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THE HIEROGLYPHIC INSCRIPTION OF BOHÇA

Anna Morpurgo Davies-Oxford – J.D. Hawkins-Londra

We owe to Piero Meriggi a great deal of what we know about Hieroglyphic Luwian, both because of his pioneering work in the decipherment and because of all that he has contributed to the correct understanding of the texts. As a small token of gratitude for his life work we should like to offer him a new edition of BOHÇA, a text for which he has first offered a coherent interpretation (see Fig. 1, photograph; Fig. 2, copy).

Transliteration:

   1 HEROS–li–isâ 1 ("INFANS") ni–mu–wa/l–za–sa
   ("OCCIDENS") i–pa–ma–ri + l–i 1 ORIENS + MI–ma–ri+i–ha

2 § 1 PRAE 1 AUDIRE–MI–ti–mi–[sa₂]11 1 I REX–ti–sâ

2 § 2. 1 wa/i–ta 1 (DEUS)TONITRUS–ku–ti 1 za–ri+i
   1 (BONUS)wa/i–su–wa/i–i

3 § 3. 1 wa/i–mu 1 TERRA–REL+ra/i–zi 1 SUPER+ra/i
   1 "CAPERE" (→) lâ/i+u–na–"' 1 pi–pa–sa–i

4 § 4. 1 (DEUS) CERVUS₂–ti–pa–wa/i–ta–"' 1 za–ri+i(→)ja–pa–' (?)
   1 (BONUS)wa/i–su–wa/i

5 § 5. 1 wa/i–mu 1 za–ri+i 1 â–ma–ta 1 (ANIMAL)
   ("BESTIA") REL₂–sa₅+ra/i 1 pi–pa–sa–ta

   1 REL–zi 1[3] sa–ta
7. | REL-pa-wali (DEUS) TONITRUS-hu-za-sa  
   I NEG₂ I REL-ha-na  I wa/i+ra/i-la-la
8. | á-mu-wali I REL+ra/i  I wa/i+ra/i-la-la
9. | wa/i-mu I "TERRA"-REL+ra/i-zī I SUPER+ra/i  
   I "CAPERE"(-) lá/i/u-na  I pt-pa-sa-la

4. 10. | á-mi-zī-ha (-) -wa/i > 1tā-til-zi AVUS-ha-zi- 
  ha-l"?1 I REL-h (ANIMAL)"EQUUS <" >-su sā-ta  
  la-u-na REL "PES₂_PES₂" (-) tā-ta

11. | REL-pa-wali (DEUS) CERVUS₂-ti-ia-[-at]1  
  [1²] NEG₂-" [1²] REL-ha-na [1²]wa/i+ra/i[-la²]-ta
12. | [1²] á-mu-wali I REL+ra/i  I wa/i+ra/i-la-la
13. | [1²] wa/i  I za-ti-i I "TERRA"-sa-REL+ra/i-i  
  I za-ti-i I LOCUS-ta₂-til-i I 1 CENTUM  
  (ANIMAL) GAZELLA ā-ha *"381"-ta I REL-za

Translation:
1. I (am) Kurtis, the hero Askiršis' son, the  
   king heard of by the west and the east.
2. Here I am good to Tarhunzas,
3. he grants to me to take over the territories ;
4. and here . . . I am good to Runtiyas,
5. here he grants to me the beasts (as?) samaya.
6. And (those) who were my fathers and grand-
   fathers,
7. Tarhunzas does not help at all,
8. as he helps me,
9. — he grants to me to take over the territories.
10. And when my fathers and grandfathers came to  
    take (such) horse(s) as (there) were,
11. Runtiyas did not help at all,
12. as he helps me,
13. since(?) in this territory, in this place, I  
    took 100 gazelles . . .

The historical context.

Of the personal names in the inscription, that of the author, ku+ra/i- 
-ti-l, is a common Anatolian name attested elsewhere on HISARCIIK 1 
and 2 (Glossar², 76 with discussion; Manuale II/2 nos. 68, 69); and also 
twice on the KULULU lead strip 1 in the forms ku+ra/i-ti(-la)— (Öz-
güç, Kâlptepe and its vicinity in the Iron Age, Ankara 1971, Plate I and 
the index on p. 115). This name has been compared with the name attested 
in cuneiform Assyrian inscriptions MAT/NAT/LAT/SAT/KUR-ti-l, in which 
the selection of the last optional value of the first sign permits an interpreta-
tion of cuneiform and hieroglyphic writings to indicate the name Kurti(ya)- 
(Glossar², loc. cit.); none of the other optional readings produce a name 
identifiable with one attested in indigenous hieroglyphic sources. We may 
further compare the name gar/gur-di-l attested in the inscriptions of Semna-
cherib as that of a leader of Til-garimmu (RII III, s.v. Guri). Kurti, 
previously read Matti (Laroche, Noms, no. 789 (2)), was a king of the land of 
Atuna (or Tun(n)a), who was mentioned by Sargon in connection with the 
events of 718 and 713 B.C. (Lie, Sargon 10 — annals I.71; Winkler, 
Sargon, 102 — Display inscription I. 29; ibid., II, 45 — prism fragment SM 2022; 
Luckenbill, ARAB II, §§ 7, 55, 214). The possibility of the identity of 
Sargon's Kurti with the author of BOHÇA remains for consideration.

On BOHÇA, Kurtis' father's name is very worn but appears to be á- 
[sa-REL₂-st]-sa₄, which would seem to indicate some such reading as 
Askiršis. In the Assyrian records a predecessor of Kurti on the throne of 
Atuna is Usšittu, registered as tributary to Tiglath-pileser III in 738 and 732 
B.C. (written 1uš-šitt(-lt)-ti/te; Rost, Tigrat—pileser, 26 — annals 1.153;
areas. These new pieces of evidence suggest that though Atuna was primarily
the name of a city controlling the northern end of the Cilician gates the place
name could somehow wander much further north, in the vilayets of Kayseri
and Nevşehir. If this were so, the identification of the names of known kings
of Atuna on the hieroglyphic stele of BOIÇA would seem less implausible.
The suggestion awaits further evidence to corroborate it or disprove it.

Commentary

At the moment the only modern commentary available is that by Meriggi in Manuale di etico geografico, II/1 (1967), 106 ff. Meriggi’s text is based
on personal collaboration, on new photographs, and on the earlier editions
(Messerschmidt, CHL LI, B.B. Charles, Hittite Inscriptions (Cornell Expedi
tion to Asia Minor), Iliaca 1911, 16 ff.; Hrozný III VII, 261 ff.). Our
text obviously makes use of all these sources, but is based on Hawkins’ collation,
on new photographs, and on a latex squeeze. The inscription is preserved
in the Kayseri Museum and was collated there.

The transliteration employs values and conventions discussed in J.D.
Hawkins, A. Morpurgo Davies, G. Neumann, Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian:
new evidence for the connection, Nachrichten der Ak. der Wiss. in Göttin
gen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1973, nr. 6, pp. 143–197 [HHL], and in An. St. 25
(1975), 153–5. Two vertical bars ( | ) indicate a new line of the text,
and the numbers preceded by an asterisk are the conventional numbers assigned
by Laroche to the hieroglyphic syllabograms and logograms. The abbrevia
tions used are those listed in HHL, p. 145, note.

§ 1. (“OCCIDENS”) i – pa – ma – ri + i | ORIENS + MI – ma – ri + i–
ha | PRAE | AUDIRE + MI – ni – mi – | izq 1. The phrase was discussed in An. St. 25 (1975), 151. The obvious comparison is with the almost identical phrase of CARCHEMISH A 6, 1, which however, has ‘west’ and ‘east’
in asyndeton.

§ 2. za – ri + i. Here and in § 4, this could be the dative singular of the
demonstrative pronoun in agreement with the datives Tarhunti and Runnti.
Yet in § 5, zari must be adverbial (‘here’ or the like) since there is no
other dative with which it can agree. If so, it is probably simpler to assume
that it has the same functions here and in § 4.
wali-stu-wali-l. The verb wasu-, obviously a derivative of wasu-—‘good’, occurs twice in this inscription and probably once in TOPADA, 4. Here the meaning must be something like ‘I am favourable, I am good’, a sense not contradicted by the Topada evidence.

TOPADA, 4:

(i) wah-i-mu-ta d-ma-sa.4 DOMINUS-ni-sa (DEUS) TONUS-zi/a (DEUS)‘SARMA’ (DEUS)*198-sa.6 (DEUS) BOS.*206.PANIS-sa.x-ha PRAE-na A-li-ta-ta

(ii) wah/i-mi-ta SCRIBA-pa-sa.6-ti wah/i.4-sa-ta

"And my lord Tarhunzas, Sarrumas, X, and Y ran (?) in front of me, and I was successful by smiting (??)"

In our interpretation we agree with Mustafa Kalaq (KZ, loc. cit.) that (i) is so closely comparable to the very common phrase “the gods ran (Hitt. hula-, Luw. hulua-, Hier. REL.-ia-) before me”, that this must determine our interpretation of the verb A-li-ta-ta.

The suggested meaning ‘I was successful’ of wasuha, as contrasted with the meaning ‘I am favourable’ attributed to wasuwi in BOHCA, is justified by the two different constructions. In TOPADA the verb is accompanied by the reflexive particle -mi-, in BOHCA it governs the dative and there is no reflexive particle.

Two denominatives, similar to wasu-, but not identical, are also attested:

TOPADA, 2:

wah/i-mu tar/i-z i REX-ii-z i CUM-ni wah/i.4-sa.7-ta...

"three kings were favourable to me . . . " (the names of the three kings follow).

The passage was discussed in *An. St.* 25 (1975), 150; also ibid. 29 (1979), 166.

BOLKARMADEN, 1–2:

1 b–wah/i-ia ta 1 d–mi-1 DOMINUS-ni-i wah/i + ra/i-ia-lah wah/i-ia-1 REX-ii-i 1 (‘BONUS’) wah/i-sa-sa-ha

"I was good to my lord Wargalwas the king"

(For the problems raised by the text of BOLKARMADEN, see below, § 5.)

Finally, there is a participle wah/i-sa-mi-sa or BONUS-ri-sa (see the references in Glossar², 151 f.), which is found in the introductory sentence of a number of inscriptions: the meaning must be ‘good’, ‘favourite’, ‘honoured’ or the like.

It is obvious that the three verbs quoted, wasu-, wasa- (which also yields wasamis), and wasa-, are very close in meaning and function. wasa- is construed with -ta and a dative just like the wasuwi of BOHICA. In TOPADA, 2, wasa- also governs a dative though there is no -ta (there does not seem to be any sign after wah/i-mu and before the following word, though the space for one exists).

We do not know enough about verbal formation in Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian to be able to analyse the evidence with anything approaching certainty but a few observations may be made.

First, it seems clear that wasa- is formed from wasa- with the -sa- ‘iterative’ suffix, which is attested elsewhere (cf. IIIH, 185 f.). The basic verb wasa- must be related to wasu-—‘good’. We may wonder what is the exact formation. A possible explanation is that wasu- yielded a denominative *wasya- which, with a secondary phonetic change, turned into wasa-. A general case could be made for a -syaj -sa- change, but exact parallels are lacking.

Wasuwi and wasuha must also be denominative forms from wasu- but create more problems. Two alternative explanations are possible. Conceivably there may have been another -ya- denominative built on wasu- without deleting the final -u- of the stem (Hittite offers evidence both for deletion and non-deletion; contrast aštu-, ašiya- and hušu-, hušwai-). If so, we could reconstruct a verb *wasu(wy)a- > *wasul- or the like (a -ya- > -i- change is well attested). Cun. Luwian offers good
evidence for a $\text{-ui-} \rightarrow \text{-u-}$ change (cf. Larocque, D.L.L., 134), so that a postulated $\ast \text{wasutu}-\text{nua-}$ could eventually yield $\text{wasu-}$. The general problem with this approach is that it is difficult to see why one and the same adjective would both delete and not delete the final vowel of the stem before the $\text{-ya-}$ suffix.

The second possibility is that the verb $\text{wasu-}$ is an entirely new analogical creation. In the case of the $\text{-i-}$ stem adjectives the normal denominalities are formed with a $\text{-ya-}$ suffix: cf. e.g. $\text{sa-na-wal-la-ta}$ of SULTANHAN, 3, beside the adjective $\text{sanawi-}$, 'good'. It is normal for these verbs to undergo a $\text{-ya-} \rightarrow \text{-i-}$ change so that in the last resort the verbal stem does not differ, in spelling at least, from the adjective stem: cf. e.g., $\text{PUGNUS}(-)\text{la\text/-u-mi-}\text{-ha}$, 'I made strong' (CARCHEMISH A 15, 1), beside the adjective $\text{PUGNUS}(-)\text{la\text/-u-mi-}$, 'strong' (ibid.). If so, it is easy to imagine an analogical process which on the model of the $\text{-i-}$ verbs and $\text{-i-}$ adjectives leads to the creation of $\text{-u-}$ verbs based on $\text{-u-}$ adjectives. At the moment, both hypotheses seem plausible and we have no clear criterion which allows us to make a choice between them.

The meaning of the $\text{-ya-}$ denominalities also creates a problem. $\text{wasu-}$ and $\text{wasutu-sa-}$ seem to mean 'to be good, to be favourable', and, as we have seen, in TOPADA the presence of the $\text{-mi-}$ particle and the reflexive construction of $\text{wasu-}$ explains our translation 'to be successful'. Elsewhere too we find $\text{-ya-}$ denominalities which show the same semantic relationship with the basic adjective. Thus in SULTANHAN, 3, $\text{sa-na-wal/la-ta}$, which, as mentioned above, is formed on $\text{sanawi-}$, 'good', must mean 'was good' (it is predicated of wine). Similarly the frequently attested $\text{IRA-sa-la\text/-u-sa/sa-la-}$ seems to be a derivative of the adjective $\text{IRA-sa-li-}$, 'angry' and means 'to be angry' (for the form of the adjective cf. Hawkins in Florilegium Anatolicum, 1979, 152). On the other hand (BONUS) $\text{wal-li-la-}$ is a derivative of $\text{wal-}$, 'mighty' and must mean 'make mighty, exalt', i.e. it has a factitive meaning which is difficult to distinguish from that of the causative (BONUS)$\text{wal-li-la-na-}$. Similarly $\text{PUGNUS}(-)\text{la\text/-u-mi-}\text{-ha}$ (CARCHEMISH A 15, 1) must be a derivative of $\text{PUGNUS}(-)\text{la\text/-u-mi-}$, 'strong' (ibid.), but must mean 'I made strong' rather than 'I was strong'. The question would require a much more extended discussion.

§ 3. The reading "\text{CAPERE}\text{-la\text/-u-na\text{-}\text{-}}" is assured by collation and by the comparison with § 9. What Meriggi read as $\text{mi}$ is in fact a normal word divider followed by a second word divider which replaces the first element of the logogram marker. § 9, which is absolutely parallel, shows that this must be the correct interpretation. "\text{CAPERE}\text{-la\text/-u-na\text{-}\text{-}}" may be taken as an infinitive governed by the reduplicated verb $\text{pipasai}$. In BABYLON, 6, we have evidence for a similar construction where the simplex $\text{pi\text/-la\text{-i}}$ governs an infinitive:

\[ \text{pa-ta-wal-li-} \quad \text{HALPA-pa-wal-li-mi-sa} \text{ (DEUS)} \]
\[ \text{TONITRUS-sa} \quad \text{ara-li-} \quad \text{pa-ta} \quad \text{NEG}_3\text{-sa} \quad \text{pi-la-i} \]

\text{ARHA I DOMUS-RA/i\text/-nu\text/-u-na} \quad 
"to him may Halabean Tarhunzas not grant to dispose of ARA PATA" (Cf. Hawkins, An. St. 25 (1975), 142 f.)

It seems likely that either (\text{-la\text/-u-na\text{-}}) is a complete infinitive or stands for $\text{la\text/-la\text/-u-na}$, i.e. for the infinitive of a reduplicated verb. In either case the root must be $\text{la\text{-\text{\text{-}}}}$ 'take', which can be compared with the well known $\text{la\text{-\text{\text{-}}}}$ or $\text{lala\text{-\text{\text{-}}}$ verb of Cuneiform Luwian (cf. Larocque, D.L.L., 61 and add to the evidence the numerous occurrences of the imperative $\text{la\text{-\text{\text{-}}du}$ in Kbo XIII 260). The standard verb for 'take' in Hieroglyphic Luwian is $\text{ta\text{-}}$ (normally written with the sign $\text{HH no. 41}$), but there is some evidence for an alternative $\text{ta\text{-}}$ stem. This may be conveniently collected here:

\[ (1) \text{KÖRKÜN A, 3-4 :} \]
\[ \text{na-na-si-pa-wal-li-ta} \quad \text{INFANS-ni} \quad \text{REL-sa} \quad \text{ARHA \text{ta\text{-i}} ibid. B-C} : \]
\[ \text{za-pa-wal-li-tu-ta (VINUM)wal-li-mi-na} \quad \text{REL-sa} \]
\[ \text{ARHA} \quad \text{la-li} \quad \text{na-na-si} \quad \text{INFANS-na\text{-ni} (NEPOS) ha-ma-si (NEPOS)ha-ma-su-la} \]

"Who(ever) takes it away from Nanasis (or) the child . . ."  
"Who(ever) takes away this wine from her, from Nanasis, (or) the child (or) the grandchild (or) the great-grandchild . . ."
The order of reading the KÖRKÜN inscription is difficult to determine on account of its certainly irregular arrangement. Differing from the first editor, we assume the following order:

1. A 1 + A 2 + Ba
2. A 3 + A 4
3. Bb + VINUM + Cb + Ca

In (3) the order passes from Bb through the VINUM logogram between the god’s legs, and is read in an ascending direction through Cb to Ca. By so reading we may extract a clause (the protasis of a curse formula) from B – C which is closely parallel to that on A 3 – 4. It would appear from the immediately preceding sentence (d – mi – sa FEMINA – t – s – 1a na – na – sî – sî) that Nanas is the wife of the author (and mother of his child).

(2) MARAŞ 3, 3:
REL – sa ARHA “CAPERE”(–)la – 11 – na POST – ta

“Who(ever) take(s) away …”

The text is very broken but a comparison with ARHA la – i of KÖRKÜN is obvious. Collation would confirm whether we can read la – 1a or la – i rather than la – na.

(5) MARAŞ 1, 6:
wa/i – mu X – ha 1 X(–) tara/i – za – i PRAE – i
1 (“CAPERE”)la – la – ta

Both sentence and context are obscure (for the further context see below in the commentary to § 5). It seems likely that the gods are the subject and that the action referred to is favourable to the author of the inscription.

In addition to the five passages quoted above, evidence for la – is also provided by the two infinitives (–)la/1(1u – na – ) of BOÇA § 3 and 9, by la – u – na of § 10, and by la – ha of § 13.

The evidence speaks for a verbal stem la – and a reduplicated stem lala – attested at least in MARAŞ 1. In BOÇA we cannot know whether “CAPERE”(–)la/1/1u – na – ” represents the simple or the reduplicated verb; the different spelling of la – u – na in § 10 and the absence of the logogram both there and before la – ha of § 13 could be explained if these two last instances belonged to the simple verb and the infinitive of § 3 and 9 to the reduplicated one. It is also possible — though perhaps far fetched — to argue that an iterative meaning would not be out of place in § 3 and 9 but would be odd in 10 and 13.

In the two clauses where it occurs “CAPERE”(–)la/1/1u – na – ” must be an infinitive. If so, we may take it as a contracted form in contrast with the non contracted la – u – na of § 10, but even this does not allow us to assign it a certain phonetic interpretation. The sign HH no. 445 is certainly found in the 2nd millennium with a lu value; in the 1st millennium the sign

(3) MARAŞ 4, 4:
wa/i – ta 1 lâ/i/1/u – 1 1 [ 1 1 CAPERE(–)la – ha

“I took [down] (conquered) [the city of] Ila[wasi]”
alternates with la and ta but positive evidence for the value la other than the present context is lacking. Also, we have no clear evidence for the treatment of -au- in Cun. or Hier. Luwian, though Meriggi registers a contraction of -aw- to -a- for Hieroglyphic (Manuale I, p. 21). The few other infinitives attested do not necessarily belong to -a- stems, let alone to monosyllabic roots. The only possible parallel is i-zi-i-sa-ta-na of KARATEPE (262), from a verb of which we know a third pers. sing. i-zi-i-sa-ta-i (parallel to la-i) from CARCHEMISH A 1 b, 3. If the parallel were to be taken seriously, it might induce us to read the infinitive of (--)la-as (--)luna.

The meaning 'take over' (the territories) is called for by the context. The contrast between sara (--)la-in our text and kata (--)la-in MA-RAS 4,2 is not surprising: cf. Hitt. katta da- "herunterholen, unterwerfen" and šara da- "in Besitz nehmen".

The presence of both la- and ta- in the same language is bound to reopen the question of the relationship of these two roots. So far 'take' was expressed by ta- only in Hittite and in Hieroglyphic Luwian, and by la- only in Cuneiform Luwian. The evidence is still scanty, but one cannot help being struck by the absolute identity of usage of la- and ta- in Hieroglyphic itself (cf. the two passages from KÖRKÜN quoted above) and by the fact that in Hieroglyphic the la- root is preceded by the CAPIERE logogram, i.e. by the ta sign. We could try to simplify the position of Hieroglyphic by arguing that the numerous instances of ta-i, ta-ia, ta-ti-i, ta-ia ought all to be read logographically: CAPIERE-i, CAPIERE-ia, CAPIERE-ti-i etc., and given a phonetic interpretation of the lai, laia etc. type. Yet this is intrinsically implausible and in any case does not explain why CAPIERE has a well established ta value and is regularly used before la-. It seems that we must accept the presence of both la- (with laia- and ta- in Hieroglyphic. Does this point to an etymological identity of the two roots as suggested e. g. by Kronasser (Etymologie der heithittischen Sprache, 64)? And what consequences does this have for our views about the dialectal position of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian?

§ 4. This clause is in every respect parallel to § 2, though the name of Run- tiyas replaces that of Tarhumzas. The few signs which follow za-ri t- remain incomprehensible. Should we read pa-ia-", thus introducing the neuter plural Nom.-Acc. of (a)par 'that'? Elsewhere both wasu- and wasa(za) seem to be intransitive and no object is called for. Non ligit.

§ 5. za-ri t-i must be adverbial: 'here', pi-ka-sa-ia must be third pers. sing. from the well known reduplicated form of piya- 'to give'. This text is rich in -i /-a- verbal forms. In the present context it comes natural to translate pipasaya as a present, but in § 7 below the sense requires that wašt-ri-ta-ia should be in the past. Yet the regular past form with a -ta ending is attested in § 11. The most likely conclusion at present is that -i and -ia are interchangeable and that they are both present endings, although the use of § 7 is anomalous. The value and distribution of the -i/-ia forms will be discussed in Festschrift Szemerényi, 1979 pp. 577-610.

sa-ša-ia (ANIMAL, "BESTIA") REL-sašaš-ra/ri. We may take sa-ša-ia as an adjective (or participle) in agreement with the noun which follows or we may construe it predicatively as indicated in our translation. The noun calls for some comment. It occurs elsewhere (in this or a similar form) in association with Runtias, the god of wild life.

(1) BOLKARMADEN, 3 (see Fig. 3):

"u" - im sa-pa-wašš i (DEUS)CERVUS š-sh-ta-saš-ta-i
I (BONUS) wašš-saš rašš-ta-i I š-mi-i DOMINUS-nš-ta
I (BESTIA) REL-sašš rašš-ta-i "pa-ta-i I u-ta-ia ha-ha-
and by the favour of... Runtias I... ed there the beasts for my lord".

Meriggi's text (Manuale II / 1, p. 100 ff.) is based on that of Messerschmidt (CII, XXXII), with corrections, but does not seem to have made use of that of the Cornell Expedition (CE, plate XII). Recently Mustafa kaleş has offered a new text (Anadolu Araştırmaları IV/V (1976–77), 61–66), which agrees in many points with that of the Cornell Expedition, though this was apparently not available to him. Hawkins' personal collation and
squeezes confirms many of the Cornell and Kalaç readings, especially in line 3.

(2) MARAŞ 1, 4–5 :

I wa'ī- -mu
| X-ha | 1 X(-)tara/ -i-za-ı | 1 PRAE-ı
(“ÇAPERE”) la-la-ta
I i-pa2- -si- -pa- -wa/i- -mu- -ı | (DEUS)CERVUS- -ti- -la- -sá
| REL- -za- -wa/i- | (BESTIA)REL- -2- -tara/i | 1 pi- -pa- -sa- -ta
I wa/i- -ta | tā- -mi- -zi | tā- -ti- -zi | . . .

"and (for?) me . . . he/they took . . .
and which beasts Runtiyas of the lpa- gave to me, my fathers . . ."

In the second sentence REL- -za could be a conjunction (‘since’, ‘as’ or the like) or a relative pronoun Nom.- Acc. neuter singular. In either case the -wa is unexpected and must be wrongly repeated from its normal position at the beginning of the clause.

(3) ALEPPO 2, 2 (see Fig. 4) :

(i) I za- -ā- -zi- -pa- -wa/i- -mu | DEUS- -ni- -zi | 1 REX- -[tā2] - -hi- -tā
CUM- -ni | 1 PES2 | PES2- -(-) - -tā- -ti- -ı
(ii) wa/i- -mu- -ı | [x- -x]- -ia | 1 (BESTIA)REL- -2- -sa- -ra/i- -sa
(iii) wa/i- -ta | PRAE- -na | ARHA | 1 (PUGNUS + PUGNUS) hu- -hu- -ra/i- -pa- -ti- -ı

". . . these gods shall walk with me for kingship.
The beasts shall . . . (to) me,
and they shall paran arba haharpa-.”

Here the name of Runtiyas does not appear but the logogram BESTIA and the word which follows make the text relevant. Our readings are based on Hawkins’ collation. If it is possible to divide (ii) and (iii) as we have done, the verb in (ii) may be [x-x]- -ia, but the meaning of the last two clauses remains obscure.

It seems reasonable to identify (BESTIA)REL- -sara of BOHÇA and BOLKARMADEN with (BESTIA)REL- -sara of MARAŞ 1. (BESTIA)REL- -sā + +ra/i- -sa of ALEPPO may also be taken as the same word if we assume that it is a neuter Nom.- Acc. with the added particle -sa / -za which, as expected, would appear as -sa after -r- (cf. HHL, 173–6). If so, the -sara / -tara forms may be taken either as a neuter plural Nom.- Acc. or as rare examples of neuter singulars without the -sa particle added. The alternation between -tar- and -sar- obviously creates difficulties and the most likely hypothesis is that we have here two alternative suffixes. In view of the logogram and in general of the context in which the word occurs REL- -sar- or -tar- may be identified with the Hittite huatar, ‘wild life’, ‘beasts of the field’, etc. (how significant is -tn- in huitneš, huitnešt?), and it is not surprising to find this word in connection with the god Runtiyas. The alternative form would then be read as *huatar(u) and we would have to assume that the -sar- suffix is here preserved as an archaism instead of being ‘thematized’ into -s(t)i- (cf. An. St. 28 (1978), 107).

§§ 6–8. These sentences have been discussed by Hawkins in An. St. 25 (1975), 139 ff. Here we have somewhat modified the interpretation of REL+ra/i of § 8 (cf. also § 12) which we now translate ‘as’, rather than ‘since’. This has the advantage that we do not need to introduce in our version an adverbiale particle which is not in the text.

REL- -pa- at the beginning of § 7 need not have a subordinating value : cf. An. St. 28 (1978), 113. The pronominal form NEG2 REL- -ha- -na of §§ 7 and 11 was also discussed in An. St. 25 (1975), loc. cit. It must be an indefinite pronoun in the accusative, where either the ending is added to the final particle (as in Lyc. tišše or in Latin ipsum) or two endings appear (as in Greek τοῦδεewitness, τῶδεωσις). In the first case we ought to read *kwi- -han, in the second *kwlan- -han. Linguistically it would be preferable to take the form as an accusative singular of the common gender (since for the neuter we might expect a -za termination). This meaning would fit our text, but ASSUR f 3 (quoted in An. St., loc. cit.) speaks for a neuter, since there NEG2 REL- -ha- -na seems to be the subject of a clause.

In An. St., loc. cit., the verb wa/i+ra/i- -ia- was given the meaning
"help". In a different context Carruba, *Athenaeum* 47 (1969), 51 note 13, has quoted some Hittite texts where the verb *warreštu*—is referred to gods who help mortals (cf. e.g. KUB XXXI 47 obs. 11 f., and also KUB XX 60,7 + 1 22, 12, which mentions ḫU wa—ar—ra—bi—ta—aš—[ša—]aš, ‘the Storm—god of help’, an obvious luwism).

§ 10. The reading of this sentence is difficult and the scribe is probably guilty of some negligence which adds to our difficulties. At the beginning we ought to introduce the —wa particle which is omitted. If we are right in our interpretation, the fifth word, EQUUS—šu, has no ending and it is possible that other case endings too have been omitted. There is no word—divider between sa—ta and la—u—na but we see no objection to our division of words, all the more so since it restores the expected parallelism with §§ 6 and 9 and makes sense of the whole sentence. Of the two relatives in the sentence, we take one to apply to the sentence as a whole and the other to apply to a relative clause within the sentence. The translation indicates our interpretation of the text, but the grammar would run much better if we could read REL—i <—zi> EQUUS—šu <—zi> instead of what is actually written. The clause would then mean ‘what horses (there) were’ and the construction would be parallel to that of § 6. If this supplement is unacceptable, then REL—i will have to be taken as a relative conjunction meaning something like ‘as’.

In our interpretation la—u—na is a non—contracted infinitive of the monosyllabic non—repetitive verb la— (see above). The infinitive is governed by the verb "PES₂.PES₂"(—)ta—. For a similar construction of a verb of movement (possibly the same verb) with the infinitive cf. CARCHEMISH A 31/2, 3:


"the kings and the . . . lords will come into it to worship".

§ 13. The final clause is difficult to read and to understand. Our translation is purely tentative and we have not tried to offer an interpretation for
Fig. 3 — Bolkarmaden 3

Fig. 4 — Aleppo 2, 2

**Logograms**

- **ANIMAL**
- **BESTIA**
- **CAPERE**
- **CENTUM**
- **EQUUS**
- **GAZELLA**