

The Edict Issued by the Hittite King Ḫattušili III Concerning the Priesthood of the Goddess Ištar/Šaušga

Stefano de Martino

Abstract: This essay presents an updated edition of the Hittite document KBo 6.29+. This text is a royal edict issued by Ḫattušili III and establishes that the sanctuary of the Goddess Šaušga will be exempted from any levies. The regulations concerning this sanctuary are preceded by a long introduction where the king relates his conflict with Urḫi-Teššob. This presentation can be compared with the narrative on this event that is documented in the ‘Apology.’

1. Introduction

The edict issued by the Hittite king Ḫattušili III on the priesthood of Ištar/Šaušga is documented in two manuscripts, namely KBo 6.29 + and KUB 21.5+. Although the findspot of the tablets KBo 6.29 and KUB 21.15 is unknown, we argue that these documents were originally kept in Temple 1 because the fragments KBo 50.56 and KBo 50.59, which join respectively KBo 6.29 and KUB 21.15, come from the area of this temple. Incidentally, the collection of tablets stored in Temple 1 also includes some manuscripts of the other edict that deals with the priesthood of Šaušga, the so-called ‘Apology,’ or ‘Autobiography’ (CTH 81.A, B, D, F, and G).

The tablet KUB 21.15+ omits a line in the first paragraph of the third column¹ that is preserved in KBo 6.29, which contains some scribal errors as well. Hence, we argue that both tablets were copied from the lost original recension of the decree. Overall, the two manuscripts do not differ much, in contrast with the manuscripts of the ‘Apology,’ which survives in several tablets that show significant linguistic and orthographic differences.²

The edict KBo 6.29 attracted the attention of Albrecht Götze, who published the first two columns in his book *Ḫattušiliš* (1925). After five years this scholar published a complete edition of the text in his book *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Ḫattušiliš und den Paralleltextrn* (1930), where he could restore some damaged passages by means of the duplicate KUB 21.15. Although we owe Albert Götze a debt of thanks for this exemplary philological work, the discovery of the new joining fragments KBo 50.56 and 59 (a, b, c) requires an updated edition of this text, which is of great historical value.

¹ See Groddek 2008: 50 n. 49.

² See Klinger 2022: 141.

Stefano de Martino, University of Turin, Italy, stefano.demartino@unito.it, 0000-0001-6886-636X

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup_referee_list)

FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup_best_practice)

Stefano de Martino, *The Edict Issued by the Hittite King Ḫattušili III Concerning the Priesthood of the Goddess Ištar/Šaušga*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0042-4.03, in Clelia Mora, Giulia Torri (edited by), *Administrative Practices and Political Control in Anatolian and Syro-Anatolian Polities in the 2nd and 1st Millennium BCE*, pp. 9-23, 2023, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0042-4, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0042-4

The resolutions taken by Ḫattušili III in KBo 6.29 concern the priesthood of Šaušga of Šamuḫa, whose name is written with the Akkadogram *IŠTAR*, and the economic support given by the Hittite royal house to the sanctuary of the deity.

We share Imparati's assumption (1995) that the issuing of the edict KBo 6.29+ preceded the composition of the 'Apology';³ in fact, in the latter document the king appoints his son Tutḫaliya as priest of Šaušga of Šamuḫa and eventually elevates him to the dignity of *tubkanti*. Instead, in KBo 6.29+ Ḫattušili III only establishes that one of his sons shall be priest of the deity, without mentioning any of them by name (see also *ultra*). Thus, we argue that KBo 6.29 was written when the children of Ḫattušili and Pudu-Ḫeba were little, and hence the royal couple could not yet decide which of them would merit being chosen for the priesthood of the patron deity of the king.

As the *incipit* documents, the edict KBo 6.29 was issued by Ḫattušili III, whose name is followed by his genealogy. This Hittite sovereign only mentions his father Muršili II, his grandfather Šuppiluliuma I,⁴ and his homonymous predecessor Ḫattušili I of Kuššara. Hence, here as well as in the other official documents issued by Ḫattušili III, the king aimed to inscribe his own name as the direct heir of his father by cancelling the names of Muwatalli II and Muršili III. Furthermore, the reference to his ancestor Ḫattušili I was intended to prove his affiliation to an old royal dynasty. The name of Pudu-Ḫeba occurs after the titles and genealogy of her husband, but the queen's name is not present in other decrees issued by Ḫattušili III, such as KBo 6.28+ (de Martino in press b), KBo 4.12, KUB 26.58, and the 'Apology,' with the sole exception of KUB 21.17.⁵

2. The Content

2.1. Ḫattušili III's Autobiography

A long introduction precedes the regulations on the priesthood of Šaušga and is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the youth of Ḫattušili, his marriage to Pudu-Ḫeba, and his appointment as ruler of Ḫakpiš during the reign of Muwatalli II, while the second one describes the reasons for his conflict with his nephew Muršili III.

Although the presentation of the events of Ḫattušili's life in KBo 6.29+ and in the 'Apology' differs, and the latter is also much more detailed, both texts emphasise the protection and support that Šaušga of Šamuḫa offered to Ḫattušili. As is well known, in the 'Apology' the Hittite king states that his brother Muwatalli appeared in a dream to Muršili II and said that the health problems of Ḫattušili might be resolved by handing him over to the cult of Šaušga. But the account in KBo 6.29+ (i 6-16) simply relates that the deity requested prince Ḫattušili from his father.

KBo 6.29+ does not make any mention of the lawsuit with Arma-Tarḫunta that was judged by Muwatalli II and is described in detail in the 'Apology,' and it presents Ḫattušili's wedding with Pudu-Ḫeba as the first significant event in his life (i 16-21). The 'Apology' explicitly states that Ḫattušili met with his future wife in Lawazantiya on his way back from Qadeš, where he had taken part in the struggle against the Egyptian army, while KBo 6.29 reports that Šaušga appeared in a dream to the Hittite prince and ordered him to marry Pudu-Ḫeba. Ḫattušili explicitly states that he did not marry

³ Differently, see Beckman 2016: 72.

⁴ See Klinger 2017: 71.

⁵ See de Martino in press a.

her in the heat of passion, but at the command of the goddess (i 19-20). This statement aimed to legitimise Pudu-Ḫeba as the Great Queen of Ḫatti who had been destined by the goddess for this dignity.

Another important moment in Ḫattušili's life was his appointment as priest of the Storm-god of Nerik in Ḫakpiš. It was Muwatalli II, his brother and king, who gave him the priesthood and the province of Ḫakpiš to rule. The territory under Ḫattušili's authority comprehended the lands of Ištaḫara, Taraḫna, Ḫattena, and Ḫanḫana (ii 25-28).⁶ The same four lands are also mentioned in KBo 22.73 (+) KUB 21.11, and they are part of the kingdom of Ḫakpiš. According to Corti (2006), this text is a decree issued by Ḫattušili when he still ruled only Ḫakpiš. This decree documents that prince Ḫattušili reconquered and resettled the whole territory, winning the resistance of the Kaškean tribes. KBo 6.29+ i 28 adds that the border of Ḫattušili's territory was the town of Kuruštama,⁷ a detail that does not occur in the 'Apology' (ii 57-60), even though it documents a much longer list of lands and towns belonging to the kingdom ruled by Ḫattušili.

Another passage in KBo 6.29+ (i 46) adds that the lands of Pala and Tummana were inside the kingdom of Ḫattušili, and they are also listed among his possessions in the 'Apology' (ii 59). The passage in KBo 6.29+ refers to the fact that Urḫi-Teššob took away from Ḫattušili all the regions that Muwatalli II had given him to rule. We argue that Pala and Tummana were not part of the territory assigned by Muwatalli II but were conquered by prince Ḫattušili himself in the years when he was king of Ḫakpiš.

The narrative in KBo 6.29+ briefly mentions Muwatalli II's transfer of the capital to Tarḫuntašša, where the deities of Ḫatti, of Arinna, and of Kizzuwatna were brought. It does not make any reference to the transfer of either the statues or the remains (GI-DIM) of the dead ancestors of the Hittite royal house, a detail that is mentioned in the 'Apology' (ii 52; Singer 2006).

2.2 The Conflict with Urḫi-Teššob

Ḫattušili III claims the merit of having supported Urḫi-Teššob and promoted him as the legitimate heir of Muwatalli II. This was not true; in fact, as is well known, Muwatalli II had already appointed Urḫi-Teššob to the position of *tubkanti*, as documented by the seal impressions discovered at Nišantepe.⁸

Ḫattušili III states in the 'Apology' (iii 41) as well as in KBo 6.29+ that he supported Urḫi-Teššob, who was the son of a secondary wife of Muwatalli II, because there was no other adult first-rank prince.⁹ The statement that Urḫi-Teššob was a prince of a lower rank (*pahḫurši*)¹⁰ is repeated in a passage of the treaty concluded by Tutḫaliya IV with Šaušga-muwa of Amurru (ii 28).¹¹

⁶ On these place names see Corti 2017: 220-224.

⁷ Kryszew (2016: 177) argued that Ḫanḫana was the westernmost region of Ḫattušili's reign, and that Kuruštama lay instead on its southern border.

⁸ See Hawkins 2001; Herbordt 2005: 278. For a critical analysis of the narrative in KBo 6.29, see now Gilan 2022.

⁹ See n. 53.

¹⁰ See CHD P: 17.

¹¹ See Kühne, Otten 1971: 10-11; Beckman 1999: 105.

Ḫattušili III also relates in the ‘Apology’ that he consigned the whole country of Ḫatti to his nephew Urḫi-Teššob (iii 42’-44’), retaining for himself only the government of the land of Ḫakpiš. According to the narrative in KBo 6.29+, the first act of Urḫi-Teššob, which created a rift between him and his uncle, was his abandonment of Tarḫuntašša and transfer of the capital to Ḫattuša. This does not mean that Ḫattušili was the ruler of the former capital,¹² but presumably implied that Urḫi-Teššob could more directly control the activities of his uncle.

The description of the struggle between Urḫi-Teššob and Ḫattušili is much more detailed in the ‘Apology.’ In this text, the king states that his nephew took away from him all the lands that Muwatalli II had placed under his authority. Even the city of Nerik was taken away from Ḫattušili, though he was the priest of the Storm-god of this city. This was perceived as a sacrilegious act committed by Urḫi-Teššob. Muršili II, for example, had acted more cautiously when establishing the borders of the land of Mira after the rebellion of Mašḫuiluwa. According to the treaty concluded by Muršili II with Kupanta-Kutuntiya, the latter was not allowed to expand his territory into the region near and beyond the Šiyanta river. This restriction notwithstanding, the Hittite Great King left in the hands of Kupanta-Kuruntiya a sacred centre that was situated on the Šiyanta and had originally belonged to his predecessor Mašḫuiluwa.¹³ In this way, Muršili II hoped to avoid the anger of the gods that were venerated by the ruling family of Mira in the sanctuary of this town.

The main fault of Urḫi-Teššob was his progressive diminution of his uncle’s prestige, authority, and power. This accusation, including the verb *teḫnu-* ‘to diminish,’ occurs in the ‘Apology’ (iii 59) and in KBo 6.29+ I 41, as well as in the loyalty oath imposed by Ḫattušili III on the people of Ḫatti (KUB 21.37 l. 20’).¹⁴ As we read in these three texts, Ḫattušili summoned the gods to judge his case (‘Apology’ iii 78-79; KUB 21.37 r. 35’), and hence the political contention between uncle and nephew became a legal contest to be assessed by the divine court of justice.¹⁵

The conflict between the two members of the royal family is presented by Ḫattušili III as an asymmetrical struggle because he was only the ruler of a small land, while Urḫi-Teššob was the Great King of Ḫatti. On the contrary, we argue that Ḫattušili had the advantage here, as he possessed corps of highly trained soldiers who had fought with him in northern Anatolia, while Urḫi-Teššob, who had no chance to lead the imperial army during his reign, did not have any military experience.

As Liverani (1990: 153-55) wrote concerning the administration of divine justice, ‘once the legal challenge has been formulated, events run toward the correct outcome. At times the signs of divine decision may be perceived before the final encounter.’ This was indeed the case in the struggle between Muršili II and Uḫḫa-zidi of Arzawa, as well as in the conflict between Ḫattušili III and Urḫi-Teššob; in fact, Šaušga caused an eclipse and an earthquake. This spectacular manifestation of divine protection, which is mentioned only in KBo 6.29+, predicted the ruin of Urḫi-Teššob and led his allies to join the side of Ḫattušili III. The ‘Apology’ describes a different and less dramatic intervention by Šaušga; the goddess appeared in a dream to Pudu-Ḫeba and reassured her of the eventual victory of Ḫattušili. The deity also appeared to the gen-

¹² See Singer 2001.

¹³ See Beckman 1999: 76.

¹⁴ See Archi 1971: 203-208; Giorgieri 2020: 159-160.

¹⁵ See Liverani 1990: 155-156.

erals who had been dismissed by Urḫi-Teššub and encouraged them to take the side of Ḫattušili (iv 1-23).

The narrative differences between the ‘Apology’ and KBo 6.29+ are manifest as well in the account of the overthrow of Urḫi-Teššub. The former text states that Šaušga locked Urḫi-Teššub in the city of Šamuḫa like a pig in a sty (iv 25-26). Differently, in KBo 6.29+ we read that Urḫi-Teššub fled from Maraššantiya and went to Šamuḫa. Ḫattušili, on his way to Šamuḫa, welcomed the lords allied to Urḫi-Teššub, and his former followers offered to kill the king. But the Hittite prince refused and continued marching towards Šamuḫa. At this point, Šaušga again took action in support of his *protégé* and broke down the wooden wall of the city.¹⁶ Ḫattušili easily entered Šamuḫa and caught Urḫi-Teššub like a fish in a net.

This intervention of the deity, which is not mentioned in the ‘Apology,’ clearly is a fictitious element in the narrative. Nevertheless, we wonder whether the mention of wooden city walls guarding Šamuḫa may be accurate. The archaeological excavations at Kayalıpınar/Šamuḫa have discovered no monumental stone fortifications,¹⁷ and we cannot exclude that the city was indeed surrounded by a wooden palisade in some way similar to the one discovered at Hissarlık Höyük/Troy.¹⁸

2.3 Exemptions, Curses and Blessings

The upper portion of the reverse of KBo 6.29+ is not preserved, and this part of the text is also missing in the duplicate. As the first surviving lines in the third column state, the lands of Pala and Tummana, whoever among the royal princes might become their ruler, shall pay tribute to Šaušga. We infer from this provision that the son of Ḫattušili III, who would be appointed to the priesthood of Šaušga, also became the ruler of the northern region of Ḫatti and hence retraced the stages of his father’s career. The following lines are fragmentary, but they state that the priesthood of Šaušga shall only be conferred on Ḫattušili III’s male descendants, or, if the king has no living sons, on the husband of a royal princess.¹⁹

In addition, this decree establishes that the sanctuary of Šaušga shall be exempted from any levies and impositions.²⁰ Thus, it shall be free from the *šabḫan* and *luzzi* levies and from the *ILKU* obligation to be given to the ‘Lord of the land,’ nor will it hand over any products of the estate belonging to the sanctuary, such as wood for the construction of chariots, firewood, cereals, grass, straw, and trained horses. This exemption implies that the estate of the goddess comprehended arable lands, pastures, and woodlands. Finally, the people working in the lands of the sanctuary of Šaušga were exempted from being recruited as auxiliary troops.²¹

The tablet ends with the curse formulas, which are fragmentary; only the first lines (iii 40’-43’) are preserved. The surviving lines in the fourth column state that those who do not contravene the word of the king shall have free access to the sanctuary of Šaušga and shall receive whatever they desire.

¹⁶ See Gilan 2019: 33.

¹⁷ See Schachner 2022: 444.

¹⁸ See Jablonka 2006: 172-174.

¹⁹ See n. 39.

²⁰ See Imparati (1974: 148-170) for a comparison of the exemptions established in the decrees KBo 6.28+, KBo 6.29+ and KUB 26.50+.

²¹ On the *NARĀRU*-troops see Beal 1992: 56-71.

3. The Text²²

A) KBo 6.29 + KBo 50.56 + KUB 23.127 + KUB 21.12 + KUB 1.1 (=2026b)

B) KUB 21.15 + KBo 50.59a + KBo 50.59b + KBo 50.59c (Groddek 2008: 48-51)

Obv.

i

1. A i 1. UM-MA^DUTU-ŠI^mHa-at-tu-ši-li LUGAL GAL LUG[AL KU]R²³URU^{URU}HA-AT-TI2. A i 2. DUMU^mMur-ši-DINGIR-^{LIM}LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR^{URU}HA-AT-TI3. A i 3. DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA^mŠu-up-pí-lu-li-u-ma LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR^{URU}HA-AT-TI4. A i 4. NUMUN ŠA^mHa-at-tu-ši-li LUGAL^{URU}Ku-uš-šar5. A i 5. ÛA-MA-AT^fPu-du-ḫé-pa MUNUS.LUGAL GAL-TI KUR^{URU}HA-AT-TI6. A i 6. A-NA A-BU-YA-za^mMur-ši-li EGIR-iš₁ DUMU-aš e-šu-un7. A i 7. nu-mu kap-pí-in-pát DUMU-an^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-m[u-ḫ]a

8. A i 8. A-NA A-BU-YA ú-e-ek-ta nu-mu A-BU-YA [A-N]A DINGIR-LIM

9. A i 9. ÌR-an-ni pa-ra-a pé-eš-ta GIM-an-ma-za-kán₁ ŠA₁ DINGIR-LIM

10. A i 10. aš-šu-la-an uš-ki-iš-ki-u-wa-an te-ḫ-ḫu-un IŠ-TU DINGIR-LIM-mu

11. A i 11. pa-ra-a pa-ra-a SIG₇-iš-kat-ta-ri nu-mu^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa12. A i 12. GAŠAN-YA^{GIŠ}TUKUL pé-eš-ta ŠA A-BÉ-E-YA-mu²⁴

13. A i 13. Û ŠA ŠEŠ-YA ka-né-eš-šu-u-wa-ar pé-eš-ta

14. A i 14. am-mu-uk-ma-kán DINGIR-LUM GAM-an pít-ta-iš-ki-u-wa-an te-ḫ-ḫu-un

15. A i 15. nu-mu É-ir ku-it e-eš-ta nu-kán IŠ-TU É-YA

16. A i 16. ^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa ḫa-an-ti-ya-nu-un^fPu-du-ḫé-pa-aš-ma17. A i 17. ŠA₁^DIŠTAR^{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya GÉME¹-aš²⁵ DUMU.MUNUS^mPé-en-ti-ib-LUGAL18. A i 18. LÚSANGA^DIŠTAR e-eš-ta nu-za a-pu-u-un-na19. A i 19. AŠ₁-ŠUM₁ DAM-UT-TIM mar-ri Û-UL da-ḫ-ḫu-un20. A i 20. IŠ-TU INIM DINGIR-^{LIM}za-an da-ḫ-ḫu-un DINGIR-LIM-an-mu₁ Û-it₁

21. A i 21. ḫé-en-ek-ta

22. A 22. GIM-an-ma A-BU-YA ku-wa-pí BA.ÚŠ ŠEŠ-YA-ma-za-kán

23. A i 23. ^mNIR.GÁL-iš A-NA^{GIŠ}GU.ZA A-BI-ŠÚ e-ša-at24. A i 24. am-mu-uk-ma-aš-ši pé-ra-an KUR.KUR^{MES}ma-ni-ya-ḫ-ḫe-eš-ki-nu-un25. A i 25. nu-mu I-NA^{URU}Ha-ak-piš-ša A-NA^DURU^{URU}Ne-ri-ik26. A i 26. LÚSANGA i-ya-at nu-mu₁ KUR^{URU}Ha-ak-piš-ša KUR^{URU}Iš-ta-ḫa-ra27. A i 27. KUR^{URU}Ta-ra-ḫ-na KUR^{URU}Ha-a[t-ti-n]a [KUR^URU^{RU}Ha-an-ḫa-na-ya28. A i 28. pé-eš-ta nu-mu *ras.*^{URU}Ku-ru-uš[-ta-ma Z]AG-an i-ya-at29. A i 29. nu-uš-ši ke-e KUR.KUR^{MES}ḫu-u-ma-an[-da pí-r]a-an30. A i 30. ma-ni-ya-ḫ-ḫe-eš-ki-nu-un²⁶ ŠEŠ-YA-m[a (DINGIR^{MES}U)]^{RU}ḫat-ti DINGIR^{MES}URU^{TÚL}-na31. A i 31. DINGIR^{MES}GIŠERIN-aš ša-ra-a da-a-aš n[(a-aš I-N)]A^{URU}D^U-aš-ša32. A i 32. pé-e-da-aš nu-za^{URU}D^U-ša-an²⁷ šal-l[(i AŠ-R)]U i-ya-at²² I am grateful to H. Craig Melchert for his precious comments on some passages of this text.²³ See Groddek 2008: 48.²⁴ See Weeden 2011: 137 n. 595.²⁵ Differently, Mouton 2007: 92: GÉME^{LIM}.²⁶ B i 1': [ma-ni-y]a-ḫ-ḫi-iš[-ki-nu-un].²⁷ B i 4': ^{URU}D^U-aš-ša-an.

33. A i 33. nu DINGIR^{MEŠ} a-pí-ya da-ni-nu-ut GI[(M-an-ma Š)]EŠ-YA BA.ÚŠ
 34. A i 34. nu A-NA ŠEŠ-YA ku-it ŠA [(DAM-ŠU) ḫu-u-i-]ḫu-iš-šu-wa-li-iš
 35. A i 35. DUMU-aš na-a-wi ku-iš-ki [(e-eš-ta A-N)]A ŠEŠ-YA
 36. A i 36. na-ak-ki-ya-an-ni ḫ[(a-an-da-aš²⁸ mU)r-ḫi-^DU-ub-an š]a-ra-a
 37. A i 37. da-aḫ-ḫu-un₁ na-a[(n A-NA) GIŠGU.ZAA-BI-ŠU (AŠ-ŠUMLUGAL-UT-TI)]
 38. A i 38. te-eḫ-ḫu-un₁ [(^mU)r-ḫi-^DU-ub-aš-ma (DINGIR^{MEŠ}URU^DU-aš-ša-az ša-ra-a)]
 39. A i 39. t[a-a(-aš na-aš EGIR-pa^{URU}Ḫa-at-tu-ši ar-)nu-ut]²⁹
 40. B i 13'. ₁am-mu-₁uk-ma-aš me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da [ku-ru-ur e-eš-ta]³⁰
 41. B i 14'. ₁nu-mu₁ te-ep-nu-ma-an-zi ša-an-a[ḫ-ta]
 42. B i 15'. nu-mu^{LÜ.MEŠ}MU-IR-TU₄-TI ku-i-e-eš [ma-ni-ya-aḫ-ḫa-an-ni]³¹
 43. B i 16'. ₁pí-₁ya-an-te-eš e-šer na-aš-mu-kán a[r-ḫa da-a-aš]
 44. B i 17'. ₁IR₁an-ni-ya-mu ku-e KUR.KUR^{MEŠ}pí-ya-a[n e-šir]
 45. B i 18'. nu-mu-kán a-pé-e-ya ar-ḫa da-at-ta/da-at-ta[-at]
 46. B i 19'. ₁nu-mu₁ KUR^{URU}Pa-la-a KUR^{URU}Tu-ma-an-na d[a-at-ta(-at?)]
 47. B i 20'. [nam-ma-(?)]mu ši-ya-it am-mu-u[k(-)]
 48. B i 21'. [] x x x []

 49'. B ii 1' a]r-ḫ[a
 50'. B ii 2']x-aš-ši k[u-
 51'. B ii 3' me-na-]aḫ-ḫa-an-₁[da] ku-ru-ri-ya-a[ḫ-ta
 52'. B ii 4']x ku-ru-ri-₁ya-aḫ-ḫu-un-wa-a[t-ta]

ii

1. A ii 1. nu-wa-za zi-ik LUGAL.GAL am-mu-uk-ma-wa-za LUGAL.TUR^{RU}
 2. A ii 2. nu-wa-an-na-aš e-ḫu A-NA^DU EN-YA
 3. A ii 3. Ū A-NA^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa GAŠAN-YA DI-eš-ni
 4. A ii 4. ti-ya-u-e-ni nu-wa-za ma-a-an zi-ik DI-eš-na-za
 5. A ii 5. ša-ra-az<-zi->iš nu-wa tu-uk ša-ra-az-zi-ya-aḫ-ḫa-an-du
 6. A ii 6. ma-a-an-ma-wa-za am-mu-uk-ma DI-eš-na-za *ras*
 7. A ii 7. ša-ra-az-zi-iš nu-wa am-mu-uk
 8. A ii 8. ša-ra-az-zi-aḫ-ḫa-an-du
-
9. A ii 9 nu-wa A-NA^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa GAŠAN-YA ŠU-an
 10. A ii 10. ša-ra-a e-ep-pu-un nu-mu^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa GAŠAN-YA
 11. A ii 11. wa-ar-ri-iš-ši-iš-ta nu ša-ra-az-zi
 12. A ii 12. kat-te-ir-ra-ya an-da :ma-ru-wa-a-₁it₁ nu ne-₁pí-iš₁
 13. A ii 13. te-kán-na kat-kat-te-nu-ut nu-mu^DIŠTAR^{URU}Ša-₁mu-ḫa₁ [(GAŠAN-YA)]
 14. A ii 14. EGIR-an ti-ya-at nu ḫa-at-ra-nu-un ku-e-da[(-aš KUR-)]e-aš
 15. A ii 15. EGIR-an-wa-mu ti-ya-at-tén na-at-mu EGIR-an ti-₁i-e-₁er
 16. A ii 16. Ū-UL-ya ku-e-da-aš KUR-e-aš ḫa-at-ra-a-nu-un
 17. A ii 17. nu ḫu-u-ma-an-pát am-me-e-ta-az ti-ya-at
-
18. A ii 18. a-pa-a-aš-ma GIM-an iš-ta-ma-aš-ta

²⁸ B i 8': the gloss wedge comes before the word ḫa-an-da-aš.

²⁹ Götze (1930: 46) argued that the word pé-e-da-aš may be restored in the gap, but the sign AR is now readable in the fragment KBo 50.59a i 12' that joins KUB 21.15.

³⁰ See CHD L-N 3: 277.

³¹ See Götze 1930: 46.

19. A ii 19. *na-aš-kán*^{URU} *Ma-ra-aš-ša-an-ti-ya-za ar-ḥa pár-aš-ta*
 20. A ii 20. *na[-aš] I-NA*^{URU} *Ša-mu-ḥa an-da-an pa-it*
 21. A ii 21. *am-mu-uk-ma-aš-ši EGIR-an-da pa-a-un GIM-an-ma*
 22. A ii 22. *[I-NA]*^{URU} *Šu-lu-up-pa ar-ḥu-un nu-uš-ši EN*^{MES} *ku-i-e-eš*
 23. A ii 23. *EGIR-aš-ša UN*^{MES} *-uš kat-ta-an e-še-er*
 24. A ii 24. *na-at-mu me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da ú-e-er nu-mu me-mi-er*
 25. A ii 25. *pa-a-i-u-e-ni-wa-ra-an-kán ku-en-nu-um-mi*³² *-e-ni*
 26. A ii 26. *nu-wa-at-ta SAG.DU-an me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da*
 27. A ii 27. *ú-tum-me-e-ni na-aš Ú-UL tar-na-aḥ-ḥu-un*
 28. A ii 28. *na-an-kán Ú-UL ku-en-ner nu-uš-ši I-NA*^{URU} *Ša-mu-ḥa*
 29. A ii 29. *ú-ki-la kat-ta-an pa-a-un*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *Ša-mu-ḥa-ma-za*
 30. A ii 30. *GAŠAN-YA a-pí-ya-ya pa-ra-a ḥa-an-da-tar ti-ik-ku-u š-ša-nu-ut*
 31. A ii 31. *nu-uš-ši kat-ta-an EGIR-an ku-e-da-ni me-e-ḥu-ni*
 32. A ii 32. *ar-ḥu-un BĀD-eš-šar-ma ŠA IZ-ZI 40*³³ *gi-pe-eš-šar*
 33. A ii 33. *kat-ta ú-it a-pu-un-ma-kán*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *Ša-mu-ḥa GAŠAN-YA*
 34. A ii 34. *KU₆-un GIM-an :ḥu-u-pa-la-za EGIR-pa iš-tap-ta*
 35. A ii 35. *na-an iš-ḥi-ya-at na-an-mu pa-ra-a pé-eš-ta*
 36. A ii 36. *na-an-kán kat-ta *eras.* ú-wa-te-nu-un*
 37. A ii 37. *[na-an-za-an-]kán a-pí-ya-ya ŠA ŠEŠ-YA*
 38. A ii 38. *[na-ak-ki-ya-]an-ni ḥa-an-da-aš da-aḥ-ḥu-un*
 39. A ii 39. *[nu-uš-ši Ú-UL ku-i]t-ki i-ya-nu-un*

-
40. A ii 40. *[nu-mu*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *Ša-m]u-ḥa GAŠAN-YA ŠU-an e-ep-ta*
 41. A ii 41. [*šal-]a-i*³⁴ *pé-di*
 42. A ii 42. [] *x*

Rev.

iii

- 1'. A iii 1'. [*-an]_na KUR*^{URU} *]*³⁵
 2'. A iii 2'. *KUR*^{UR} *]U Pa-la-a KUR*^{URU} *Tum[-ma-an-na]*
 3'. A iii 3'. *[ku-e-da-n]i A-NA DUMU.NI [TA pé-]eḥ-ḥi ma-a-an A-NA*^L *[ú]tuhkanti (??)]*³⁶
 4'. A iii 4'. *[ma-a-an] da-me-e-da-ni ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki*
 5'. A iii 5'. *[A-]NA DUMU.NITA na-at A-NA*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *Ša-mu-ḥa GAŠAN-Y[A]*
 6'. A iii 6'. *:ar-kam-ma-na-al-la-a-ú-i nu-uš-ma-aš-kán ku-i[n]*
 7'. A iii 7'. *ar-kam-ma-an ša-ra-a e-ep-mi*
 8'. A iii 8'. *na-an A-NA*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *Ša[-m]u-ḥa GAŠAN-YA pé-e ḥar-]kán-zi,*

-
- 9'. A iii 9'. *nu ku-u-un ku-in DUMU-an AŠ-Š[UM*^{LÚ} *S(AN)]G A-UT-TIM*
 10'. A iii 10'. *É-er-ra A-NA*^D *IŠTAR*^{URU} *[Ša-m]u-ḥa]R-an-ni [pé-eḥ-ḥu-]un*³⁷
 11'. A iii 11'. *na-at kat-ta DUMU-ŠÚ DUMU[.DU(MU-ŠÚⁱ ḥa-aš-)]š]a ḥa-an-za-aš-[-*
-ša,]

³² B ii 26': *-me-*.

³³ So Weeden 2011: 182.

³⁴ We may confront this passage with Hattušili III's 'Apology' iv 65, Otten 1981: 28.

³⁵ See Götze 1930: 48

³⁶ In the duplicate text a line seems to have been omitted here, see Groddek 2008: 50 n. 149.

³⁷ The restoration follows the passage in the 'Apology' iv 76-76; instead Groddek (2008: 51) restores *[te-eḥ-ḥ]u-un* in the duplicate text.

- 12'. A iii 12'. *am-me-el* NUMUN-*an-za* *eras.* [L^USAN(GA-U)]T-TA []
 13'. A iii 13'. A-NA D^IŠTAR^{URU} Š[a-m]u-*ḫa* [ḫar-du-pát ma-a-an []_x]
 14'. A iii 14'. [DUMU-Y]A DUMU.DUMU-YA *ḫa-a*[š-š]a *ḫa-an*[za-]aš-ša-an an[-ze-
 el (?)]
 15'. A iii 15'. [NUMUN Š]A [DUMU.NITA Ú-UL] [k]u-it-ki L^USANGA-UT-TA []
 16'. A iii 16'. [A-N]A D^IŠTAR^{URU} Š[a-m]u-*ḫa* ŠA DUMU.MUNUS-YA x!³⁸ ḪA[-DA-
 -NU ḫ]a-an-ti-iš (??)³⁹
 17'. A iii 17'. *ḫar-du-pát da-a-ma-iš-ma-at* NUMUN-*an-za* le-e e[-ep-zi]_j
 18'. A iii 18'. DINGIR^{LUM} *da-me-el* [NUMUN-]aš pé-ra[-an] EGIR-pa le-e
 19'. A iii 19'. *tar-na-a-i* É-er-ra ku-it [ŠA] D^IŠTAR^{URU} Ša-mu-*ḫa*
 20'. A iii 20'. *na-at-kán* [ša-ab-ḫa-]za [lu-]z-zi[-ya-za]_j
 21'. A iii 21'. ŠA EN KUR^{TI} E[L-KI] (?) [ŠA] (?) [] UD]U IGI.DU_s.A^{UDU}ku-ut-ri
 22'. A iii 22'. G^{IS}ŠÀ.KAL-az G^{IS}B[U-BU-TI] G^{IS}wa-ar-ša-am-ma-za
 23'. A iii 23'. IŠ-TU ŠE Ú IN.NU[.DA IŠ-TU IŠ-ŠI/ŠU⁴⁰] *ḫar-pa-al-li-ya-aš*
 24'. A iii 24'. ANŠE.KUR.RA^{MES} wa-*ḫa-an-na-a*[š ú-e-t]um-ma-za!⁴¹
 25'. A iii 25'. IŠ-TU ÉRIN^{MES} [NA-]RA-R[I da-pí-a]n-da-za⁴² a-ra[-wa-ab-ḫa-an]_j
 26'. A iii 26'. e-eš-du n[u-ká]n A-N[A D^IŠTAR^{URU}]U Ša-mu-*ḫa*_j
 27'. A iii 27'. [ša-ab-ḫa-ni] lu-uz-z[i-ya] [e-e ku-]i-š-ki
 28'. A iii 28'. [ti-]ya-az-z[i]

-
- 29'. A. iii 29'. UDU L^UMÁŠ.GAL ŠA D^U[TU^{URU}PÚ-na ku-i]š ar-kam-ma-aš
 30'. A. iii 30'. *na-an-kán* A-NA D^UTU^{URU}[PÚ-na ar-ḫa-p]át pé-eš-ši-ya-nu-un
 31'. A. iii. 31'. nu IŠ-TU 10 É ti[-it-ta-nu-wa-an-z]i

-
- 32'. A iii 32'. DUMU.NITA ku-in [A-NA] D^IŠTAR^{URU} Ša-mu-<-ḫa>
 33'. A iii 33'. AŠ-ŠUM L^USANGA-UT[-TIM] ti-it-ta<nu->mi⁴³
 34'. A iii 34'. nu-uš-ši ki-i ku-it_j É-ir ka-ru-ú_j <ú->da-an
 35'. A iii 35'. ma-a-an-na-aš-ši EGIR-*an-da* D^UTU^{ŠI}
 36'. A iii 36'. IŠ-TU NAM.RA^{MES} pé-eḫ-ḫi na-aš-ma[-kán] (?) IŠ-TU *eras.* EL-LI
 37'. A iii 37'. pé-eḫ-ḫi na-aš-ma Ú-NU-TUM na-aš-ma TÚG-UŠ-TUM
 38'. A iii 38'. pé-eḫ-ḫi nu[-uš-]ši ma-a-an L[Ú-aš ku-i]š-ki
 39'. A iii 39'. ú-wa-a-i [pé-e-da-]i nu L^USANGA-UT-TA (?)⁴⁴ ar-ḫa da-an-na
 40'. A iii 40'. ša-an-ab-zi

-
- 41'. A iii 41'. ku-iš-ma ŠA DUMU-YA [DUMU.DUMU-YA ḫa-aš-ša] ḫa-an-za-aš-ša
 42'. A iii 42'. L^USANGA-UT-TA ŠA D^I[IŠTAR] U^{RU}Ša-mu-*ḫa*
 43'. A iii 43'. [ḫu-ul-la-a-]i nu da-me-e[l] NUMUN-aš
-

³⁸ A vertical wedge seems visible (see Götze 1930: 48), but the tablet is badly damaged here.

³⁹ A possible logical restoration might be *ḫa-a*[n-te-ez-zi-ya-aš L^Uan-t]i-an-ti-iš, but the space in the gap does not seem to contain the word *ḫantezziyaš*. Furthermore, there is no evidence that L^Uantiyant- ever became an *i*-stem. We owe H. Craig Melchert for the restoration that we propose in this damaged passage.

⁴⁰ See KUB 26.58 obv. 11; see HW² III H/15: 336.

⁴¹ The scribe has written: ú-e-t]um-mar.

⁴² On *dapiant*- see Oettinger 2006: 1331.

⁴³ See CHD Š 1: 200.

⁴⁴ See Götze 1930: 50.

iv.

- 1'. B iv 1'. *kat-ta* x[
 2'. B iv 2'. *mi-ya-tar* [] x x [
 3'. B iv 3'. :*u-ša-an da-at*-[*ta*(-)
 4'. B. iv 4'. IGI^{HL.A} *kat-ta i-ya-at/d-x*[
 5'. B. iv 5'. *tar-ḫu-i-li-iš!*⁴⁵ ^DIŠTAR ^{URU}Ša-m[*u-ḫa*

-
- 6'. B. iv 6'. *ku-iš-ma ke-e A-WA-TE*^{MES} *pa-aḫ-ša-ri* []
 7'. B iv 7'. *nu DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA ḫa-aš₁-ša₁ ḫa-an-za-aš-ša*
 8'. B iv 8'. [*ka*]t-ta NUMUN-YA⁴⁶ IŠ-TU^{LU} SANGA-UT-TI
 9'. B iv 9'. ŠA₁ ^DIŠTAR ^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa Ú-UL ti-i[*d-da-nu-zi*]⁴⁷
 10'. B iv 10'. É-ir-ma *ša-aḫ-ḫa-ni*
 11'. B iv 11'. *lu-uz-zi Ú-UL ti-id-da-nu-zi*
 12'. B iv 12'. *na-an-za-an* ^DIŠTAR ^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa GAŠAN-YA
 13'. B iv 13'. *pí-ra-an EGIR-pa tar-na-a-ú*
 14'. B iv 14'. *nu-uš-ši-kán* NINDA.KUR₄.RA *iš-pa-an-du-zi*
 15'. B iv 15'. ŠU-az ar-ḫa da-a-ú KUR.KUR^{MES}₁ -ma-aš-ši₁
 16'. B. iv 16'. IŠ-TU DUMU A-MI-LU-UT-TI-ya⁴⁸ i[š-
 17'. B. iv 17'. *nu-za-kán* ŠA LUGAL^{GIS} *ku-ra-k[i-iš* (?)
 18'. B iv 18'. *aš-šu-li ḫa-aš-ši*[-*ik-du*]

Obv.

i

1. Thus, His Majesty Ḫattušili, Great King, ki[ng of] Ḫatti,
2. son of Muršili, Great King, king of Ḫatti,
3. grandson of Šuppiluliuma, Great King, king of Ḫatti,
4. descendant of Ḫattušili king of Kuššar,
5. and (this is the) word of Pudu-Ḫeba, Great Queen of Ḫatti.

-
6. I was the youngest son of my father Muršili,
 7. and Šaušga of Šamu[ḫa] requested me, (while still) a little child,
 8. from my father, and my father
 9. handed me over to the service for the goddess, and as soon as
 10. I began seeing the deity's favour, thanks to the goddess
 11. my circumstances got better and better,⁴⁹ and Šaušga of Šamuḫa,
 12. my Lady, gave me the means,
 13. and she also gave me the recognition of my father and my brother,
 14. I began fleeing (for protection) to the goddess,
 15. and the property that I had, with my property
 16. I took care of Šaušga of Šamuḫa. Pudu-Ḫeba,
 17. a servant of Ištar of Lawazantiya, was the daughter of Pendib-Šarri,
 18. the priest of Šaušga, and

⁴⁵ So according to the photo, in the copy: -uš.

⁴⁶ Diversely Groddek (2008: 50) reads: ŠEŠ-YA.

⁴⁷ So Otten, Rüster 1973: 85.

⁴⁸ See Weeden 2011: 469.

⁴⁹ See CHD P/2: 123.

19. I did not take precisely⁵⁰ her in marriage in the heat of passion,
 20. I took her at the command of the goddess. The goddess
 21. assigned her to me in a dream.⁵¹

-
22. And as soon as my father died, my brother
 23. Muwatalli sat on the throne of his father,
 24. but I started administering the lands for him,
 25. and he (= Muwatalli) made me priest for the Stormgod of Nerik in the city of Ḫakpiš,
 26. and gave me the land of Ḫakpiš, the land of Ištaḫara,
 27. the land of Taraḫna, the land of Ḫa[ttē]a, and [the land of] Ḫanḫana,
 28. and established the [bou]ndary for me at Kuruš[tama],
 29. and I continued to administer all these land[s fo]r him.
 30. And when my brother took up the deities of Ḫatti, the deities of Arinna,
 31. (and) the deities of (the land of) the cedar (=Kizzuwatna),⁵² he carried them to
 Tarḫuntašša,
 32. and made the city Tarḫuntašša his great place (= capital),
 33. and set the deities there. But when my brother died,
 34.-35. since my brother did not yet have any [ad]ult⁵³ son of his wife,
 36. I took up Ur[ḫi-Teššob] for the (sake of my) esteem for my brother⁵⁴
 37. and I placed him in kingship [on the throne of his father],
 38. but Ur[ḫi-Teššob] took up the deities from Tarḫuntašša
 39' and transfer[red] them to Hattuša.
 40. And he [was hostile] towards me,
 41. and tri[ed] to diminish me,
 42.-43. and [he took] aw[ay from] me the subjects who had been given to me,
 44. and the lands which [had been] given to me in subjection
 45. he took even them away from me,
 46. and he t[ook] the land of Pala, the land of Tummana from me,
 47. [furthermore (?)] he pressed (?) me⁵⁵ [
 48. []]... [

 49' a]wa[y
 50']... [
 51' agai]nst bec[ame] hostile [
 52'] : "I waged war against y[ou

ii

1. You (are) a great king while I (am) a small king,⁵⁶
 2.-3. and come, let us go to trial before the Storm-god, my Lord, and Šaušga of Šamuḫa,
 my Lady,

⁵⁰ This is a quite free translation of the enclitic expression *-a/-ya* that may also mean 'even' in this passage. We would have expected *-pát* here.

⁵¹ See CHD P/2: 185.

⁵² See Singer 2006: 42.

⁵³ See Singer 2002: 744-45; Cammarosano 2010: 48-49, who does not exclude a different translation for this word, such as 'apt for the succession;' Knapp 2015; see also HW III/2 Lief 19, 645-46.

⁵⁴ See CHD L-N 4: 370.

⁵⁵ See CHD Š 1: 20

⁵⁶ See CHD Š 2: 249.

- 4.-5 thus, if you (are) the winner in the litigation, let them declare you as the winner,
 6. if, however, I (am) the winner in the litigation,
 7.-8. let them declare me as the winner.

-
9. I held up my hand to Šaušga of Šamuḥa, my Lady,
 10. and Šaušga of Šamuḥa, my Lady,
 11. helped me and
 12. she blackened⁵⁷ (the sky) above and below,
 13. she even shook heaven and earth and Šaušga of Šamuḥa, my Lady,
 14. took my side, and all the lands to which I wrote:
 15. ‘Let you take my side!’ they took my side,
 16. also the lands to which I did not write,
 17. precisely all of them were on my side.

-
18. And as soon as he (= Urḫi-Teššob) heard it,
 19. he fled from Maraššantiya
 20. and went into Šamuḥa.
 21. I pursued him, but as soon as
 22. I came to Šuluppa, the lords
 23. and the lower rank⁵⁸ men who were with him
 24. came in front of me and said:
 25. ‘We will go and kill him
 26. and we will bring (his) head to you.’
 27. I did not allow them (to do it),
 28. thus they did not kill him, instead
 29’ I went myself to him in Šamuḥa, and Šaušga of Šamuḥa,
 30’ may Lady, also there shew (her) providence,
 31’ and right at the time when
 32. I reached him, the wooden wall (of the city)
 33. came down over 40 *gipessar*, hence Šaušga of Šamuḥa, my Lady,
 34. shut him up like a fish (caught) with a net,⁵⁹
 35. and she bound him and handed him over to me
 36. and I brought him down (with me),
 37.-38. and even on that occasion, for the (sake of my) [este]em for my brother, I captured him
 39. but I did [not] do [an]ything [to him]

-
40. [And Šaušga of Šam]uḥa, my Lady, took [my] hand
 41. [in the gre]at(est) position

iii

- 1’. [] . the land of [
 2’.-3’. [] to any son to [whom] I’ll [gi]ve the land of Pala (and
 the land of Tummana, either the [*tubkanti* (?)]),
 4’. or any other

⁵⁷ On the possible meanings of the verb *maruwai*- see CHD L-N 2: 202; Kloekhorst 2008: 562-563.

⁵⁸ Differently Weeden 2011: 480, on the expression EGIR-*aš-ša*: ‘last men.’

⁵⁹ See CHD L-N 2: 101.

5'.-6'. son, I'll make them (= these lands) tribute-bearing to Šaušga of Šamuḫa, my Lady, and
 7'. any tribute that I'll take from them,
 8' it shall be given to Šaušga of Šamuḫa, my Lady.

9'. Thus, this son whom for the office of [priest],
 10'. with⁶⁰ the household (which) I [gav]e to serve Šaušga of Šamuḫa,
 11'. his son, [his grand]son, [(all his) pr]ogeny,
 12'.-13'. my seed, shall keep holding the office of [priest] of Šaušga of Š[am]uḫa, if [].
 14'. there is no [son] of [mi]ne, grandson of mine, (any) progeny (who is)
 15'. o[ur] seed in the male line,
 16'. [his fore]most son in law (?)⁶¹ shall keep holding the office of priest of Šaušga of Š[am]uḫa,
 17'. and let no other descendant take it,
 18'. may the deity not allow (one) of another seed free access (to her),⁶²
 19'. and the household which (is) of Šaušga of Šamuḫa
 20'. from the *šabḫan* and [lu]zzi levies
 21'. from the *ILKU*-obligation (in favour of) the 'Lord of the land,' from (?) [] the provision of she]ep, *kuṭri*-sheep,
 22'. wo[od] for chariots (?),⁶³ from firewood,
 23'. from cereals, grass, stra[w, from wood] for wooden piles,
 24'. trained horses,⁶⁴ from [construct]ion works,
 25'. from auxiliary troops, from all (impositions) (shall be) freed,
 26'-28'. and let no one appear befo[re Šaušga] of Šamuḫa for (any imposition of) *šabḫan* and *luzzi*.⁶⁵

29'. The sheep, [wh]ich is the tribute of the goat-herd for the Sungod[des of Arinna],
 30'. I have given it up for the Sungoddess of [Arinna],
 31'. and it shall be t[aken] from ten households.

32'.-33'. The son whom I appoint [to] the office of priest of Šaušga of Šamuḫa
 34'. and this household that (has) already (be) furnished to him,
 35'. if afterwards I, the Majesty, give him
 36'. (some subjects taken either) from the deportees or from the free-men,
 37'. or I give either equipment or clothing,
 38'-39' if s[ome]one cause[s] difficulties to him [and] tries to take away the office of priest]

40'.-42'. whoever opposes (the claim) of my son, [grandson, my all] (my) [pro]geny, to the office of priest of Š[aušga] of Šamuḫa
 43' and (someone) of another seed [to the office of priest of Šaušga]⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Literally: 'and.'

⁶¹ For the Akkadian word *ḫatanu* in the Hittite texts see Weeden 2011: 507.

⁶² See CHD P 3: 306.

⁶³ See Weeden 2011: 183-184.

⁶⁴ Literally: 'horses of turning.'

⁶⁵ See CHD L-N 1: 91.

⁶⁶ See CHD Š 1: 200.

iv

1'.-4'. *Fragmentary*

5' the power of Šaušga of Šam[uḫa]

6'. But⁶⁷ whoever keeps these words
 7'.-9'. and does not re[move] my son, my grandson, all (my) progeny, my seed, from the
 office of priest of Šaušga of Šamuḫa,
 10'.-11'. and does not make the household (of the goddess) stand (liable) for *šabḫan*
 and *luzzi*,⁶⁸
 12'. may Šaušga of Šamuḫa, my Lady,
 13'. allow him free (cultic) access,
 14'.-15'. and may she accept from (his) hand bread and libations,⁶⁹ the lands to him
 16'. from (any) human being .[
 17'. and a col[umn] (?) for the king [
 18'. he [shall] be satisfied with (any possible) good

References

- Archi A. 1971, The propaganda of Ḫattušili III, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 14: 185-213.
 Beal R. 1992, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, Texte der Hethiter 20, Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
 Beckman G. 1999, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7, Atlanta, Scholars Press.
 Beckman G. 2016, Hattušili III Between Gods and Men, in S. Erkut, Ö. Sir Gavaz (eds), *Studies in Honour of Ahmet Ünal*, Istanbul, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları: 69-74.
 Cammarosano M. 2010, Tanuḫepa: a Hittite Queen in Troubled Times, *Mesopotamia* 45: 47-64.
 Corti C. 2006, Ḫattušili III e la gestione del culto nella città santa di Nerik (I), in C. Mora, P. Piacentini (eds), *L'ufficio e il documento*, Milano, Cisalpino: 313-329.
 Corti C. 2017, The North: Hanhana, Hattena, Ištahar, Hakpiš, Nerik, Zalpuwa, Tummana, Pala and Hulana River Land, in M. Weeden, L.Z. Ullmann (eds), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/121, Leiden – Boston, Brill: 219-238.
 de Martino S. in press a, Some Observations on the Hittite Decree KBo 6.29+, in a Festschrift.
 de Martino S. in press b, The Decree Issued by Hattusili III for the ^{NA4}*ḫekur Pirwa* (KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48), in a Festschrift.
 Gilan A. 2019, “Now See How the Mighty Storm-God my Lord is Running Before Me”: Revelation of Divine Power in Hittite Historiography, in St. Anthonioz, A. Mouton, D. Petit (eds.), *When Gods Speak to Men*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 289, Leuven – Paris – Bristol, Peeters: 33-47.
 Gilan A. 2022, “Šawoška of Šamuḫa, My Lady, caught him like a fish with a net”, in L. Portuese, M. Pallavidini (eds.), *Ancient Near Eastern Weltanschauungen in Contact and in Contrast. Rethinking Ideology and Propaganda in the Ancient Near East*, wEdge 2, Münster: Zaphon: 289-307.
 Giorgieri M. 2020, The Dynastic Crisis of the Hittite Royal Family in the Late Empire Period: Evidence from the Loyalty Oaths, in S. de Martino, E. Devecchi (eds), *Anatolia Between the 13th and the 12th Century BCE*, Eothen 23, Firenze, LoGisma: 155-175.
 Götze A. 1925, *Ḫattusilis. Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten*, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft 29.3, Leipzig, Hinrichs.

⁶⁷ This sentence is contrastive to what the previous damaged passages presumably contained; in fact, the ‘power if Ištahar’ should punish whoever did not keep the word of the tablet.

⁶⁸ See CHD L-N 1: 91.

⁶⁹ See CHD P 3: 306.

- Götze A. 1930, *Neue Bruckstücke zum grossen Text des Hattušilis und den Paralleltexten*, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft 34.2, Leipzig, Hinrichs.
- Groddek D. 2008, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 50*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 28, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins J.D. 2001, Urḫi-Tešub, *tuḫkanti*, in G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongress für Hethitologie Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 45, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 167-179.
- Herbordt S. 2005, *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullens aus dem Nišantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*, Boğazköy-Ḫattuša, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 19, Mainz, Philipp von Zabern.
- Imparati F. 1974, Una concessione di terre da parte di Tuthaliya IV, *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 32: 1-209.
- Imparati F. 1995, Apology of Ḫattušili III or Designation of his Successor?, in Th. van den Hout, J. de Roos (eds), *Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Publications de l'Institut historique-archeologique neerlandais de Stamboul 74, Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: 143-157.
- Jablonka P. 2006, Leben ausserhalb der Burg – der Unterstadt von Troia, in M.O. Korfmann (ed.), *Troia*, Mainz, Philipp von Zabern: 167-180.
- Knapp A. 2015, The Meaning and Significance of Hittite *ḫūiḫušuwali-*, *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2015/3: 117-120.
- Klinger G. 2017, Die Entwicklung von Herrschergenealogien bei den hethitischen Grosskönigen, in A.-B. Renger, M. Witte (eds), *Sukzession in Religionen*, Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter: 55-84.
- Klinger G. 2022, The Hittite Writing Traditions of Cuneiform Documents, in S. de Martino (ed.), *Handbook Hittite Empire. Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective* 1, Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter: 93-154.
- Kloekhorst A. 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5, Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Kryszeń A. 2016, *A Historical Geography of the Hittite Heartland*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 437, Münster, Ugarit Verlag.
- Kühne C., Otten H. 1971, *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 16, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Liverani M. 1990, *Prestige and Interest: International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C.*, History of the Ancient Near East Studies 1, Padova, Sargon.
- Mouton A. 2007, *Rèves hittites*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 28, Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Oettinger N. 2006, Pronominaladjektive in frühen indogermanischen Sprachen, in R. Bombi, G. Cifoletti, F. Fusco, L. Innocente, V. Orioles (eds), *Studi Linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso: 1327-1335.
- Otten H. 1981, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Otten H., Rüter Chr. 1973, Textanschlüsse von Boğazköy-Tafeln (21-30), *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 63: 83-91.
- Schachner A. 2022, Building for king and Country: Architecture as a Symbol of the Hittite Empire, in S. de Martino (ed.), *Handbook Hittite Empire. Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective* 1, Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter: 421-466.
- Singer I. 2001, The Fate of Hattusa during the Period of Tarhuntassa's Supremacy, in Th. Richter, D. Prechel, J. Klinger (eds), *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken, Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag: 395-403.
- Singer I. 2002, Danuḫepa and Kurunta, in S. de Martino, F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, Eothen 11, Firenze, LoGisma: 739-751.
- Singer I. 2006, The failed reforms of Akhenaten and Muwatalli, *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 6: 37-58.
- Weeden M. 2011, *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 54, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.