-aš-ta-x[497[
14’ ] x [  

Col. iii’

§6’

1’ [m]Šu-na-a-i-[l][i]
2’ [L]Ú URU Ta-ḫa-na(-)[
3’ kat-ti-iš-ši-[y][a N[498 LÚ.MEŠ]

§7’

4’ mŠu-na-a-i-[l][i]
5’ LÚ URU U-un-da-[š]
6’ kat-ti-iš-ši 1 L[Ú]

§8’

7’ mŠa-me-ti-li
8’ kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 2 [LÚ.MEŠ]

§9’

9’ mŠu-na-a-i-li pi-[ o o ]-ḫa-ra-a-i

497 Cf. von Schuler (1965: 141): ( -)a-aš-ta(-)a[š?
498 The number of men is probably 39, that is, if we are restoring iii 15’ correctly, which gives the sum of men as 59.
10’ LÚ URU*Ta-pa-a-lu-pa
11’ kat-ti-iš-ši-ya 4 LÚ.MEŠ

§10’
12’ mŠu-na-a-li
13’ [L]Ú URU*Ta-pa-pa-ah-šu-wa
14’ [kat-t]i-iš-ši-ya 13 LÚ.MEŠ

§11’
15’ [ŠU.NIGIN? 5]9 LÚ.MEŠ

§12’
16’ [ o o o -h]ar-pi
17’ [ o o o o] x x-wa499[ ]

Chapter Five

The Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal

Introduction

CTH 375 is an Early Empire Period composition commonly known as the “Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal.” The central theme of the prayer, addressing the Sun Goddess of Arinna and the gods, is the devastation inflicted by the Kaška upon cultic centers in the north, most importantly Nerik. The composition is preserved in several copies, the majority of which are from the Empire Period. The colophons of CTH 375.1.D and 375.2 suggest that the text was recorded on two tablets. Significant parts of the text are missing, including the beginning and end of most manuscripts and the majority of the second tablet.

There are two previous editions of CTH 375, by Einar von Schuler in Die Kaškäer (1965: 152-65) and René Lebrun in Hymnes et prières hittites (1980: 132-54), and a recent English translation by Singer in his Hittite Prayers (2002: 40-43). Since their publication, a number of new fragments and joins have been published that advance our understanding of the structure and purpose of the composition, which will be considered in the present text edition and discussion. There have been no discussions of the structure, components, or genre of this document.

---

500 For an earlier English translation see Goetze (1950: 399-400).
Middle Hittite copies

There are three MH copies of this composition: CTH 375.1.A, CTH 375.1.B, and CTH 375.2, the latter of which may have been a parallel rather than a duplicate. A and B are relatively well-preserved copies, but since the beginning and end of both tablets are missing, we do not know if either of them had a second tablet.\footnote{It is possible that B did not have a second tablet, since it had more lines per column than either A and C. Consider, for instance, the fact that B iii 1’-10’ correspond to C iv 1’-11’.
}

Of CTH 375.2, only the first three paragraphs and the colophon remain.\footnote{The very small NH fragment KBo 60.17 seems to be a duplicate of CTH 375.2 obv. ll. 3-7, but has no more than a few words preserved.} Since none of the manuscripts of CTH 375.1 have the corresponding paragraphs preserved, it is difficult to decide whether CTH 375.1 and 2 were parallels or duplicates. The Online Konkordanz treats them as parallels, but because the colophons of CTH 375.2 and CTH 375.1.D appear to be the same (except that the former was “not complete” but the latter “complete,” see below), it seems more probable to me that they were duplicates.\footnote{I have nevertheless followed the CTH numbering of the Online Konkordanz to avoid confusion.
}

New Hittite copies

The majority of the extant copies of CTH 375 date to the Empire Period: CTH 375.1.C, H, G, and the smaller fragments KBo 52.15a(+), KBo 55.19, KBo 55.20, KBo 57.17, KBo 58.5, KBo 59.2, and KBo 60.17.\footnote{The unpublished fragments Bo 3322 and Bo 8295 were not available to me and have not been taken into account in the present edition.
} The best-preserved among these is CTH 375.1.C and it seems closer to the MH copy CTH 375.1.B in spelling and various grammatical details (see transliteration).\footnote{It has a few differences, though. Compare NINDA.GUR.RA.ḪI.LA-ḫš in C ii 3 to …]ḪI.LA in B i 12’; ṣ-uk in C i 12’ and ṣ-e-eš in B i 9’.
} CTH 375.1.D, though in fragmentary condition, is the only copy of the second tablet, unless one or more of the smaller

\footnote{501 It is possible that B did not have a second tablet, since it had more lines per column than either A and C. Consider, for instance, the fact that B iii 1’-10’ correspond to C iv 1’-11’.
\footnote{502 The very small NH fragment KBo 60.17 seems to be a duplicate of CTH 375.2 obv. ll. 3-7, but has no more than a few words preserved.
\footnote{503 I have nevertheless followed the CTH numbering of the Online Konkordanz to avoid confusion.
\footnote{504 The unpublished fragments Bo 3322 and Bo 8295 were not available to me and have not been taken into account in the present edition.
\footnote{505 It has a few differences, though. Compare NINDA.GUR.RA.ḪI.LA-ḫš in C ii 3 to …]ḪI.LA in B i 12’; ṣ-uk in C i 12’ and ṣ-e-eš in B i 9’.
}
fragments are also to be assigned to the second tablet. Whereas the better-preserved first column of D (§§1-9) seems to continue the list of towns and governors we see at the end of B and C (B iii 5’-iv 12, C iv 5’-11’), the contents of the rest of the tablet are difficult to discern.\footnote{It seems that ii §§10’-13’, iii §§14’’-18’’, and iv §19’ comprised some sort of narrative (§§11’, 12’, 15’’-18’’, 19’’’) alternating with lists of towns/governors (§§13’, 14’’). This type of alternation between lists and narrative is reminiscent of the Kaška agreements.}

It is also difficult to determine the relationship of some of the smaller fragments to CTH 375, due to significant gaps and the fragmentary condition of the second tablet. I am not entirely convinced CTH 375.1.G belongs to this composition.\footnote{The only reference cited in the Online Konkordanz is Singer (2002: 40-43), which is the translation of CTH 375.} Col. ii\footnote{The Online Konkordanz cites Otten (1969: 27),} includes a list of “governors” similar to that in CTH 375, but column iii does not correspond to any known part of CTH 375. The 3 sg. verbal forms in ll. 2’-5’ are especially problematic. The list of “governors” and geographical names attested in KBo 52.15a (CTH 375.5) indicates that it is related to CTH 375\footnote{The Online Konkordanz cites Otten (1969: 27),}. It should be noted, however, that the form of the list in this fragment is rather different from those in CTH 375.1. The list in this fragment seems to have the form: URU GN QADU LÛ.MEÅ tapariyallit (for the instrumental forms see KBo 52.15b ll. 1’-3’). The use of QA-DU ‘(together) with’ in this list reminds one of the use of katti zšši/šmi ‘with him/them’ in the Kaška agreements. The relationship of the fragments KBo 55.20, KBo 57.17, and KBo 59.2 to CTH 375 remains unclear.

The predominance of NH copies of CTH stands in stark contrast to the Kaška agreements, of which there are only three possible NH fragments (KBo 40.14, KUB 40.21, and KUB 43.1, the latter of which may or may not belong to the Kaška agreements). Neu (1983: 399) has suggested that the NH copies of the Kaška agreements...
and the Prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunika\(^{509}\) were created during the reign of Ḫattušili III, who was governor in the north before ascending the Hittite throne and was personally invested in the fortunes of the city Nerik (which he claims to have reconquered and rebuilt, see Chapter Five). The references to the history of the conflict with the Kaška in documents from his reign and his decree for the town Tiliura (CTH 89), according to Neu, can be seen as the background to the NH copies of the Kaška agreements and CTH 375.

I would like to point out that the reign of Muršili II is also a good candidate for when some of the NH copies of CTH 375 were made. There are obvious similarities between CTH 375 and some other prayers composed during the reign of Muršili II, most notably CTH 376.A, a hymn and prayer to the Sun Goddess of Arinna, and CTH 377, a hymn and prayer to Telipinu. For example, the “only in Ḫatti” motif (more on this below) was used only in CTH 375 and prayers of Muršili II, CTH 376.A (§§ 2-3, A i 6’-28’) and CTH 377 (§§ 5-8, i 18-19). Also, the descriptions of the offenses of the Kaška are very similar to the descriptions of the behavior of the enemies of Ḫatti in these texts (CTH 376.A §11’ A iii 1-8, CTH 377 §13 iii 18-iv 8). That some of the NH copies of CTH 375 may have been created during the reign of Muršili II appears even more plausible when we consider that the fact that parts of Muršili II’s hymn and prayer for the Sun Goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A) were copied “almost verbatim” (Singer 2002: 50) from another MH prayer, CTH 376.C, a prayer to the Sun Goddess of Arinna concerning plague and enemies.

\(^{509}\) Note that Neu refers to the agreements and CTH 375 together as “Kaškäer-Verträge.”
Before we embark on a discussion of the structure, components, and purpose of this composition, some background information on Hittite prayers may be necessary.

The native terminology related to Hittite prayers has been treated effectively by numerous scholars; therefore only a few points relevant to CTH 375 will be repeated here. The main term in Hittite to refer to what we call prayers was the verbal noun _arkuwar_, from the verb _arkuwai-_ ‘to pray, to plead’. The semantics of the verb are debated, but the term is generally understood to mean “to present a plea, an argumentation, or a defense against an accusation” (Singer 2002: 5). Based on this concept, we may summarize the purpose of Hittite prayers as: to present a plea to the gods 1) for general blessings such as health, abundance, and protection, or 2) to reverse or avoid a negative situation, by making a logical argument and showing why the deity should grant the supplicant’s wishes, by either defending and exculpating oneself from the various sins that must have caused them, or by simply confessing all sins and asking for mercy. As was noted by Singer (2002: 2), praying was just one of the steps taken by the Hittites in order to reverse a negative situation, along with oracular inquiries, invocation rituals, hymns and offerings, and prayers were always, even when the ritual parts were not preserved or included in the text, embedded in offering rituals (p. 12). The ritual context is reflected in the compositions themselves, and the term _arkuwar_, the actual plea and its justification, was often but one part of the composition. Gods also had to be invoked (_taliyawar_), praised (_walliyatar_), persuaded (_arkuwar_), and promised

---

510 The main treatment of the subject is still Laroche (1964: 3-39); for a brief overview and further references see Singer (2002: 5-6). Recently Justus (2004: 267-83) has treated the terminology of Hittite prayers as well, comparing Hittite Prayers to Indo-European parallels.

511 See Kloekhorst (2008: 246) for a discussion of the semantics of _arkuwai_.
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(malduwar) or presented with various offerings. While these terms refer to the different actions and parts of the prayer and its ritual context, the texts themselves were referred to by the occasion or incident that called for their existence.\footnote{See the colophons of CTH 385.10, 375, 376.C, 376.A, 377, 378.2, 378.1, 382, translated by Singer (2002).}

Prayer compositions were not made up solely of personal pleas fashioned for the particular king or queen they are ascribed to. Most prayers have long invocations, hymnic parts, and lists of offerings that frame the personal plea, and were often derived from older compositions. As it is highly unlikely that these parts would have been originally composed or dictated by the kings and queens themselves, we can assume with a fair degree of certainty that it was the scribes who composed the prayers, inserting the king or queen’s personal plea in the appropriate place. Indeed, it seems that learning how to compose prayers, or to compile a new prayer using older examples was part of the scribal education. As was pointed out by van den Hout (2006: 404, in reference to the fragment KBo 12. 132), parts of prayers could be on Sammeltafeln. Models like Muwatalli’s Prayer to the Assembly of the Gods (CTH 378), or the Prayer of a “Mortal,”\footnote{Previous arguments about the supplicant in this prayer have ranged from this prayer demonstrating the democratization of the Hittite state because the supplicant was a commoner—(Lebrun 1980: 419, cited by Singer 2002: 6, n. 18), to it emphasizing the mortality of the supplicant as opposed to the divine addressee—(Singer 2002: 30). I will instead suggest here that CTH 372 was a model prayer as well. The word “mortal” in this text seems to have been used like a fill-in-the-blank space, for the supplicant’s (certainly a king or someone related to him) name.} were most likely related to educational practices as well.

With a few explicable exceptions, most prayers came from Building A on Büyükkale and Temple I. The texts were distributed chronologically: most of the Empire-period texts came from Temple I, with the exception of the prayer of Tudhaliya IV from the Haus am Hang, and no Empire Period texts came from Building A (except when the
copies were Empire Period but the compositions were older). On the other hand, most of
the older prayers came from Building A, but there were some which came from Temple I,
indicating, that while most of the older prayers were up at the reference library of
Büyük Kale A, some of them were brought to Temple I to be studied or copied. These
findings support van den Hout’s suggestion that after the rebuilding of the capital in the
reign of Tudhaliya IV, the Haus am Hang was where the most recent (reign of Tudhaliya
IV) cult-administrative records were kept; Temple I was where older, but still relevant
texts were kept, while Building A was a reference library with older material (van den

Interestingly, all copies of the prayer of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal (CTH 375)
with a recorded provenance come from Temple I. This indicates that the MH copies of
this prayer (CTH 375.1.A, B, and CTH 375.2) were brought to the Temple I at some
point in the Empire Period (probably in the reign of Muršili II or Ḫattušili III as I argue
above) to create new copies (CTH 375.1.C, D, H, G, and the smaller fragments KBo
55.19, KBo 55.20, KBo 58.5, KBo 59.2, KBo 60.17).

Structure and principal components of CTH 375

CTH 375 has been classified in Hittitological literature as a “prayer.” Indeed, the
introduction and colophon of the document, preserved only in CTH 375.2 and 375.1.D,
reveal that the entire composition was conceived as an address to the Sun Goddess of
Arinna, spoken before the assembly of gods, who were to intercede on behalf of the royal
couple:
[Thus (speaks)] His Majesty Arnuwanda, Great King, and [Ašmunikal, Great Queen [...] for you, O Sun-goddess of Arinna [...]. (CTH 375.2 obv. 1-2)

[First tablet.] When [they speak concurrently before] the gods, concerning the Sun Goddess of Arinna. N[ot complete]. (CTH 375.2 rev. 1-2)

Second Tablet. When they speak concurrently before the gods, concerning the Sun Goddess of Arinnna. Complete. (CTH 375.1.D iv 3’-5’)

Though the actual plea of the royal couple is not preserved in any of the copies, we can assume that the principal purpose of the composition was to exonerate the royal couple from responsibility for the disruption of the cults in the north, particularly at Nerik (home to the Storm God of Nerik, son of the Sun Goddess of Arinna). Also part of the plea was probably a request for divine intervention and support for restoring Hittite control over towns and territories in the central Black Sea region, which the Hittites had lost to the Kaška not so long ago.

The major components of CTH 375 can be characterized as 1) the argument, through which the gods and the Sun Goddess of Arinna are persuaded, 2) the vows, and 3) the list of “commanders.”

The argument

The majority of the composition (and the first tablet) was dedicated to the persuasion of the gods. To this end, the royal couple employ a number of discursive strategies or arguments, some of which are characteristic of Hittite prayers. The arguments are not confined to a specific part of the document, but were distributed throughout the composition (probably into the second tablet as well).

We may refer to the first argument as the “only in Ḫatti” motif, using Singer’s terminology (2002: 11). §§1’-6’ demonstrate how only in Ḫatti were the gods properly
taken care of—their temples looked after and revered, their offerings, figurines, and utensils renewed, and their festivals and rituals performed. This section is concluded by a reference to the past, when the towns and personnel of the gods were oppressed by tax and corvée duties, which is then contrasted to how Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal have restored respect for them (§§ 7’-9’).

The second and most important argument was based on a vivid description of the ravages inflicted on the north by the Kaška, demonstrating how the gods would personally be affected by this situation (§§22’-29’’, 40’’, 44’’-45’’). At the conclusion of this argument is a description of the present situation in the north, again, emphasizing how this affects the gods themselves:

And furthermore, for you, O Gods, in those lands, no one calls (your) name. No one gives the rituals of (each) day, of (each) month, and of annual recurrence. The festivals and ceremonies, no one performs for you. (CTH 375.1.A iii 12-16, B ii 21’-24’, H iii 6-10)

In the final extant argument the royal couple seeks to demonstrate to the gods that they (i.e., the royal couple) are still trying to fulfill their cultic obligations by making agreements with the Kaška and sending gifts to Ḥakmiš for the Storm God of Nerik (§§40’’-42’’), but that their attempts keep failing as the Kaška break their oaths and take the gifts intended for the gods (§§41’’-42’’).

**Vows**

Like most Hittite prayers, CTH 375 includes vows conditional upon the gods’ response to the suppliants’ pleas.⁵¹⁴ Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal’s vows are partially

---

⁵¹⁴ Singer (2002: 11) notes that the vows were usually no more than “better execution of the prescribed rites, along with constant praise and adulation.”
preserved in §§10’-18’. The royal couple’s vows include various offerings (e.g.,
sacrificial animals, bread, and libations), ensuring that their temples and towns are shown
the proper reverence and that they are free of oppressive tax and corvée duties, restoring
whatever is missing, establishing the causes of divine displeasure and making them right.

“Commanders”

Manuscripts B, C, and D, as well as a number of small fragments, incorporate a
list of towns and people identified as tapariyalleš, often translated as “governors,” though
“commanders” is probably a more appropriate translation. Given the significant gap at
the end of manuscript A, it is very likely that this manuscript, and in fact all versions of
CTH 375, incorporated this list.

The list shows the following structure, “URU GN, the entire town and governors
mPN and mPN.” But, as was mentioned above, CTH 375.5 (KBo 52.15a/b), a fragment
whose relationship to CTH 375 is not entirely clear to me, displays a slightly different
structure: ^URU1 GN QADU LÚ.MEŠ tapariyallit.

The presence in this composition of the lists of “commanders,” together with the
reference to placing Kaška men under oath (A iv 11-12, C iii 28’-29’) link this document
to the Kaška agreements; in fact some scholars have talked about the treaty-like character
of this composition.\(^{515}\) The PNs of the commanders, as well as the onomastic epithets of
some of the commanders are obviously similar to the oath-takers in the Kaška agreements
(see Appendix). The GNs are clearly in the Hittite-Kaška frontier region; some of them,
such as Kammama and Taggašta, are among the towns lost to the Kaška enumerated

\(^{515}\) Neu, for instance, calls is “vertragsähnlich” (1983: 398), see also Klinger (2005: 353-54).
earlier in the composition (A ii 23’ and B ii 4’, respectively). Singer has suggested that
the presence of the list has to do with the ritual context of the prayer, in which the prayer
was recited as part of an offering ritual.

Perhaps the list of governors appended to some copies of the prayer of
Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal is also relevant to the question of the audience present
at the recitation of royal prayers (Singer 2002: 12).

This suggestion is, however, unlikely, since it is not only the commanders that are listed
but “the entire town and the commanders” (URU-aš hūmanza LÚ.MEŠ tapariyalleš-a).

The following question seems essential to me: were the tapariyalleš part of the
Hittite administration displaced due to the conflict with the Kaška, in which case the
translation “governors” would be more appropriate, or are we to understand the LÚ.MEŠ
tapariyalleš in this document as Kaška “commanders” who were the offenders described
in the prayer, with whom the Hittite King made futile agreements? Based on what is left
of the paragraph before the beginning of the list (§49’’, B iii 1’’-4’’, C iv 1’-4’’), and
the alternation between the list of “commanders” and the narrative of the offences of the
Kaška in the second tablet (see above), the latter alternative seems more likely to me.

The verbal forms wa-al-ḫa-an-ni-iš-kăn-zi (“they continuously attack”) in B iii 4’’ and
ša-ru-u-š[- (from šaruwe- ‘to plunder, loot’) in C iv 4’, right before the beginning of
the list, may indicate that the towns and “governors” listed were the Kaška men with
whom the Hittite king was in conflict. In other words, I do not view the list of
commanders as a separate, loosely related section, but as a part of the complaint about the
Kaška, which was central to the prayer.

---

516 Note that since both manuscripts have no more than a few extant words, their relationship to one another
is unclear.
CTH 375


CTH375.2
A: KUB 31.123 + FHL 3
B: KBo 60.17

CTH 375.1
A: KUB 17.21 + KBo 51.16 + KBo 52.14 + KBo 55.32
B: KBo 53.10 (+) KUB 31.124 (+) KUB 48.28
C: KBo 55.17 (+) KBo 55.18 (+) KUB 23.115 (+) KUB 31.117 (+) KUB 23.17
D: KUB 48.107 (+) KUB 48.110 + KUB 31.72
H: KUB 48.108
G: HFAC 72

Transliteration

Tablet One

CTH 375.2

Obv.

§1

A1  [UM-MA] ṭUTU šT mAr-nu-an-da LUGAL.GAL ŠUr [Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL]


517 A photo of this fragment is not available on the Online Konkordanz. Yoshida’s (1996: 37, n. 10) reading “[ka-a]-ša” also makes sense.
A3 [o]₃ x¹-ₕ-en ^nu-ₕ-ta₁ ku-it mAn-nu-an-ta-[aš LUGAL.GAL Û Aš-mu-ni-(iK)-kal
B2' e [518] n nu-ₕ-ta ku-[ / ]-ik-kal

A4 [(MUNUS)] LUGAL.GAL me-mi-iš⁻¹kán-zi x x x x¹ [ MUNUS.L[UGAL / ]x(-)na-an la-a-

§2

A5 ka-a-ša šu-ma-a-š/DING[(IR.MEŠ-a)š [519]
B5'f. -m[a-a-š DINGIR.MEŠ-a[š / ]x

A6 ḫa-an-da-a-an ša-n[e-ez-zî [520]
B6'f. ḫa-an-da-a-an [n / ]¹šal-li¹

A7 ša-ne-ez-zî ta-aš-šu [ š[a⁻¹
A8 iš-ša-an-x [ ]

§3

A9 nu dUTU dIM dLAMMA [id][

A10 ḤUR₁[SAG₁.MEŠ ÍD.MEŠ k[æ-ṛ-i-li-eš DINGIR.MEŠ [521]
A11 [I-NA¹KUR¹ URUT Ha-₁-lat₁-][t [522]
A12 x [ ]

(text breaks off)

CTH 375.1

§1'

Ai1' x AN [x x x¹

[518] α=CTH 375.2.B (KBo 60.17). Online Konkordanz does not give this fragment its own identifying number/letter but labels it simply as “CTH 375.”
[519] See A i 5' below.
[520] See obv. 7 below.
[522] Cf. Yoshida’s (1996: 37) reading x-uš GAM’-ra-[a-a[n(-).
É.DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU-ya-aš-ma-aš

[x] 1Ú-UL ku-wa-pi-ik-ki

§2’

nu šu-ma-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš 1URU Ha-at-tu-ša-aš-pát ḫa-an-da-a-an pár-ku-i

KUR-e SÍSKUR.HI.A-aš-ma-aš pár-ku-i šal-[li] ša-ne-ez-zi

1URU Ha-at-tu-ša-aš-pát KUR-ya pî-[iš]-1ga-u-e-ni nu-uš-ša-an

šu-ma-a-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš na-ah-ša-ra-at-1ta-1-an 1URU Ha-at-tu-ša-aš-pát

KUR-e zi-ik-ki-u-wa-ni

§3’

nu šu-me-eš-pár DINGIR.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-ta-an-[a]-1ni-[i] še-ek-te-[i]ni


[i-wa-a]r Ú-[U]L ku-iš-ki kap-pu-u-1wa-1-an ḫar-ta

§4’


ki-iš-ša-an 1Ú-UL 1[ku-iš-ki i]ya-an ḫar-ta

nu-Za šu-me-en-za-an 1ŠA 1[DINGIR.MEŠ] 1a-1-aš-šu-u KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN

BI-IB-RI₁₁LA

TÚG.HI.A an-ze-el i-1wa-ar₁ EGIR-an 1Ú-UL ku-iš-ki

kap-pu-u-wa-an ḫar-ta
§5’

Ai18’ nam-ma-[š]u-[me]-en-za-an DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ku-e ALAM.[H]I.A-KU-NU ŠA

KUBABBAR GUŠKIN

Ci1’ [nu-uš]-ša-an1 [ku-e-da]-ni1 DINGIR-LIM ku-it tu-e-ši


Ai21’ na-at an-zi-el i-wa-ar EGIS-pa Ú.-UL ku-iš-ši
Ci3’ [na-at] an-zie-el i-wa-ar EGIS-pa Ú.-UL ku-iš-ši

Ai22’ ne-wa-ah-[h]-a[n ḫa-]f[a
Ci4’ [ne-wa]-1 [523-ah-ha-an] ḫa-ša-an

§6’


Ai24’ na-ah-ša-ra-at-[a-a]n ki-iš-ša-an Ú.-UL ku-iš-ši ti-ya-an ḫar-ta
Bi2’ [na-ah]-ša-ra-at-[a-a]n ki-iš-ša-an Ú.-UL ku-iš-ši ti-ya-an ḫar-ta
Ci6’ [na-ah]-ša-ra-at-[a-a]n ki-iš-ša-an Ú.-UL x2 ku-iš-ši ti-ya-an ḫar-ta

Ai25’ nu-uš-ma-aš UD-aš ITU-aš MU-ti me-ya-ni-ya-aš SÍSKUR.[H]I.A
Bi3’ SÍSKUR.[H]I.A
Ci7’ [ -a]š UD-aš ITU-aš MU KAM-ti me-ya-an-ni-ya-aš SÍSKUR

Ai26’ EZEN,[H]I.A ki-iš-ša-an ša-ra-a Ú.-UL ku-iš-ši
Bi3’ EZEN,[H]I.A-ya /

Ai27’ ti-it-ta-nu-wa-an ḫar-ta
Bi4’ -a[n ḫar-ta]
Ci8’ ti-it-ta-nu-wa-an ḫar-ta

523 This broken sign ends in a vertical, which makes [ne-wa]-1[ah-ha-an] the likeliest reading.
§7’

Ai28’ nam-ša DINGIR.MEŠ SAG.GÉME.ARAD.MEŠ-KU-NU
UR[(U.DIDL1.ḪI.A-K)]|U-NU| ša-ah-ḫa-ni-it

Bi5’ ]|1ni-it

Ci9’ ]|1DINGIR1.MEŠ SAG.GÉME.MEŠ URU.DIDL1.ḪI.A-KU-NU
ša-a-ah-ḫa-ni-it1

Ai29’ lu-uz-zi-it dam-mi-ḫi-iš-ḫi-š-kir [(nu-za šu-me-e)]n-za-an

Ci10’ da|m-mi-iš-<<eš>>-ḫi-eš-kir nu-za šu-me-en-za-an

Ai30’ ša DINGIR.MEŠ ARAD.MEŠ-KU-NU GÉME.MEŠ-KU-NU d[(a-aš-ki-ir-ra)]

Bi6’ ša[A DINGIR.MEŠ /
Ci10’f ša]1DINGIR1.MEŠ / [ -N]U da-aš-ki-ir-ra

Ai31’ nu-uš-za ARAD-na-ah-ḫi-iš-kir GÉME-ah-ḫi-[i[(š-kir) -w]a-za524
Bi7’f. -ḫi1-eš1-kir GÉME-ah-ḫi-eš-kir1/ [ ]
Ci11’f. na-aš-za ARAD-ah-ḫi-eš-kir GÉME-ah-ḫi1-eš-kir / [ ] -za

§8’

Bi9’ [nu-uš-ma-aš ka-a-ša525 DINGIR.M(EŠ) ú-e-eš (mAr-nu-wa-a)]n-ta
LUGAL.GAL

Ci13’ [ M]EŠ ú-uk mAr-nu-wa-an-ta1 LU1[GAL1].GAL

Bi10’ [Ū iAš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL na-ah-ša-ra-(at-ta)]-an
ḫu-u-ma-an-ta-az-pát

Ci11 ]|1at-ta-an ḫu-u1-ma-a[n-

Bi11’ [ti-ya-an ḫar-u-(en)]

Cii2 ] -en

§9’

Bi12’ [ ] (NINDA.GUR3.RA.)ḪI.A iš-pa-an-du-zi-ta


Bi13’ [k(u-e pé-eš-kir nu šu-me-eš-pát) DINGIR.MEŠ-aš Z]i-it še-ek-te-ni

Cii4f ] k[u-e pé-eš-kir nu šu-me-eš-pát / [ -i] še-ek-te-ni

524 End of Ai.

525 Cf. von Schuler (1965: 154), who restores [... Šu-ma-aš DINGIR.(MEŠ)].
§10’

**Bi14’** [nu ú-e-eš mAr-nu-(wa-an-da-aš LUGAL.GAL Ū]) tAš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL

Cii6 [wa-an-da-aš LUGAL.GAL Ū tAš-mu]-[ childs]


Cii7 [š UDU.HI.A wa-ar-kán-du-[uš]

**Bi16’** [NINDA.G(UR₄.RA.HI.A DUG₁š-pa-an-d)u-uz-zi]-ya SIG₃-an-ta

Cii8 [GUR₄.RA.HI.A DUG₁š-pa-an-d-[u-

**Bi17’** [EGIR-p(a pé-eš-ga-u-e-)]ni

Cii9 -p]a pé-eš-ga-u-e-ni

§11’

Cii10 [ pI]-[š-ga-u-e-ni]

(gap of approximately 4-5 lines)

§12’

**Bii1** nam-ma šu-me-en-za-an ku-e [childs]

**Bii2** nu-za ú-e-eš LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL EGI[R-an₁

[šu-u]-[ma-an-ta₂ -e-ni]

§13’

**Bii3** nu₅²⁶-ša-aš-kán A-NA É.HI.A-KU-NU na-ah-šar-[ra]-[at-ta-an ti-ya-u-ni₅²⁷]

**Bii4** nam₁-aš-ma-aš URU.DIDLI.HI.A-KU-NU šu-u-ma-an-[a-az₅²⁸ -e-ni]

---

₅²⁶ The NU sign was written with two horizontals like the TAR (on both the copy and the photo); this was either a scribal error or NU was written above erasure.

₅²⁷ See B ii 18. For nahšarattan tiya-, see A i 8’-9; 13’-14’.

₅²⁸ Cf. B i 10’ šu-u-ma-an-ta-az-pát.
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§14’

Bii5 \( an^{-}tu^{-}1-u^h^{-}-še^{-}-et\) GUD-\( it\) UDU-\( it\) ḫal-\( ki^{-}it\) \( i\)\[^{529}\]

Bii6 nam-ma-\( aš^{-}-kán\) ša-\( a^{-}-aḥ^{-}-ḫa^{-}-ni^{-}it\) lu-\( uz^{-}zi^{-}it\) \( 1\)\[^{530}\]-[\( ra^{-}u^{-}w^{-}a^{-}ḥ^{-}-hu^{-}\)wa-\( ni^{-}\)]

Bii7 na-at EGIR-an šu-ma-aš-pát A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ a-ra-u-\( wa^{-}[, aḥ^{-}-ḫu^{-}-wu^{-}wa^{-}\)ni]\)

§15’

Bii8 ku-i-ta-\( aš^{-}-ma^{-}-aš^{-}-ṣa^{-}-an\) wa-aq-qa-\( a^{-}-ri^{-}ya\) na-\( 1\)\[^{a}\] [\( šu^{-}-ma^{-}-aš^{-}-pát\]

Bii9 ú-e-eš EGIR-an-da m\( Ā\)r-nu-an-da LUGAL.GAL \( 1\)\[^{A}[š^{-}-mu^{-}-ni^{-}-kal\]

MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL]

Bii10 ku-un-ga-\( aš^{-}-ki^{-}-u^{-}w^{-}a^{-}-ni\) na-at SIG₅-\( aḥ^{-}-hi^{-}-iš^{-}-ki^{-}-u^{-}w\)[a-\( n\)]

§16’

Bii11 nu-\( uš^{-}-ma^{-}-aš^{-}-kán\) ḥu-u-\( ma^{-}-an^{-}-da^{-}-az\) ma-\( aḥ^{-}-ḫa^{-}-an\) \(-\)wi\( a^{-}\)]

Bii12 nu a-pa-a-at-ta DINGIR.MEŠ-eš-pát še-ek-te-ni

§17’

Bii13 ku-e-da-\( ni^{-}-ma^{-}-aš^{-}-ṣa^{-}-an\) DINGIR-LIM ku-\( 1\it\) ud-\( dar\) [\[\[\]

Bii14 na-aš-\( ma\) ku-e-ez im-\( ma\) ku-e-ez ud-\( d\)[a-\( na^{-}a\)]\[na^{-}at\[ú-e\)]\[eš\]

Bii15 Ú-UL ḫa-an-da-a-u-\( n\)

§18’

Bii16 nu-un-na-\( aš^{-}-a-pa^{-}-a-š\) DINGIR-LIM a-pa-[\( a\)]\[-at ut-tar\]³ ku-it na-ak-ki\³ na-\( a\)t]

[^{529}]: Or \( u\)\[š\], or \( k\)\[a\].

[^{530}]: Photo confirms \( 1\)\[^{a}\]; contra \( m\)\[^{e}\] in CHD S (s.v. \( šaḥ\)\[^{b}\]han d, p.7).

EGIR-pa / a-ap-pa]

Bii18 ti-ya-u-ni na-at SIG₃-ahl-ḫu-ni

§19’

Bii19 nu-uš-ša-an ka-aša ú-e-e[š mAr-nu-an-da LUGAL.GAL]
Aii1’ nu-u[š

Bii20 Ú †Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL [ 
Aii2’ †Aš-mu-n[i-

Bii21 nu-uš-ma-aš-kán ḫu-u-ma-an-d[a(-) -wa-ni]
Aii3’ nu-uš-ma-aš-1kán!

§20’

Bii22 šu-me-eš-ša-aš-ša-an DINGIR.MEŠ k[a₃₃₃-aša an-za-aš mAr-nu-an-da LUGAL.GAL]
Aii4’ šu-me-eš-ša-aš-a[n

Bii23 †Ú†Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL [m]Tu-ud-ḫa-li-ya (tu-ḫu-kán-ti)]
Aii5’†Aš-mu-ni-kal [ / tu-ḫu-kán-ti

Bii24 [†]Ša-ta-an-du-ḥe-pa mPa-r[i-ya-wa-at-raq₃₃₃ (DUMU.NITA SANGA)
Aii7’ DUMU.NITA [SANGA]l]

Bii25 [ †. . . -he-p]a₃₃₄ [kat-ta] [ 
Aii7’ †. . . -he-]lpa[m]x[

Aii8’ ḫa-an-[za]l-x[o o o]i i-x[

Aii9’ x[o o o EGIR-an a[r-du-ma] -at

₃₃₁ See Div 2’.
₃₃₂ Or i[š-, or n][š-.
₃₃₄ There is room for c. six signs in the break. De Martino (2010: 92, n. 16) suggests †[Mušu-her-p]a (?), but does not indicate that there is space for another two signs before the restored †Mušuhepa.
§21’

Aii10’ LÚ.KÚR.M[EŠ]-ma ma-a-ah-ḥa-an KUR URU Ha-at-ti [GUL-ah-ḥi-ir⁵³⁵ nu  ]

Aii11’ KUR-e ša-ru-u-e-er na-at-za da-a-ir |na-ar¹ x x[

Aii12’ šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-ni-pát nu-uš-ma-aš-ša-[an?]

Aii13’ DI-NAM ar-nu-uš-ki-u-wa-ni

§22’

Aii14’ šu-me-en-za-an ne-pí-ša-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ku-e KUR.KUR.ḪI.A

NINDA ḫar-ša-ya¹-aš

Aii15’ DUG iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ya-aš ar-ga-ma-na-aš-ša e-eš-ta

Aii16’ ar-ḥa-kán LÚ.MEŠ SANGA MUNUS.MEŠ AMA.DINGIR-LIM šu-up-pa-e-eš

LÚ.MEŠ SANGA¹

Aii17’ LÚ.MEŠ GUDÚ LÚ.MEŠ NAR LÚ.MEŠ iš-ḥa-ma-tal-le-eš ku-e-le²

Aii18’ i-ya-an-ta-at DINGIR.MEŠ-ša-kán ar-ga-ma-nu-uš ḫa-az¹-zi-ú-ya

Aii19’ ku-e-ez ar-ḥa píd-da-a-ir

§23’


Aii21’ ŠA KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI ZABAR URUDU.ḪI.A TÚG.SIG.ḪI.A-TIM TÚG.ḪI.A

a-du-up-li

Aii22’ TÚG.GÙ.È.A ku-ši-ši-ya-aš NINDA ḫar-ša-uš DUG iš-pa-an-tu-uz¹-zi-ya

Aii23’ ku-e-ez ar-ḥa |píd¹-da-a-ir

§24’

Aii24’ a-ú-li-ú-ša-kán GUD.[MAH]1.ḪI.A NIGA ḠUD1.ÂB NIGA UDU.ḪI.A NIGA
MÂŠ.GAL.ḪI.A NIGA

Bii1’’

Aii25’ ku-e-ez ar-ḫa na-an-[n]i1-e-
er
Bii2’’ [l]e1-er

§25’

Aii26’ KUR [URU]Ne-ri-ig-ga-az[URU] [H]u-ur-ša-ma-az KU[(R UR)] K[a]-a-a[š]-ta-ma-az
Bii3’ ]-ur-ša-ma-[l]az1 KUR [URU]Ka-aš1-ta-[m][a

Aii27’ KUR [URU]Ši-e-ri-ša-az KUR [URU][Hi-i-mu-wa-az KUR UR][Tâg-ga-aš-ta-a)]z
Bii4’ [Hi-i-mu-wa-az KUR UR]Tâg-1 gal-aš-ta-a[z

Bii5’ Za-al-pu-wa-az KUR [URU]Ka-pî-i-rû-[p][a]-š[a-wa-a]z


Bii7’ KUR [URU]Ta-ru-up-tal-az1 K[UR ]-ḫa-az1 <KUR> [URU]Zi-[i]h-ḫa1-na-[l

Bii8’ KUR [URU]Si-pî-id-du-wa-az KUR [URU]Pa-ḫa1-ya-az KUR [URU]Pa-tal-li-ya1-[a-

§26a’

Aii32’ nu ke-e-da-š A-[(NA KUR.KUR.ḪI.)]|A1|šu1-me-en-za-an ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ
ALAM.MEŠ

Aii33’ ar-ḫa ḫu-u[(l-li-ir)]

536 See del Monte and Tischler 1978: 204.
§26b'  
uke-e-da-aš A-NA KUR.KUR.ḪI.A šu-me-en-za-an ŠA Ė.ḪI.A

DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU

Bii10'  ku-e-eš-ta-nu-at LÚ.MEŠ URU Ga-aš-ga ar-ḫa pi-ip-pi-ir

Bii 11'  nu šu-me-en-za-an ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ IALAM¹ḪI.A I ar¹-ḫa ḫu-ul-li-ir

§27'

Aiιι1  nu-za KÙ.BABBAR [(KÙ.GI BI-IB-RI)].ḪI.A GA[(L.ḪI.A ŠA KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI)]

Bii12'  nu-za KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI BI-IB-RI.ḪI.A¹ GAL.ḪI.A ŠA KÙ.BABBAR

Aiιι2  ku-un-na-aš [(Ú-NU-TE.MEŠ-KU-NU-ya)] ŠA ZABA[(R)]

Bii12'f. ku]-un¹-na-aš / Ú-NU-TE.MEŠ-KU-NU-ya ŠA ZABAR

Aiιι3  TÚG.ḪI.A-KU-NU ša-ru-u-e-[er¹ na-at-za ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir¹]

Bii13'f. TÚG.ḪI.A-KU-NU ša-ru-e-er / na-at-za ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir

§28'

Aiιι4  LÚ.MEŠ SANGA šu-up-pa-e-ša-za LÚ.MEŠ SANGA MUNUS.MEŠ AMA DINGIR-LIM

Bii16'  LÚ.MEŠ SANGA šu-up-pa-e-eš-ša-až LÚ.MEŠ [SANGA] MUNUS.MEŠ IAMA DINGIR-LIM

Aiιι5  LÚ.MEŠ NAR LÚ.MEŠ iš-ha-ma-tal¹-lu-us LÚ.MEŠ MUḪALDIM

Bii16'  LÚ.MEŠ iš-ha-ma-a-tal-lu-us LÚ.MEŠ MUḪAL[D]IM

Aiιι6  LÚ.MEŠ NINDA¹DÚ.DÜ LÚ.MEŠ APIN.LÁ LÚ.MEŠ NU.GIŠ.KIRI₆ ar-ḫa

Bii16'f. LÚ.MEŠ NINDA¹DÚ.DÜ LÚ.MEŠ APIN.ILÁ¹ LÚ.MEŠ NU.GIŠ.KIRI₆ ar-ḫa

Hiιι1  [ar-ḫa]

Aiιι7  [(šar-ri-i)]r nu-uš-za ARAD-na-ah-ḫi-ir

Bii17'  šar-ri-il[r] l-za¹ AR[AD-a]ḫ-ḫi-ir

Hiιι1  [r]l-ir nu-uš-za ARAD-ah-ḫi-ir

537 LÚ.MEŠ¹GÚDU¹, written above LÚ.MEŠ¹NAR, was added later.
§29’

Aiιi8 GUD.HI.A-KU-NU.-y[(a-aš-ma-aš-za UDU.HI.A-K)]U-NU ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir

Aiιi9 A.ŠÀ A.GÀR.HI.A-K[(U-NU-ma-az/za NINDAḫar-š)]a-ya-aš
GIŠKIRIₐ,GEŠTIN.HI.A
Biι9’ A.ŠÀ A.GÀR-KU-NU-ma-za NINDAḫar-ša-ya-aš GIŠ
Hiιi3 A.ŠÀ A.GÀR.HI.A-KU-NU-ma-az NINDAḫar-ša-ya-aš GIŠKIRIₐ,GEŠTIN.HI.A

Aiιi10 DUG.ιš-pa-an-f[(u-uz-zi-ya-aš)] ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir
Biι9’f. [ ] / ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir
Hiιi4 DUG.ιš-pa-an-tu-1uz-zi-ya₁-aš ar-ḫa šar-ri-ir

Aiιi11 na-aš-za LÚ.MEŠ [(URU Ga)-aš-ga da]-a-ir
Biι20’ na-aš-za LÚ.MEŠ URU[Ga₁]
Hiιi5 na-aš-za lLÚ.MEŠ URU[l ^]₁a₁-ir

§30’

Aiιi12 na-aš-ta nam-m[(a šu-ma)]-l-aš¹ DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-pé-e-da-aš
Biι1’ na-aš-ta nam-ma šu-ma-aš A-NA D[INGIR
Hiιi6 lna-aš-ta[l ]⁻⁻⁻{-l}vé-da₁-aš

Aiιi13 A-NA KUR.KUR.HI.A l[(a-a-ma-a)]l-na Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ú-e-ri-[l]⁻{-l}z-i
Biι1’f. [ ] / la-a-ma-an-na Ú-UL ku-iš-ki [l][
Hiιi7 ]⁻⁻⁻{-l}e₅₃₈⁻{-l}ri-iz₁⁻{-l}z-i

Aiιi14 nu-uš-ma-aš ŠA U[D.M]I ŠA ITU.KAM MU-ti me-e-ya-ni-ya-a[(š)]
Biι2²’f. [ ] / ŠA ITU.KAM MU-ti me-e-ya-na-aš
Hiιi8 ]⁻{-l}x-x-ya₅₃⁹

Aiιi15 SÍSKUR.HI.A Ú-[U]L ku-iš-ki pa-a-i EZEN.HI.A-aš-ma-aš
Biι2₃’f. [ ] / EZEN.HI.A-aš-ma-aš
Hiιi9 ]⁻{-l}m₁a-aš

Aiιi16 ḫa-az-lz₁⁻{-l}[(lN])-y]a Ú-UL ku-iš-ki i-ya-az-zi
Biι2₄’ ḫa-az-zi-lN⁻{-l}[-z]i
Hiιi10 -z[i

₅₃₈ It is clear from the photo that the traces belong to l₁, rather than lN, as the copy implies.
₅₃⁹ The traces on the copy and photo are not legible.
§31’
Aiii17 1ka₁-ya-aš-ma-aš 1A¹-NA KUR URUHa-at-ti nam-ma ar-g[a-ma-nu-úš\(^540\)]
Bii25’ ka-a-ya-aš-ma-aš A-NA [ ]

Aiii18 ḫa-az-i-ú-ya Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ú-da-i LÚ.MEŠ SANGA
[(šu-up-pa-e-eš-š)al-kán\(^541\)]
Bii26’ ḫa-az-i-ú-ya [ ] / šu-up-pa-e-eš-ša-kI án

Aiii19 LÚ.MEŠ SANGA MUNUS.MEŠ AMA LINGIR-LIM LÚ.MEŠ iš-ḫa-ma-[al-le]-eš
Bii28’ NAR LÚ.MEŠ iš-ḫa-m[a-]

Aiii20 nam-ma ar-ḫa Ú-UL ku-e-ez-ga ú-wa-an-zí

§32’

Aiii21 nam-ma šu-ma-a-laš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ dUTU URU A-ri-in-na

Aiii22 [š]i-it-ta-re-š-eš ar-ma-an-ni-uš-ša KÚ.BABBAR K[Ú.GI]\(^542\)
Bii1’ x š[ ]

Bii2’ ZABA[R]

Aiii24 TÚG.GÚ.É.A ku-[š]i-ši-ya-aš Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ú-da-i
Bii3’ [TU]GÜ.É [ ]

Aiii25 Ú-UL-ma š[u-m]a-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ NINDAḫar-ša-uš

DUG iš-pa-[n-tu-uz-zi-ya]

Aiii26 a-ú-li-uš-[š]a ŠA GU₄.MAH.HI.LA NIGA ṢA GU₄.ÁB.HI.LA NIGA

Aiii27 UDU.HI.LA NIGA MÁŠ.G[AL.HI.LA.NIGA Ú-UL ku-iš-ki] u-un-na-i

§33’
Aiii28 nu-za ke-e [

\(^541\) Yet another geminating a that’s problematic. If the enclitic particles came onto SANGA, one would think they are separate.
\(^542\) The break may be restored on the basis of §23’-24’.
Aiii29 \[NINDA]\*har-ša-y[a-aš

Aiii30 \[ša-ne-ez\*]-[zi

(A breaks off, large gap partially bridged by C)

§34”
Ciii1’ ]x ]x[
Ciii2’ DINGIR\*\*MEÅ]-aš-ša a[ti/la

§35”
Ciii3’ šu-u]\*p-\*e-eš\* SANGA x[
Ciii4’ ]x-iš-kir nam-ma-aš a-pé-\*e-[z

§36”
Ciii5’ \*SANGA MUNUS \*[\*AMÀ\* LUM]-e-eš iš-šu-ú-[ni]
Ciii6’ -y[a-aš ú-e-eš x[

§37”
Ciii7’ [nu-uš-m]\*a\*š]-ša-an KUR.KUR.\*H.I.A ni-wa-al-la-an še-er
\*hal-zi-iš-[ga-u-e-\*ni\*543]
Ciii8’ [\*URU]G]\*a\*š-ta-ma-an\*44 \*URU Tág-ga-aš-ta-an \*URU Še-e-rí-iš-[a-an
Ciii9’ [\*URU]T]\*a\*š-ta-re-eš-ša-an \*URU Ták-ku-up-ša-an \*URU Ka-am[-ma-ma-an
Ciii10’ [\*URU]Z]\*a\*al-pu-u-wa-an \*URU Ne-rí-ig-ga-an

§38’’

Ciii11’ [ki-n]u-un-pát ú-e-eš mAr-nu-wa-an-ta LUGAL.GA[L]
Ciii12’ IÜ₁ Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL šu-ma-a-aš DINGIR.ME[Š-aš]
Ciii13’ [EGI]R-an ar-wa-aš-ta-at nu-kán šu-ma-a-aš [DINGIR.MEŠ-uš]
Ciii14’ [hal-z]i-iš]-ga-u-e-ni”

§39’’

Ciii15’ LÚ.MEŠ IURUGa-aš-ga₁ x x [  
Ciii16’ šu-ma-a-aš A-NA D[INGIR.MEŠ 
Ciii17’ Ú-UL tar-r[a-

§40’’

Aiv1 [(nu ú)]-e-er ka-a URU Ha-at-tu-[š]i
Ciii18’ [nu ú-e-er ka]-a[I]

Aiv2 [(URU]u-u]-ha-šu-na-an za-aḫ-ḫi-[ir [ 
Ciii19’ URU Tu-u-ḫa-šu-[na-an

Aiv3 URU Ta-ḫa-ta-ri-ya-an za-a[h]-hi-[ir K]Á.GAL-aš
Ciii20’ URU Ta-ḫa-an-[a-ri-ya-an

Aiv4 kat-ta-an ú-e-er nu URU Ḥu-um[-
Ciii21’ kat-ta-an Ḥu-[]

§41’’

Aiv5 nu ú-e-eš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ku-it na-[aḫ-ḫa-an]-r[e-eš nu DINGIR.MEŠ-aš A-NA EZEN₃, ḤI.LA 
Ciii22’ nu ú-e-eš D[INGIR 

Aiv6 EGI]-R-an-pát ar-wa-aš-ta IKUR URU Ne₁-ri-ig-ga-ma-az 
Ciii23’ EGI]-R-an-pát a[r-
Aiv 7  LÚ.MEŠ URU Ga-aš-ga ku-it da-a-an ḫar-kān-zi ú-e-ša
Cii24’  LÚ.MEŠ URU [Ga-a]-[š-ga

Aiv 8  A-[NA dIM URU Ne-ri-ik Û A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ URU Ne-ri-ik
Cii25’  A-NA [d][Ne-ri-ik]

Aiv 9  SÍS[KUR.HI.A URU] Ḥa-at-[tu]-ša-az URU Ḥa-ak-mi-š-ši
Cii26’  SÍSKUR.HI.A [x [ -ši

Aiv 10  up-pi-[(_š-ga-u)_]-[e]-ni NINDA.GUR₄.RA.HI.A DUG-iš-pa-an-tu-už'-zi GUD.HI.A
Cii27’  up-[pi-iš-ga-u-e-ni] NINDA.G[UR₄.RA GU]D.HI.A
UDU.[H.I.A

§42”

Aiv 11  LÚ.MEŠ URU[a-aš-ga-ma ḫal-zi-wa-ni nu-uš-ma-aš NÍG.BA.HI.A
Cii28’  LÚ.MEŠ Ga-aš-ga-ma ḫal-zi-w[a- NÍG.B]A.HI.A

Cii28’  f. pi-ú-e-[n][i] / [ -g]a-nu-ma- ni /

Aiv 13  [ku]-it SÍSKUR up-pi-ú-e-ni nu-wa-az ḫa-an-za-an šu-me-eš ḫar-te-en

Aiv 14  [nu-wa]-ra-at KASKAL-ši le-e ku-iš-ki wa-al-ah-zi

§43”

Aiv 16  ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-at [EGR]-pa a-ra-an-zi na-aš-ta li-in-ga-a-uš
Aiv 17  šar-ra-an-zi nu-za šu-me-en-za-an ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ me-mi-ya-nu-uš
Aiv 18  te-ep-nu-wa-an-zi nu ŠA dIM li-in-ki-ya-aš NA[KISIB xer
Aiv 19  ar-ḫa ḫu-u-ul-la-an- zi

§44”

Aiv 20  nu I-NA KUR URU[Ḫa]-ak-mi-[iš]-ša KASKAL.[HI.A]-TIM ap-pa-an-zi
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Aiv21  nu A-NA d[IM]\(^{URU}\)Ne-ri-ik\(^1 ku-it [SÍSKUR\(^1 NINDA.[GUR\(^{4}].RA.ĦI.A

Aiv22  DUG\(^iš-pa-an-t[u]-uz-zi GUD.ĦI.A UDU.ĦI.A up-pí-[ú\(^1]-[e-n[545]

Aiv23  na-at LÚ.MEŠ\(^{URU}\)Ga-aš-ga KASKAL-[ši\(^1 ša-ru-wa-an-z[i

Aiv24  na-at A-NA d[IM]\(^{URU}\)Ne-ri-ik ta-ra-u-wa-x[  

Aiv25  Ú-UL \(^{ar1-nu-an- zi

§45”’

Aiv26  [I]-NA KUR \(^{URU}\)Ha-at-ti-ma [o]x ku-[iir\(^1 x x[ o ]x šu-me-en-za-an  

Aiv27  [ ]\(^{MEŠ\(^1} KUR-[a]\(^1 LÚ.MEŠ\(^{URU}\)Ga-aš-ga ú-wa-an-[zi\(^1

Aiv28  [ -z]i nu x[ ]\(^{NI-I]\(Š DINGIR-LIM ki-iš-ša-a[n]

Aiv29  [ Ú-]\(^1 ÚL\(^3\(^1 [ \(x [n]am-ma KUR \(^{URU}\)Ha-a[t-ši]

Aiv30  [ ]

§46”’

Aiv31  [ ]\(^{ka}\(^1 a-ra-an-[zi\(^1

Aiv32  [ ]\(^{x x x

(A breaks off, B iii follows after a gap of uncertain length)

§47”’

Biii1’ x ka-

Biii2’ x UZU\(^{7}\[  

\(^{545}\) See A iv 13.
§48’’’
Biii3’ [o] x [ (gap of significant length) ]

§49’’’
Biii1’’ nu-x[ ] x x [ ]
Biii2’’ na-at x[ ] EGIR-an a-pé-e[l']
Biii3’’ nu-za lGÉŠPUl-an ḥa-aš-ta-ya w[a']-
Biii4’’ wa-al-ḥa-an-ni-is-kán-zí x[546]

§50’’’
Civ5’ URU Tág-ga-aš-ta(-)x[548]
Biii6’ mHa-ta-e-ep-ta-aš mZi-pí-li-[ ]
Civ6’ mḪa-ta-ep-ta-aš[š]
Civ7’ mPi-iš-šu-ri-u[š]

§51’’’
Civ8’ URU Ka-a-am-ma-m[a-aš U]RU-aš ḫu-[ ]
Biii8’ mŠu-na-a-li-iš pí-ig-ga-ap-pí-lu [ m... ]
Civ9’f. mŠu-na-a-li-iš pí-i[g-ga-pé-e]- / mTe-lep’-x[l o-aš]

546 The remains in the duplicate C cannot be aligned here with B:
Civ1’ [ o o o ḫu-u-lu]-
Civ2’ [ o o ]-aš-ti śu-x]-
Civ3’ [ o ]x KUR URU ḫa-a[l]-
Civ4’ [n]a-at ša-ru-u-[e]-er’
547 Cf. the various spellings in B iv 3, 5, 7, 9.
548 The traces do not pass for AŠ, as we see in B iii 5’, or URU, if the URU Taggašta was in stem form.
Bii9’  pi-ku-du-uš-te-na-aḫ mTe-mi-it-ti [ 
Civ10’  pi-ku-du-uš-t[e-

Bii10’[m]Pa-zi-zi-iš pi-tu-un-tu-ū-na[( ]
Civ11’  x x [ ]p[t]-in-ū-[n-

§52’’’’

Biv1  [ LÚ.MEŠ[ ]-pa-][[ri]1-x-x-x[ 
Civ12’  ]x-aš U[RU-aš ḫu-u-m]a-an-z[a  LÚ.MEŠ[ ]

Biv2  [ ]
Civ13’  iš[m]Z[i'-]x x[

§53’’’’

Biv3  [ ][LÚ.MEŠ[ ]-pa-ri-y-a-li-][e-eš549]-ša[ 
Civ14’  ]x-ti-iš-ša-aš URU-aš ḫ[u-u-ma-an-za[ 

Biv4  [ ]
Civ15’  ]x mTi-ya-ru-uk( )x[

§54’’’’

Biv5  [ LÚ]MEŠ[ ][ ]-pa-ri-y-a ][al-li-][e'-][eš-ša[ 
Civ16’  ][ ]-ma-][a-aš URU1-aš ḫu-u-ma-a[ ]n-za[ 

Biv6  [ m ...]x[550]-ar-ri-iš-ša[ 
Civ17’  ]x x-i-li-[iš][

§55’’’’

Biv7  [ LÚ.MEŠ[ ]-pa-ri-y-a ][al-li-][e-eš-ša[ 
Civ18’  ]x[

Biv8  [ ]-ir-ri-[iš[ 

549 Confirmed by photo.
§56

Biv9 [ ] x x$^{551}$ [ -a]l-li-eš-ša

Biv10 [ ]

---

§57

Biv11 [ $^{L\U.MEÅ}ta-\text{pa-\text{ri-\text{ya-Al-i-i-eš-ša}}$]

Biv12 [ ]

(text breaks off)

CTH 375.2

Colophon

1’ [DUB.1.KAM PA-NI] DINGIR.MEŠ-aš-kán ma-ah-ḫa-an [...

2’ ŠA dUTU $^{URU}A-\text{ri-in-na Ú-[UL QA-TI}}$

Tablet Two

Col. i

§1

Di1 $^{[URU]}Iš-\text{k}u-\text{ru-ų-Ḫa-aš URU-aš ḫu-u-ma-an-za}$

Di2 $^{[LÜ]}MEŠ\text{-ta-\text{pa-\text{ri-ya-li-eš-ša mKa-an-nu-un-nu-ľuš}$}

Di3 $^{mPī-id-du-mu-u-\text{wa-aš-ša}}$

$^{551}$ The sign traces on the copy and photo are too damaged to be identified with any part of the word [ta-pa-\text{ri-ya-a}]-l-li-eš-ša, which comes at the end of this line (KUB 31.24 + KUB 48.28).
§2
Di4 $\text{URU} Ti$-wa-ra-a$\text{š URU}$-a$\text{š }hu$-u-ma-an-za $\text{LÚ$\text{MEŠ} ta$-er$-pa$-ri$-ya-[li$-eš$-ša]$

Di5 $m\text{Pí}$$\text{-ka-aš$-du$-i$-li$-i$š }m\text{Hi-ir$-hi$-ir$-ri$-iš$-ša$

\pagebreak

§3
Di6 $\text{URU} \text{Pí-šu$-nu$-pa-aš$-ši$-iš URU}$-a$\text{š }hu$-u-ma-an-za $\text{URU}$-$p$-[a

Di7 $\text{LÚ$\text{MEŠ} ta$-pa$-ri$-<ya$>-li$-eš$-ša }m\text{Pí$-ha$-ša$$-hi$$-iš$

Di8 $m\text{Pé-e$-ha$-ta$-hi$-la-aš$-ša$

Di9 $\text{URU} Zi$-WAR$'$$-zi$-ya-a$\text{š URU}$-a$\text{š }hu$-u-ma-an-za $\text{URU}$-$Z$-[i

Di10 $\text{LÚ$<<$MEŠ$>> ta$-pa$-ri$-ya$-li$-eš$-ša }m\text{Pí$-hu$-$u$-ga$-nu$-uš$-$<<ša$>$

§4

Di11 $\text{URU} Tal$-ma$-li$-ya-a$\text{š URU}$-a$\text{š }hu$-u-ma-an-za $\text{LÚ$\text{MEŠ} t$-[a$

Di12 $\text{LÚ$\text{MEŠ} ta$-pa$-ri$-ya$-al$-li$-i$-e$-es$-ša$

Di13 $m\text{Pa$-az$-zi$-zi pí$-iš$-du$-l$-mu$-$l$-[o $x$x$x$

Di14 $m\text{Ar$-ltu$-ul$$-l$-x $x$x$x$x$

552 $β=KBo$ 58.5. The Online Konkordanz does not give this fragment an identifying number/letter, labelling it as “CTH 375?”

553 $HU$ seems to have been written over erasure according to photo.
§6
Di15 URU $Iš-ka-lu-\text{[]}u^{1}$
Di16 $\text{mPî-it-tu-}[ud-du-uš^{2}]$

§7
Di17 URU $Ta-ḥa-\text{x}[\text{]}$
Di18 $\text{LÜ.MEŠ}[a-p[\text{]}a-ri-ya-li-eš-ša}$

§8
Di19 URU $Ka-pî-r[u-ḥa-aš$
Di20 $\text{mPu-u-ti-}[s^{2}]$

§9
Di21 URU $Zi-ku-\text{[]}r-[\text{]}$
Di22 $\text{LÜ.MEŠ}[ta-la-pa^{1}[ri-ya-li-eš-ša}$
Di23 $\text{x x [}\text{]}$

Col. ii

§10'
Dii1' $\text{x[}\text{]}$
Dii2' $\text{]}$
Dii3' $\text{]}x(-)ḥa-aš-ša [\text{]ar-x-an^{1}}$
Dii4' $\text{]}$

312
| §11’ | Diii5’ | ]x |
| §12’ | Dii8’ | URU]Qa-aš-ga ḫu-u-ma-an |
|      | Dii9’ | ]x-it-ti-ni-ya-aš |
|      | Dii10’ | ]x-an-za |
| §12’ | Dii11’ | ]x-aš-ša URU-aš ḫu-u-ṣma-an-za-ṣ |
|      | Dii12’ | ] |

**Col. iii**

| §14’’ | Diii1 | ]-laš |
|      | Diii2 | -i]d-du-wa-aš URU-aš |

| §15’’ | Diii3 | -y]a ḫu-u-ma-an |
|      | Diii4 | ḫKÚR |
|      | Diii5 | -y]a-aš ar-ga-ma-na-ša |
|      | Diii6 | a]r-ḥa šar-ri-ir |
§16’’
Diill1 |x-MEŠ li-in-ki-iš-ki-ir
Diill8

§17’’
Diill9 |x EGIR-pa
Diilll0 -š]a-an-zi

§18’’
Diilll1 |x nu |x x DINGIR.MEŠ’’
Col. iv
§19’’’
Div1’ |x A-NA x1[
Div2’ MUNUS ENSI’’[""

Colophon
Div3’ DUB.2.KAM PA-NLI [DINGIR].|MEŠ’-kán GIM-an
Div4’ an-da me-mi-š]-kán-zi
Div5’ ŠA a.ÞUTU URU A-ri-in-na° QA-TI
Translation

Tablet One

CTH 375.2

Obv.

§1
1 [Thus (speaks)] His Majesty Arnuwanda, Great King, and [Ašmunikal, Great Queen]
2 [for you, O Sun-goddess of Arinna […]
3 we [], which Arnuwanda [Great King and Ašmunikal]
4 Great [Queen] th[ey] continuously speak […]

§2
5 Now, for you O Gods…
6 truly fine […]
7 fine, heavy […]
8 Too fragmentary for translation

§3
9 And the Sun God, Storm God, the Protective Deity […]
10 mountains, rivers a[ncient gods…
11 in the Land of Ḫatti […]
12 …

(text breaks off)
CTH 375.1

§1’ (A i 1’-4’)

Ai1’ Too fragmentary for translation

Ai2’ ] your (pl.) temples

Ai3’ ] nowhere

Ai4’ ]

§2’ (A i 5’-9’)

Ai5’ For you, O Gods, only the Land of Ḫatti (lit. Ḫattuša) is a truly pure land. For you, we continuously give pure, great, and fine sacrifices

Ai6’ only in the Land of Ḫatti.

Ai8’ For you, O gods, only in the Land of Ḫatti

Ai9’ we continuously establish respect.

§3’ (A i 10’-12’)

Ai10’ You alone, O Gods, know by your divine souls that

Ai11’ formerly, no one took care of your temples

Ai12’ like we have.

§4’ (A i 13’-17’)

Ai13’ For your temples,

Ai14’ No one had thus established respect.

Ai15’ And no one had taken care of your goods, O gods, the silver, gold, rhyta, garments like we
Ai17’ have.

§5’ (A i 18’-A i 22’, C i 1’-3’)

Ai18’ Furthermore, (as to) the images of you, O gods, which are of silver and gold—
Ai19’ that which, on the body of whichever god,
Ai20’ was old, and the utensils of the gods which were old,
Ai21’ no one had
Ai22’ renewed them like we have.

§6’ (A i 23’-27’, B i 1’-4’, C i 5’-8’)

Ai23’ Furthermore, for you, in the matter of the purity of the rituals,
Ai24’ no one had thus established respect.
Ai25’ And for you, the rituals and festivals of (each) day, of (each) month, and of
annual recurrence
Ai26’ no one had thus
Ai27’ set up.\textsuperscript{554}

§7’ (A i 28’-31’, B i 5’-8’, C i 9’12’)

Ai28’ Furthermore, your servants and towns, O gods,
Ai29’ they continuously oppressed by means of šāḥḥān and corvée. And your,
Ai30’ servants and maids, O Gods, they continuously took
Ai31’ and they made servants and maids for themselves.

\textsuperscript{554} Translation of A i 25’-27’ with CHD L-N (s.v. meya(ni) a 2’’, p. 230).
§8’ (B i 9’-11’, C i 12’-C ii 2)

Bi9’ [For you gods, I Arnuwanda, Great King,

Bi10’ [and Ašmunikal, Great Queen]

Bi11’ established [res]pect in everything.

§9’ (B i 12’-13, C ii 3-5)

Bi12’ [the thick breads and the libations

Bi13’ [which they continuously gave, you alone] know with your [divine so]uls.

§10’ (B i 14’-17’, C ii 6-9)

Bi14’ [We, Arnuwanda, Great King, and] Ašmunikal, Great Queen,

Bi15’ will continuously give fat and fine oxen (and) sheep,

Bi16’ first-rate thick bread and libations

Bi17’ back (to the gods).

(the last paragraph of B i is not legible)

§11’

Cii10 [we continuously [gi]ve.

(gap of approximately 4-5 lines)

§12’

Bii1 Furthermore, your [ ] which […]

Bii2 We, king (and) queen [ ] back/again (to/for) ourselves […]

§13’

Bii3 And [we will establish] resp[ect] for your temples.
Furthermore, your towns [ ] in everything […]

§14’

With human(s), ox(en), sheep, grain […]

Furthermore, [ we will free ] them from šahhan and corvée

We will fr[ee] them back for you, O Gods.

§15’

And whatever is missing for you, […]

we, Arnuwanda, Great King and Ašmunikal, Great Queen

constantly “swing” it back [for you], and make it go[od].

§16’

And how [we ] in everything,

you alone, O gods, know that too.

§17’

And to which(ever) god, what(ever) matter […]

Or from whatever ma[tter…

will we not establish it?

§18’

And that god (nom.), that matter/sin”

by means of a male seer and by means of [a female seer…

we will establish. And we will set it right.
§19’ (B ii 19-21, A ii 1’-3’)

Bii19 And now, w[e, Arnuwanda, Great King.]
Bii20 and Ašmunikal Great Queen,[…]
Bii21 For you, al[l we].

§20’

Bii22 You, O Gods, [ Arnuwanda, Great King,
Bii23 and Ašmunikal, Great queen […
Bii24 Šatandumpe, Pariyawatra, the Priest

Aii8’ Too fragmentary for translation
Aii9’ [ you (pl.) shall stand!

§21’

Aii10’ How the enemy [attacked] the land of Ḩatti [and ]
Aii11’ plundered the land, took it, and [ ] it
Aii12’ we will continuously tell you, O Gods.
Aii13’ We will continuously plead our cases.

§22’

Aii14’ Your lands, O gods of heaven, which were (the suppliers) of
Aii15’ the libations and tribute,
Aii16’ the priests, priestesses, the (ritually) pure priests
Aii17’ the GUDU-priests, the musicians, the singers
Aii18’ went from them, and the tribute and ritual objects, O Gods,
Aii19’ they carried away from them.

§23’
Aii20’ The sun-discs and the lunulae
Aii21’ of silver, gold, bronze, (and) copper, the fine garments,
Aii22’ robes, and tunics of gown-garment, the offering breads and the libations
Aii23’ for the Sun Goddess of Arinna, they carried away from them.

§24’ (A ii 24’-25’, B ii 1’-2’’)
Aii24’ The sacrificial animals— the fattened bulls, fattened cows, fattened sheep, and fattened goats
Aii25’ for the Sun Goddess of Arinna, they drove away from them.

§25’ (A ii 26’-31’, B ii 3’-8’)
Aii26’ From the Land of Nerik, from the Land of Ḫuršama, from the Land of Kaštama,
Aii27’ from the Land of Šeriša, from the Land of Ḫimuwa, from the Land of Taggašta,
Aii28’ from the Land of Kammama, from the Land of Zalpūwa, from the Land of Kapiruḥa,
Aii29’ from the Land of Ḫurna, from the Land of Dankušna, from the Land of Tapašawa,
Aii30’ from the Land of Tarugga, from the Land of Ilalūḥa, from the Land of Zīḥṇa,
Aii31’ from the Land of Šipidduwa, from the Land of Wašḥaya, from the Land of Patalliya.

§26’a (A ii 32’-33’)
Aii32’ In these lands, they smashed your images,
Aii33’ O Gods.

§26’b (B ii 9’-11’)
Bii9’ Your temples, O Gods, which were in these lands,
Bii10’ the Kaška men destroyed them,
Bii11’ and they destroyed your images, O Gods.

§27’ (A iii 1-3, B ii 12’-13’)
Aiii1 Silver and gold, rhyta, cups of silver, gold,
Aiii2 and copper, your utensils of bronze,
Aiii3 and your garments they plundered, and they divided them up among themselves.

§28’ (A iii 4-7, B ii 16’-17’, H iii 1)
Aiii4 The priests, the (ritually) pure priests, the priestesses, the GUDU-priests,
Aiii5 the musicians, the singers, the cooks,
Aiii6 the bakers of bread, the plowmen, and the gardeners
Aiii7 they divided up, and they enslaved them for themselves.

§29’ (A iii 8-11, B ii 17’-20’, H iii 2-5)
Aiii8 They divided up your oxen and sheep.
Aiii9 your fields for bread and the vineyards
Aiii10 for libations, they divided up
Aiii11 and the Kaška men took them for themselves.
Aiii12 And furthermore, for you, O Gods,
Aiii13 in those lands, no one calls (your) name. No one gives the rituals
Aiii14 of (each) day, of (each) month, and of annual recurrence
Aiii15 The festivals
Aiii16 and ceremonies, no one performs for you.

Aiii17 Here, to ḫatti,
Aiii18 no one brings for you tribute and rites. The priests
Aiii19 the (ritually) pure priests, the priestesses, the musicians, the singers
Aiii20 no longer come from anywhere.

Aiii21 Furthermore, no one brings for you, O Gods, and the Sun Goddess of Arinna
Aiii22 sun-discs and lunulae, cups of silver, gold
Aiii23 (and) copper, fine garments, robes,
Aiii24 (and) tunics of gown-garment.
Aiii25 No [one] drives here (sic) to you, O Gods, the offering breads and the libations,
Aiii26 and the sacrificial animals—fattened oxen, fattened bulls, fattened cows,
Aiii27 fattened sheep, (and) fattened goats.

Too fragmentary for translation
Aiii29 Too fragmentary for translation

Aiii30 Too fragmentary for translation

(A breaks off, large gap bridged partially by C)

§34’’ (C iii 1’-2’)

Ciii1’ Too fragmentary for translation

Ciii2’ Too fragmentary for translation

§35’’ (C iii 3’-4’)

Ciii3’ (ritually) pu]re priests [...

Ciii4’ ] they continuously [ [... Furthermore [...

§36’’ (C iii 5’-6’)

Ciii5’ ] priestesse[s], we [...

Ciii6’ ] we [...

§37’’ (C iii 7’-10’)

Ciii7’ [Further]more, we [will continuously] call out to [yo]u the innocent lands:

Ciii8’ [K]aštama, Taggašta, Šešrišš[a...

Ciii9’ [T]aštrešša, Takkupša, Kam[mama]

Ciii10’ [Z]alpuwa, Nerik.

§38’’ (C iii 11’-14’)

Ciii11’ [Even no]w, we, Arnuwanda, Great Kin[g]

Ciii12’ and Ašmunikal, Great Queen,

Ciii13’ stand before you, O Gods, and to you [
Ciii14’ we continuously call out.

§39’’ (C iii 15’-17’)
Ciii15’ Kaška men […]
Ciii16’ To you, [O Gods…
Ciii17’ not […]

§40’’ (A iv 1-4, C iii 18’-21’)
Aiv1 They came here to Ḫatti […]
Aiv2 They attacked Tūḫašuna
Aiv3 They attacked Taḫantariya [ ] of the gate
Aiv4 they came down. The town Ḫum[-…

§41’’ (A iv 5-10, C iii 22’-27’)
Aiv5 Because we are respectful to the gods, and
Aiv6 we care for the festivals of the gods,
Aiv7 because the Kaška men have taken Nerik for themselves,
Aiv8 to the Storm God of Nerik and the gods of Nerik,
Aiv9 from Hattuša to Ḫakmiš
Aiv10 we continuously send rites—thick breads, libations, oxen, (and) sheep.

§42’’ (A iv 11-14, C iii 28’-29’)
Aiv11 We summon the Kaška men, we give them gifts,
Aiv12 Furthermore, we make them swear.
Aiv13 “The offerings which we send the Storm God of Nerik you watch out for them!
Aiv14  Let no one attack them on the way!

§43’’  (Aiv15-19)

Aiv15  They proceed to take the gifts, and they swear.

Aiv16  But when they return (lit. arrive back),

Aiv17  they transgress the oaths, and your words, O Gods,

Aiv18  they belittle. And the seal of the Storm God

Aiv19  they smash.

§44’’  (Aiv 20-25)

Aiv20  In the land of Ḥakmiš, they seize the roads.

Aiv21  And the thick breads

Aiv22  libations, oxen, and sheep, which we send to the Storm God of Nerik,

Aiv23  the Kaška men plunder them on the road.

Aiv24  And for the Storm God of Nerik, […

Aiv25  They do not transport.

§45’’  (Aiv 26-31)

Aiv26  [  but the Land of Ḥatti [  ] because’/which’[  ] your (pl.)

Aiv27  [  the land [  ] Kaška [men] come

Aiv28  [  and [  oat]h’ of god, in the following manner

Aiv29  [  n]ot’ [  ] furthermore the Land of Ḥatti

Aiv30  [  ]
§46’’

Aiv31  Too fragmentary for translation
Aiv32  Too fragmentary for translation

(gap of uncertain length)

§47’’’ (B iii 1’-2’)

Biii1’  Too fragmentary for translation
Biii2’  Too fragmentary for translation

§48’’’ (B iii 1’-4’)

Biii3’  ...

(gap of uncertain length)

§49’’

Biii1’  Too fragmentary for translation
Biii2’  And it [ ] after
Biii3’  And force and strength […
Biii4’  they continuously attack […

§50’’

Biii5’  Taggašta, the enti[re] town [and the commanders
Biii6’  Ḥatêpta, Zipili[-…

§51’’

Biii7’  Kammama, the entire town [and the commanders
Biii8’  Šunālii piggappilu [ m…]
Bi\texttext{ii9’} \textit{pikudu\texttext{stenah}}, Temitti […]

Bi\texttext{ii10’} Pazizi \textit{pitunt\texttext{una}} […]

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
§52’’’ & \\
Biv1 & and commanders \\
Biv2 & ] \\
\hline
§53’’’ & \\
Biv3 & ] and commanders \\
Biv4 & ] \\
\hline
§54’’’ & \\
Biv5 & and commanders \\
Biv6 & ]and m…-\textit{arri\texttext{s}} \\
\hline
§55’’’ & \\
Biv7 & ]and commanders \\
Biv8 & ] \\
\hline
§56’’’ & \\
Biv9 & ] and [command]ers \\
Biv10 & ] \\
\hline
§57’’’ & \\
Biv11 & ] and [command]ers \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
[First tablet.] When [they speak concurrently before] the gods,

Concerning the Sun Goddess of Arinna. Not complete.

Tablet Two

CTH 375.1.D

Col. i

§1

Di1 Iškurūḫa, the entire town,

Di2 and commanders Kannunnu

Di3 and Piddumūwa.

§2

Di4 Tiwara, the entire town, and command[ers]

Di5 Pikašduili and Ḥirḥirri.

§3

Di6 Pišunupašši, the entire town,

Di7 and commanders Piḫašaḫi

Di8 Pēḫataḫila
§4
Di9 Ziḫarziya, the entire town,
Di10 and the commanders Piḫūganu

§5
D11 Talmaliya, the entire town,
D12 and the commanders,
D13 Pazzizi pišdumu[-…
D14 Artumi[-…

§6
D15 Iškalū[-…
D16 Pittu[ddu

§7
D17 Taḫa[-…
D18 an[d] com[manders

§8
D19 Kapir[ul]a …
D20 Pū[i…

§9
D21 Zikur[-…
D22 and comm[anders
Colophon

Div 3’ Second Tablet. When

Div4’ they speak concurrently before the gods,

Div5’ concerning the Sun Goddess of Arinnna. Complete.
Commentary

CTH 375.2

Obv.

4 The switch from 1st pl in obv. 3 ([o]-x-ú-en) to 3 pl (me-mi-iš-lkán-zîl) in obv. 4 may reflect a shift from the perspective of the royal couple to that of the scribe or practitioner, who was going to recite the prayer and/or perform the ritual.

9-10 What is preserved of the list of deities in §3 appears similar to the lists of divine witnesses in treaties before the reign of Šuppišlulumi I (Yoshida 1996: 37), especially to those in the Kaška agreements. Like the beginning of the text, this list of deities too is preserved only on this fragment.

CTH 375.1

A i 23' The NH duplicate C i 5’ has ma-al-te-š-na-aš instead of ŠÍSKUR.HI.A. Since malteššar covers the meanings “recitation,” “vow, votive offering,” as well as “ritual (in fulfillment of a vow),” we may understand ma-al-te-š-na-aš pár-ku-ya-an-
aš ud-da-ni-i as “in the matter of the purity recitations” or “in the matter of the purity of offerings/rituals (performed in fulfillment of vows)”; see CHD L-N (s.v. malteššar 3, pp. 136-37).

§7 This paragraph describes how the gods had been treated in the past, with the purpose of highlighting (by comparison) the pious behavior of the royal couple described in the succeeding paragraph (§8’). It is unlikely that the 3rd pl. pret. verbs in
this paragraph refer to the Kaška, since the narrative concerning the ravages of the Kaška begins in §21’.

**B ii 9’** Based on the use of the 1 pl. pronoun ú-e-eš elsewhere in B (e.g., B ii 2, ii 9, ii 19), the 1st pl. pronoun ú-e-eš seems more likely in this line, despite the 1st sg. ú-uk in the corresponding C i 12’.

**C ii 4** The verb in C is 3rd pl. unlike in the preceding and succeeding paragraphs.

**B ii 5** The lack of a clause-initial conjunction/enclitic chain and the series of instrumentals are difficult to interpret without the verb. There are no other instances of the instrumental of antuḫša- in HW2 or the HED. B ii 6 and 7 of this paragraph suggest that in this paragraph the royal couple promise to improve the condition of the property of the gods (i.e., towns and temples mentioned in the preceding paragraph, §13’). The series of instrumentals in B ii 5 may therefore be viewed as among the items to be restored. At the end of the line there probably was a verb with the meaning ‘to provide’:

“[we provided you] with man, ox, sheep, (and) grain.”

**B ii 10** The choice of the verb kunk- ‘to shake, sway, swing, rock, dandle’ (ku-un-ga-aš-ki-u-wa-ni is 1st pl. pres. iterative) in this context is difficult to explain. None of the examples cited in HED (HED K, s.v., kunk-, p. 248-50 ) seem to have a meaning that would make sense in this paragraph, in which Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal promise to “make good” (SIG₃-ah-ḫi-iš-ki-u-w[a-ni]) whatever is missing for the gods.

**B ii 15** The negative clause is best interpreted as a rhetorical question since it is very unlikely in this context for the royal couple to confess that they have not established or prepared something.
A ii 21’ TÚ.G.SIG.Ḫ A-TIM and TÚ.G.Ḫ A.SIG-TIM in A iii 23 are both unusual, since the more common designation is TÚ.G.Ḫ SIG, “dünnes Ḫemd,” HZ 198, n 212. TÚ.G.SIG.Ḫ A-TIM/TÚ.G.Ḫ A.SIG-TIM was probably also a fine cloth.

A iii 25-27 A iii 25-27 appear to have constituted a single clause. However, the verb unnā- ‘to drive here’ is appropriate only for the second half of the list of items (i.e., sacrificial animals) in A ii 26-27. In a parallel passage that appears at an earlier point in the composition, this list is divided into two paragraphs (§§23’-24’). §23’ lists the precious objects, garments, the offering breads, and the libations. §24’, on the other hand, lists the sacrificial animals (A ii 24’). In §32’, however, the two paragraphs are merged.

A iv 26 The first two signs preceding KUR URURU-La-at-ti-ma could only have been logograms.

D iv 4’ The meaning of anda mema- according to the CHD (s.v. mema-, 13a, pp. 261-62) is to ‘speak concurrently with an action.’ And indeed in all the examples cited in CHD, anda mema- follows another action (e.g., “then the commanders of the army place their hands on the rams and speak concurrently as follows,” KUB 9.32 i 18-22).

However, in the colophon of CTH 375.1.D anda memai- stands alone: “Second tablet. When they speak concurrently before the gods, concerning the Sun Goddess of Arinna. Complete.”
§1’
1 |x
2 |x-pi-i-li-[š

§2’
3 URU-aš ḫu-u-ma-an-[n-z][a] LÜ.ta-pa-ri-ya[-le-e]š-[ša]₁
4 ]-ur-me-la-aš'

§3’
6 -h]a-tal-li-iš

§4’
7 |x[ -r]i-ya-le-eš-ša₁

(text breaks off)

Col. iii’

§5’
1’ |x-[ma-la-a-an²₁ x[
3’ -a]l-ha ku'[e-e[š

§6’
4’ ] SIG₇-in i{n-n]a-ra-wa-an
5' \[]^{ SIG_{-in}} [p]^{\hat{h}u_{-te}}\cdot zi

6' \[x^{ SH_{A}} KUR \ Hur-ri-ya

7' \[KU]^{R_{URU}} [H]^{a-at}\cdot ti\)

(end of column)
CTH 375.5

KBo 52.15a (+) 52.15b

Rev. iii?

§2'

1' \[x-pī-\text{iš}] QA-\text{DU}]

2' \[x-az-zi-aš] QA-D[U

3' -p][a⁵]-ú-un-aš QA-\text{D}[U

4' \[x-az-pa-aš] QA-D[U

5' \text{UR}U Da-a]\text{n-[ku]1-uš-na QA-D[U] [LÚ.MEŠ]ta¹-[]

6' \[x-ya-aš] QA-\text{DU}][LÚ.MEŠ]ta-pa¹-ri[i-

7' \[x-šu-wa-aš] QA-\text{DU}][LÚ.MEŠ]ta¹-pa-ri[i-

8' \[x-na-aš] QA-\text{DU}][LÚ.MEŠ]ta-pa-ri[y]a-

9' \[x-aš] QA-\text{DU}[LÚ.MEŠ]ta-pa-ri[y]a-

10' ] [QA-D]U[LÚ.MEŠ]ta-pa-ri[y]a-

11' ] [LÚ.MEŠ][

KBo 52.15b

§3''

1' \text{LÚ.MEŠ} ta¹-pa-ri-ya-li-it¹

2' \text{LÚ.MEŠ} ta¹-pa-ri-ya-li-[t

3' \text{LÚ.MEŠ} ta-pa-ri-ya-li-[t

4' \text{LÚ.MEŠ} ta-pa-ri-ya-li-[}
LÚ. |\textsuperscript{MEŠ} | \textit{ta-ri-ya-l[i-}
CTH 375 (further fragments)

KBo 55.19

Obv.?

1 šu-me-en-za-an DINGIR.MEŠ URU\MEŠ-KU-NU \KUR\[ ]
2 -zi nu-uš-ša-an tu-uk A-NA [ ]
3 ]x-1iš1-aš \NINDA\har-ši-ya1[ ]

KBo 55.20

1’ ]x[ ]
2’ -l]\e\-e-eš-ša
3’ ]x \mPí-ma-aš-ku-ru-uš-š[ ]

4’ U]RU-aš ḫu-um-an-za [ ]
5’ ]x x x x[ ]

KBo 57.17

§1’

1’ ]x x[ ]
2’ ]x x ši pí-[ ]

§2’

3’ ]x-aš URU-aš ḫu-u-[ ]
4’ ]x-pí-iš m[ ]
5’ ]x pí-te-k[ji\(-\)]

339
§3’
6’ (-)zi-ta-äš U[RU]
7’ ]x x [ 

KBo 59,2 (723/z)

§1’
1’ ]x x x x [ 
2’ ]Ha-at-ti i-x[ 
3’ pár-ku-i ša-ni-i[z-

§2’
4’ ]-zi-l-yaš-ma-kăn [ 
5’ ]-l-š-li-yaš[a- 
6’ ]x-š-ma-š-pár-ku-š[ 
7’ ]šu-ma-a-š [ 

§3’
8’ ]-ma-a-[š 
9’ ]x x[ 
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Chapter Six

Summary and Conclusions

Early Empire Period Kaška texts

Documents dating to the Early Empire Period are characterized by structural and formal diversity and significant overlap between different document types. This study approaches juridical-administrative documents from the Early Empire Period as a continuum, rather than a collection of distinct genres. The agreements with the Kaška and those with other peripheral communities that inhabited the frontiers of Ḫatti (discussed in Chapter Four) occupy a middle point in this continuum, somewhere between administrative (internal) and diplomatic (external) documents. The idiosyncrasies of the Kaška agreements were directly related to the status of the Kaška on the fringes of Hittite authority and the nature of the frontier they shared with the Hittite state.

The Hittite-Kaška frontier and Hittite frontier policy

This study argues that the Kaška did not inhabit a putative homeland (“Kaška Land”) beyond the frontier but were part of the inhabitants of the frontier region. In this region there never was a definite border in the shape of a line of fortifications or a wall, which separated Hittite and Kaška territory. Hittite-controlled territory in this region was
“discontiguous,” restricted to fortified towns, their immediate surroundings, and routes of communication. Hittite control was also episodic, since towns and population groups in the frontier region could and easily did change their political allegiance (as we see in examples from the Mašat correspondence, see Chapter Three).

Modern treatments of Hittite-Kaška interactions give the impression that Empire Period rulers (until the time of Ḫattušili III) resorted to increasingly defensive measures in reaction to increasing Kaška aggression. I have argued that this modern narrative is based (mostly, if not solely) on historiographic accounts, which sought to justify the king’s actions to an elite and/or divine audience. In historiographic accounts Hittite territorial expansion is masked behind stories of enemy aggression or defiance, whereas defeat is often depicted as voluntary withdrawal (Klinger 2001). I have suggested instead that Hittite kings seem to have adopted more aggressive strategies during the Empire Period and conducted repeated military campaigns for territorial expansion and the forced extraction of tribute. The refortification and repopulation of frontier towns, in this scenario, are seen not as defensive but offensive measures.

It seems as though the practice of making agreements with the Kaška, well documented during the Early Empire Period, was given up during the Empire Period. Except for three possible fragments, the Kaška agreements were not recopied during the Empire Period.556

---

555 Parker’s terminology, in reference to the northern frontier of the Neo-Assyrian Empire (2001: 17).
556 One can contrast this to the multiple NH copies of the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal.
Hittite-Kaška interactions

Hittite-Kaška interactions were diverse and not exclusively hostile. The exclusionist policies recorded in the Tiliura Decree (CTH 89) seem to have been particular to the reign of Ḫattušili III and perhaps to a single town and cannot be used to generalize about Hittite-Kaška relations in other periods. The Kaška agreements and Mašat correspondence, our principal sources on Hittite-Kaška interactions, suggest economic and possibly social and cultural symbiosis between Hittite-controlled towns and the Kaška populations in the frontier region. Peaceful interactions were beneficial to all parties involved. In fact, we know that groups of Kaška regularly came to Hittite towns seeking peace, and were sent by Hittite officials to the capital to be placed under oath. The Hittite state benefited from the economic transactions, but ultimately needed the troops and the loyalty of the allied Kaška for the security and stability of the frontier. On the other hand, raids on towns, cultivated lands, and herds were of great economic significance for both the Hittite state and the hostile Kaška.

Who were the Kaška?

The present study questions the prevalent notion that the category “Kaška” in Hittite sources corresponded to an ethnic group under that name. It makes a distinction between “Kaška” as a category in Hittite sources and the identity or identities of the people designated as Kaška. “Kaška” in Hittite sources was a social designation embracing diverse population groups inhabiting the northern frontier of Ḫatti, who were not under the direct control of the Hittite state despite their close proximity and
interactions. It does not seem to have been used as a cultural, linguistic, or ethnic label in Hittite sources.

Nevertheless, a few factors may indicate the existence of shared identity at least among some of the groups designated as Kaška, which may be interpreted as ethnic identity. We may count among these factors the use of the name Kaška in personal names already during the Early Empire Period, the attestation of the name Kaška in sources outside of Ḫatti (e.g., Egyptian and Assyrian sources), and especially, the use of onomastic epithets by Kaška leaders attested in Hittite documents. If my interpretation of the use of the Kaška name in combination with the Ḫattic and Luwian suffixes -ili and -muwa is correct, we may tentatively suggest that Kaška may have originally been a local name for all or part of the central Black Sea region.

The emergence of the Kaška problem coincides with the formation of the “empire” in the period known as the Early Empire Period. This period beginning with the reign of Tudḫaliya I (c. 1400 BCE) saw the reorganization of the political and administrative structure of the Hittite state (the capital Ḫattuša and the provinces), solidifying the absolute power of the king. New document types such as treaties, išhiul-documents, “oaths,” and instructions for various administrative institutions were developed to meet new administrative needs (Archi 2005: 225-29). This period also saw the creation of the frontier as a distinct administrative category and the institution of new

---

557 I am aware that this interpretation is precisely what von Schuler has warned us against in Die Kaškaer (1965: 91).
558 The use of onomastic epithets, though their meaning or function are not clear, seems to be the only unique feature of the Kaška.
559 This does not necessarily contradict my suggestion that “Kaška” in Hittite sources was a name for groups of people, not a territory or polity.
560 I agree with Zimansky (2007: 164) that the “Kaska start behaving like the Kaska” when the “Hittites start governing like Hittites.”
frontier policies, as we see from the abovementioned agreements with frontier populations (including the Kaška agreements) and the Maṣat correspondence. We may hypothesize that conflicts in the north began during this period with part of the population of the central Black Sea Region who were somehow affiliated with the name Kaška and who practiced mixed subsistence strategies (of pastoralism and agriculture, possibly in combination with seasonal vertical transhumance) that allowed them to avoid the drawbacks of a centralized empire. Gradually, as other towns, population groups, or individuals (i.e., fugitives) broke away from Hittite authority in reaction to the process of imperial consolidation described above, they too came to be categorized as “Kaška.” This process was probably similar to formation of the ḫabiru, a social category that was widely attested in the ancient Near East during the Late Bronze Age, which included persons who were compelled to leave their political communities, kin groups, or places of residence.\footnote{For a concise discussion of the ḫabiru and further references, see von Dassow (2008: 105-11).} During the Empire Period, aggressive Hittite frontier policy appears to have triggered the process of the formation of more centralized forms of political organization among the Kaška, as is evidenced by the prominence in historiographic accounts of Kaška rulers such as Pittagatalli, Pittaparra, Dadišu, and most importantly, Piḥḫuniya.\footnote{We may point here to Parker, who suggests that “Urartu was created as a reaction to Assyrian imperial aggression” (2001: 253-54).}

The scenario proposed in this study differs in two significant respects from traditional narratives concerning the Kaška and the history of their conflict with the Hittite state. First, the designation Kaška is described as a social category denoting populations in the north that escaped or outright opposed Hittite authority. Second, and perhaps more
importantly, the Kaška, or the “Kaška enemy” as Hittite sources more often refer to them, are viewed as a creation of the Hittite Empire.
Appendix One

Structural Overview of CTH 137-140, CTH 375

CTH 137.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column i</th>
<th>§1’-4’</th>
<th>Provisions for ‘men of Kammama’ concerning hostages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§5’-6’</td>
<td>Incipit (for new section) and provisions’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column ii</th>
<th>§7’-8’</th>
<th>Provisions for ‘men of Šattuppa’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§8’</td>
<td>Oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§9’-10’</td>
<td>Curses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§11’-12’</td>
<td><em>(Fragmentary)</em> Oath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Column iii | §13’-18’ | Lists of oath-takers and provisions |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column iv</th>
<th>§19’-23’</th>
<th>Lists of oath-takers and provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§24’</td>
<td>List of oath-takers and summary/short provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§25’</td>
<td>List of oath-takers and summary/short provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§26’</td>
<td>List of oath-takers and summary/short provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§27* (Fragmentary) List of oath-takers and summary/short provisions
CTH 139.1.A and B

Column i

§1’-6’ Provisions

Column ii

§7’ Provisions (fragmentary)
§8’ List of Divine Witnesses
§9’-11’ Curses and blessings

§12’ List of oath-takers

§13’ List of oath-takers

§14’ List of oath-takers

§15’ List of oath-takers (fragmentary)

Column iii

§16’ List of oath-takers and summary/short provisions
§17’-19’ Provisions

Column iii

§20’ Provisions’ (fragmentary)

§21’ List of oath-takers and provisions’ (fragmentary)
CTH 140.1.A

Column i

§1’-6’ Lists of troops and leaders

§7’-8’ Lists of troops and leaders
§9’-12’ Provisions
§13’-14’ Lists of oath-takers
§15’-17’ Provisions

Column iv

§18’ Provisions
§19’ List of oath-takers
§20’-23’ List of oath-takers and provisions
§24’ List of oath-takers
§25’-26’ List of takers and provisions
§27’ List of troops

§28’-29’ Lists of oath-takers²

Colophon Includes sum of troops (*very fragmentary*)
CTH 138.1.A

Obverse

§1-6 List of Divine Witnesses

§7 Provisions (very fragmentary)

Break

§8’-9’ Provisions (very fragmentary)

§10’-23’ Provisions concerning:
- The relationship of the allied Kaška to the enemy (i.e., hostile Kaška)
- Defensive and offensive alliance
- Reporting hostile activity to the Hittite king (and governor?)

Reverse

§24’-30’ Provisions concerning fugitives and the exchange of messengers

§31’-34’ Provisions concerning:
- Settling in Hittite territory
- The relationship of the allied Kaška to the enemy

§35’ Provisions concerning trade in Hittite territory

§36’-38’ Provisions concerning defensive and offensive alliance

§39’-42’ Provisions concerning the herding of cattle and sheep

Break

§43’ Provisions (very fragmentary)

§44’ Provisions concerning mercantile activity

§45’-47’ Provisions concerning defensive and offensive alliance
## TABLET 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>§1*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Obv. 1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Only in Ḫatti”</td>
<td>§2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§1’-2’</td>
<td>Col. i</td>
<td>1’-9’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§3’-4’</td>
<td>10’-17’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§5’</td>
<td>18’-22’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. i</td>
<td>1’-4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§6’</td>
<td>23’-27’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5’-8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to the past</td>
<td>§7’</td>
<td>28’-31’</td>
<td>5’-8’</td>
<td>9’-12’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§8’-9’</td>
<td></td>
<td>9’-11’</td>
<td>13’ Col. ii</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vows</td>
<td>§10’</td>
<td></td>
<td>14’-17’</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§11’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§12’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. ii 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§13’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§14’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§15’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§16’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§17’-18’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea?</td>
<td>§§19’-20’</td>
<td>Col. ii</td>
<td>1’-9’</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ravages of the Kaška”</td>
<td>§21’</td>
<td>10’-13’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§22’</td>
<td>14’-19’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§23’</td>
<td>20’-23’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§24’</td>
<td>24’-25’</td>
<td>1’-2’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§25’</td>
<td>26’-31’</td>
<td>3’-8’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§26’</td>
<td>32’-33’</td>
<td>9’-11’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§27’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. iii 1-3</td>
<td>12’-13’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§28’</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>16’-17’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§29’</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>17’-20’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present situation in the north</td>
<td>§30’</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>21’-24’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§31’</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>25’-28’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§32’</td>
<td>21-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§33’</td>
<td>28-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>§34’’-36’’</td>
<td>Col. iii</td>
<td>1’-6’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea?</td>
<td>§37’’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7’-10’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§38’’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11’-14’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravages of the Kaška</td>
<td>§39’’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15’-17’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§40’’</td>
<td>Col. iv</td>
<td></td>
<td>18’-21’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CTH 375.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piety of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal in the face of difficulties</td>
<td>§41”</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>22'-27’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§42”</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>28'-29’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravages of the Kaška</td>
<td>§43”</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§44”</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§45”-46”</td>
<td>26-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>§§47”-48”</td>
<td>Col. iii</td>
<td>1’-3’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravages of the Kaška</td>
<td>§49”</td>
<td>1’-4’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of towns and governors</td>
<td>§§50”-51”</td>
<td>5’-10’</td>
<td>Col. iv</td>
<td>5’-11’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§52”-55”</td>
<td>Col. iv</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>12’-18’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§56”-57”</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon of Tablet 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. 1’-2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TABLET 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of towns and governors</td>
<td>§§1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. i</td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§10’-13’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. ii</td>
<td>1’-12’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§14’-18’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. iii</td>
<td>1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col.IV</td>
<td>1’-2’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophon of Tablet 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3’-5’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two

Geographical and Personal Names in CTH 137-140, CTH 375

Geographical names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GN</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>CTH</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ašdžera</td>
<td>UBU Aš-du-be-l-e</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 49'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āšta</td>
<td>UBU A-ašt-a</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankuruwa</td>
<td>UBU An-ku-r[u]-wa'</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ėršita</td>
<td>UBU E-e[r]-hi-ta</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 53'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškamaňaša</td>
<td>UBU Iš-ka-ma-[u]-aš-[i]-ta</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 43'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškuruňa</td>
<td>UBU Iš-[k]u-ru- [u]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iššupītta</td>
<td>UBU Iš-[u]-pi-[i]-t-ta</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ėšumišta</td>
<td>UBU Iš-[u]-mi-[i]-š-ta</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ėšumišta</td>
<td>UBU Iš-[u]-mi-[i]-š-ta</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaluňa</td>
<td>UBU I-la-a-lu-u-[u]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaluňa</td>
<td>[I]š-aš-[a]-[u]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaščama</td>
<td>UBU G[a]-aš-ta-m-a-an</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>C iii 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaščama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-aš-ta-m[a]</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaščama</td>
<td>UBU K[a]-a-[a]-u-[a]-ma-[a]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākaddwa</td>
<td>UBU Ka-a-kad-du-[u]-wa</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-am-ma-ma</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>i 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-am-[a]-m[a]</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>i 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>[I]BU Ka-am-ma-am-ma-aš</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 41'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>[I]BU Ka-[a]-am-ma-am-ma</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.B</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-am-ma-ma-[a]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-am-[m]-a-[a]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C iii 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-am-ma-ma-[a]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammama</td>
<td>UBU Ka-a-[a]-m[a]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C iii 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapipišta</td>
<td>UBU Ka-pi-pi-[i]-š-ta</td>
<td>CTH 138?</td>
<td>KBo 43.1</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiruňa</td>
<td>UBU Ka-pi-[r]-u-[u]-aš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiruňa</td>
<td>UBU Ka-pi-[r]-u-[u]-aš</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KUB 40.36+</td>
<td>A ii 34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiruša</td>
<td>UBU_Ga-pí-ru-u-ša</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiruša</td>
<td>UBU_Ka-pí-ru-u-ša-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 28’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiruša</td>
<td>UBU_Ka-pí-ru-[ša]-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilimuna</td>
<td>UBU Ki-li-mu-na</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 13’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kušašušuša</td>
<td>UBU Ku-šašušušuša</td>
<td>CTH 236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+)</td>
<td>i 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kušašušuša</td>
<td>UBU Ku-šašušušušušušušuša</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 16’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapihina</td>
<td>UBU La-pí-hi-na</td>
<td>CTH 236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+)</td>
<td>i 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litta</td>
<td>UBU Li-it-ta</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 54’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāsišili</td>
<td>UBU Ha-i-ši-il-li-ilš</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 27’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitta</td>
<td>UBU Ha-iti-ta</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākmiš</td>
<td>UBU Ha-ak-mi-iš-ši</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A iv 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākmiš</td>
<td>UBU Ha-ak-mi-iššša</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A iv 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākmišša</td>
<td>UBU Ha-ak-mi-ilšši</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KUB 40.36+</td>
<td>A i 36’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākmišša</td>
<td>UBU Ha-ak-mi-iššša</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 36’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-ta-mi-šig’-ša</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 31.33+</td>
<td>7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-at-mi-šig’-ga</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 11’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-at-mi-šig’-o</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 11’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-at-mi-šig’-a</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-at-mi-šig’-ga</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 13’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatmigga</td>
<td>UBU Ha-at-mi-šig’-a</td>
<td>CTH 140.2</td>
<td>KUB 26.20+</td>
<td>A i 13’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerik</td>
<td>UBU Ne-ri-ik-ka-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 26’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerik</td>
<td>UBU Ne-ri-ik-ka-an</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C iii 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerik</td>
<td>UBU Ne-ri-ig-ga-ma-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A iv 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himuwa</td>
<td>UBU Hi-ı-mu-wa-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 27’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himuwa</td>
<td>UBU Hi-ı-mu-wa-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūršama</td>
<td>UBU Húr-ša-ma-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 26’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūršama</td>
<td>UBU Húr-ša-ma-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurna</td>
<td>UBU Hu-rur-na-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 29’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patalliya</td>
<td>UBU Pa-tal-li-y-ya-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 31’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patalliya</td>
<td>UBU Pa-tal-li-y-ya-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pišunapšiši</td>
<td>UBU Pi-shu-na-pa-aš-ši-iš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D ii 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pintalašša</td>
<td>UBU Pi-in-ta-la-aš-ša</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šatuppa</td>
<td>UBU Ša-ad-di-um-pa</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šatuppa</td>
<td>UBU Ša-ad-di-um-pa</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>ii 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šatuppa</td>
<td>UBU Ša-ad-di-um-pa</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>ii 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šerišša</td>
<td>UBU Še-ri-iš-ša</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 23’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šerišša</td>
<td>UBU Še-ri-iš-ša</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 27’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šerišša</td>
<td>UBU Še-ri-iš-ši</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>C iii 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šipidduwa</td>
<td>Ši-pi-id-du-wa-a[z]</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šipidduwa</td>
<td>Ši-pi-id-du-wa-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBō 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dankušna</td>
<td>Da-a[na]-kil-aš-na</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBō 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dankušna</td>
<td>Da-an-ku-aš-na-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darittara</td>
<td>Da-ri-[t-ta-ra]</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taštarešša</td>
<td>[¹URU]a-š-ta-re-č-ša-an</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBō 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iii 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taštarišša</td>
<td>Ta-š-ta-ri-iš-š[a]</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggašta</td>
<td><a href="T%C4%81g-%5Bga%5D-a%C5%A1-ta-a">¹URU</a>[za]</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggašta</td>
<td>Tāg-[ga]-aš-ta-an</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>C iii 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggašta</td>
<td>Tāg-[ga]-aš-ta-[za]</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBō 53.10 (+)</td>
<td>B ii 4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggašta</td>
<td>Tāg-[ga]-aš-ta-š</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBō 53.10 (+)</td>
<td>B iii 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggašta</td>
<td>Tāg-[ga]-aš-ta-[a]</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBō 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iv 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taihirriya</td>
<td>Ta-[l]-hi-ri-[y]a '</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 31.33+</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takašturiya</td>
<td>Ta-ka-aš-tu-ri-ya</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KBō 8.35</td>
<td>B iv 4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takupša</td>
<td>Tāk-ku-[p]-ša</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takupša</td>
<td>Tāk-ku-up-ša-ša</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBō 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iii 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫantariya</td>
<td>Ta-ḫa-ta-ri-ya-an</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A iv 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫantariya</td>
<td>Ta-ḫa-an-[a]-ri-ya-an</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBō 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iii 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫpašara</td>
<td>Taḫ-pa-[ša]-ra-[a] '</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapašawa</td>
<td>Ta-pa-[ša]-wa-[a]</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapašawa</td>
<td>Ta-[p][ša]-wa-[a] '</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBō 53.10 (+)</td>
<td>B ii 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapālupa</td>
<td>Ta-pa-[a]-[u]-pa</td>
<td>CTH 140.3</td>
<td>KBō 50.61+</td>
<td>13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapālupa</td>
<td>Ta-pa-[a]-lu-[pa]</td>
<td>CTH 234.2</td>
<td>KBō 16.66</td>
<td>iii 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapapašuwa</td>
<td>Ta-pa-pa-šu-šu-wa</td>
<td>CTH 234.2</td>
<td>KBō 16.66</td>
<td>iii 13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapauwa</td>
<td>Ta-pa-un-wa</td>
<td>CTH 138.2.A</td>
<td>KUB 31.105</td>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapurāni</td>
<td>Ta-pu-ra-ša-ni</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarugga</td>
<td>Ta-ru-ug-ga-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarupta</td>
<td>Ta-ru-up-[a]-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBō 53.10 (+)</td>
<td>B ii 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tešenippa</td>
<td>Te-še-ni-[l]p-pa</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KUB 40.36+</td>
<td>A ii 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tešenippa</td>
<td>Te-še-ni-ip-pa</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KBō 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terniya</td>
<td>Te-mi-ya</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 55'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepiya</td>
<td>Ti-pi-ya</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwarā</td>
<td>Ti-wa-ra-aš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiyarēš</td>
<td>Ti-ya-ri-[e]</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiyarēš</td>
<td>Ti-ya-ri-[e]</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuššuna</td>
<td>[¹URU]u-a-ha-šu-na-an</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A iv 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuñaåuna</td>
<td>UBU-Tu-u-ša-[na-an]</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iii 19’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undaš</td>
<td>UBU-U-un-da-[š]</td>
<td>CTH 234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>iii 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppošitta</td>
<td>UBU-U-up-pa-aš-[ši-i-ta]</td>
<td>CTH 137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppošitta</td>
<td>UBU-U-up-pa-aš-[ši-i-ta]</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 19’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waššaya</td>
<td>UBU-Wa-aš-[ša]-ya-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 31’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waššaya</td>
<td>UBU-Wa-aš-[ša]-ya-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yašrišša</td>
<td>UBU-Ya-šri-iš-ša</td>
<td>CTH 139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 32’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zašpiya</td>
<td>UBU-Za-aš-pi-ya-aš</td>
<td>CTH 140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 28’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Załpuwa</td>
<td>UBU-Za-al-pu-wa-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 28’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Załpuwa</td>
<td>UBU-Za-al-pu-wa-az</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17 (+)</td>
<td>C iii 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilharziya</td>
<td>UBU-Zi-šAR-zi-ya-aš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilhanna</td>
<td>UBU-Zi-iš-ša-na-az</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>A ii 30’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilhanna</td>
<td>UBU-Zi-iš-ša-na-az</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B ii 7’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partially preserved geographical names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GN</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>CTH</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...-ašša</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-aš-ša</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D ii 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-šuwa</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-šū-wa-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-azpa</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-az-pa-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-azzi</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-az-zī-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-idduwa</td>
<td>...-]&lt;i-du-wa-aš</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D iii 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-na</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-na-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-paḫtuna</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;x-pa-ḫtu-na</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-pauna</td>
<td>-]&lt;p-û-un-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-pi</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-pi-teš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-ya</td>
<td>...-]&lt;x-ya-aš</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>KBo 52.15a(+)</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāla-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;š-a-la-x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 52’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ašte-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;aš-te-l-x-x</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 57.2</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gati-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;gati-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 50.71</td>
<td>7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškalu-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;iš-ka-lu-u-1</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškū-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;iš-ku-u-x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 31’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katta-</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;kat-š[a</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāzzi-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ka-a-az-zi-[</td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+</td>
<td>i 11’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kil-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ki-[l</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 47’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ku-ur-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwati-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ku-wa-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṯali-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;mu-ṭa-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 45’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hā-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ha-a-[x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haša-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ha-š[a</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ha-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hašši-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;hašši-[x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 21’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handati-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ha-datu-[x</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 24’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥami-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ha-m[i</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 51’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;hu-um-[</td>
<td>375.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 17.21+</td>
<td>iv 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piška-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;piš-iška-[x</td>
<td>236.2</td>
<td>KBo 47.193</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫ-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;taḫ-[x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḥa-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;taḫ-[</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫana-</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;taḫana-[</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>iii 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ta-pu-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 23’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;t[a-ra-[</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ta-ra-[</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 24’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tat-...</td>
<td>URU-]&lt;ta-at-[x</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 46’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepa-</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{URU} Te-e-pa(\mbox{-})]</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iv 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tila-</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{URU} Ti-i-[a-]</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip-</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{URU} Ti-ip'l-]</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zikur-</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{URU} Zi-ku-ú[r-]</td>
<td>375.1.D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Personal names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Epithet/Title</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>CTH</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aššapala</td>
<td>mĂš-ša-p[a-la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 21'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šahara</td>
<td>mŠa-ša-ra-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.3.</td>
<td>KBo 50.61</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šappalina</td>
<td>mŠa-[pal]-li-in-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šazina</td>
<td>mŠa-zi-na-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mŠa-me-e-ti-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.29(+)</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mŠe-me-ti-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mŠe-me-ti-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mŠe-me-ti-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>[m]ši-me-ti-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mŠa-me-ti-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.3.</td>
<td>KBo 50.61</td>
<td>11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mši-me-ti-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 47.193</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šemetili</td>
<td>mša-me-ti-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>iii 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardul</td>
<td>măr-du-u-ul</td>
<td>pî-šu-...</td>
<td></td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+)</td>
<td>8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardul</td>
<td>măr-tu-ul 1'l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375.1</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atitta</td>
<td>mĂš-lit-ta-aš</td>
<td>DUMU mKCommit to it-pî-ir-ri</td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>[mš][u-na-i-li</td>
<td>pî-ku-ûr-ya-al-li</td>
<td>LŪ [Balma-ti-x]</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[u-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[u-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[u-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[ua-i-li-š][i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mšan-ša-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mšu-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 21'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>[mšan-ša-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mšu-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mšu-na-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[u-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>KUB 31.33</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>mš[u-na-i-li-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.2.</td>
<td>KUB 26.20</td>
<td>11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Epithet/Title</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Ša-uš-ši-li</td>
<td>[LU uru]a-ar-mi-ša-g[a]</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>140.2.</td>
<td>KUB 26.60</td>
<td>12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 57.2</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-a-i-li</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>ii i</td>
<td>1’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-a-i-li</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>ii i</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-a-i-li</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>ii i</td>
<td>9’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-a-i-li</td>
<td>234.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.66</td>
<td>ii i</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-na-a-i-li</td>
<td>pt-...-ša-ra-a-i</td>
<td>375.1.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-a-uš-ši-li</td>
<td>Šu-a-uš-ši-li</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-a-uš-ši-li</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šunaili</td>
<td>Šu-a-uš-ši-li</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KUB 40.36+</td>
<td>A ii</td>
<td>28’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dada</td>
<td>Da-da-aš</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>27’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškari</td>
<td>Iš-ka-ri-x...</td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>38’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškari</td>
<td>Iš-ta-ta-za</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 50.71</td>
<td>11’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kašaluwa</td>
<td>Ka-la-lu-wa-aš</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.29(+)</td>
<td>16’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kašiyara</td>
<td>Ka-si-yar-šu</td>
<td>DUMU mTa-ra-aš-ku-šu</td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaška</td>
<td>Ka-aš-qa-šša</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>27’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailu</td>
<td>Ka-aš-ša-li</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 57.2</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmaḫaziti</td>
<td>Kal-ma-ša-zi-ti</td>
<td>DUMU m...</td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannunu</td>
<td>Ka-an-nu-un-na-lušša</td>
<td>375.1.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanu</td>
<td>Qa-ša-lušša</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazzipirri</td>
<td>Kαl-pi-tr-rri</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippuruwa</td>
<td>Ki-ip-pu-ru-wa-aš</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iii</td>
<td>4’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuriyalli</td>
<td>Ku-ri-yar-ša-ša</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.29(+)</td>
<td>13’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuriyallu</td>
<td>Ku-ri-ša-aš-ša</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii</td>
<td>26’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwa</td>
<td>Ku-ša-wa-aš</td>
<td>L[U uru]Sa-a-la...</td>
<td>140.1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaziti</td>
<td>Na-ša-ša-ša-ša</td>
<td>L[U uru]ša-la-ša</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaziti</td>
<td>Na-na-ša-ša-ša</td>
<td>L[U uru]ša-la-ša</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>21’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Epithet/Title</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimaškuru</td>
<td>ᵐPš-ma-aš-ku-ru-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 55.20</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikašduili</td>
<td>ᵐPš-ka-aš-du-ti-li-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 40.36+</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pazzizi</td>
<td>ᵐPš-tu-un-tu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 53.10+</td>
<td>i 55'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pazzizzi</td>
<td>ᵐPš-tu-un-tu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 53.10+</td>
<td>i 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddumwa</td>
<td>ᵐPš-id-du-mu-u-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 40.36+</td>
<td>i 16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piššuri</td>
<td>ᵐPš-tšu-ri-uš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 53.10+</td>
<td>i 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peḥatahila</td>
<td>ᵐPš-e-ha-ta-hi-la-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 40.36+</td>
<td>i 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paldu</td>
<td>ᵐPa-al-du-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 53.10+</td>
<td>i 13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥirḫirri</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-ir-ḥi-ir-ta-ša</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 53.10+</td>
<td>i 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narikkaili</td>
<td>ᵐNa-ri-iq-qa-i-li</td>
<td>at-ta-an</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥatipta</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-ti-ip-ta-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥatipta</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-te-ip-ta-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥatipta</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-ta-e-ep-ta-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥatipta</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-ta-e-ep-ta-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>ii 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 54'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥazzina</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-az-zu-na-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 54'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥimuilí</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-mu-i-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥazzina</td>
<td>ᵐḤṭ-az-zu-na-aš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>i 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narikkaili</td>
<td>ᵐNa-ri-iq-qa-i-li</td>
<td>at-ta-an</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piduddu</td>
<td>ᵐPš-it-ta-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 40.36+</td>
<td>i 16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddumwa</td>
<td>ᵐPš-id-du-mu-u-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 40.36+</td>
<td>i 16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimaškuru</td>
<td>ᵐPš-ma-aš-ku-ru-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 55.20</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Epithet/Title</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pihušahi</td>
<td>mPi-ḥa-ša-ḫi-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pihušanu</td>
<td>mPi-ḥu-ū-ša-ru-ūš-&lt;&lt;ša&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375.1</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipellu</td>
<td>mPi-ḫa-ša-ḫi-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirwi</td>
<td>mPi-ru-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piya</td>
<td>mPi-ya-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzizzi</td>
<td>mPi-ya-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>A ii 28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzizzi</td>
<td>mPi-iz-zi-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzizzi</td>
<td>mPi-iz-zi-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>A ii 23'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzizzi</td>
<td>mLpI-iz-zi-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>KBo 16.29(+)</td>
<td>19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puti</td>
<td>mPu-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375.1</td>
<td>KUB 48.107(+)</td>
<td>D i 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taḫašta</td>
<td>mTa-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i iv 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taškuil</td>
<td>mTa-ra-ša-š</td>
<td>DUMU mLpI-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 57'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarḫuštaiti</td>
<td>mTa-ra-ša-š</td>
<td>DUMU mLpI-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarḫantiša</td>
<td>mTa-ra-ša-š</td>
<td>DUMU mLpI-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatili</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KBo 26.66+</td>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatili</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatili</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatili</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 31.33</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatili</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 47.193</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temetti</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temetti</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375.1</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B iii 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temetti</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B ii 27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iv 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>iv 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutu</td>
<td>mLpI-ša-ša-š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 12'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

363
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Epithet/Title</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>CTH</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuttu</td>
<td>mTu-at-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1. A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 36'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttu</td>
<td>mTu-at-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1. A</td>
<td>KUB 31.33</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttu</td>
<td>mTu-at-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1. A</td>
<td>KUB 31.33</td>
<td>8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttu</td>
<td>mTu-ud-du</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>KBo 50.70</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttu</td>
<td>mTu-at-tu</td>
<td>pr-ip-pa-la-la</td>
<td></td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+)</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltàği</td>
<td>mWa-al-ta-ḥi-iš</td>
<td>LŪ URU ḫa-mi-…</td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1. A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 51'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipili</td>
<td>m\Zi-pi-li-iš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.1. A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 41'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Partially preserved personal names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Epithet/Title</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>CTH</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>m...</td>
<td>1(p)i(^1)ti-(h)u-(n)u-(m)a-(a)š</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 51'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>m...</td>
<td>DUMU mPa-a-ta</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 58-59'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>m...</td>
<td>pi-ka-du-uš-te-na-(a)h</td>
<td>375.1.B</td>
<td>KBo 53.10(+)</td>
<td>B iii 9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>m...</td>
<td>1(p)i(^3)in-tu-(i)n-</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C' iv 11'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...šazuva</td>
<td>m...(-)x-ša-zu-wa</td>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>KBo 8.35</td>
<td>B iv 4'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ara</td>
<td>m...(-)-a-ra-aš-ša</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 19'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...gatalli</td>
<td>m...(-)-x-(l)(a)tal-li-iš</td>
<td>375.1.G</td>
<td>HFAC 72</td>
<td>G ii 6'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ipmela</td>
<td>m...(-)-(p)-me-la-aš</td>
<td>375.1.G</td>
<td>HFAC 72</td>
<td>G ii 4'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ittili</td>
<td>m...(-)-x-(i)-(ti)-(l)i</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 34'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-kaela</td>
<td>m...(-)-xka-e-la-aš</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 5'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...pi</td>
<td>m...(-)-x-pi-iš</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>KBo 57.17</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...piduddu</td>
<td>m...(-)-p(i)-(d)-(u)-(d)-(u)</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 6'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...pili</td>
<td>(-)(p)l(i)-(l)i</td>
<td>236.3</td>
<td>KBo 31.74(+)</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...-pili</td>
<td>m...(-)-x-pi-(i)-(l)i-(i)ši</td>
<td>375.1.G</td>
<td>HFAC 72</td>
<td>G ii 2'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...- tilili</td>
<td>[ o ]-x-(i)-(ti)-(l)i (^1)</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>iv 20'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...tušili</td>
<td>...-(l)(u)-(ši)-(l)i (^{(-)})</td>
<td>140.3.A</td>
<td>KBo 50.61</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...ziti</td>
<td>m...(-)-(z)-(i)-(t)i</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ššaš-..</td>
<td>m(š)-(a)-(a)-(š)-(x)-(l)i</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 14'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kān-..</td>
<td>m(k)-(a)-(a)-(n)-(x)-(l)i</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iii 13'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwatta..</td>
<td>m(m)-(u)-(a)-(wa)-(at)-(l)a (^{-})</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>KBo 16.27+</td>
<td>iv 33'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥap-..</td>
<td>m(h)-(a)-(a)-(p)-(u) (^{-})</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 14'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pašši-..</td>
<td>m(p)-(a)-(ši)-(š)-(i)-(l)si</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KBo 50.64</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pī-..</td>
<td>m(p)-(u) (^{-})</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 16'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pī-..</td>
<td>m(p)-(i)-(x)l (^{-})</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 52'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pišṭu-..</td>
<td>m(p)-(i)-(š)-(u)-(l)i (^{-})</td>
<td>140.3.A</td>
<td>KBo 50.61</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tep-..</td>
<td>m(t)-(e)-(p)-(i)-(š)-(l)i (^{-})o-(a)š</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C' iv 10'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiyašu-..</td>
<td>m(t)-(i)-(a)-(š)-(u)-(t)-(u)-(k)-(u)-(k)-(u)-(k)-(u)-(k)l (^{-})</td>
<td>375.1.C</td>
<td>KBo 55.17(+)</td>
<td>C' iv 15'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gašša-..</td>
<td>m(g)-(a)-(š)-(a)-(š)-(a)</td>
<td>140.1.A</td>
<td>KUB 26.66+</td>
<td>i 15'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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