5. On the various proposals for the term *ka-ia-an-zu*, see Pentiuc 2001:93–94. Outside of the legal formula presented above, *kayanzu*-was defined in relation to the town of Emar (TBR 83:18–19) and other settlements in its environs: Zaggattu (TBR 83:11, 15) and Rabbān (TBR 83:12, 16). A trial report (TBR 36:13–16) identifies fields (A.ŠA₃.ḪI.A) in the vicinity of the "gate of the town of Izbu" (ka₂ ᵘʳᵘ*Iz-bi*) as the *kayanzu*-property of a man's father.

6. On the reading of *mala… kašādu* as, "to reach and equal in value/amount to," see CAD K:275a. The basic sense of the clause is that each heir receives an equal share of the divided patrimony, perhaps reflecting the same custom as described by the expression "let them divide (the estate) equally, according to the (custom) of the town" (*itti aḫāmeš kīma āli lizūzū* [Yamada 1997]).

7. Beckman (1996:25) wonders if the scribe omitted the determinative URU, referring to the site of "Newtown" located near Emar. However, Charpin (2016:71) has recently challenged this reading, suggesting that the expression *ālu eššu* referred to a "district" (nouveau quartier) of the town of Emar based on OB parallels.

## Abbreviations

DNWSI HOFTIJZER, J. and K. JONGELING. 1995: *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, Leiden.

DULAT DEL OLMO LETE, Gregorio and Joaquín SANMARTÍN. 2003: *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, 2 vols, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson, HOSNME 67, Leiden.

Emar ARNAUD, Daniel. 1986: *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI/3 : Textes sumériens et accadiens, textes*, Paris.

PRU 3 NOUGAYROL, J. 1955: *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, III : Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales*. Mission de Ras Shamra VI, Paris.

RE BECKMAN, G. 1996: *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*, HANEM 2, Padova.

TBR ARNAUD, Daniel. 1991: *Textes syriens de l'âge du bronze récent*, AuOrSupp 1, Barcelona.

Ug. 5 NOUGAYROL, J., LAROCHE, E., VIROLLEAUD, C., SCHAEFFER, C. F. A. 1968: *Ugaritica V: Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit*, Mission de Ras Shamra XVI, Paris.

## Bibliography

ARNAUD, D. 1975: "Les textes d'Emar et la chronologie de la fin du bronze récent," *Syria* 52:87–92.

CHARPIN, D., 2016: "La 'ville neuve' (âlu eššu) d'Emar", *NABU* 2016/42, 71– 72.

FLEMING, D. 2000: *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's House*, MC 11, Winona Lake.

FLEMING, D., DÉMARE-LAFONT, S. 2009: "Tablet Terminology at Emar:'Conventional' and 'Free Format'," *AuOr* 27:19–26.

—. 2015: "Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams: Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity," *RA* 109:45–77.

HUEHNERGARD, J. 2009: *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, HSS 32, Cambridge, MA.

PENTIUC, E. 2001: *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar*, HSS 49, Cambridge.

PRUZSINSZKY, R. 2003: *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*, SCCNH 13, Bethesda.

RUTZ, M. 2013: *Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia: The Diviners of Late Bronze Age*, AMD 9, Leiden.

VAN EXEL, V. 2010: "Social Change at Emar: The Influence of the Hittite Occupation on Local Traditions," *RA* 104: 65–86.

VAN SOLDT, W. G. 1991: *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*, Neukirchen.

WESTBROOK, Raymond. 2001: "Social Justice and Creative Jurisprudence in Late Bronze Age Syria." *JESHO* 44: 22–43.

WILCKE, C. 1992: "AH, die 'Brüder' von Emar. Untersuchungen zur Schreibtradition am Euphratknie," *AuOr* 10: 115–150.

YAMADA, M. 1993: "Division of a Field and Ninurta's Seal: An Aspect of the Hittite Administration in Emar," *UF* 25: 453–460.

—. 1997: "*kīma āli*: On the Customary Law of Emar," *BNESJ* 40: 18–33.

Dylan R. JOHNSON <dylan.johnson@uzh.ch>
University of Zürich, Zürich (SWITZERLAND)

**45) Further data on the Hittite myths of the disappearing deity (addenda to *AuOr* 38/2, 2020, pp. 373-391) —** In Pisaniello 2020 I made some philological remarks on the passages concerning the alteration and the restoration of the natural order in the Hittite myths of the disappearing deity, particularly focusing on the sentence É-*er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati* in the first version of the Myth of Telipinu (KUB 17.10 + Kbo 55.8

i 5′/16′). In the Appendix at the end of the paper, I provided a number of parallel passages found in other Hittite myths: in this short note, I would like to add two further passages which I omitted, with a brief commentary.

(1) KBo 26.127 obv. (CTH 322.2.A, MS)

3′ [ᵈ*Te-li-pí-nu-u*]*š ša-a-an-za* ᴳᴵˢ*l*[*u-ut-ta-a-uš kam-ma-ra-a-aš e-ep-ta*]
4′ [É-*er túḫ-ḫ*]*u-iš e-ep-t*[*a iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ]
5′ [*ú-e-šu-ri-y*]*a-an-da-ti* ⌜*I-NA*⌝ [GUNNI *kal-mi-i-še-ni-iš ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-da-ti*]
6′ [*I-NA* TÙR-*k*]*án an-da* UDUᴴ[ᴵ.ᴬ KI.MIN *I-NA* É.GU₄-*kán an-da* GU₄ᴴᴵ.ᴬ KI.MIN]
7′ [UDUᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*za* SILA₄ᴴᴵ]·⌜ᴬ⌝-*ŠU-NU Ú-UL* kap-p[*u-wa-an-zi* GU₄ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*ma-za* AMARᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*ŠU-NU*]
8′ [*Ú-UL* kap-p]*u-u-wa-an-*[*zi*]

'[Telipin]u is angry. [The mist took the windows, the smo]ke too[k the house. On the altars, the deities are opp]ressed; in [the hearth, the logs are oppressed]; in [the sheepfold], the shee[p ditto; in the cowshed, the oxen ditto. The sheep] do not take [care] of their [lamb]s, [the oxen do not tak]e car[e of their calves].'

This fragment is currently listed under CTH 322, i.e. the myth of Telipinu and the daughter of the Sea, although its belonging to this composition is far from assured (cf. Polvani 1992: 447-448). My transliteration slightly diverges from the one on the Hethitologie Portal Mainz.[1] All restorations should be regarded as tentative.

Line 3′: traces of the first broken sign are compatible with UŠ, thus [ᵈ*Te-li-pí-nu-u*]*š* seems to be the best restoration, because this deity also appears in rev. 2′. Such a restoration also provides indicative information on the distance of the left edge of the tablet.

Lines 4′-5′: I restore first the sentence concerning the deities and after that the one concerning the logs. The opposite order is also possible and attested,[2] although, to my knowledge, the altar never occurs with the Akkadian preposition *INA* in parallel passages.

Line 6′: based on the photo,[3] the first broken sign is clearly KÁN, not TÙR as in the online edition on the Hethitologie Portal Mainz. For the particle in this context, cf. e.g. KUB 33.36 ii 7 (CTH 333.B, MS = Pisaniello 2020, no. 22) and other parallel passages.

Line 7′: the plurals UDUᴴᴵ.ᴬ and GU₄ᴴᴵ.ᴬ are required by the clitic possessive pronoun -*ŠUNU* and the verbal form in line 8′, which should be restored as kap-p]*u-wa-an-*[*zi*] (the last sign probably was at the end of the line). In parallel passages, the two nouns only occur in the plural form in KUB 33.12 iv 7′-8′ (CTH 324.3.C, NS = Pisaniello 2020, no. 3), in the section about the restoration of the natural order.

(2) KUB 33.43 (CTH 370.I.11.A, NS)

4′ [E]GIR-*pa aš-*⌜*nu*⌝-x[…]
5′ *eras.* É-*e*[*r*? *túḫ-ḫu-iš tar-na-aš*…]
6′ *ḫa-an-ta-an*-*t*[*a-at*…]
7′ *e-te-er iš-pí-*⌜*e*⌝[*-er e-ku-er ḫa-aš-ši-ik-ke-er*…]
8′ UDU-*uš QA-DU* KI.MIN G[U₄…]

The fragment is listed under CTH 370, containing diverse mythological fragments, but I suggest that it should be moved to CTH 335 (Fragments of myths of disappearing and returning deities), because the mention of the house in line 5′, the verb *ḫantantat* in line 6′, and the phrase *eter išpiēr* 'they ate (and) were satisfied' in line 7′ strongly recall the paragraph on the restoration of the natural order in the myths of the disappearing deity.

Line 8′: the edition on the Hethitologie Portal Mainz[4] transliterates UDU.NITA, but I prefer UDU-*uš*. As far as I know, the sentence UDU-*uš QA-DU* KI.MIN is without parallels in the other versions of the myth. As mere speculation, I wonder if SILA₄-*SÚ*! 'its lamb' was intended instead of *QA-DU*, based on the homophony between SILA₄ and SÌLA (= QA), because the expected sentence in this context would be 'the sheep recognised its lamb, the ox recognised its calf' (KI.MIN replacing here *ganišta*).[5]

**Notes**

1. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 322.2 (TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26). See also Hutter-Braunsar 2011: 133 fn. 16.

2. Cf. e.g. KUB 33.17+ i 14-16 (CTH 330.1.A, NS = Pisaniello 2020, no. 19); KUB 33.40 iv 5-8 (CTH 335.7.2.A, NS = Pisaniello 2020, no. 31).

3. hethiter.net/: fotarch B0751b.

4. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 370.I.11 (TX 2009-08-31).

5. Cf. e.g. KUB 17.10+ iv 24: UDU-*uš* SILA₄-*SÚ pé-en-ni-iš-ta* (probably corrupted from original *ga-ni-iš-ta*, as suggested in Pisaniello 2020: 374 fn. 6), KUB 33.29+ iv 20′: UDU-*uš* SILA₄-*SÚ* KI.MIN, etc. (see the Appendix in Pisaniello 2020 for other parallel passages). The exact origin of the mistake is difficult to envisage: as a tentative hypothesis, we may perhaps assume that the scribe wrote QA-ZU under dictation in the model from which KUB 33.43 was copied, "corrected" to *QA-DU* in the latter. As an alternative solution, although unlikely in my opinion, one could explain DU as a phonetic complement indicating the Akkadian reading *puḫādu* 'lamb'.

**References**

HUTTER-BRAUNSAR, S. 2011: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu den Texten über eine aus Zorn verschwundene Gottheit, in M. Hutter, S. Hutter-Braunsar (eds.), *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn* (AOAT 391), Münster, pp. 129-144.

PISANIELLO, V. 2020: É-*er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati* in the Hittite Myth of Telipinu, *AuOr* 38/2, pp. 373-391.

POLVANI, A.M. 1992: Su alcuni frammenti mitologici ittiti, in H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem, A. Süel (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, pp. 445-454.

Valerio PISANIELLO <valerio.pisaniello@univr.it>
University of Verona (ITALY)

**46) Šuwašuna: Some Remarks on an Anatolian Theonym** — The Hittite cuneiform tablets containing the name of the god Šuwašuna always show the determinative DINGIR and full phonetic writing (even though the rendering of the geminate consonants is not entirely consistent). The attested occurrences of Šuwašuna occur in rituals related to a Luwian religious context:[1] ᵈ*Šu-wa-šu-na, -an* KBo 4.11 obv. 5, rev. 45 (CTH 772);[2] ᵈ*Šu-wa-aš-šu-un-na-a*[*n* KUB 55.65 iv 30 (CTH 772);[3] ᵈ*Šu-wa-aš-šu-un-na-an* KUB 32.123+ iv 34' (CTH 772);[4] ᵈ*Šu-wa-*⸢*aš-šu*⸣*-u*[*n-na-an* KUB 60.30 iv 8 (CTH 670);[5] ᵈ*Šu-wa-aš-š*]*u-un-na-an* KUB 51.9 rev. 8 (CTH 771);[6] ᵈ*Šu-wa-šu*[- KBo 14.85 ii 4 (CTH 640)[7]; and ᵈ*Zu-u*[- KBo 34.246, 6 (CTH 771).[8]

More specifically, Šuwašuna is one of the deities of the Festritual (KUB 55.65 rev. iv 1–37 // KUB 32.123+ rev. iv 22'–37') carried out in the city of Ištanuwa, which generally provides information about the Luwian pantheon and, in particular, about the figure and cult of the local Sun-goddess.[9] According to Steitler (2017, 382-3): "The first sequence [of the ritual] follows offerings that are presented to the Storm-god and the Sungoddess of Ištanuwa and consists of a combination of drinking rites and other ritual activities performed for Tarwalliya, Winiyanta, the 'pure inner chamber' (É.ŠÀ-⸢*da*?⸣-*an* ⸢*šu-up-pí*⸣-*i*[*n*]), the temple(?) of the Stag-god (ᵈKAL É-*ir*), Šuwaššunna, Yarri, Šiuri, Iyašallašši, Wandu, Wištašši, the Sun-god of the gatehouse and finally the Storm-god. The second sequence (in KUB 35.132+) is similar to the first, but varies in the order of deities: ŠA É […], ᵈKAL of the inner chamber, the Sun-god of the gatehouse, Šuwaššunna, Yarri, [Šiuri], Iyaššalašši, [Wandu] and the Storm-god of the steppe".

Geographically speaking, the name of ᵁᴿᵁIštanuwa is derived from the theonym ᵈIštanu.[10] Notwithstanding the Hattian origin of these names, and according to the amount of Luwian evidence we have, Ištanuwa could reasonably be a Luwian-speaking city of the Middle-Late Bronze Age. Indeed, Watkins referred to the bilingual passage of KBo 4.11 rev. 45-46 (Hitt.: EGIR-*ŠU* ᵈ*Šu-wa-šu-na-an-an e-ku-zi* / Luw.: *aḫ-ḫa-ta-ta a-la-ti a-ú-i-en-ta* **ú-i-lu-ša-ti**) to ascribe ᵁᴿᵁIštanuwa, ᵈŠuwasuna, and ᵁᴿᵁWiluša to the context of the North-West and to prove the relation between (the Sun-god) Apollo and (W)Ilion.[11] However, at present, the city has not been identified on the basis of unequivocal evidence, so its geographical position, which would be crucial for a full contextual reconstruction of the cultural and sociolinguistic environment, remains unknown. Nevertheless, the lack of Hurrian influence in the local pantheon[12] might be a further clue for localization in the (north-)western part of Anatolia somewhere between Wiluša and Ḫattuša.[13] According to Mouton, even the possibility that those Luwian rituals were performed in Ištanuwa or the capital Hattuša cannot be excluded.[14] In the light of the broader Luwian context surrounding the name of Šuwašuna and the textual evidence connected to it, and since the name does not match formally any Hattian lexical element, one may wonder whether the deity was originally