

# Urhi-Tešub, *tuhkanti*

(Tafeln VI-IX)

David Hawkins - London

The very large number of sealed bullae excavated at Boğazköy among the ruins of the *Westbau* on Nişantepe in 1990-1991<sup>1</sup> were impressed with seals of two categories, the royal and the official. The former are those of kings, often with their queens, or even of queens alone<sup>2</sup>. Every king from Suppiluliuma I to Suppiluliuma II is represented by a number of different seals<sup>3</sup>, often surviving in a number of different impressions, some of already attested seals, others of new examples<sup>4</sup>. These royal seals are of the expected digraphic type with the names written in Hieroglyphs in the centre and in Cuneiform in one or more surrounding rings which are often partly or barely preserved in any given impression. Starting with seals of Muwatalli, figures of gods and/or the seal holder begin to appear in the centre of

---

<sup>1</sup> Reported by the excavator P. Neve (Neve 1991: 322-325, 1992: 307-316); cf. Neve 1992b: 52-62. The publication of the royal seals was undertaken by H. Otten, who has to date produced the following preliminary studies: Otten 1993, 1993b, 1994, 1995, 1995b. The publication of the officials' seals is being prepared by Dr. Suzanne Herbordt, who as her Habilitationsschrift has submitted *Prinzen- und Beamtsiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit* (seals cited from here below as *Herbordt* + number), and has published in addition a number of preliminary studies. I have had the privilege of being invited to collaborate with her on the readings of the seals, and the pleasure of working on them with her at Boğazköy in 1992 and 1993 and for other shorter spells.

<sup>2</sup> Notably Danuhepa and Puduhepa: Neve 1992: 314 Abb. 7c = id., 1992b: 58 Abb. 157; 1991: 329 Abb. 31b.

<sup>3</sup> Seals, find-spots and totals tabulated by Neve 1991: 333; updated Neve 1992: 313, repeated Neve 1992b: 87.

<sup>4</sup> It is often difficult to identify with certainty impressions of the same seal especially when examples are only partial or fragmentary, but it looks as if most of the previously known royal seals from Boğazköy (as found principally in the Büyükkale group, published in *SBo* I) recur as impressions in the Nişantepe group in addition to the impressions from new seals. An exception is Suppiluliuma I, whose already known seals *SBo* I 1-6 are not found repeated, nor are the Mursili II + Danuhepa seals *SBo* I 24-29 (cf. below, n. 21). For new impressions of Muwatalli *Umarmungssiegel* *SBo* I 38, 40, see below n. 11; Muwatalli + Danuhepa, *SBo* I 42, below, n. 22; Urhi-Tešub + Danuhepa, *SBo* I 43-49, below n. 23; Mursili III (Urhi-Tešub), *SBo* I 13, below n. 10. Noteworthy are new impressions of the seals of Tudhaliya IV and Ini-Tešub known before only from Ugarit (Otten 1993: 35-37, 41 f.).

the seal along with the Hieroglyphs<sup>5</sup>, and the seal-cutter's art reaches high levels of skill. The bullae became larger and the seals more elaborate as the dynasty progresses, so that the largest and the most varied are those of the late and historically insignificant Arnuwanda III<sup>6</sup>.

The non-royal seals are those of officials including princes, scribes and various professions, even occasionally women<sup>7</sup>. These only very exceptionally bear Cuneiform inscriptions alongside the Hieroglyphs in which they are regularly composed<sup>8</sup>. Represented here are ordinary stamp seals, impressed like the royal ones on the circular bases of conical bullae, and signet rings impressed on small drop-shaped bullae. They show a wider variety of design than the royal seals, and though generally smaller, often show figures and may be executed as finely or even more so.

Among these groups, impressions of two nearly identical but different seals stand out<sup>9</sup>. A quick glance identifies them as typical royal seals of the *Umarmung* type, i.e. showing a central *Umarmungsszene*, in which a god embraces a smaller figure, usually taken as that of the seal-holder but here argued by Suzanne Herbordt to be his patron deity. Such seals have Hieroglyphs identifying the god and the seal-holder, which are matched by digraphic Cuneiform inscriptions, though because of the size of these seals, these legends are not usually substantially preserved<sup>10</sup>. *Umarmung* seals

<sup>5</sup> Muwatalli's *Umarmungssiegel*, below, n. 11; now Mursili III (Urhi-Tešub) *Umarmungssiegel*, below, n. 12; Tudhaliya IV, Ugarit seal, including *Umarmungsszene*, and a further such on an unusual cylinder impression, below, n. 13. Tudhaliya IV and Arnuwanda III use mountain-figures to write their (mountain) names, and Kurunta the Stag or God on Stag for his (Neve 1992b: 21 Abb. 40-42). Note the exquisite figure of Danuhepa in "I am ..." posture (Neve 1992 and 1992b, above, n. 2); also the figure on the silver seal "Tarkondemos" of Tarkasnawa king of Mira, now dated as a later contemporary of Tudhaliya IV (Hawkins 1998: 1 ff.). Curiously neither Hattusili nor Puduhepa have figures on their known seals.

<sup>6</sup> At least two different seals published from his total of 45: Neve 1991: 330 Abb. 34a-b. His bullae are notable for their size.

<sup>7</sup> Photograph of a small selection of official seals: Neve 1992b: 60 Abb. 162. Much the most common woman's seals are those of Muwatti with at least ten different seals; *Herbordt*, nos. 261-271.

<sup>8</sup> The exceptions which are digraphic include *Herbordt* nos. 3 (Alalime), 162 (Kilani), 217 (Mahhuzzi), 248 (Mizrimuwa), 281 (Nanuwa), 305 (Pihatarhunta).

<sup>9</sup> See below, n. 14 for identification.

<sup>10</sup> Seals were often larger than the base of the bullae on which they were impressed, which may result in none or only part of an inner ring of Cuneiform being visible. If they were misplaced on the receiving surface, perhaps only a segment of Cuneiform appears. Very unusual is the example of a new impression of a seal of Mursili III (Urhi-Tešub), already known from Büyükkale (*SBo* I, 13 // Beran 1967, no. 180), which now

are known primarily for Muwatalli<sup>11</sup> and now for Urhi-Tešub under his throne name Mursili (III)<sup>12</sup>, and with a more elaborate scene, for Tudhaliya IV<sup>13</sup>.

The two *Umarmung* seals forming the subject of this paper are both represented by several impressions<sup>14</sup>, which can be combined to make more or less complete reconstructions. The god, identified by the epigraph below his outstretched arm as Šarruma<sup>15</sup>, is represented similarly on both seals: bearded, wearing a short kilted tunic and horned helmet, holding a spear in his outstretched left hand, his right arm encircling the smaller figure. The latter wears a pointed helmet with frontal horn, and on one seal a short kilted tunic like the god's, on the other a long draped over-garment with triangular flap hanging down his front. It is this difference of the smaller figure's attire, which most clearly distinguishes the two seals.

Behind the smaller figure, identifying the seal's owner if not the figure itself, are three Hieroglyphs: TONITRUS (*HH* no. 199), a "lozenge" (*HH* no. 419), and a sign not before specifically identified but resembling *HH* no. 300<sup>16</sup>, cf. also *HH* no. 490<sup>17</sup>. The first two signs apparently repre-

preserves the entire three rings of Cuneiform including the outer: Neve 1992b: 57 Abb. 151 (less complete new impressions – Neve 1991: 329 Abb. 29a; Otten 1993: 26 Abb. 21).

<sup>11</sup> Neve 1991: 327 Abb. 28a, apparently from the same seal as *SBo* I 38 (= Beran 1967, no. 250); p. 329 Abb. 30a, probably from the same seal as *SBo* I 40 (= Beran 1967, no. 252), also Güterbock 1975: 47 f., Nr. 1 (661/z).

<sup>12</sup> Otten 1993: 22-26 Abb. 16-20, identifies all three as impressions of the same seal and notes other duplicates (n. 33).

<sup>13</sup> His Ugarit seal from the tablet RS.17.159 (*Ugaritica* III, pp. 14-20, figs. 24-26, pl. III); fragmentary impressions of the same seal appeared in the Nišantepe archive in 1991: Otten 1993: 35-37 Abb. 30-31. A partial impression of an unusual cylinder seal also with an *Umarmungsszene* was a further addition of 1991: Neve 1992: 315 Abb. 7d.

<sup>14</sup> Designated below Seals I and II, represented by 4 and 3 impressions respectively (see Catalogue, below, p. 177).

<sup>15</sup> Written simply (DEUS) *SARMA*. The transliteration of the Hieroglyphs in this paper follows the system set out in M. Marazzi *et al.* 1998.

<sup>16</sup> It is by no means clear that the sign under consideration does in fact have anything to do with *HH* no. 300. The latter has been identified from its appearance as a "cradle", and is used exclusively as a part of the logogram "grandson", written in the Late Period *INFANS* + \*300 + \*488 and read *hamsi-*; in the Empire Period written simply "hand" + \*300 (as "son" is written "hand + crampon", and "daughter" "hand + woman").

<sup>17</sup> The two recognized occurrences of *HH* no. 490 are both apparently titles of men who bear in addition the title "prince" (*SBo* II 21 (!, not 210) and *Boğazköy* III, Taf. 30 no. 15 (no photograph)). Both occurrences show a diagonal bar across the interior of the sign, and again it is quite unclear whether *HH* no. 490 has anything to do with

sent the seal owner's name, "Thunder-Lozenge", since they recur on another seal as the name of a Great King, paired with the Great Queen Danuhepa<sup>18</sup>. The third sign will be argued to represent the title<sup>19</sup>, and what is immediately striking is that although the seal is of a royal *Umarmung* type, the owner is not designated, as always elsewhere, "Great King". Who then is this individual, and what was his office, exalted enough to entitle him to an *Umarmung*-seal?

As noted above, the only other *Umarmung*-seals of this type belong to Muwatalli II and Mursili III (Urhi-Tešub)<sup>20</sup>. Similarly, apart from "Thunder-Lozenge", the only Great Kings to share a seal with the Great Queen Danuhepa were Mursili<sup>21</sup>, Muwatalli<sup>22</sup> and Urhi-Tešub<sup>23</sup>. Before resorting to the possibility of a fourth unknown Great King with Danuhepa, we should consider the question as to whether the name "Thunder-Lozenge"

---

the sign under consideration. Cf. also Neve 1995: 299 f., 311 fig. 14 (perhaps without diagonal bar). Note that TARSUS seal no. 40 is a seal of the same Sahuruwuwa as Boğazköy III, no. 15, also showing the sign *HH* no. 490 but incorrectly drawn.

<sup>18</sup> Bo 91/722 etc. These presumably represent the two impressions listed by Neve (1992, above, n. 3) as "Unbekannte Grosskönige, davon 2 mit Danuhepa". The other four (i.e. unknown Great Kings not with Danuhepa) are presumably among the impressions with which we are concerning ourselves.

<sup>19</sup> On the assumption that it is unconnected with *HH* nos. 300 and 490, we should note that it will need a new number and some means of transcription: see below, n. 31.

<sup>20</sup> Above, nn. 11,12.

<sup>21</sup> *SBo* I 24-29 // Beran 1967: 221-225, 228. The question has been raised as to whether the Mursili who shares the seal with Danuhepa as Great Queen was not Mursili III (Urhi-Tešub), and whether she was not the wife of Muwatalli and (step-)mother of Urhi-Tešub. Houwink ten Cate however points out that Danuhepa was both Great Queen and had sons (who would therefore have been legitimate), so it is out of the question for her to have been Urhi-Tešub's mother (an *EŠERTU*-woman according to Hattusili III), or the wife of Muwatalli and mother of his legitimate sons (he had none); see Houwink ten Cate 1994: 234-259, esp. § 2b. Thus Danuhepa should have been the last wife of Mursili and should have borne him (legitimate) sons, something that Hattusili III in his Apology was not keen to emphasize (*Hatt.* i 9-11), but which may well have given rise to the "Affair of Danuhepa" in the reign of Muwatalli. She would have continued as Great Queen in the reign of Muwatalli, and, apparently reinstated, in the reign of Urhi-Tešub. See now also van den Hout 1998: 46-49. Cf. also above n. 18; below, n. 41.

<sup>22</sup> *SBo* I 42 (Beran 1967: —); a more fully preserved impression of the same seal appears in Neve 1991: 329 Abb. 30b, and 1992b: 58 Abb. 158. Neve 1992: 313, reports a total of 20 such impressions.

<sup>23</sup> *SBo* I 43-44 // Beran 1967: 226-227; a more fully preserved impression of the same seal appears in Neve 1991: 327 Abb. 25b, and id., 1992b: 57 Abb. 148. Neve 1992: 313, reports a total of 14 such impressions.

could represent one of the known individuals Mursili, Muwatalli or Urhi-Tešub.

Muwatalli's name is written simply *mu(wa)-tà-li*<sup>24</sup>, but on his *Umar-mung* seals other names appear within the royal aedicula SOL<sub>2</sub>. MAGNUS. REX ... MAGNUS.REX under the outstretched left arm of the Storm-God of Heaven his embracer<sup>25</sup>. The one is transcribed by Nowicki<sup>26</sup> SUPER (*HH* no. 270), *TEŠUB* (*HH* no. 318)-*pa* (*HH* no. 334), and interpreted, surely correctly, as *Šarri-Tešub*, a Hurrian second name of Muwatalli, parallel to *Tašmi-Šarruma*<sup>27</sup>, the second name of Tudhaliya IV. The other Muwatalli seal has inside the usual royal aedicula the signs TONITRUS.MAGNUS.REX, so executed that the two flanking MAGNUS.REX signs align with the central MAGNUS.REX. Nowicki interpreted this central group as an alternative writing of *Šarri-Tešub*, i.e. *Tešub* (TONITRUS)-*šarri* (MAGNUS.REX), and again this is probably correct, although alternative explanations have been proposed<sup>28</sup>. Certainly TONITRUS can represent *Tešub* as on the Ini-Tešub seals<sup>29</sup>, and the reversed order will also be seen to be significant.

Thus in "Thunder-Lozenge", TONITRUS could represent *Tešub*, but we

<sup>24</sup> On all *Umarmungssiegel* (*SBo* I 38-40) written behind the figures BOS.MI-tà-li; on seal with Danuhepa (*SBo* I 42), also another by himself (Neve 1992b: 58 Abb. 156) BOS<sub>2</sub>.MI-tà-li.

<sup>25</sup> One name occurs on what appear all to be impressions of the same seal *SBo* I 38 etc. (see above n. 11); the other on impressions of two different seals, *SBo* I 40 etc. (above n. 11) and *SBo* I 39. The Storm-God carries his name written MAGNUS.TONITRUS.CAELUM on all three seals.

<sup>26</sup> Nowicki 1983: 111-118. Nowicki's first transcribed name is from the two different seals *SBo* I 39-40, the second from *SBo* I 38.

<sup>27</sup> As appearing on his Ugarit seal (see above, n. 13), and now further seal(s) with the same name (see Otten 1993: 37-40). The earlier reading of this name as *Hišmi-Šarruma* has been increasingly criticized, and a new reading *Tašmi-Šarruma* has been proposed by Sedat Alp 1998: 21-26. This new reading has been criticized in turn by S. Heinhold-Krahmer at the IVth International Congress of Hittitology, Würzburg, 1999, principally on the basis of passages showing that Tudhaliya was known under this name before becoming king: see her contribution to the present volume. This nevertheless leaves the reading of Tudhaliya's second name unresolved.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Houwink ten Cate 1994: 234 with n. 4. His proposed interpretation of TONITRUS.MAGNUS.REX (and of TONITRUS.REX on the Tarsus seal of Isputahsu) as "(Great) King of Tarhuntassa" is less convincing than Nowicki's reading, which he does not cite, especially when set against the reading of the other name, *Šarri-Tešub*.

<sup>29</sup> *Ini-Tešub* written *i(a)-nù*-TONITRUS on his stamp seals RS.17.146 and 230 (*Ugaritica* III, p. 22 f., figs. 27-29 and pl. V; cf. Otten 1993: 41 f.); and *i(a)-nù*-TEŠUB-*pa* on his cylinders RS. 17.59 and 158 (*Ugaritica* III, pp. 24-26 figs. 32-35).

have no evidence for the logographic reading of "Lozenge" (*HH* no. 419)<sup>30</sup>. Since "Thunder-Lozenge" appears with Danuhepa, it could be yet another writing of Muwatalli's second name, which would postulate a logographic value "Lozenge" = *šarri*. But this is somewhat unlikely, and we also have the further problem of the third sign, proposed as the title. We thus pass to a consideration as to whether the name represents Danuhepa's other -Tešub associate, Urhi-Tešub.

Here the traces of the fragmentary Cuneiform legend of the outer ring come to our aid, and we find that sufficient is preserved to permit a reconstruction of the whole and to answer definitively the questions as to the name and status of the seal owner.

The original seal which made the impressions on which the embraced figure wears the long over-mantle is here referred to as **Seal I**, and that on which the figure wears the short tunic **Seal II**. The bulla which offers most of the Cuneiform traces is Bo 91/820, here Seal I.1, and it is essentially from this that the Cuneiform legend is reconstructed. Once this has been achieved, it is possible to identify the traces of the differently placed Cuneiform legend on Seal II.1 (Bo 90/1122), the best-preserved exemplar of the other seal.

**SEAL I.1.** The seal impression proper on the base of the cone preserves only two traces of the Cuneiform of the surrounding ring: one, **trace a**, on the right side at 2-3 o'clock, the other, **trace b**, on the left at 8 o'clock. These two traces however can be much expanded by the more substantial traces on the body of the cone (German "Mantel"), and these, at least for the left side of the seal, can be tied into place since they preserve alongside the Cuneiform the left-hand Hieroglyphs and parts of the figures of the central scene. Thus **trace c** on the *Mantel* shows Cuneiform reading:

...] vertical *-hu-kán-ti...*

which is tied into position at 7-9 o'clock by the adjoining Hieroglyphs and permits the identification of **trace b** as reading *kán*. Similarly **trace d** reading:

<sup>30</sup> Except in the Late Period. The "Lozenge", *HH* nos. 419, also 420 (which should be merged into one entry – the variant form with an internal circle is found only, *pace* Laroche, in the two ASSUR letter attestations) is attested in the Late Period with two usages only: (1) as the not uncommon syllabogram *mí*; (2) as a logogram determining the obscure word *washa-* (see Hawkins, *CHLI* I, pp. 24, 31, 153). The sole Empire Period use cited by Laroche (*SBo* II, 7) is of uncertain identity (being tall instead of wide in shape), and the further possible connection with the "lozenge" representing the *US* in the writing of the name *Sauska* is also uncertain (cf. Hawkins, *CHLI* I, p. 33; a new Late Period writing of *Sauska* now appears on the recently discovered stele from Tell Ahmar, TELL AHMAR 6, I. C2).

...]-*ti* DUMU.LUGAL [...

is fixed at 9-11 o'clock by the adjoining trace of the TONITRUS of the Hieroglyphic inscription, and gives the continuation of **trace c**. It requires little perspicacity to restore:

...<sup>L0</sup>*t*]u-*hu-kán-ti* DUMU.LUGAL[...  
"Crown Prince, King's Son"

which can then be seen to occupy the left side of the seal from 6-11 o'clock.

This at once explains the royal *Umarmung* seal type used by one who is not a Great King, and provides us with an example of a *tuhkanti* seal not previously recognized. The third sign of the Hieroglyphic legend, already identified as representing the title, should thus stand for *TUHKANTI*<sup>31</sup>.

Returning to the name of the seal owner, we find on the *Mantel's* **trace e**:

NA<sub>4</sub>. 'KIŠIB' 'ur-[...<sup>32</sup>

and on **trace f**:

NA<sub>4</sub>. KIŠIB [...

The placing of this, the beginning of the legend in relation to the central scene is permitted by **trace a** on the full impression on the base, where the horizontal and vertical wedges belong to the *ur* fully preserved on **trace e**. **Trace a** further preserves a single diagonal wedge of the sign following *ur*, and another bulla, Seal I.2 (Bo 90/1157), has a **trace g** showing *ur* plus two diagonals. Thus combining **traces e, f, g**, and tying this into place by adding it to **trace a** we gain at 1-3 o'clock the reading:

NA<sub>4</sub>. KIŠIB 'ur- three diagonals [...

The identification of the name's second sign as *-h[i-* and the completion with the restoration of <sup>D</sup>U-*up* is obvious and carries the legend of the right

<sup>31</sup> No Hieroglyphic writing of the title has been previously identified, but it would seem that the evidence here presented provides just that, i.e. the Hieroglyphic equivalent of Cuneiform <sup>L0</sup>*tuh(u)kanti*. The problem is now how to identify (i.e. number and transcribe) this Hieroglyphic sign. Of the newly allocated numbers (Hawkins, *CHLI* I: 24; Marazzi *et al.* 1998: 124) the latest is currently 524, which leaves us no.525 for the present sign. As for a transcription into Latin, *tuhkanti-*, "crown prince" or "heir apparent", does not find an easy or exact equivalent, so we may prefer to transcribe with the identified reading *TUHKANTI*.

<sup>32</sup> Trace e as visible on the *Mantel* and in photograph may at first sight seem continuous, thus giving the vertical visible before *ur* as the final vertical of KIŠIB. Closer examination however suggests that the seal moved while impressing this sequence leaving only the traces of the first part of KIŠIB, so that the vertical before *ur* can safely be identified as the personal determinative.

side of the seal round to 5 o'clock, thus joining up with the restored legend of the left side.

This full restored legend still has a short gap at the end, 11-12 o'clock. On **trace e** the NA<sub>4</sub> shows before it in the middle of the line a single horizontal wedge belonging to the preceding sign. This suggests [GA]L, which could well be the only sign missing between LUGAL and NA<sub>4</sub> and might thus complete the legend, which would read:

NA<sub>4</sub>. KIŠIB 'ur-ḥ[i-<sup>D</sup>U-up <sup>LÚ</sup>t]u-ḥu-kán-ti DUMU.LUGAL.[GA]L  
 "Seal of Urhi-Tešub, Crown Prince, Great Son of the King"<sup>33</sup>

Utilizing this evidence we should read the left-hand Hieroglyphic legend of the central scene as:

<sup>33</sup> A title not to my knowledge elsewhere attested, but perhaps understandable as "Great Prince", a special honorific for the *tuhkanti* (but cf. Nerikkaili's title DUMU.LUGAL <sup>LÚ</sup>*tuhu[kanti]* on the Sahuruwa donation, KUB XXVI 43 rev. 28). A Cuneiform comparison could be DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL GAL borne by Henti in addition to the title MUNUS.LUGAL GAL, though this is probably to be understood as "Daughter of the Great King" rather than "Great Daughter-of-the King/Princess": see Otten 1994: 258-260; 1995: 124; and the observation of Houwink ten Cate 1995/1996: 56 f. with n. 12. Perhaps a closer comparison might be the Hieroglyphic title, REX + INFANS(+FEMINA) MAGNUS, applied to Tawananna, last wife of Suppiluliuma I, where the Cuneiform simply entitles her DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RA, "Daughter of the King of Babylon" (Otten 1995: 13-16, 34 f. Abb. 12-22). Here the Hieroglyphic title is probably better understood as "Great Daughter of the King", i.e. "Great Princess", rather than "Daughter of the Great King", where the writing of "Great" over "King" (MAGNUS + REX + INFANS(+FEMINA)) would be expected. "Great Princess" seems to be used as the title by which Tawananna was known while her predecessor as Great Queen, Henti, was still living — note that Singer has shown that the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL was *not* used in this way (Singer 1991: 327-335) On the evidence now available I do not agree with Singer's remark that DUMU.SAL GAL "should be conceived as an abbreviation of DUMU.SAL. <LUGAL> GAL". But to discuss this here would further prolong an already over-long footnote. Later in Suppiluliuma's reign she did become "Great Queen", the title which she retained in the reigns of Arnuwanda II and Mursili II (Ugarit seal(s) RS 17.227, *Ugaritica* III: 3 f. figs. 2-4, and pl.I; Otten 1995: 17-24, 35-39 Abb. 23-36). She is thus the only Hittite queen for whom a "pre-Great Queen" title of "Great Princess" is attested (with the possible exception of Gassulawiya, wife of Mursili II, on the seal *SBo I 37*, but cf. Dinçol *et al.* 1993: 97 f. with n. 29). The title here postulated for Urhi-Tešub, DUMU.LUGAL GAL, "Great Prince" (rather than "son of the Great King") could be an analogous title for the *tuhkanti*. It must however be admitted that a restoration DUMU.LUGAL [GA]L and its implications complicate still further the already highly complicated discussion of the term DUMU.NITA GAL by Houwink ten Cate 1996: 40-75.

TONITRUS.LOZENGE *TUHKANTI*

"Tešub-Urhi, Crown Prince".

"Lozenge" must stand logographically for *Urhi*<sup>34</sup>. The reason for reversing the elements of Urhi-Tešub's name in this writing is unclear but this is at least paralleled by Muwatalli's *Šarri-Tešub/Tešub-šarri* and a number of other reversals observable on the impressions of the Nišantepe seal impressions<sup>35</sup>.

**SEAL II.1.** As noted above, once the Cuneiform legend of Seal I has been reconstructed, the Cuneiform traces visible on the outer ring of Seal II can be identified, showing that this seal had the same legend but differently placed in relation to the inner scene. The Cuneiform traces are identified in the accompanying figure. They permit the restoration of an identical legend to that on Seal I, namely:

[NA<sub>4</sub>.KIŠIB] <sup>1</sup> *ur*-[hi-<sup>D</sup>U]-*up* <sup>U</sup>*tu-hu-kán-ti* [DUMU.LUGAL.GAL]

This does not add much to the whole picture, but it is at least useful to establish that the two seals did have the same legend.

### The Historical Implications

Scholars have not failed to note that the main surviving documentation for Urhi-Tešub come not from his own reign but from that of his uncle and supplanter, Hattusili III, and the latter's son Tudhaliya IV, so that it can hardly be expected to provide unbiased evidence<sup>36</sup>. Hattusili in particular, but later also Tudhaliya, is concerned to stress the illegitimacy of Urhi-Tešub's birth. Hattusili states that at Muwatalli's death, since he had left no legitimate son, he Hattusili took Urhi-Tešub the son of a concubine and

<sup>34</sup> The equivalence *urhi* (*ur-uh-zi'*, to be emended) = Sum. *gi.na*, with the meaning "true", is lexically established: see Laroche, *GLH*, p. 285, s.v. The use of the "lozenge" to write it is, like many Hieroglyphic usages, unexplained, but the evidence here presented seems adequate to assure the interpretation.

<sup>35</sup> Many of these reversals seem to be adopted for graphic reasons (i.e. the wish to group the signs in an ornamental fashion), which would not apply to the present case. Among other examples of reversal are: *Herbordt* nos. 144-146 (*i(a)*-BOS-*ni/ní*) compared with no.141 (*i(a)*-*ní*-BOS); *Herbordt* no. 223 (*hwi-zi/a-ma*) for *ma-hwi-zi/a* (nos. 218-222); *Herbordt* no. 356 (*i(a)*-SUPER+*ra/i*) for *Sariya* (nos. 350-355).

<sup>36</sup> Full treatment of the subject, with bibliographies, also caveats on the reliability of Hattusili's accounts, in the recent histories, H. Klengel 1999: 218-259; and T. Bryce 1998: ch. 10, esp. p. 268 f. For earlier studies, see especially Archi 1971: 185-215; and the recent contribution of van den Hout 1995: 1107-1120.

installed him as king, putting all Hattusa into his hands<sup>37</sup>. The impression given, no doubt intentionally, is that Urhi-Tešub owed his position solely to his powerful uncle. Yet it has been pointed out that the succession of a son of a concubine, a son of second rank, was in the absence of a son of the first rank specifically provided for in the Edict of Telipinu<sup>38</sup>, so Urhi-Tešub's succession was neither irregular nor unexpected. Indeed it has even been inferred from the presence in the Nišantepe archive of bullae bearing seal impressions both of Muwatalli and of Urhi-Tešub as Great King with Danuhepa as Great Queen<sup>39</sup> that Urhi-Tešub could have been installed as co-regent(?) with Muwatalli in his lifetime<sup>40</sup>. This latter supposition seems somewhat unlikely: it is hard to imagine that Urhi-Tešub could have taken the title Great King before the death of his father. The use of the seal of Muwatalli after his death to validate a document sealed by his successor would thus have to be explained as the result of some peculiar circumstances.

It is against this background that the appearance of these seals belonging to Urhi-Tešub as *tuhkanti* must be viewed. What they certainly establish is that he was duly installed and recognized as his father's heir presumptive or crown prince while the latter was still alive. This implicitly contradicts Hattusili's tendentious accounts of the Muwatalli/Urhi-Tešub succession. It has otherwise been supposed that this succession may have been contested and that Urhi-Tešub's successful assumption of the throne was due to the vital support of Hattusili<sup>41</sup>. But this is not to deny that he was the legitimate and recognized heir to Muwatalli: the recent appearance of these seals assure us incontrovertibly that this was so.

---

<sup>37</sup> *Hatt.* iii 40-44; cf. Klengel 1999: 226; Bryce 1998: 276 and n. 20. Note especially Košak's join of 760/v to *KUB XXI 15* (Košak 1996: 95-97), which now gives: "Because there was not yet for my brother any adult/living/legitimate (? – *huihuiswalis*) son of his wife ...".

<sup>38</sup> *Tel. pr.*, § 28; cf. the remarks of Klengel 1999: 226 with n. 402, citing Goetze's reference to the same point.

<sup>39</sup> For the position of Danuhepa, Mursili's last wife and Great Queen, the office which she held in the reigns of Muwatalli and Urhi-Tešub, see above, n. 21.

<sup>40</sup> Neve 1991: 328, 333; 1992: 313; and the remarks of Klengel 1999: 226 with n. 400, citing Houwink ten Cate's similar observation.

<sup>41</sup> For the possibility of a son of Danuhepa as a claimant, see Houwink ten Cate 1994: 239-243. Cf. van den Hout 1998: 50-53. The uncertainties encountered by Houwink ten Cate and van den Hout confronted by Neve's reference to Danuhepa's association on seal with an "unbekanntes Grosskönig" are resolved by the demonstration in this present article that this was none other than Urhi-Tešub.

## Catalogue

## Seal I

1. Bo. 91/820. Reddish bulla, 2 string holes in top (*Herbordt*, no. 504.1)  
*Base*: central *Umarmungsszene* almost fully preserved, god's helmet damaged, king's face worn. Hier. inscriptions complete except for damage to TONITRUS. Cun. legend chipped away apart from **traces a, b** (upper right, lower left).  
*Cone*: (1) impression including central scene, upper left segment, with part of Cuneiform legend (**trace c**); (2) 2 arcs of Cuneiform legend (**traces d, e**); (3) further **trace f**.  
 Drawing.
2. Bo. 91/1915. Buff bulla, 2 string holes in top (*Herbordt*, no. 504.2)  
*Base*: central *Umarmungsszene* almost completely preserved, damage around edge from 1 to 5 o'clock including god's left foot. Cun. legend, simple wedge preserved at 10 o'clock (horizontal).  
*Cone*: no impressions.  
 Drawing.
3. Bo. 91/188. Buff bulla, 2 string holes in top (*Herbordt*, no. 507)  
*Base*: upper left segment of central *Umarmungsszene* preserved, including left Hier. inscription; feet, god's left hand and spear lost. No traces of Cuneiform legend.  
*Cone*: faint traces of impression including upper left segment with left Hier. inscription and outer ring but no visible Cuneiform.  
 Drawing.
4. Bo. 90/1157. Reddish bulla, 2 string holes in top, lower part half broken away (*Herbordt*, no. 506)  
*Base*: part of upper left segment preserved, including king's head with god's arm, most of left Hier. inscription and outer ring without visible Cuneiform traces.  
*Cone*: faint traces of impressions including parts of two Cuneiform signs (**trace g**).  
 Drawing —.

## Seal II

1. Bo. 90/1122. Yellow-brown bulla, 2 string holes in top (*Herbordt*, no. 505.1).  
*Base*: central *Umarmungsszene* fully preserved, cracked. Outer ring, traces of Cuneiform legend preserved.  
*Cone*: no traces of impressions visible.  
 Drawing.
2. Bo. 91/1909. Fragment of yellow-brown bulla, cone mostly lost (*Herbordt*, no. 505.3)  
*Base*: large part of lower right segment preserved; lost, upper two signs of left Hier. inscription, figures' heads. Outer ring partly preserved from 3-8 o'clock, no traces of Cuneiform visible.  
*Cone*: small section preserved suggests that impressions were present  
 Drawing —.
3. Bo. 91/1849. Small reddish bulla, 2 string holes in top. Part of lower section broken away (*Herbordt*, no. 505.2)  
*Base*: middle section of central *Umarmungsszene* preserved, including left Hier. inscription, middle part of spear. Lost: god's head and left arm, king's helmet broken away; figures' feet and all of outer ring beyond limits of the base.  
*Cone*: no traces of impressions visible.  
 Drawing —.

## Bibliography

- Alp, S.  
 1998 "IV. Tuthaliya'nin tahta çıkmadan önceki diğer adı" in: S. Alp / A. Süel (eds.), *Acts of the III<sup>d</sup> International Congress of Hittitology*, Ankara, 21-26.
- Archi, A.  
 1971 "The Propaganda of Ḫattušiliš III", *SMEA* 14, 185-215.
- Beran, Th.  
 1957 "Siegel und Siegelabdrücke", in: K. Bittel *et al.*, *Boğazköy III. Funde aus den Grabungen 1952-1955*, Berlin, 42-58.  
 1967 *Die hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy* (BoHa 5 = WVDOG 76), Berlin.
- Bittel, K. *et al.*  
 1975 *Boğazköy V. Funde der Grabungen 1970 und 1971* (ADOG 18), Berlin.
- Bryce, T.R.  
 1998 *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford.
- Dinçol, A. *et al.*  
 1993 "The 'Cruciform Seal' from Boğazköy-Hattusa", *IM* 43 (= Festschrift für Peter Neve), 87-106, Tf. 6.
- Güterbock, H.G.  
 1975 "Hieroglyphensiegel aus dem Tempelbezirk", in: K. Bittel *et al.*, *Boğazköy V. Funde der Grabungen 1970 und 1971* (ADOG 18), Berlin, 47-75.
- Hawkins, J.D.  
 1998 "Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy Sealings and Karabel" *AnSt* 48, 1-31.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J.  
 1994 "Urhi-Tessub revisited", *BiOr* 51, 233-259.  
 1995/96 "The Genealogy of Mursilis II. The Difference Between a Legalistic and a Genealogical Approach to the Descent of Suppiluliumas I.", *JEOL* 34, 51-72.  
 1996 "The Dynastic Marriages of the Period between ca. 1258 and 1244 B.C.", *AoF* 23, 40-75.
- Klengel, H.  
 1999 *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches* (HdO I, 34), Leiden.
- Košak, S.  
 1996 "Ein hethitisches *ghost word* engeistert", *AoF* 23, 95-97.
- M. Marazzi *et al.*  
 1998 *Il Geroglifico Anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca a venti anni dalla sua "redecifrazione"*, Naples.
- Neve, P.  
 1991 "Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 1990", *AA* 1991, 299-345.  
 1992 "Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 1991", *AA* 1992, 307-338.  
 1992b *Ḫattuša – Stadt der Götter und Tempel* (Antike Welt, Sonderhefte) Mainz (= Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie, Mainz 1993, 1996)  
 1995 "Sulla datazione della Porta delle Sfingi a Alaca Höyük", in: O. Carruba / M. Giorgieri / C. Mora (Hg.): *Atti del II congresso internazionale di Hittitologia* (StudMed 9), Pavia, 295-312.

Otten, H.

- 1993 *Zu einigen Neufunden hethitischer Königssiegel* (Abh Mainz 1993, Nr. 13).  
1993b "Ein Siegel Tudhalijas IV. und sein dynastischer Hintergrund" *IM* 43, 107-112, Taf. 7.  
1994 "Die hethitische Grosskönigin Ḫenti in ihren Siegeln", *ZA* 84, 253-261.  
1995 *Die hethitischen Königssiegel der frühen Grossreichszeit* (Abh Mainz 1995, Nr. 7).  
1995 "Das Siegel B 229 von Ḫattušili III. - Puduḫepa", in: Th.P.J. van den Hout / J. de Roos (eds.), *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (PIHANS 74), Leiden, 245-252.

Singer, I.

- 1991 "The Title 'Great Princess' in the Hittite Empire", *UF* 23, 327-338.  
van den Hout, Th.P.J.  
1995 "Khattushili III, King of the Hittites", in: J.M. Sasson (ed.), *CANE Bd. II*, New York, 1107-1120.  
1998 *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tuthaliya IV* (DMOA 25), Leiden.