

É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati in the Hittite Myth of Telipinu*

Valerio Pisaniello – University of Verona

[In this paper, I will comment on the form and semantics of the sentence *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*, occurring in the main manuscript of the Hittite Myth of Telipinu (KUB 17.10 + KBo 55.8 i 5’/16’), taking into account parallel passages from related compositions.]

Keywords: Hittite, Myth of Telipinu, textual tradition.

After the joining of the fragment KBo 55.8 to the main manuscript of the Myth of Telipinu, KUB 17.10, identified by M. Dijkstra in 2012¹, the paragraph describing the alteration of the natural order due to the escape of the god runs as follows:

KUB 17.10 + KBo 55.8 i (CTH 324.1.A, MS)²
5’/16’ ^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta-a-uš kam-ma-ra-a-aš IŠ-BAT É-er ṽtúḫ-ḫu-iš¹ [ú-i-š]u-ṽri-ya-ta¹-ti
6’ ṽI-NA GUNNI-ma kal-mi-i-še-ni-iš ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-t[i iš-ta-na-na-aš
an-da-an]
7’ DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÜR an-da UDU^{HIA} KI.MIN I-NA
ṽÉ.GU⁴¹
8’ an-da-an GU⁴^{HIA} ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti UDU-uš-za SILA⁴-ŠÚ mi-im-ma-aš
9’ GU⁴-ma AMAR-ŠÚ mi-im-ma-aš

‘The mist took the windows, *É-er tuḫḫuiš* [wiš]uriyatati; in the hearth, the logs were oppresse[d³; on the altars,] the gods were oppressed; in the sheepfold, the sheep ditto; in the cowshed, the oxen were oppressed. The sheep rejected its lamb, the ox rejected its calf.’

* I would like to thank Federico Giusfredi, Alfredo Rizza, and Rita Francia for their helpful suggestions, as well as the two anonymous reviewers, whose indications significantly improved the text. Obviously, any remaining shortcomings are my own responsibility. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are mine.

1. See the record in the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de>).

2. The manuscript is Middle Hittite, but the text of the mythological narrative can be traced back to the Old Hittite period, as suggested by Houwink ten Cate (1970: 31-33).

3. Here and in the rest of the paper, I opt for the literal meaning of the verb *wišuriye-*, ‘press, oppress’, rather than ‘stifle, suffocate’, which could only work in this passage (cf. Melchert 2016: 214-219).

Before the identification of this join, which now provides us with the verb *wišuriyatati* at the end of line 5' in KUB 17.10 (= line 16' of KBo 55.8), the verbal form restored by all scholars was the Akkadian *IŠBAT*, corresponding to Hittite *ēpta*, so that the first two sentences appeared to be perfectly parallel to each other: ^{GIŠ}*luttāuš kammarāš IŠBAT É-er tuḫḫuiš [IŠBAT]*, 'the mist took the windows, the smoke [took] the house'⁴.

This solution seemed to be the best one based on various parallels. First, the restoration of the natural order is described, in the same tablet, in the following terms:

KUB 17.10+ iv

- 20 ^Ṛ*Te-li-pí-nu-uš a-ap-pa pár-na-aš-ša ú-et nu-za KUR-SÚ kap-pu-u-Ṛ^{e1}-et*
 21 ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš É-er tuḫ-ḫu-Ṛ^{iš1} tar-na-aš*
 22 *iš-ta-na-ni-iš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-na-aš ḫa-an-da-an-ta-ti GUNNI kal-mi-in tar-na-aš*
 23 ^Ṛ*A¹-NA TÜR a[n-d]a-an UDU^{HI.A} tar-na-aš I-NA É.GU₄ an-da-an GU₄^{HI.A}*
 24 ^Ṛ*tar¹-na-aš nu-za an-na-aš DUMU-ŠU pé-en-ni-iš-ta UDU-uš SILA₄-SÚ pé-en-ni-iš-ta*
 25 *GU₄ AMAR-ŠU pé-en-ni-iš-ta Ṛ^{e1}Te-li-pí-nu-ša LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL nu-uš-za*
 26 ^Ṛ*ḫu¹-iš-wa-an-ni in-na-ra-u-wa-ni EGIR.U₄^{MI} kap-pu-u-e-et*

'Telipinu came back home and took care of his country. The mist left the windows⁵, the smoke left the house; the altars were set right for the gods, (in²) the hearth it left the logs, in the sheepfold it left the sheep, in the cowshed it left the oxen. The mother accepted her son, the sheep accepted⁶ its lamb, the ox accepted its calf, and Telipinu (accepted) the king (and) the queen, and he provided them with life and strength for the days to come.'

4. Cf. Laroche 1965: 90, García Trabazo 2002: 110, Mazoyer 2003: 43; also reflected in almost all the translations: except for the early translation by Sayce 1930: 303 ("the roof of the house [he removed]"), cf. Otten 1942: 35 ("das Haus ergriff *tuḫḫui*"), Gaster 1950: 361 ("smoke beset the house"), Gurney 1952: 184 ("smoke(?) besets the house"), Goetze 1957: 143 ("Qualm faßte das Haus"), Goetze 1969: 126 ("smoke seized the house"), Kühne 1975: 182 ("Qualm erfüllte das Haus"), Ivanov 1977: 55 ("дом окутало чадом"), Pecchioli Daddi – Polvani 1990: 78 ("il fumo [invaso] la casa"), Haas 1994: 708 ("Qualm [ergriff] das Haus"), Ünal 1994: 816 ("Qualm erfüllte das Haus"), Hoffner 1998: 15 ("Smoke [seized] the house"), Beckman 2003: 151 ("Smoke seized the house"), Reyhan 2009: 88 ("the smoke kept (filled) the house"). Such a restoration is sometimes also found in publications following the discovery of the join: beside Asan (2014: 12), whose monograph represents the publication of his Ph.D. dissertation presented at the Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg in 1988 (and therefore he does not take into account KBo 55.8), see e.g. Melchert 2016: 215 and HW² V: 52.

5. For ^{GIŠ}*luttai* as a collective, see Hoffner 2003: 624.

6. Given the unusual semantics of the verb *penna-* in this context ('to accept' or the like; cf. CHD P: 267), which cannot be read with certainty in any other manuscript of the myths of the disappearing deity, and considering the various mistakes occurring in KUB 17.10+, I would like to suggest that *pé-en-ni-iš-ta* in KUB 17.10+ is possibly a mistake for *ga-ni-iš-ta*, which may have been read *pé-ni-iš-ta* by the scribe, due to the similarity between the signs GA and PÍ, and "regularised" to *pé-en-ni-iš-ta*. Cf. KUB 33.38 + Bo 9614 iv 1-5 (No. 28 in the Appendix) and KUB 33.70 ii 14'-iii 1 (see fn. 39 below).

The two parallel sentences in line 21 – ^{GIŠ}*luttai kammaras̄ tarnas̄ É-er tuḫḫuiš tarnas̄*, ‘the mist left the windows, the smoke left the house’ – suggested an analogous parallelism also in the previous section.

Furthermore, other parallel passages found in different mythological compositions seemed to confirm this solution. In the Myth of the Storm-god of the scribe Pirwa, the paragraph concerning the disruption of the natural order is restored as follows:

KBo 13.86 i (CTH 328.A, NS)

- 7’ [d]IŠKUR-aš-kán ^mPí-ir-wa-aš [...]
 8’ [^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-a-aš [e-ep-ta É-er tuḫ-ḫu-iš]
 9’ [e¹-ep-ta GUNNI ú-i-šu-r[i-ya-at-ta-ti]
 10’ [^{GIŠ}kal-mi-ša-né-eš ú-i-šu-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti ...]
 11’ 1 LI-IM DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-i-šu-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti]

‘The Storm-god of Pirwa [...]. The mist [took] the windows, [the smoke] took [the house]. The hearth was op[pressed], the logs were opp[ressed, on the altars²] the thousand gods were oppr[essed].’

In the Myth of the disappearance and return of Anzili and Zukki, we read, according to Beckman (1983: 74)⁷:

KUB 33.36 ii (CTH 333.B, MS)

- 5 [É-er² kam-ma-ra-aš IŠ-]BAT^{GIŠ}AB^{H1A} tuḫ-ḫu-iš IŠ-BAT
 6 [iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-i-š]u-ri-ya-an-ta-at A-NA ḠUNNI¹-ša-an
 7 [^{GIŠ}kal-mi-ša-ni-iš ú-i-šu-ri-y]a-an-da-at I-NA TÜR-kán UDU^{H1A}
 8 [ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-da-at I-NA] É.GU₄-kán GU₄^{H1A} Ḡú¹-i-šu-ri-an-da-at
 9 [AMA-ŠU DUMU-ŠU-ya ú-i-šu-ri-a]n-da-at DAM-ḠSÚ¹-kán
 10 [^{LÚ}MU-DU-ŠU-ya ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-d]a-at

‘[The mist to]ok [the house], the smoke took the windows; [on the altar, the gods were op]pressed, in the hearth, [the logs were oppr]essed, in the sheepfold, the sheep [were oppressed, in] the cowshed, the oxen were oppressed; [the mother and her son were oppr]essed, the wife [and her husband were oppr]essed.’

Finally, an analogous passage in the Myth of the disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna runs as follows:

7. See also HEG IV: 528. A different restoration of line 5 is found in Asan 2014: 59 (see also p. 85): [^{GIŠ}ḫu-im-pa-an kam-ma-ra-aš IŠ-]BAT^{GIŠ}AB^{H1A} tuḫ-ḫu-iš IŠ-BAT, ‘[the mist to]ok [the ^{GIŠ}ḫuimpa-], the smoke took the windows’, based on KUB 33.67 iv (8) ŠA EN ŠISKUR É-ri g[(a²-ka²-eš-ni ^{GIŠ}ḫu-in-pa-an)] (9) kam-ma-ra-aš¹ (text: -an) tar-na-aš¹ (text: -an) ^{GIŠ}[AB^{H1A} (tuḫ-ḫu-iš tar-na-aš)] (dupl. KUB 33.36 iii 4’-5’, No. 22 in the Appendix), ‘in the house of the “lord of the ritual”, in the *gakaēšsar*², the mist left the ^{GIŠ}ḫuimpa-, the smoke left the [windows]’ (cf. Beckman 1983: 74 and Boysan-Dietrich 1987: 35).

KUB 33.48 ii (CTH 334.1.1.B, NS)⁸

- 4' ... DINGIR.MAḪ-[aš-ša pa-it'^{GIŠ}(u-ut-ta-a-i) kam-ma-ra-aš ḫar-ta]
 5' É-er tuḫ-ḫu-iš ḫar-t[(a) A-NA GUNNI-ša-an^{GIŠ}kal-mi-še-ni-eš (ú-i-šu-u-ri-an)-
 ta-ti]
 6' iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-a[n DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-e-šu-ri-an-ta-ti]

- 7' I-NA É.GU₄-kán an-da G[U₄^{HI.A} ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÙR-mā-kán
 UDU^{HI.A}]
 8' ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-t[i ...

‘Ḫannaḫanna [went (away)]?: the mist kept the w]indow, the smoke kept the house; [in the hearth, the logs] were oppress[ed], on the altar, [the gods were oppressed].’

Despite the fragmentary status of the texts, all the above evidence strongly suggested that the sentence concerning the smoke (*tuḫḫui-*) should be regarded as parallel to the one concerning the mist (*kammara-*), which was also supported by semantics, so that the restoration of *IṢBAT* in KUB 17.10 i 5' seemed quite obvious.

However, now we know for certain that the verb is *wišuriyatati*, and a parallel of the sentence É-er *tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati* is also possibly found in a fragment of the Myth of the disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna. Consider the following passages:

KUB 33.46 i (CTH 334.3.A, NS)

- 10' DINGIR.MAḪ-aš kar-di-mi-¹ya¹-[wa-an-za ...
 11' ú-i-¹šu¹-ri-ya-¹at¹-ta-t[i ...
 12' GUNNI-ma-aš-ša<-an>^{GIŠ}k[al-mi-še-ni-eš ...
 13' A-NA ¹É¹.GU₄-ma-k[án ...
 14' GU₄-uš-za AM[AR-un ...

KBo 12.78 (CTH 334.8.A, NS)

- 9' [DINGIR].MAḪ-aš kar-tim-mi-ya-w[a-an-za ...
 10' [kam-m]a-ra-a-aš ¹IṢ¹-BAT ¹É¹-[er ...
 11' [...] ú-¹i-¹šu¹-ri-[ya-an-ta-ti ...
 12' [... ú-i-¹šu-¹r]i-¹ya¹-[an-ta-ti ...

According to Laroche (1965: 141 fn. 13), KBo 12.78 could be a duplicate of KUB 33.46. Following this suggestion, Asan (2014: 78) restored the first lines of the paragraph as follows:

KUB 33.46 i

- 10' DINGIR.MAḪ-aš kar-di-mi-¹ya¹-[(w)a-an-za^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta-i kam-m(a-ra-a-aš IṢ-
 BAT É)-er tuḫ-ḫu-iš IṢ-BAT ...
 11' ú-i-¹šu¹-ri-ya-¹at¹-ta-t[i ...

8. Dupl. KUB 33.47+ ii 20'-22' (CTH 334.1.1.A, NS), No. 24 in the Appendix.

12' GUNNI-*ma-aš-ša<-an>* ^{GIŠ}*k[al-mi-še-ni-eš ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti ...*

‘Ḫannaḫanna is ang[ry: the f]og took [the window, the smoke took] the hou[se ...] was oppresse[d ...] (in) the hearth, the l[ogs were oppressed ...].’

Such a restoration seems not very likely to me, because we should imagine that line 10' contained a very long text, since after *É-er tuḫḫuiš IŠBAT* another sentence should be restored, whose verb is *wišuriyattati* in line 11'. Particularly, what one would expect is the sentence concerning the gods, but *wišuriyattati* is singular, and the problem of what to restore in the rest of line 11' would remain. Although, in my view, KUB 33.46 and KBo 12.78 hardly contained the very same text⁹, they can still be regarded as parallel at least. If we restore the sentences concerning the mist and the smoke in the break of KUB 33.46 i 10', based on KBo 12.78 and the other parallels, it is likely, in my opinion, that *wišuriyattati* in line 11' should be regarded as the verb agreeing with *tuḫḫuiš*, as in KUB 17.10+ i 5'/16'. Consequently, the sentence concerning the gods would find its place in the break of line 11'. Therefore, I would tentatively suggest the following restoration:

KUB 33.46 i

10' DINGIR.MAḪ-aš *kar-di-mi-ḡya¹-[wa-an-za* ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-a-aš IŠ-BAT*
É-er *túḫ-ḫu-iš]*

11' *ú-i-ḡšu¹-ri-ya-ḡat¹-ta-t[i iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti]*

12' GUNNI-*ma-aš-ša<-an>* ^{GIŠ}*k[al-mi-še-ni-eš ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÜR-kán*
UDU^{HIA} *KI.MIN]*

13' A-NA ḡÉ¹.GU₄-*ma-k[án* GU₄^{HIA} *ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti* UDU-*uš-za* SILA₄-*SÚ* *mi-*
im-ma-aš]

14' GU₄-*uš-za* AM[AR-*un mi-im-ma-aš ...]*

However, there could be a different solution, which would rule out this passage as a parallel for the sentence *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*. Since, in some versions of the myth of the disappearing god, the sentence regarding the gods on the altars and the one regarding the logs in the hearth are split in two different sentences¹⁰, we may also suggest the following alternative restoration:

KUB 33.46 i

10' DINGIR.MAḪ-aš *kar-di-mi-ḡya¹-[wa-an-za* ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-a-aš IŠ-BAT*
É-er *túḫ-ḫu-iš IŠ-BAT iš-ta-na-na-aš]*

11' *ú-i-ḡšu¹-ri-ya-ḡat¹-ta-t[i še-ra-aš-ša-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti* GUNNI-
ma ú-i-šu-ri-ya-at-ta-ti]

12' GUNNI-*ma-aš-ša<-an>* ^{GIŠ}*k[al-mi-še-ni-eš ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÜR-kán*
UDU^{HIA} *ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti]*

13' A-NA ḡÉ¹.GU₄-*ma-k[án* GU₄^{HIA} *ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti* UDU-*uš-za* SILA₄-*SÚ* *mi-*
im-ma-aš]

14' GU₄-*uš-za* AM[AR-*un mi-im-ma-aš ...]*

9. Cf. the editions on the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*.

10. Cf. e.g. KUB 33.16, 4'-7' (No. 10 in the Appendix).

Although such a structure is less frequent, and it is not attested so far in the other preserved fragments belonging to CTH 334, this restoration cannot be completely excluded.

Returning to KUB 17.10+, we should turn to the semantics of the sentence *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*. According to the edition on the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*¹¹, its translation would be “Rauch [erst]ickte das Haus”, based on the parallel texts where *IŠBAT* or *ēpta* are found, and because an intransitive meaning for *wišuriye-* would be problematic from a syntactic point of view, since *É-er* is assumed to be the object of the verb. Similarly, Mouton (2016: 461) translates “la brume [s’em]para violemment de la maison”.

However, in my opinion, the middle form *wišuriyatati* should be regarded as intransitive as well as the other forms of the same verb occurring in the following lines¹². Clearly, with this assumption, *É-er* ‘house’ can no longer be considered as the object of the verb, but it should be regarded as an endingless locative. The resulting translation would therefore be ‘in the house, the smoke was oppressed’, whose structure “locative – subject – middle verb *wišuriye-*” perfectly parallels the one of the following sentences:

Locative	Subject	Verb
<i>É-er</i>	<i>tuḫḫuiš</i>	[<i>wiš</i>]uriyatati
<i>INA GUNNI=ma</i> [<i>ištanaš anda</i>]	<i>kalmišeniš</i>	<i>wišūriyantat[i]</i>
<i>INA TÜR anda</i>	DINGIR ^{MES}	<i>wišūriyantati</i>
<i>INA É.GU₄ andan</i>	UDU ^{HIA}	KI.MIN (= <i>wišūriyantati</i>)
	GU ₄ ^{HIA}	<i>wišūriyantati</i>

Therefore, according to this reconstruction, *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*, ‘in the house, the smoke was oppressed’, represents the first sentence of the oppressed entities section (I will come back to the semantics of this sentence at the end of the paper)¹³. Such a solution would also explain the progression of the elements involved. Indeed, according to this interpretation of the text, the

11. E. Rieken et al. (ed.) hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08), fn. 1.

12. For the intransitive meaning of middle *wišuriye-* see Carruba 1966: 51, Neu 1968: 201-202, EDHIL: 1013, and HEG IV: 527.

13. Also note that, while *kammara-* denotes an atmospheric agent (it is paired to the rain in KUB 16.81 + KUB 16.29 rev. 4’, 10’), *tuḫḫu(wa)i-* is the smoke that originates from burning and therefore, in this context, it is probably related to the hearth. A direct evidence of the connection between *tuḫḫu(wa)i-* and the hearth can be possibly found in the ritual of Ḫatiya against Wišuriyant, if the restoration by Carruba (1966: 4) is correct: KBo 15.25+ obv. (26) ... *nu-uš-ša-an ÍD-i pé-ra-an 1 GUNNI i-ya-m[i]* (27) [...]x-an [...] *na-aš-ta A-NA KU₆ KAxU-i an-da NINDA.Ī[E.DÉ.A te-eḫ-ḫi]* (28) [*n]a-a[n-ša-an ḫa-aš-ši-i pé-eš-š]i-ya-mi na-an wa-ar-nu-mi tuḫ-[ḫu-wa-iš-ma]* (29) *Ú-UL* ¹*ku¹-[iš-ki]*, ‘before the river I mak[e] a hearth, [...], then I [put] an o[ily] loaf in the fish’s mouth, I [thr]ow i[t] in the hearth] and I burn it, [but] (there is) no sm[oke] at [all]’ (MS, CTH 396.1.1). See also Kümmel 1967: 23-24. Therefore, the considerations of Della Casa (2014: 267), according to whom “mist and smoke seem to represent the inhospitable outdoors breaking into the cosmos; i.e. the wild and hostile nature of outside symbolism entering into the protected buildings, denoting the collapse of the hearth as a symbol of the warm and comfortable inside, i.e. of cosmic order”, could be correct as far as the *kammara-* is concerned, but are less appropriate with regard to the *tuḫḫu(wa)i-*. Furthermore, also the idea that “the reference to mist (Hitt. nom. *kammara-* c.) and smoke (Hitt. nom. *tuḫḫui-* c.) seizing the cosmos brings to mind the idea of elements that block sight” (Della Casa 2014: 267) only works for *kammara-*, which is actually attested as referring to the dimness of the eyes (cf. e.g. KUB 24.13 ii 6: IGI^{HIA}-*wa-aš-ma-ták-kán kam-ma-ra-an ar-ḫa da-an-du*, ‘let them take away the dimness of your eyes’), while I did not find any similar context involving the noun *tuḫḫu(wa)i-*.

original version would involve the presence of an external agent affecting a threshold, represented by the window; as a result, various elements are “oppressed” in different places, which are listed in a sequence that moves from the whole (the house) to the different parts (the hearth, the altars, the sheepfold, and the cowshed)¹⁴.

One of the major difficulties of this interpretation – which is perfect from the formal point of view – may be represented, as mentioned, by the parallel passages that suggest a connection between the sentence with the smoke and the one concerning the mist, the most compelling of which is the one contained in the same text, concerning the restoration of the natural order:

KUB 17.10+ iv

- 21 ^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš É-er tuḫ-ḫu-^Γiš¹ tar-na-aš
 22 iš-ta-na-ni-iš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-na-aš ḫa-an-da-an-ta-ti GUNNI kal-mi-in tar-na-aš
 23 ^ΓA¹-NA TÜR a[n-d]a-an UDU^{HL.A} tar-na-aš I-NA É.GU₄ an-da-an GU₄^{HL.A}
 24 ^Γtar¹-na-aš ...¹⁵

However, this passage poses some problems, and its translation is by no means obvious. Theoretically, we would expect perfect parallelism with KUB 17.10+ i 5’-9’, concerning the disruption of the natural order, but this is not the case.

Line 21 seems not to be problematic and can be translated as ‘the mist left the windows, the smoke left the house’¹⁶. The following sentence – *ištananiš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*naš ḫandantati* – is less obvious and has been recently discussed by Melchert (2016: 215-216), who accepts Goetze’s translation, ‘the altars were set right for the gods’¹⁷. The passage then becomes quite puzzling: the subject of the verb *tarnaš* in GUNNI *kalmin tarnaš* seems to be GUNNI, but ‘the hearth left the logs’ does not make much sense; however, if we consider GUNNI to be a dative-locative, the subject of *tarnaš* is lacking (the mist? The smoke? Telipinu?). The same goes for the other two sentences, which clearly start with a locative expression.

Indeed, Melchert (2016: 216) considers the passage to be a compressed and corrupt version of what we read, for example, in the Myth of the Storm-god of the queen Ḫarapšili:

KUB 33.19 iii (CTH 327.1.A, NS)¹⁸

- 2’ [... (^{GIŠ}A)]B-ya kam-ma-ra-a-aš tar-n[a-aš]
 3’ [É-er tuḫ-ḫu-w(a-iš t)]ar-na-aš ZAG.GAR.RA-aš ḫa-an-^Γda-at-ta-at¹
 4’ [še-er-ra-aš-š(a-an DINGIR^{ME})]^š ḫa-an-ta-an-da¹-ti

14. I am very thankful to Alfredo Rizza for this suggestion.

15. The full paragraph and a tentative translation are given above.

16. Note that Friedrich (HW: 162) regarded É-er as a dative-locative here, which is rejected by Neu 1980: 28-29 and Mazoyer 2003: 92.

17. Cf. Goetze 1969: 128. Such an explanation seems to be better than amending the text as suggested in the online edition on the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*: *iš-ta-na-ni-iš<-ša-an>* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*na-aš ḫa-an-da-an-ta-ti*, “Auf dem Altarpostament kamen die Götter wieder in Ordnung” (Rieken et al. (ed.), *hethiter.net*: CTH 324.1 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08)). Note however that some parallels could justify such an amendment (cf. KUB 33.67 iv 10, No. 21 in the Appendix).

18. Restored after the duplicates KUB 33.20 iii 3’-5’ (CTH 327.1.B, LNS), KBo 8.69, 13’-16’ (CTH 327.1.D, NS), KUB 60.32 rev. 10-12 (CTH 327.1.E, NS), Nos. 13-15 in the Appendix.

- 5' [GUNNI-*ma* *ḫa-a*]n-d[a-a]t-ta<-at> *še-er-ra-aš-ša-an*^{GIŠ}kal-mi-i-e-eš₁₇
 6' [(*ḫa-an-ta*)-a]n-^rta-at¹ ^Éḫi-li-kán an-da UDU^{rHI.A} *ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-ti*
 7' [I-NA É.G]U₄-^rma¹ an-da GU₄^{HI.A} *ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-ti*

‘The mist lef[t] the windows, [the smo]ke left [the house]. The altar was put in order; [on it], the gods were put in order. [The hearth was put] in or[d]er; on it, the logs were put in order. In the fold, the sheep were put in order; [in the cowsh]ed, the oxen were put in order.’¹⁹

Nevertheless, Melchert relies on KUB 17.10+ iv 22 to challenge the restoration of *ištananaš andan* (or the like) in KUB 17.10+ i 6', since, for the sake of parallelism, we would also expect the altars to be the subject in the opening passage. In my view, this is unlikely for several reasons: (1) the sentence in KUB 17.10+ i 6'-7' requires a locative at the beginning for reasons of consistency within the paragraph; (2) such a locative is actually attested in some other versions of the myth²⁰, as well as in parallel passages concerning the restoration of the natural order; (3) where the nominative *ištananaš* occurs as the subject of *wišuriye-*, the gods occur in another sentence (but this is not the structure we find in KUB 17.10+ i 5'-9')²¹.

Since it is not a perfect parallel, I prefer not to take into account KUB 17.10+ iv 20-24 for the interpretation of KUB 17.10+ i 5'-9', at least for the moment. I will return later to this passage.

We have seen that the textual tradition attests two relevant competing variants – *É-er tuḫḫuiš ēpta* and *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*²² – that completely change the structure of the passage, the first one linking the sentence to the preceding one (^{GIŠ}*luttai kammaras ēpta*), while the second one links it to the following ones (*ḫašši=ma*^{GIŠ}*kalmišeniš wišuriyantati*, etc.). In this situation, we may imagine that the less frequent variant, i.e. *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*, could be regarded simply as an occasional mistake, also because KUB 17.10+ actually shows several errors²³. However, since it is possibly not a *lectio singularis* (if my restoration of KUB 33.46 i 10'-11' is correct), we can also think that both variants were genuine and coexisting.

Now, given that the presence of the one or the other variant greatly changes the meaning of the sentence, they cannot be considered to be interchangeable. In my view, such a situation is best explained assuming that one variant reflected the original text, and the other a later trivialisation. Therefore, I suggest that *É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati*, which seems to be the *lectio difficilior*, could

19. Cf. also KUB 33.21+ iii 2'-6' (CTH 326.A, NS) and KUB 33.40 iv 4-8 (CTH 335.7.2.A, NS), Nos. 9 and 30 in the Appendix.

20. cf. KUB 33.17+ i 16' (CTH 330.1.A, NS) and KUB 33.48 ii 6' (CTH 334.1.1.B, NS), Nos. 19 and 25 in the Appendix.

21. Parallel passages that seem to break the structure “locative – subject – *wišuriye-/handae-*” into two different sentences are sporadically found (cf. e.g. KUB 33.16, 4'-7', No. 10 in the Appendix), but KUB 17.10+ i 5'-9' consistently show the “locative – subject – *wišuriye-*” structure, so that a different pattern for the sentence concerning the altars and the gods would be unexpected, despite the parallel section on the restoration of the order.

22. A third variant, *É-er tuḫḫuiš ḫarta*, only occurring in the Myth of the disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna, is structurally and semantically similar to *É-er tuḫḫuiš ēpta* and can be left aside in this discussion.

23. Cf. Houwink ten Cate 1970: 55-56 and Kellerman 1986: 116-117. It has been also suggested that the text was drafted by a Luwian scribe, which can be further supported by the presence of several Luwian loanwords. However, the lack of *Glossenkeile* marking such Luwianisms, pointed out by Howink ten Cate and Kellerman, is not really an argument for the Luwian origin of the scribe, since we know that this scribal practice was extremely rare in the Middle Hittite period (only one uncertain case seems to be attested so far; cf. van den Hout 2007: 230).

have been the original sentence, starting the series of the oppressed entities. The reasons why it was later altered to É-er tuḪḪuiš ēpta can be easily envisaged: from the formal point of view, the endless locative É-er was less transparent and could have been regarded as a nominative-accusative, parallel to ^{GIŠ}luttauš/^{GIŠ}luttai; from the semantic point of view, the affinity between tuḪḪu(wa)i- and kammaraš- may have favoured the association of the two sentences. Conversely, the reverse path, from É-er tuḪḪuiš ēpta to É-er tuḪḪuiš wišuriyatati, could hardly be explained²⁴.

The problem remains of agreeing the solution suggested here with the passage concerning the restoration of the natural order, where the sentence É-er tuḪḪuiš tarnaş, ‘the smoke left the house’, parallel to ^{GIŠ}luttai kammaraš tarnaş, ‘the mist left the window’, seems to occur in every version of the myth, while all the previously oppressed entities have a different verb (*ḫandae-*). The only exception I know is represented by KUB 17.10+ iv 21-24, which, as mentioned, is probably corrupt. In this passage, the verb *tarnaş* does not only occur with *kammaraş* and *tuḪḪuiş*, but also, unexpectedly, in the sentences concerning the logs of the hearth, the oxen, and the sheep, while the one concerning the altars of the gods regularly has *ḫandantati*. The only explanation I can imagine for such a corruption is that the manuscript from which the scribe of KUB 17.10+ was copying replaced *ḫandantati* with KI.MIN in the sentences following the one about the altars, wrongly understood as standing in place of *tarnaş*²⁵. However, the accusative *kalmin* in the sentence GUNNI *kalmin tarnaş* remains quite unexplained, because it does not make any sense with the verb *ḫandae-*. Therefore, in my view, the sequence *kal-mi-IN* is probably a mistake for *kal-mi-ŠE-NI* (with a missing *-iš/-eš* in the end), to be considered as the subject of an original sentence such as *GUNNI *kalmişenieş* KI.MIN (= *ḫandantati*)²⁶. Otherwise, the corruption in KUB 17.10+ iv 21-24 could hardly be the result of an original passage as the one in KUB 33.19 iii 2’-7’ given above, and we should possibly imagine that it may hint at an older text different from the later “standard(ised)” version we read in KUB 33.19 iii 2’-7’ and other parallels, although, in my view, such a solution would be totally *ad hoc* and should be avoided.

Rather, I believe that the original text could actually run as KUB 33.19 iii 2’-7’ (but without the sentences concerning the gods and the logs being split in two), with the two parallel sentences ^{GIŠ}luttai kammaraş tarnaş É-er tuḪḪuiş tarnaş, followed by those with *ḫandae-*²⁷. If I may be allowed to speculate a little, we can imagine that, from a semantic point of view, É-er tuḪḪuiş wišuriyatati, ‘in the house the smoke is oppressed’, may refer to the stagnation of the smoke inside the house; therefore, the release of the smoke could well be expressed by É-er tuḪḪuiş tarnaş, ‘the

24. The later change to É-er tuḪḪuiş ēpta and the resulting parallelism with ^{GIŠ}luttai kammaraş ēpta also had consequences on the order of the elements affected, so that we occasionally find passages in which it is the smoke that takes the windows (cf. e.g. KUB 33.36 ii 5, No. 22 in the Appendix).

25. Note that passages where *ḫandantati* is consistently replaced by KI.MIN after the first occurrence actually exist, see e.g. KUB 33.29+ iv 16’-22’ (CTH 325.C, MS), No. 7 in the Appendix.

26. A common gender stem *kalmi-*, however, seems to be attested in the nom.pl. ^{GIŠ}kal-mi-i-e-eš₁₇ (KUB 33.19 iii 5’, No. 12 in the Appendix) and possibly in the coll. ^{GIŠ}kal-mi-ya (KUB 39.35+ iv 12’). I would also suggest that the misreading *kalmin* could have been the reason why the scribe of KUB 17.10+ misinterpreted the KI.MIN, because an accusative would have been problematic with *ḫandantati*.

27. Theoretically, we cannot entirely exclude that the change from É-er tuḪḪuiş wišuriyatati to É-er tuḪḪuiş ēpta also influenced this paragraph, determining the parallelism between ^{GIŠ}luttai kammaraş tarnaş and É-er tuḪḪuiş tarnaş, but the presence of the latter in KUB 17.10+, where the original sentence É-er tuḪḪuiş wišuriyatati is found, makes such a solution less likely.

smoke left the house'. However, such an expression would not have worked equally with the other entities listed in the following lines, so that a different solution was adopted.

Be such a scenario correct, the sentence *É-er tuḥḥuiš tarnāš* would be not a counterargument to the hypothesis that *É-er tuḥḥuiš wišuriyatati* was the original sentence in the beginning section. Rather, the resulting parallelism with ^{GIŠ}*luttai kammaraš tarnāš* could have been a further element later favouring the trivialisation of *É-er tuḥḥuiš wišuriyatati* to *É-er tuḥḥuiš ēpta*.

Appendix

For the sake of completeness, I think it is worth giving the transliterations of all the passages concerning the disruption and the restoration of the natural order occurring in the Myth of Telipinu and related compositions, with some philological remarks in the footnotes.

1. Myth of Telipinu (CTH 324)

- (1) KUB 17.10 + KBo 55.8 i (CTH 324.1.A, MS)
 5'/16' ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-a-uš kam-ma-ra-a-aš IŠ-BAT É-er ᵀtúḥ-ḥu-iš¹ [ú-i-š]u-ᵀri-ya-ta¹-ti*
 6' *ᵀI-NA GUNNI-ma kal-mi-i-še-ni-iš ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-t[i iš-ta-na-na-aš an-da-an]*
 7' DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÜR an-da UDU^{HL.A} KI.MIN I-NA É.GU⁴*
 8' *an-da-an GU⁴HL.A ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti UDU-uš-za SILA⁴-SÚ mi-im-ma-aš*
 9' *GU⁴-ma AMAR-ŠU mi-im-ma-aš*
- (2) KUB 17.10+ iv (CTH 324.1.A, MS)
 20 *ᵀ^{d1}Te-li-pí-nu-uš a-ap-pa pá-r-na-aš-ša ú-et nu-za KUR-SÚ kap-pu-u-ᵀe¹-et*
 21 ^{GIŠ}*lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš É-er túḥ-ḥu-ᵀi¹ tar-na-aš*
 22 *iš-ta-na-ni-iš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-na-aš ḥa-an-da-an-ta-ti GUNNI kal-mi-in tar-na-aš*
 23 *ᵀA¹-NA TÜR a[n-d]a-an UDU^{HL.A} tar-na-aš I-NA É.GU⁴ an-da-an GU⁴HL.A*
 24 *ᵀtar¹-na-aš nu-za an-na-aš DUMU-ŠU pé-en-ni-iš-ta UDU-uš SILA⁴-SÚ pé-en-ni-iš-ta*
 25 *GU⁴ AMAR-ŠU pé-en-ni-iš-ta ᵀTe-li-pí-nu-ša LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL nu-uš-za*
 26 *ᵀḥu¹-iš-wa-an-ni in-na-ra-u-wa-ni EGIR.U⁴MI kap-pu-u-e-et*
- (3) KUB 33.12 iv (CTH 324.3.C, NS)
 x+1 *ᵀ^{d?}Te-li-pí-nu-uš ...*
 2' *an-da pa-it [^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš]*
 3' *É-ᵀer túḥ¹-[ḥu-iš tar-na-aš I-NA GUNNI-kán]*
 4' ^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-eš-ša-n[i-eš ḥa-an-da-an-ta-ti]*
 5' *I-NA ŠÀ É.GU⁴-k[án GU⁴HL.A ḥa-an-da-an-ta-ti]*
 6' *I-NA ŠÀ TÜR-k[án UDU^{HL.A} ḥa-an-da-an-ta-ti]*
 7' *nu-za GU⁴HL.A AMAR-[ŠU-NU ga-ni-eš-šer]*
 8' *UDU^{HL.A}-ma-za SILA⁴-[SÚ-NU ga-ni-eš-šer]*
-
- 9' *ᵀTe-li-pí-nu-ᵀuš¹-š[a LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MEŠ}.LUGAL]*
 10' *ᵀ KUR^{URU} Ḥa-at-ti [ga-ni-eš-ta nu-uš-za]*
 11' *ᵀI-an-ni in-na-ra-[u-an-ni EGIR.U⁴MI kap-pu-u-et]*

- (4) KBo 32.7 obv. (CTH 324.8.A, NS)²⁸
 16' *iš-ta-na-na-aš ú-i-šu-ri-ya-at-[ta-ti]*
 17' *ḫa-a-aš ú-i-šu-ri-ya-ta-ti ḫ[a-²⁹*
 18' 'ŠÀ TÜR¹ an-da UDU^{HLA} KI.MIN É.GU₄ a[n-da GU₄ KI.MIN

2. The disappearing of the Storm-god (CTH 325)

- (5) KUB 33.24+ i (CTH 325.A, LNS)
 3' [^{GIS}lu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-aš e-ep-ta É-er túḫ-ḫu-wa-iš] e-ep-t[a]
 4' [I-NA GUNNI-ša-an an-da-an ^{GIS}kal-mi-i-še-ni-e-eš] ṽ¹-e-šu-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti]
-
- 5' [*iš-ta-na-na-aš an-da-an DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA*] TÜR an-da-a[n]
 6' [UDU^{HLA} ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA É.GU₄-ma an-da-an GU₄^H]^{LA}
 7' [*ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti UDU-uš-za SILA₄-SÚ me-em-ma-aš GU₄-m]a AMAR-ŠU me-em-ma-aš*
- (6) KUB 33.24+ iv (CTH 325.A, LNS)
 10' ^dIŠKUR-aš a-ap-[pa p]ár-na-aš-š[a ú-et n(u-za KUR-SÚ kap-pu-u-e-et) ^{GIS}AB^{HLA}]
 11' kam-ma-ra-a-aš t[ar-n]a-aš É-e[r (túḫ-ḫu-i)š tar-n(a-aš) iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}]
 12' ḫa-an-[(d)a-[(an-t)]a-ti G[(UNNI)-ma ka(l-mi-ša-ni-eš KI.MIN) I-NA TÜR-kán an-da-an]
 13' UDU^{HLA}[(^{LA}[(KI.MIN I)]-NA É.GU₄ [(an-da-an) GU₄^{HLA} (KI.MIN) AMA-aš DUMU-ŠU g(a-ni-eš-ta)]
 14' ṽ¹UDU¹-[(uš SILA₄-SÚ)] KI.MIN GU₄-[uš AMAR-ŠU KI.MIN ^dIŠKUR-aš LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL (KI.MIN)]
 15' ṽ¹nu-uš-za TI-ni¹ in-na-ra-u-[wa-an-ni EGIR.U₄^{MI} (kap-pu-u-et)]
- (7) KUB 33.29+ iv (CTH 325.C, MS)
 16' ṽ^dIŠKUR¹-[(aš a-ap-)pa p(ár-na-aš-š)a ú-et n]u-za KUR-SÚ ṽ¹kap-pu¹-[u]-e-et
 17' [^{GIS}AB^{HLA} (kam-ma-ra-a-aš t)ar-n(a-aš)] ṽ¹É¹-er túḫ-ḫu-i[š tar-n]a-aš
 18' [*iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ} (ḫa)-ṽ¹an¹-da-a-an-ta-ti GUNN[I ka]l-mi-ša-ni-eš ṽ¹KI¹.MIN*
 19' [I-NA TÜR-kán an-da-an (UDU^{HL})]^{LA} KI¹.MIN I-NA É.GU₄ an-da-an [GU₄^{HL}]^{LA} KI¹.MIN
 20' [AMA-aš DUMU-ŠU g]a-ni-eš-ta UDU-uš SILA₄-SÚ KI.MIN GU₄-[uš AMAR-ŠU KI.MIN]
 21' [^dIŠKUR-aš LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL] KI.MIN nu-uš-za TI-an-ni in-na-[ra-u-wa-ni]
 22' [EGIR.U₄^{MI}] kap-pu-u-e[t]

28. In the online edition on the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* (Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 324.8 (TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26)) DINGIR^{MEŠ} is tentatively restored in the end of line 15'; note however that the verb in line 16' is singular.

29. Possibly ḫ[a-aš-ši kal-mi-ša-ni-eš KI.MIN] or the like (cf. HW² III: 389).

3. The Storm-god of the queen Ašmunikkal (CTH 326)

- (8) KUB 33.15+ ii (CTH 326.A, NS)
 11' [GIŠA(B^{H1.A} kam-m)]a-ra-aš IŠ-BAT GIŠ.ÙR^{H1.A} (tuḥ-ḥu)-iš
 12' [IŠ-BAT (...)³⁰ i(š-t)]a-na-na-aš ú-i-šu-[(ri-y)a-at-ta-ti ...
 13' [ú-i-šu-ri-ya-a]t-ta-ti nu-za-k[án ...]
 14' [...] ʾú¹-e-šu-r[i-ya-an/at-ta-ti]
- (9) KUB 33.21 + KBo 60.13 + KBo 53.1+ iii (CTH 326.A, NS)
 2' ... [GIŠ³AB^{H1.A1}][...
 3' iš-ta-na-n[a-aš ḥ]a-an-ta-i[t-ta-at ...
 4' DINGIR^{MEŠ} ḥa-an-da-a[n-t]a-at GUNNI-a[š³¹ ...
 5' GUNNI-an³² GIŠ³kal-m[i-ša-n]i-uš KI.MIN [...
 6' UDU^{H1.A} KI.MIN É.GU₄-[ká]n EGIR-pa GU₄^{H1.A1} [...
 7' az-zi-kán-zi na-a[t-z]a iš-pí-ʾe¹-[er]
 8' nam-ma ak-ku-uš-kán-ʾzi na-at-za¹ ḥ[a-aš-ši-ik-ke-er]
- (10) KUB 33.16 (CTH 326.B, NS)
 3' [... GIŠA]B^{H1.A} kam-ma-ra-aš IŠ-BAT *eras.* GIŠ.Ù[R^{H1.A}]
 4' [(tuḥ-ḥu)-iš IŠ-BAT i]š-ta-na-na-aš ú-e-šu-ri-y[a-at-ta-ti]
 5' [še-ra-aš-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}] ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-[ti]³³
-
- 6' [...]x-ʾit¹ na-i-e-er GUNNI-[ma[?]]
 7' [ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-at-ta-ti š]e-[r]a-aš-ša-an GIŠ³kal-mi-ša-n[i-eš]
 8' [ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti ḥ]i-li-iš-ša-an an-da UD[U^{H1.A}]
 9' [ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti] ʾÉ¹.GU₄-kán an-da GU₄^{H1.A}-u[š]
 10' [ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti]³⁴ az-z]i-kán-zi na-at-za ʾna¹-[at-ta iš-pí-ya-an-zi]
 11' [ak-ku-uš-kán-zi na-at-za Ú-UL] ḥa-aš-ši-ʾkán¹-[zi]
- (11) KUB 33.18 (CTH 326.C, MS[?])³⁵
 3' [...]IŠ-BAT É-er tuḥ-ḥu-[iš ...

30. DINGIR^{MEŠ} can be possibly restored here (cf. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 326 (TX 2009-08-18, TRde 2009-08-26)).

31. GUNNI-a[n[?] according to Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 326 (TX 2009-08-18, TRde 2009-08-26), but we would expect the hearth to be the subject of a lost *ḥantaittat* here (cf. e.g. KUB 33.19 iii 5[?], No. 12).

32. The phonetic complement seems to point to the acc.sg. *ḥaššan*, although we would rather expect a locative here. Restoring GUNNI<-ša>-an may be a good solution (many thanks to Rita Francia for this suggestion).

33. The restoration of the line is mine. *Contra* Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 326 (TX 2009-08-18, TRde 2009-08-26), *wišūriyantati* in this line cannot be the verb of the sentence concerning the logs, which occurs in the following paragraph.

34. Laroche (1965: 120) restores KI.MIN at the end of line 9[?] (thus also Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 326 (TX 2009-08-18, TRde 2009-08-26)); however, considering the restorations assumed for the preceding and following lines, there would be enough space for *ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti* at the beginning of line 10[?].

35. I am not sure that this fragment should be regarded as a duplicate of KUB 33.15+ (Nos. 8-9) and KUB 33.16 (No. 10), because in these manuscripts the hearth and the logs are in two different sentences, as well as the altars and the gods, while *INA* GUNNI in KUB 33.18, 4[?] is perhaps not consistent with this structure (see however GUNNI-an GIŠ³kal[m[išan]iuš KI.MIN in KUB 33.21+ iii 5[?], No. 9).

- 4' [... ú-i-šu-u-ri-a]n-ta-at I-NA GUN[NI-ma]
 5' [... ú-i-š]u-[u-r]i-an-da-t[i]

4. The Storm-god of the queen Ḫarapšili (CTH 327)

(12) KUB 33.19 iii (CTH 327.1.A, NS)

- 2' [... (^{GIŠ}A)]B-ya kam-ma-ra-a-aš tar-n[a-aš]
 3' [É-er tuḪ-ḫu-w(a-iš t)]ar-na-aš ZAG.GAR.RA-aš ḫa-an-^rda-at-ta-at¹
 4' [še-er-ra-aš-š(a-an DINGIR^{MEŠ})]^š ḫa-an-ta-an-da-ti

- 5' [GUNNI-ma ḫa-a]n-d[a-a]t-ta-<-at> še-er-ra-aš-ša-an ^{GIŠ}kal-mi-i-e-eš₁₇
 6' [(ḫa-an-ta)-a]n-^rta-at¹ ^Éḫi-li-kán an-da UDU^{rHI.A} ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-ti
 7' [I-NA É.G]U₄-^rma¹ an-da GU₄^{HI.A} ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-ti
 8' [nu² az-zi-ik]-^rkán-zi¹ na-at-za iš-pí-i-e-er ^rnam-ma¹
 9' [ak-ku-uš-k]án-zi-ma na-at-za ḫa-aš-ši-ik-ke-[er] ...

(13) KUB 33.20 ii (CTH 327.1.B, LNS)

- 3' [... iš]-ta-na-na-aš
 4' [... še-er-ra-aš-š]a-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}
 5' [... ḫa-a]n-da-it-ta-a[t]
 6' [... ^{GIŠ}kal-mi-š]a-ni-eš ḫa-an-da-[an-ta-at]

(14) KBo 8.69 (CTH 327.1.D, NS)

- 13' ... ^{GIŠ}AB^{HI.rA1} [...
 14' [... iš-ta-na-n]a-aš ḫa-an-da-at-t[a-at ...
 15' [... še-er-r]a-aš-ša-an ^{GIŠ}[kal-mi-ša-ni-iš ...
 16' [... I-NA É.GU₄-kán an]-da GU₄^{HI.rA1} [ḫa-an-da-an-ta-at ...
 17' [...] ḫa-a[n-da-an-ta-at²]

(15) KUB 60.32 rev. (CTH 327.1.E, NS)

- 10 [... ^{GIŠ}A]B^{HI.A}-uš
 11 [... túḫ-ḫu-w]a-iš tar-n[a-aš]
 12 [...]x[...]

5. The Storm-god of the scribe Pirwa (CTH 328)

(16) KBo 13.86 i (CTH 328.A, NS)

- 7' [^d]ŠKUR-aš-kán ^mPí-ir-wa-aš [...]
 8' [^{GI}]^šlu-ut-ta-i kam-ma-ra-a-aš [e-ep-ta É-er túḫ-ḫu-iš]
 9' ^re¹-ep-ta GUNNI ú-i-šu-r[i-ya-at-ta-ti]
 10' [^{GI}]^škal-mi-ša-ni-eš ú-i-šu-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti ...]
 11' 1 LI-IM DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-i-šu-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti]

(17) KUB 33.32 ii (CTH 328.B, NS)

- 4 ... ^{GIŠ}AB-*i kam-m[a-ra-aš tar-na-aš]*
 5 [É-*er túh-ḫu-i*]š *tar-na-aš*

-
- 6 [...]_x I-NA É ^mPí-*ir-wa* [...]
 7 [GUNNI-*ma-aš-ša-an*³⁶ *kal-m*]i-*ša-ni-eš ḫa-an-ta-[an-ta-at I-NA É.GU₄]*
 8 [GU₄^{HIA} *ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-a*]t I-NA TÜR-*m[a-kán UDU^{HIA}]*
 9 [KI.MIN I-NA ZAG.GAR.RA-*m*]a[?] ḠDINGIR^{MEŠ1} *ḫa-an-t[a-an-ta-at]*

(18) KUB 33.32 iii (CTH 328.B, NS)

- 4' [... t]ar-na-aš É-*er túh-ḫu-ḡiš*¹
 5' [... n]a-at-za *iš-pí-er e-ku-er*
 6' [...]_xli-*iš ú-da-aš*

6. The Storm-god of Kuliwišna (CTH 330)

(19) KUB 33.17+ i (CTH 330.1.A, NS)

- 13 [^{GIŠ}AB]-*e kam-ma-a-ra-aš IŠ-BAT É-ir túh[-ḫu-wa-iš IŠ-BAT*³⁷
 14 [ka]l-*mi-iš-ša-ni-iš ú-i-šu-u-ri-y[a-an-ta-ti GU₄^{HIA}]*
 15 *ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti UDU^{HIA} [ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti]*
 16 *iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an L[^I-IM DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti]*

7. Fragment of the disappearing of the Storm-god (CTH 332)

(20) KUB 33.34 obv.[?] (CTH 332.2.A, NS)

- 13' [...]_x ^d10-*aš¹ nu* ^{GIŠ}AB^{HIA} *kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš* [...]
 14' [...]_xti-*kán ARAD^{MEŠ} GÉME^{MEŠ} ḫa-an-ta-an-ta-at GUN[NI ...]*³⁸
 15' [... I-N]A É.GU₄ KI.MIN ^dIŠKUR-*aš-kán ḠEGIR-pa[?]1 ú-et* [...]
 16' [... na-at]-za *ḫa-aš-ši-ik-ke-er an-na-aš-za DU[MU-ŠU ka-ni-]eš-t[a]*³⁹ ...
 17' [...]_x LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL [...]

36. I tentatively suggest this restoration *contra* Laroche (1965: 125) and the online edition on the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* (Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 328 (TX 2009-08-26, TRde 2009-08-26)), where *še-ra-aš-ša-an* is restored.

37. Glocker (1997: 26) also restores I-NA GUNNI-*ma* here, but it is difficult to decide: on the one hand, line 15 shows that at least the sentence concerning the sheep did not start with a locative; on the other hand, *iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an* is found in line 16.

38. An erased sequence of signs is found between lines 14' and 15'.

39. Laroche (1965: 127) restores *ka-ni-]eš-t[a]* based on the ritual passage KUB 33.70 ii (14') ... *nu-za UDU-uš ma-aḫ-ḫa-an SILA₄-an ka-ni-eš-zi* (15') [GU₄-*uš ma-a*]ḫ-*ḫa-an AMAR-ŠU ka-ni-eš-iz-zi at-ta-aš an-na-aš* (16') [ma-aḫ-ḫa-an] DUMU-ŠU-*NU ka-ni-eš-ša-an-zi zi-ga* ^dUTU-uš (iii 1) [(LUGAL) MUNUS.L]UGAL ḠDUMU^{MEŠ} LUGAL Q^{A1}-[TAM]-ḠMA *ka¹-ni-eš-ša-an ḫ[(ar-ak)]*: 'As the sheep recognises the lamb, [a]s [the ox] recognises its calf, [as] the father (and) the mother recognise their child, you also, Solar deity, shall keep the king, [the qu]een, and the princes recognised in the s[ame] way!'. See also KUB 33.38 + Bo 9614 iv 1-5 (No. 28 below) for a more suitable parallel. As an alternative, *pé-en-né-]eš-t[a]* could be a possible restoration as well, based on KUB 17.10+ iv 24-25, but see fn. 6 above.

8. *The disappearing of Anzili and Zukki (CTH 333)*

(21) KUB 33.67 iv (CTH 333.A, NS)

- 7 *an-da-ma-aš-kán ti-ya-a*[*t*^d*An-z(i-li-iš* ^d*Zu-uk-ki-iš*)]
 8 ŠA EN SÍSKUR É-ri g[(*a*²-*ka*²-*eš-ni* ^{GIŠ}*ḫu-in-pa-an*)]
 9 *kam-ma-ra-aš*⁴⁰ *tar-na-aš*⁴¹ ^{GIŠ}[^{AB}^{HLA} (*tuḫ-ḫu-iš tar-na-aš*)]
 10 *iš-ta-na-ni-^Γiš-ša¹-an* [DINGIR^{MEŠ} (SIG₅-*ya-an-ta-at*)]
 11 *A-NA ^ΓGUNNI-iš-ša¹-a*[(*n* ^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-ša-ni*)-*eš* SIG₅-(*ya-an-ta-at*)]

- 12 TÜR-kán UDU^{HLA} SIG₅-*an-t*[*a-at I-NA É.GU₄-kán GU₄^{HLA} SIG₅-an-ta-at*]
 13 AMA-ŠU DUMU-ŠU-*ya* ^ΓSIG₅¹-*an-ta*-[*at DAM-SÚ-kán* ^{LÚ}*MU-DI-ŠU-ya*]
 14 SIG₅-*an-ta*-[*at*]

(22) KUB 33.36 ii (CTH 333.B, MS)

- 5 [*É-er kam-ma-ra-aš IŠ-*]BAT^{GIŠ} ^{AB}^{HLA} *tuḫ-ḫu-iš IŠ-BAT*
 6 [*iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ú-i-š*]u-ri-*ya-an-ta-at A-NA ^ΓGUNNI¹-ša-an*
 7 [^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-ša-ni-iš ú-i-šu-ri-y*]a-*an-da-at I-NA TÜR-kán UDU^{HLA}*
 8 [*ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-da-at I-NA*] É.GU₄-*kán GU₄^{HLA} ^Γú¹-i-šu-ri-an-da-at*
 9 [AMA-ŠU DUMU-ŠU-*ya ú-i-šu-ri-a*]n-*da-at DAM-^ΓSÚ¹-kán*
 10 [^{LÚ}*MU-DU-ŠU-ya ú-i-šu-ri-ya-an-d*]a-*at*

(23) KUB 33.36 iii (CTH 333.B, MS)

- 3' [(*an-da-ma-aš-kán ti-ya-a*)*t*^d*An-z*]i-*li-iš* ^Γ*Zu¹-uk-ki-iš*
 4' [(ŠA EN SÍSKUR É-ri g)]*a*²-*ka*²-*eš-ni* ^{GIŠ}*ḫu-in-pa-an*
 5' [(*kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš* ^{GIŠ})^{AB}^{HLA}] *tuḫ-ḫu-iš tar-na-aš*
 6' [(*iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-an*) DINGIR^{MEŠ} S]IG₅-*ya-an-ta-at*
 7' [(A-NA GUNNI-iš-ša-a)]n ^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-ša-ni*[-*eš*]
 8' [... SIG₅-]ya-*an-ta-at*⁴²

9. *The disappearing of Hannahanna (CTH 334)*

(24) KUB 33.47+ ii (CTH 334.1.1.A, NS)

- 20' [(DINGIR.MAḪ)-*aš-ša pa-it*² ^{GIŠ}]u-*ut-ta-a-i* *eras.*
 21' [*kam-ma-ra-aš ḫar-ta* (É-er *túḫ-ḫ*)]u-^Γ*wa¹-iš ḫar-ta*
 22' [A-NA GUNNI-*ša-an* ^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-še-ni-eš*] ^Γ*ú-i-šu-u-ri-an¹*-[*ta-ti*]

(25) KUB 33.48 ii (CTH 334.1.1.B, NS)

- 4' ... DINGIR.MAḪ-[*aš-ša pa-it*² ^{GIŠ}](u-*ut-ta-a-i*) *kam-ma-ra-aš ḫar-ta*
 5' É-er *tuḫ-ḫu-iš ḫar-t*[(*a*) A-NA GUNNI-*ša-an* ^{GIŠ}*kal-mi-še-ni-eš* (*ú-i-šu-u-ri-an*)-*ta-ti*]

40. Text: *-an*.

41. Text: *-an*.

42. Possibly [SIG₅-*ya-an-ta-at TÜR-kán UDU^{HLA} SIG₅-]ya-*an-ta-at*.*

6' *iš-ta-na-ni-iš-ša-a[n DINGIR^{MEŠ} ú-e-šu-ri-an-ta-ti]*

7' *I-NA É.GU₄-kán an-da G[U₄^{H1.A} ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-ti I-NA TÛR-ma-kán UDU^{H1.A}]*

8' *ú-e-šu-ri-ya-an-ta-t[i an-na-aš-za DUMU-an Ú-UL kap-pu-u-wa-ez-zi]*

9' *GU₄-uš-ma-za AMAR-un ^UÚ-[UL kap-pu-u-wa-ez-zi ...*

(26) KUB 33.37 + KUB 33.39+ iv (CTH 334.2.1.A, NS)

1 *[I-N]A ŠÀ É.GU₄-kán GU₄^{H1.A} ^Uú-i-šu¹-r[i-y]a-an-ta-ti*

2 *[Š]À TÛR-^Uma¹-kán UDU^{H1.A} ú-i-šu-ri-an-ta-ti*

3 *[a]n-na-aš-za DUMU-an Ú-UL kap-pu-u-wa-ez-zi*

4 *GU₄-uš-za AMAR-un Ú-UL kap-pu-u-wa-ez-zi*

5 *^UUDU-uš¹-ma-za SILA₄-an Ú-UL kap-pu-u-wa-ez-zi*

(27) KUB 33.46 i (CTH 334.3.A, NS)⁴³

10' *DINGIR.MAH₃-aš kar-di-mi-^Uya¹-[wa-an-za ...*

11' *ú-i-^Ušu¹-ri-ya-^Uat¹-ta-t[i ...*

12' *GUNNI-ma-aš-ša<-an> ^{G1Š}k[al-mi-še-ni-eš ...*

13' *A-NA ^ÉGU₄-ma-k[án ...*

14' *GU₄-uš-za AM[AR-un ...*

(28) KUB 33.38 + Bo 9614 iv (CTH 334.6.A, MS)⁴⁴

1 *[nu]-za A[MA²-aš DUMU-ŠU ga-ni-eš-ta] GU₄-uš ^UAMAR-ŠU¹*

2 *[g]a-ni-eš-ta U[DU-u]š S[ILA₄-SÚ g]a-ni-iš-ta <<x>>⁴⁵*

3 *DINGIR^{LUM}-ma LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL [g]a-ni-eš-ta ^UÚ¹ KUR ^{URU}Ha-at-ti*

4 *[g]a-ni-iš-ta nu-uš-za hu-iš-wa-an-ni ^Uin¹-na-ra-u-a[n-ni]*

5 *EGIR.U₄^{MI} kap-pu-u-e[t]*

(29) KBo 12.78 (CTH 334.8.A, NS)

9' *[DINGIR].MAH₃-aš kar-tim-mi-ya-w[a-an-za ...*

10' *[kam-m]a-ra-a-aš ^UIŠ¹-BAT ^Éer ...*

11' *[...] ú-^Ui-šu¹-ri-[ya-an-ta-ti ...*

12' *[...] ú-i-šu-r[i-^Uya¹-[an-ta-ti ...*

10. Fragments of myths of the disappearing god (CTH 335)

(30) KBo 9.110 (CTH 335.1.1.A, NS)

5' *[...] -^Ui¹-uš⁴⁶ IŠ-BAT iš-t[a-na- ...]*

6' *[...] ú-i-šu-u-ri-ya-an-ta-ti² ^Unu¹-za-kán IGI^{H1.A}-ŠU-N[U ...]*

43. See above for a tentative restoration.

44. Cf. Groddek 2015: 136-137.

45. There is a small vertical wedge here.

46. Perhaps [... *túh-hu*]-^Ui¹-iš¹ (cf. Rieken et al. (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 335.1.1 (TX 2009-08-28, TRde 2009-08-28)).

- 7' [... TÚ]R-kán UDU^{H1.A} KI.MIN ᵀᵀ-[NA É.GU₄-kán GU₄^{H1.A} KI.MIN]
 8' [...] ak-ku-uš-kán-z[i na-at-za Ú-UL ḫa-aš-ši-ik-kán-zi]
- (31) KUB 33.40 iv (CTH 335.7.2.A, NS)
 4 [ᵀᵀ^{GIŠ}lu-ut-ta]-ᵀᵀ¹ kam-ma-ra-aš tar-na-aš É-er
 5 [túḫ-ḫu-wa-iš ta]r-na-aš ḫa-aš-ši-iš-ša-an
 6 [ᵀᵀ^{GIŠ}kal-mi-ša-n]i-eš ḫa-an-da-an-da-ti
 7 [ᵀᵀ^{GIŠ}iš-ta-na-ni-i]š-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-eš
 8 [ḫa-an-da-an-da]-ᵀᵀ¹
- (32) KBo 24.84 i (CTH 335.8.A, MS)
 3' [... ᵀᵀ^{GIŠ}lu-ud-da-a-uš
 4' [... I]Š-BAT GUNNI [...]
 5' [... ᵀᵀ^{GIŠ}ᵀᵀ¹kal¹-mi-š[a-ni-eš]
 6' [...]x [...]
- (33) KBo 34.32 (CTH 335.16.A, NS)
 3' [... t]úḫ-ḫu-u-i-iš IŠ-BAT ᵀᵀ^dUTU-u[š-za ...
 4' [...] e-te-er Ú-UL-at-za iš-[pí-er ...

References

- Asan, Ali Naci (2014), *Der Mythos vom Erzürnten Gott. Ein philologischer Beitrag zum religionshistorischen Verständnis des Telipinu-Mythos und verwandter Texte* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 41), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Beckman, Gary M. (1983), *Hittite Birth Rituals. Second Revised Edition* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 29), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Beckman, Gary M. (2003), The Wrath of Telipinu, in W.W. Hallo, K.L. Younger Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, pp. 151-153.
- Boysan-Dietrich, Nilüfer (1987), *Das hethitische Lehmhaus aus der Sicht der Keilschriftquellen* (Texte der Hethiter 12), Heidelberg: Winter.
- Carruba, Onofrio (1966), *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanša* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 2), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CHD = *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1989-.
- CTH = Laroche, Emmanuel (1971), *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Études et commentaires 75), Paris: Klincksieck (updated online version: S. Košak – G.G.W. Müller, hethiter.net/: Catalog).
- Della Casa, Romina (2014), Symbolic Representations of the Sacred Space/Landscape in the Telepinu Myth, in P. Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology. Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011*, Warsaw: Agade.
- EDHIL = Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- García Trabazo, José Virgilio (2002), *Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales* (Biblioteca de Ciencias Bíblicas y Orientales 6), Madrid: Editorial Trotta.

- Gaster, Theodor H. (1950), *Thespis. Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*, New York: Henry Schuman.
- Glocker, Jürgen (1997), *Das Ritual für den Wettergott von Kuliwišna. Textzeugnisse eines lokalen Kultfestes im Anatolien der Hethiterzeit* (Eothen 6), Firenze: LoGisma.
- Goetze, Albrecht (1957), *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens*, München: C.H. Beck.
- Goetze, Albrecht (1969), Hittite Myths, Epics, and Legends, in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 120-128.
- Groddek, D. (2015), Bemerkungen anlässlich der Edition eines Ensembles hethitischer Texte (CHDS 2), *Altorientalische Forschungen* 42, pp. 127-141.
- Gurney, Oliver R. (1952), *The Hittites*, Melbourne – London – Baltimore: Penguin.
- Haas, Volkert (1994), *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/15), Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill.
- HEG = Tischler, Johann (1983-2016), *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20), Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Hoffner, Harry A. (1998), *Hittite Myths. Second Edition* (Writings from the Ancient World 2), Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Hoffner, Harry A. (2003), On a Hittite Lexicographic Project, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123, pp. 617-625.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H.J. (1970), *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire (C. 1450-1380 B.C.)* (PIHANS 26), Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- HW = Friedrich, Johannes (1952), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- HW² = *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1975-.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. (1977), *Luna, upavšaja s neba. Drevnjaja literatura Maloj Azii*, Moskva: Khudozhestvennaja Literatura.
- KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, vols. 1-6 Leipzig: Hinrichs; vols. 7-70 Berlin: Mann; vol. 71 Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1916-.
- Kellerman, Galina (1986), The Telepinu Myth Reconsidered, in H.A. Hoffner Jr., G.M. Beckman (eds.), *Kaniššumar. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday. May 27, 1983* (Assyriological Studies 23), Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, pp. 115-123.
- KUB = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1921-1990.
- Kühne, Cord (1975), Hethitische Texte, in W. Beyerlin (ed.), *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 169-204.
- Kümmel, Hans Martin (1967), *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 3), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Laroche, Emmanuel (1965), Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. Première Partie. Mythologie anatolienne, *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 23/77, pp. 61-178.
- Mazoyer, Michel (2003), *Télipinu, le dieu au marécage. Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du Royaume hittite* (Collection KUBABA. Série Antiquité II), Paris: L'Harmattan.

Melchert, H. Craig (2016), Marginalia to the Myth of Telipinu, in Š. Velhartická (ed.), *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 79), Leiden / Boston: Brill, pp. 210-220.

Mouton, Alice (2016), *Rituels, mythes et prières hittites* (Littérature Anciennes du Proche-Orient 21), Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.

Neu, Erich (1968), *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 5), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Neu, Erich (1980), *Studien zum endungslosen "Lokativ" des Hethitischen* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 23), Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Otten, Heinrich (1942), *Die Überlieferungen des Telipinu-Mythus* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 46/1), Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Pecchioli Daddi, Franca – Polvani, Anna Maria (1990), *La mitologia ittita* (Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 4.1), Brescia: Paideia.

Reyhan, Esma (2009), The Missing God Telipinu Myth: A Chapter from the Ancient Anatolian Mythology, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 45, pp. 85-106.

Sayce, Archibald H. (1930), The Legend of Telibinus, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2, pp. 301-319.

Ünal, Ahmet (1994), Hethitische Mythen und Epen, in K. Hecker, W.G. Lambert, G.G.W. Müller, W. von Soden, A. Ünal, *Mythen und Epen II* (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testament III, 4), Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, pp. 802-865.

van den Hout, Theo (2007), Institutions, Vernaculars, Publics: The Case of Second-Millennium Anatolia, in S.L. Sanders (ed.), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (Oriental Institute Seminars 2), Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, pp. 221-262.