

Altorientalische Forschungen	15	1988	2	269–305
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

RICHARD H. BEAL

The ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-institution in Second Millennium Hatti

One of the more intriguing problems of the organization of Hittite society is the purpose and function of that institution whose members are referred to by the titles LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL, LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA, and EN ^{GIŠ}TUKUL. The terms occur in a fairly broad range of Hittite texts: laws, legal texts, land grants, treaties, instructions, historical texts, cult inventories, rituals and festivals. Despite the pervasive occurrence of bearers of these titles, the part played in Hittite society by these people has, in my opinion, been largely misinterpreted.¹

There is a long literature involving various scholars' attempts to translate these terms. In 1920 B. Hrozný² read ^{ISKU}PL and translated „Die ^{GERAT}GERÄTE(-LEUTE?)“ when editing the passage from the “Protocol of the Door-man” (below § 19). In a footnote he adds „kaum ^{GERAT}(sic)WAFFEN?“ Two years later, the same author³ in editing the Laws (below §§ 1–6) translated what we have called the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man as «HOMME D'ARMES» and his duty as «LA (CHARGE D')ARMES». These two translations “weapon-man” and “tool-man” more or less set the parameters for subsequent discussion.

In subsequent years the translations “weapon-man” and “weapon service” dominated.⁴ A. Götze⁵ in discussing §§ 40–41 of the Laws (our §§ 1–2 below) suggested that the “man of the weapon” received possession of a field from the village community, who allotted it on commission from the king. In return the “Waffenmann” was obliged to serve in the army. Several years later⁶ he expressed his opinion that the military class was sustained by fiefs (^{GIŠ}TUKUL). He further argued that ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men were unfree since they could be given

¹ This article is an extract from my Ph. D. dissertation, “The Organisation of the Hittite Military” (University of Chicago, 1986). I would like to thank the following people, who have read various drafts of this section, for their help and suggestions: H. A. Hoffner, H. G. Güterbock, S. Košak, G. Beckman, A. Ünal, J. Scurlock. I must emphasize that these scholars are in no way responsible for errors of omission or commission that may remain. Abbreviations follow those used by H. A. Hoffner — H. G. Güterbock (eds.), *The Hittite Dictionary of The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago 1980—.

² BoSt 5 [1920], 26 f.

³ Hrozný, CH pp. 30–33, 40 f., 46 f., 108 f.

⁴ H. Zimmern — J. Friedrich, in: AO 23/2 [1922], 11 §§ 41 f.; K. Fabricius, in: *Acta Orientalia* 7 [1929], 277–282, Walther, HC 253 ff. §§ 40 ff. (“soldier/military holding”), A. Götze, *Kleinasien*, Munich 1933, 97.

⁵ NBr 57.

⁶ Götze (see n. 4) 97 f.

as part of land grants. Elsewhere,⁷ he pointed out the comparison between artisans and farmers and the “Waffenleute” (see below § 20). He then noted that *šarikuwa*-men, a type of military personnel, are once mentioned beside artisans.⁸ Furthermore, since the Sumerogram LÚ^{GIŠ}TUKUL shows a phonetic complement *-uš* in the Old Hittite version of the Laws (Law no. 40, see below § 1), it could be equated with a shortened form of this word, **šariku-*. The form ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-*li-* refers to the service on the field, not to the man, and so is not in question.⁹ In sum, A. Götze suggested equating his unfree “Waffenmann” (LÚ-^{GIŠ}TUKUL) with the *šarikuwa*-troops/men. Elsewhere A. Götze¹⁰ translated the term *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL (below § 61) as “ein Waffen-Herr”, without further commentary. J. Friedrich edited the text quoted below in § 48. Based on this text and on the one in § 51, he translated the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-man as “Mann der langen Waffe”.¹¹ In his commentary he suggested with a question mark that this was someone who belonged to an elite unit of troops or who held a high military rank.¹²

Against taking these terms as having to do with the military was F. Sommer.¹³ In 1935 F. Sommer published a tentative suggestion of A. Ungnad’s that one should read not LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL but LÚ *IS-QU* “shareholders” in the Laws (see below §§ 1–6). To this, he compared Greek *klēroúkhos*.¹⁴

In 1938 F. Sommer did the first thorough study of this set of terms.¹⁵ He began by defending the reading *ISQU* even while accepting J. Friedrich’s rejection of it.¹⁶ He quoted J. Friedrich as admitting that no ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-people appear in conjunction with weapon-service, but suggesting that they received the title either because they were taken with a weapon, or because they were utilized for military service.¹⁷ It should be noted that the term “taken with a weapon” occurs in conjunction with ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men in several texts (see below §§ 22, 53).

Transplantees¹⁸ uprooted from defeated lands and transported to Hatti were often resettled and made into ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men. Thinking of these as “taken with a weapon” makes sense. F. Sommer, however, argued that vacant ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-land was normally given to the men of the city, that is, new ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men were recruited from the men of the city, and only as a last resort were they recruited from transplantees.¹⁹ F. Sommer’s second argument against

⁷ AM 231 f.

⁸ KUB 13, 10:4.

⁹ AM 232 n. 1.

¹⁰ Madd. 8 f., obv. 34.

¹¹ SV 1, 58 f.: 37, 84.

¹² SV 1, 84.

¹³ AU 24 n. 2.

¹⁴ OLZ 38 [1935], 280.

¹⁵ HAB 120–134.

¹⁶ HAB 120 f. A. Ungnad’s suggestion had earlier been rejected in the same year in which it was put forth by E. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, Chrest. 220 f., 227, since a type of service called *ISQU*-service “lot-service” made no sense in their opinion.

¹⁷ HAB 121.

¹⁸ For this translation see below n. 42.

¹⁹ HAB 121 f. This argument seems to be very weak. While it seems possible that ^{GIŠ}TU-

J. Friedrich's suggestion that the GIŠTUKUL-man got his name because he was "taken with a weapon" is far stronger. Since transplantees only became GIŠTUKUL-men when they were settled, the term GIŠTUKUL-man should have nothing to do with their origin as captured enemy civilians.²⁰ Because of this argument, it seems to me that F. Sommer was correct in disallowing any link between the origin of the term GIŠTUKUL-man and the phrase "taken with a weapon (GIŠTUKUL)".

F. Sommer then argued against the proposition that since the title of these people means "weapon-man" they must have been used for military service. Having gone through all the evidence then known, F. Sommer concluded that there was no evidence that GIŠTUKUL-men had anything to do with weapons or weapons with them. The texts say nothing about any obligation by the GIŠTUKUL-man to military service.²¹ The same things, he concluded, could be said about the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men²² and the EN GIŠTUKUL.²³ For this reason he also dismissed as unlikely A. Götze's equation of GIŠTUKUL-men with *šarikuwa*-men/troops.²⁴

Having dispatched the opposition, F. Sommer next explained what he thought a GIŠTUKUL-man was. Based on texts §§ 19–21 (see below), where GIŠTUKUL-men are listed with various professional designations, he concluded that these three texts leave no doubt that a GIŠTUKUL-person was one who performed a professional activity.²⁵ Having denied any connection between the GIŠTUKUL-man and the word "weapon", F. Sommer then had to explain how the Sumerogram GIŠTUKUL "weapon, mace" came to be used for this title. He argued for a progression GIŠTUKUL "implement" > "work tool" > "craft" ("Handwerk") > "craftsman" ("Handwerker"). F. Sommer admitted that GIŠTUKUL = (Akk.) *kakku*, means weapon and never, or almost never, means "implement" in Akkadian context. However, he pointed to Greek words which he claimed meant both "implement" and "weapon" (*hóplon* and *teúkhon*).²⁶ This was intended to show that the Hittites also could have had a common word for weapon and tool. If this were so, they then could have used a Sumerogram for "weapon

KUL-men were recruited from sources other than transplantees, there is no evidence for this and much evidence for the installation of transplantees as GIŠTUKUL-men. I would suggest that the working of the land by the men of the city was only a temporary expedient. The law does not say that one of the men of the city should be selected to work the land and become a GIŠTUKUL-man, but that "they" (collectively) could/should work the land.

²⁰ HAB 122.

²¹ HAB 122f.

²² HAB 123.

²³ HAB 127f.

²⁴ HAB 126 n. 2.

²⁵ "eine gewerbliche Tätigkeit ausübenden Personen", HAB 123–125.

²⁶ *hóplon* means 1. a ship's tackle, ropes; 2. tools, in full: the tools of a . . . ; 3. (pl.) implements of war; 4. the large shield; 5. (pl.) men at arms, equivalent to "hoplites"; 6. (pl.) the military camp. The derived professional term *hoplite* means a specific type of soldier and other derivatives have to do with soldiering. H. G. Liddell – R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford ⁹1940, 1240. *teúkhos* comes from a verb "to make or build". It means 1. implements of war; 2. ship's gear (rare); 3. a container of any kind. Liddell – Scott 1784.

on” to cover both concepts.²⁷ F. Sommer noted that in one text GIŠTUKUL-men occur among domestic servants (below § 20), while in the same text a GIŠTUKUL-man is mentioned as the previous owner of a plot of forest/orchard (below § 28). Furthermore, no particular profession is mentioned in any text when a transplantee is settled. Therefore, F. Sommer felt that these GIŠTUKUL-men were not just craftsmen, but a whole class of people, made up largely of craftsmen, who lived in towns, and who, although they owned fields, were not professional farmers. He compared them with the Athenian *dēmiourgoi*. He called this class “petty bourgeoisie” (“Kleinbürger”).²⁸ He further pointed out the parallels between GIŠTUKUL-men and “free” (*ELLU*) men (§§ 17, 40), which show that the GIŠTUKUL-men as a class were not slaves (contra A. Götze) but free. As for the land grants, F. Sommer argued that whole towns were given without mention of the status of the people. Therefore in F. Sommer’s view, what the king was granting was probably a right to the rents and services normally due to the crown. Even if some of the “craftsmen” were slaves, he argued that the class as a whole was free and held land.²⁹ In summary, F. Sommer thought that a GIŠTUKUL-man was a craftsman and/or a member of the petty bourgeoisie.

As for the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA, F. Sommer ruled out any translation based on “the long-tool”, “the long weapon”, or “the long-(land-)portion”. He saw the passage in the tributary treaties as the key to this term (below § 48). “If someone of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or a free man comes as a fugitive from Hapalla to Hatti, I will not return him to you . . . But if he is a farmer or a weaver (or) a leatherworker, whatever kind of workman (*EN QĀTI*) that he is, (if) he does not [bring(?)] work(?), . . . I will pick him up and give him back to you.” F. Sommer pointed to the pronoun “he” in “if he is a farmer” and argued that its antecedent could only be “GIŠTUKUL-man or free man”. This, according to F. Sommer, means that “farmer, or weaver, (or) leatherworker . . .” is a subset of “GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or free men”. F. Sommer further argued that what differentiated the two sets and was the reason that in the first case the fugitive was not returned and in the second that he was returned, was that in the second case the fugitive “does not [bring(?)] work(?)”. Thus F. Sommer argued that “farmer or weaver (or) leatherworker, whatever-sort of workman” was another way of saying a “GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man or free man”. F. Sommer had already shown that “artisans” (GIŠTUKUL-men) were free men and both artisans and free men are listed second in their respective synonymous phrases in this text. Therefore, what is listed first in each phrase must be synonymous. In this way F. Sommer argued that the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men were farmers. The GÍD.DA “long” portion of the Sumerogram F. Sommer then explained by saying that hoe, spade, rake and pitchfork are “long implements” (GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA) as opposed to hammer, awl and needle, ordinary “imple-

²⁷ HAB 125.

²⁸ HAB 126 f. w. n. 4.

²⁹ HAB 128–130. He differentiates those with LÚ, who were, in his opinion, free men, and those without, who, in his opinion, were often slaves. See, however, K. K. Riemschneider, in: *ArOr* 33 [1965], 334 n. 8 and I. M. Diakonoff, in: *MIO* 13 [1967], 324 n. 34. See further below n. 61.

ments” (GIŠTUKUL).³⁰ An unmentioned corollary is that LÚAPIN.LAL “farmer” = LÚENGAR “farmer” would also = LÚ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA “farmer”.

Finally, as for the EN GIŠTUKUL, F. Sommer was of the opinion that all or some were bosses of GIŠTUKUL-people (especially §§ 60, 63, 67, 70). In no case could the term be translated “weapon-lord”.³¹

In summary, F. Sommer saw no evidence for a connection between GIŠTUKUL-men, GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men, or EN GIŠTUKULs and the military. He did see a connection between these and craftsmen and laborers. Therefore he assumed that the Hittites had the same word³² for weapon and tool, and used the same Sumerogram, GIŠTUKUL, to cover both. He saw the GIŠTUKUL-man as first and foremost a craftsman and by extension a member of the petty bourgeoisie. The GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man he saw, on the other hand, as a professional farmer.³³

Since F. Sommer wrote, although some scholars have rejected the extended meaning “petty bourgeois” („Kleinbürger“) and there is still much argument on minor points, virtually all scholars have accepted the major points of F. Sommer’s argument.³⁴

However, is F. Sommer’s understanding of these terms correct? One major problem with F. Sommer’s argument involves the Sumerogram GIŠTUKUL.

³⁰ HAB 131 f.

³¹ HAB 127 f.

³² Note also F. Sommer’s suggestion that GIŠTUKUL = *ḫatanti-* and LÚGIŠTUKUL-*li-* = *ḫa(n)tantiyali-* (HAB 132 f., followed by H. G. Güterbock, in: *Belleten* VII/26 [1943], 306 n. 30 [*ḫatanti-* = GIŠTUKUL “Waffe, Gerät”, but not GIŠTUKUL “Keule”], quoted in HW 65, and by H. G. Güterbock, in: *CRRAI* 18 [1970] = *ABAW* 75 [München 1972], 95 f.). F. Sommer’s equation is discussed further by V. Souček, in: *ArOr* 27 [1959], 382 f. w. n. 84, K. K. Riemschneider, *ArOr* 33, 333 n. 5, E. Neu, *StBoT* 18, 29 „keine sichere Handhabe dafür“, and M. Marazzi, in: *VO* 4 [1981], 29; note the word *ḫatant-* “dry” (H. G. Güterbock, in: *JNES* 26 [1967], 80).

³³ HAB 133 f.

³⁴ Among others, O. Gurney, in: *AAA* 28 [1948], 33 (EN GIŠTUKUL = “master craftsman(?)”); E. Laroche, in: *RA* 43 [1949], 71 f.; HW 296 f. (“Arbeiter(?)”, *Handwerker*(?), *Kleinbürger*(?)); Goetze, *Kl* 104 (“Handwerker”); *Dienstanw.* 50 iii 66; HG 28 f. and *passim* and see 97, 146, 149 (“Kleinbürger”); H. G. Güterbock, in: *JCS* 15 [1961], 68 (LÚGIŠTUKUL = “craftsman”, “Handwerker”, but “‘Kleinbürger’ gives it an unnecessary and unwarranted modern nuance.” GIŠTUKUL = “craft”, GIŠTUKUL *ḫarzi* = “he performs the craft”, maybe lit. “he holds the tool”?); A. Goetze, in: *NHF* 28 w. n. 28 (“LÚGIŠTUKUL rather ‘toolman’ than ‘weaponman’ . . . ‘Kleinbürger’ . . . I cannot accept.” “Toolmen” were “people who acquired special skills,” “to whom parcels of land were distributed in exchange for the obligation to serve the king,” (and) “who devoted their time to manufacturing goods . . . (for) the needs of the country, both military and civilian.”); *Imparati, Leggi* 225–228; Riemschneider, *ArOr* 33, 334 w. n. 8, 11; H. Otten – V. Souček, *StBoT* 1, 30 (GIŠTUKUL = “Dienstleistungen”), 44 f. w. n. 4 (“Handwerk?”); H. M. Kümmel, *StBoT* 3, 92 f. (GIŠTUKUL = “Handwerk, Beruf, Berufsgruppe(?), Funktion, Amt”, LÚ/EN GIŠTUKUL = “Handwerker, Berufsangehöriger Funktionär”); H. Hoffner, *EHG* 89 (“tool: *ḫatanti-*, GIŠTUKUL”), 33 (“craftsman: *ḫa(n)tantiyalli-*, *BEL* GIŠTUKUL”); A. Goetze, in: *ANET* 190 f. (LÚGIŠTUKUL = “craftsman”, GIŠTUKUL = “craftsman’s fee”); H. Otten, *StBoT* 11, 17 (on EN GIŠTUKUL, without tr.); E. Neu, *StBoT* 12, 40 f.; Güterbock, *CRRAI* 18 (see n. 32) 94 f. (“Handwerker” not “Kleinbürger”. The GIŠTUKUL-men are unfree in the sense of serf (based on our §§ 1, 5, 31, but not §§ 17, 40). GIŠTUKUL is only “weapon” never “tool” but following P. Garelli, there is no difference

F. Sommer admitted that the term in Akkadian is rarely, if ever, attested with the meaning “tool”. CAD³⁵ now cites several examples under this translation. However, the first example under this heading actually should be translated “weapon” as the three objects are all potentially weapons.³⁶ The following reference is probably to a GIŠTUKUL-weapon as the symbol of a deity.³⁷ The remaining examples do not mean “tool” but are a type of tool, probably one somehow resembling a GIŠTUKUL-weapon.³⁸ The generic word for “tool, implement” in Akkadian seems to be *UNŪTU*. This means that one still must argue, as F. Sommer did, that the Hittites had one word for “tool” and “weapon”; thus when they took over a Sumerogram meaning “weapon” they applied it to the whole range of meanings. This, is, of course, possible. However, F. Sommer cites no evidence, nor do I know of any, where the term GIŠTUKUL in Hittite context means “tool”. There are many places in Hittite where it means “mace, weapon”.³⁹ The remaining references are to the duty owed by a GIŠTUKUL-man. The Hittites appear to have used the Akkadogram *UNŪTU* to refer to “tools” (as well as more generally “implements, items”). Thus the only reason to translate GIŠTUKUL as “tool” is if one has already decided, as did F. Sommer, that a GIŠTUKUL-man is a “craftsman”. Since the meaning of the Sumerogram GIŠTUKUL in Hittite and Akkadian contexts is “weapon” (or “mace”) the combined term *LÚ GIŠTUKUL* must have originally meant “weapon-man”.⁴⁰

The question then is what is the function of the man whose title literally means “weapon-man”. In order to answer this question, it is necessary to review the attestation of the terms *LÚ GIŠTUKUL*, *LÚ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA* and *EN GIŠTUKUL*.

References to GIŠTUKUL-men

§ 1. A law (No. 40) reads, “If a GIŠTUKUL-man disappears and an *ILKU*-man has stepped forward⁴¹ and the *ILKU*-man says ‘this is my GIŠTUKUL,

between civil and military service (“Dienst”); A. Archi, in: *FsOtten* 18 w. n. 7 (“artisan”, not a status, but one who possesses a certain technical skill; can be free, servant, or serf (quoting our §§ 22, 17, 30), a possessor of community land); A. Archi, in: *SMEA* 18 [1977], 8 w. n. 6, 13f.; A. Archi, in: *FsLaroche* 47; *CHD* 3/1, 90b (“craftsman”); F. Imparati, in: *JESHO* 25 [1982], 229 w. n. 10; *Mestieri* 30–35 (“lavoratore, artigiano(?)”); *CHD* 3/2, 150 *mān* 5c (GIŠTUKUL.MEŠ = “occupations”); Ph. Houwink ten Cate, in: *Anatolica* 11 [1984], 61 (“craftsman”). The only notable exception is Diakonoff (see n. 29) 321ff.; I. M. Diakonoff, in: *Oikumene* 3 [1982], 50f., 87 (a translation of his articles in *VDI* 102–106 [1967–1968]).

³⁵ CAD K 56.

³⁶ Two are types of axes and the third is a *maššatu*, which is also not a type of tool but a weapon, see CAD M_I 398.

³⁷ ARM(T) 10, 96: 5–9. G. Dossin translates “arme” (pp. 146f.) and explains that it was a divine symbol (p. 270).

³⁸ Note that AHW 422 s. v. *kakku* does not admit a translation “tool”.

³⁹ For a study of this term see R. Beal, *The Organization of the Hittite Military*, Ph. D. Diss., Univ. of Chicago 1986, 669–676. Cf. also Güterbock, *CRRAI* 18 (see n. 32), 95 (*kakku* nur “Waffe”, aber niemals “Werkzeug” bedeutet).

⁴⁰ See already Diakonoff, *MIO* 13, 330f.

⁴¹ *tittiyanza* There has been considerable discussion concerning the meaning of this word.

but that is my *šahhan*,⁷ he shall acquire the field of the GIŠTUKUL-man under seal. He shall hold the GIŠTUKUL and he shall do the *šahhan*. If, however, he

For its meaning in this and the following inverse law, F. Hrozný, CH, translated “vient”. J. Friedrich, in: ZA 36 [1925], 51 suggested “ist (ihm) beigegeben” (= Engl. “is associated with or attached (to him)”), repeated in HG 28f., 136 (“beigesellt(?)”) and followed by F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB 121 (“beigesellt”), *Imparati, Leggi* 57 (“(è a lui) associato”), and *Imparati, JESHO* 25, 229 (a GIŠTUKUL person and an *ILKU*-person were associated with each other to cultivate the land). I. M. Diakonoff, MIO 13, 323 w. n. 31, translated “befindet sich in Nachbarschaft(?) (>(bei)sitzender, benachbarter, angeschlossener(?))”. A. Walther, HC 253, suggested “arise”. Earlier H. Zimmern – J. Friedrich, AO 23/2, 11 §§ 41, 42, translated “auftritt” (= Engl. “comes forward”). This translation was followed by A. Götze, NBr 57. E. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, Chrest. 220f., opted for a translation “is assigned”, which was followed by A. Goetze, in: ANET, Princeton 1955, 190, Hoffner, Diss. 206f. (reduplicated form of *dai* “to place”), N. van Brock, in: RHA 22, fasc. 75 [1964], 143, who argues in favor of this meaning (“est établi”): “On ne peut ‘associer’ quelqu’un à un homme qui n’est plus là, et on voit mal ce qui aurait motivé antérieurement cette association”, Güterbock, CRAI 18 (see n. 32), 95 (“eingesetzt ist”), and by E. von Schuler, in: TUAT 1/1 103 (“eingesetzt [ist]”). Outside of these laws the verb *tittiya-* occurs in the following contexts:

(1) “(Labarna I) continually destroyed the (foreign) lands. He overpowered the lands and made the boundaries the seas. Whenever he returned from campaign, each of his sons went to each land . . .” URU.DIDLI.ĪA GAL.GAL-TIM *tittiyan-teš ešer* (var. *tittiyan-ta eš-ta*) “And the great cities were *t.*” KBo 3, 1 i 6–8, 11, w. dupl. KUB 11, 1 i 6–8, 11 (Tel. pr., OH/NS), ed. Chrest. 182f. (“were assigned (to them)”), A. Ünal, apud. I. Hoffmann, Theth 11, 12–15 (“ging es wohl” > “waren gesäugt, genährt, versorgt”), tr. HAB 121 n. 3 (“vereinigt”), Hoffner, Diss. 207 (“were assigned”), van Brock, RHA 22, fasc. 75, 143 (“été fondées”);

(2) “Whenever (Hattušili I) returned from campaign each of his sons went to each land.” *apēlla ŠU-i* URU.DIDLI.ĪA GAL.GAL-TIM *tittiyan-teš ešer* “In his hand(s) also the great cities were *t.*” KBo 3, 1 i 17–19 (Tel. pr. OH/NS), ed. Chrest. 182f. (“were put into his hands”), other bibliogr. as above;

(3) “If a slave angers his master, . . . if at that time he dies (i.e., is killed), he does not die alone.” MĀŠ.ŠU=ma-šši *tittian-pat* (dupl. [*tittian-pat*]) “But his family is *t.* (with) him as well.” KUB 13, 4 i 28f., 33, w. dupl. KUB 13, 17 i 6 + KUB 31, 91:3 (instr. for temple officials, pre-NH/NS), ed. Chrest. 148f. (“is included with him”), Süel. Direktif Metni 24f. (“ona katılır” [= Engl. “joins him”]), discussion 111, tr. AU 137f. (“beigesellt wird” [= Engl. “will be associated”]), HAB 121 w. n. 3 van Brock, RHA 22, fasc. 75, 143f. (“est placé, aligné avec lui”);

(4) “The implements which they handed over (*āppa maniyahh-*) to me,” *nuwarat tittiyan* “‘They are *t.*’” KUB 42, 100 iii 34–35 (testimony in cult inv., Tudh. IV), ed. G. del Monte, in: OA 17 [1978], 184, 187 (“a me sono registrati”), CHD 3/2 167a (“have been set up”);

(5) *namma=kan* GI.ĪA *šarā tittiyanz[i]* (dupl. [*šarā*] *hūittiyanzi*) “Then they *t.* (dupl. pull) arrows upward, (and release them point downward.)” Bo 3085 i 10, w. dupl. KUB 7, 46 rev. 6f. (CTH 418, rit.), ed. StBoT 22, 43 (no tr. of *t.*), cf. HAB 121 n. 3 (no tr.);

(6) [. . . N]Ī.TE-ŠU-ušši *tittiyanza* “his body is *t.* to him” KUB 18, 33 obv. 1 (oracle);

(7) [. . . / *titt(?)titiyan-pat ešdu nu mahhan* DUMU (!?, copy *i-*) [. . . / m^o-]x-LUGAL LUGAL-uezni-*tittianz[i]* . . .] “Let [. . .] be *t.* When a child/prince(!?) [. . .] they *t.* X-šarri for kingship, [. . .]” KUB 36, 114:21–22 (“protocol of dynastic succession”, MH/MS), ed. O. Carruba, in: SMEA 18 [1977], 190f. (“... nur soll . . . sein. Und sobald als Sie stellen als den König in der Königsherrschaft ein.”) There is, however, no space in the copy between the x and the LUGAL. The x could be an *ik* or a *pal* or perhaps a *ti* sign. As [T]I.LUGAL or [GIŠI]G.LUGAL are unlikely, perhaps a PN is to be restored (suggestion courtesy of J. G. McMahon).

(8) [. . . GIŠ]MAR.GÍD.DA-aš *tittianda* “[. . .] The *t.*(-d things) of the ‘wagon’ [are . . .].” KUB 8, 14 rev. 8 (celestial omen protasis), ed. K. Riemschneider, Omentexte 130, 132

refuses the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL, then they declare the field of the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man vacant. The men in the town/village will (may?) farm it. When the king gives a

“die Gesellschafter(?) des ‘Lastwagens’”), tr. HAB 121 n. 3 (“in Gesellschaft = in Nachbarschaft des Grossen Bären”);

(9) *urnirniš* ZAG-az GÜB-laz *tittian*[za?] “A ‘finger’ is *t*. on the right and left.” KBo 16,97 rev. 45 (oracle, MH/MS), cf. E. Laroche, in: RA 64 [1970], 136 (“établir, installer”);

(10) [...i]š ZAG-az GÜB-laziya *tittianza* ibid. obv. 42;

(11) /DUGLIŠ.GAL *tittiy*[a-...] / *tittiyanteš* nu[...] / 176/t ii 5–6;

(12) in broken context in KBo 13,3 iv 9 (Anumherwa, OH/NS); KUB 36,3 iii 7 (Kingship in heaven); [...]x *tittiyān udanzi*/KBo 11,72 ii 4 (rit., MH?/NS); KBo 11,8:26 (rit.); KUB 46,57 i 14; /*tittiyantan* KUB 51,53 rev. rt. col. 7; KBo 11,14 iii 11 (CTH 395,1, MH/NS); KUB 15,11 ii 31 (dream); [t]e?-et-ti-ya-an KUB 49,70 rev. 16;

(13) “I took [...]. The prostitutes [...] a flower. I [...] I [...] from the person.” GÜB-lan *tietāššet*/ [...]x DUMU.SAL *tittiškizzi* “Her left breast [...] the young girl repeatedly *t*-s (or: [...] repeatedly *t*-s the female child)” KBo 14,98 i 14–17 (rit. CTH 458,9), cf. A. Goetze, in: JCS 18 [1964], 93 (“give the breast, nurse”, denominative from *titan* “breast”). Assuming that the final example (13) is not simply a play on words, (and it should be noted that *tittiške-* has a doubly written *t*, while *tita(n)-* “breast” has not), then one has a clear meaning “to suckle” for *tittiške-*. This iterative may well be formed from a verb *tittiya-*. This meaning for *tittiya-* will fit tolerably well in the Telipinu Proclamation (1–2), if one extends the meaning to “nourish”, as A. Ünal, apud. I. Hoffmann, THeth 11, 15 w. n. 1 (“gesäugt, genährt”), already noted. This meaning will also fit tolerably well in the passage in the laws: “and a ^{LÜ}ILKI is being nourished (by the field)” that is, he is farming it and supporting himself from the crops. However, the meaning “suckle” or even “nourish” cannot be made to fit the other examples. Thus a/another verb *tittiya-* with entirely different meanings must exist. J. Friedrich’s translation “to be associated with” was designed to fit the temple officials’ instructions (3). It will fit as well in (8–11). The Telipinu Proclamation (1–2) passage will also yield good sense with this translation. Perhaps in the hand of the ruler the formerly independent and mutually hostile cities were “associated” that is integrated into the Hittite kingdom or perhaps were “associated” with each other into provinces. The fit is much more difficult in (4–5). Perhaps one could translate “The implements which they handed over to me are all together (associated with each other)” or “are in my keeping (are associated with [me])”. In (5) one could suggest that *šarā tittiya-* means that the arrows were to be removed (from the quiver?) in a bunch (associated with each other). In our passage from the laws, contra F. Imparati, JESHO 25, 229, N. van Brock is probably correct: one is not associated with someone who has perished and furthermore there would be no motive for such an association. As we will see below (§ 6), a ^{LÜ}HA.LA, not an *ILKU*-man, is the partner or associate of a ^{LÜ}GIŠTUKUL. However, what the *ILKU*-man may be “associated with” is the land, now that its possessor, a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man, has disappeared. Alternatively, one could argue, following I. M. Diakonoff, that *tittiyanza* means that the *ILKU*-man was a neighbor. E. Sturtevant’s translation “assigned” was designed for the Telipinu Proclamation (1–2): “The great cities were assigned into his hands.” Passage (3) could mean that the slave’s family were “assigned (for death) too”. In (4) a translation, “The implements which they handed over to me, are assigned” (to me(?)/others(?)) makes sense. However, sense is left wanting in (8) a constellation being “assigned”, in (9) the “finger” being assigned on the right and left and in (5) arrows being “assigned upward”. An alternative translation, given by Hoffner, Diss. 207, “installed”, solves many of the problems; however, in a passage not dealt with by H. A. Hoffner, “installing arrows upward” (with dupl. “pulled upward”) is difficult to fathom.

H. Zimmern, J. Friedrich, and A. Götze’s long abandoned translation “auftreten” (=English “come forward, step forth, be found”), perhaps a reduplicated form of *tīya-*, should also be examined. It fits (3): “He does not die alone; his family is also stepping forward (with) him.” Text (4) likewise makes sense: “The implements which

transplantée (NAM.RA), they will give the fields to him, and it becomes (again) a GIŠTUKUL (or: he becomes a GIŠTUKUL(-man)).”⁴²

§ 2. Another law (No. 41) reads, “If an *ILKU*-man disappears, and a GIŠTU-KUL-man has stepped forward and the GIŠTUKUL-man says, ‘This is my

they handed over to me are presenting themselves (i.e. are to be found available for viewing)”. In (9) the “finger” could have “come forward” and in (8) “the coming forward of the ‘wagon’ constellation” could be imagined. The “protocols of dynastic succession” (7) may describe several contenders who “come forward for kingship”. In the ritual (5), “the arrows come forward in an upward direction”. Translating *tittiya-* in this passage as a verb of motion gives far better sense than any of the other suggested translations and is at least somewhat parallel to the duplicate’s *šarā huittiyanzi*. The Telipinu Proclamation is perhaps the most difficult passage for this translation of *tittiya-*. However, a translation such as “the great cities stepped forward (in his hands)” will make sense if one understands this as “advanced in an economic sense”, “prospered”.

What of the passage in the laws? To begin with, the phraseology for an official act of appointment, as given later in the same law is: “When the king gives a transplantee”. An act by nameless government officials is phrased with the impersonal “they”, also in the same law: “They declare the field of the GIŠTUKUL-man vacant.” Furthermore, the *ILKU*-man seems to become official not when he is *tittiyanza* but only after his declaration and his receiving a sealed tablet. The *ILKU*-man may have taken over the empty field at the unofficial suggestion of the authorities or he may have done it on his own initiative. This does not seem to be the concern of the law. The passive *tittiyanza* in this law seems only to imply that the *ILKU*-man has taken possession of the field. Thus, one suspects that this phrase does not imply an official act. To arrive at this meaning, one could employ the translation “suckle, nourish”: “An *ILKU*-man is being nourished (by the field).” One could also say that “An *ILKU*-man is associated (with the field)”. Or, one could take *tittiyanza* as the passive of a reduplicated form of *dai-* and assume that just as *dai-*’s passive *ki-* can mean both “to be laid” and “to lie” so perhaps *tittiyanza* can mean both “was put in place” and “is in place”. Perhaps the best alternative is to follow H. Zimmern’s old suggestion and translate “an *ILKU*-man has stepped forward.”

⁴² KBo 6,2 + KBo 19,1 ii 19–22 (Law § 40, OS), w. dupl. KUB 6,3 ii 37–42 (OH/NS), ed. HG 28f., translit. H. Otten – V. Souček, in: AfO 21 [1966], 2f. For the translation GIŠTUKUL(-man) see the following note and compare KBo 22,1:21, translated below § 9. I have avoided translating the term NAM.RA = Hitt. *arnuwala-* with the usual translation “deportee” because, “to deport” is technically “to expel a foreign alien”. The host country, the one doing the deportation, does not care where the deportee goes, so long as he is gone. The person’s own country is not involved. How different from the Hittite NAM.RA! The NAM.RA is initially resident in his own foreign land and is removed from his abode by the Hittites either as part of plunder of war or after his land has been incorporated into the Hittite kingdom. The purpose of this removal is not to expel him from Hatti, but to bring him to Hatti as a productive (though perhaps dependent) member of Hittite society, perhaps as a GIŠTUKUL-person, as here (§§ 1, 3, 17, 37, 54) or as a servant of temples (§§ 33, 35, 50–53, and KUB 38,12 i 3–11, translit. Mestieri 210f., tr. Beal, Ph.D. Diss. [see n. 1] 127f.) etc. Thus, far from being one who is deported/expelled (Hitt. *arḥa peššiya-* not *arnu-*!), the Hittite *arnuwala-*/NAM.RA is one who is to be or has been moved and resettled. Therefore in this work I shall use the term “transplantée” rather than the incorrect “deportee”. For the size of the king’s share of NAM.RA see Beal, Ph.D. Diss. [see n. 1] 355. For private individuals having NAM.RA cf. KUB 14,15 iii 49–52 w. dupl. KUB 14,16 iii 19–22, ed. AM 56f. and KUB 51,23 obv. 11. Note the sale by two individuals (soldiers?) of some of the NAM.RA that they had captured (KUB 26,69 v 1–16, ed. StBoT 4, 44f.). For references and literature on *arnuwala-*/NAM.RA see S. Alp, in: JKF 1 [1950–1951], 113 to 135, HW² 336–339.

GIŠTUKUL, but that is my *šahhan*, he shall acquire the field of the *ILKU*-man under seal. He shall hold the GIŠTUKUL and he shall do the *šahhan*. But if he refuses the *šahhan*, they take the fields of the *ILKU*-man for the Palace and the *šahhan* disappears.”⁴³

These two laws tell us that a GIŠTUKUL-man was someone who held a category of field. In return for this type of field, he had, on pain of forfeiture, to “hold the GIŠTUKUL”. This is paired with “doing *šahhan*”. *šahhan* is a well-known type of tax or service. Then probably “holding the GIŠTUKUL” was a tax or service as well. The field itself may also have been called a GIŠTUKUL,⁴⁴ but this is not clear. The GIŠTUKUL-man is contrasted with an *ILKU*-man. The latter was someone who held a different category of field for which he had, on pain of forfeiture, to do *šahhan*. A GIŠTUKUL-man and an *ILKU*-man could each acquire the vacant fields of the other, assuming that they provided the services/taxes appropriate to each type of field. Vacant GIŠTUKUL-fields could be worked temporarily by the men of the town/village until the king appointed a transplantee to do the GIŠTUKUL-service and farm the field.⁴⁵ That is, a vacant GIŠTUKUL-field remained a GIŠTUKUL-field. The king would eventually find a new GIŠTUKUL-man for it. Vacant *ILKU*-fields simply fell to the government (“Palace”) and the *šahhan* ceased.⁴⁶ Therefore, it seems that it was more important that someone continued “holding the GIŠTUKUL” for each field than it was that someone be “doing the *šahhan*” for each field.

§ 3. A third law (no. 112) reads, “If they give the field of a GIŠTUKUL-man and grain to transplantees, for three years they do not do *šahhan*, but in the fourth year they shall begin to do *šahhan* with the GIŠTUKUL-men.”⁴⁷

This shows that a GIŠTUKUL-man had to “do *šahhan*” as well as do GIŠTUKUL-service. Thus, both the GIŠTUKUL-man and the *ILKU*-man had to do *šahhan*. Since the GIŠTUKUL-man had to provide GIŠTUKUL-service in addition to *šahhan*, while the *ILKU*-man did only *šahhan* (as shown by his never being exempted from GIŠTUKUL-service), it seems likely that the *ILKU*-man was the ordinary type of land holder, while the GIŠTUKUL-man was the special type.

§ 4. Yet another law (no. 47B) reads, “If someone buys all the fields of a

⁴³ KBo 6,2 + KBo 19,1 ii 23–26 (Law § 41, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,5 iv 1–6 (OH/NS) and somewhat garbled dupl. KBo 6,3 ii 43–47 (OH/NS), translit. Otten – Souček, AfO 21, 3. KBo 6,5 iv 1 has “a GIŠTUKUL has stepped forward”, omitting the LÚ “man”; for discussion see below § 9 w. nn. 60f. and § 38.

⁴⁴ If one assumes that in the final line of § 1 (Law § 40) the lack of a LÚ “man” before the GIŠTUKUL is significant.

⁴⁵ Contra Götze, NBr 57, Diakonoff, MIO 13, 325, Archi, FsOtten 17f.; Archi SMEA 18, 13f., and Imparati, JESHO 25, 230, this is certainly not a reason for assuming that GIŠTUKUL-fields belonged to the village community.

⁴⁶ Contra Götze, NBr 57, Imparati, Leggi 225, Diakonoff, MIO 13, 325, Archi, FsOtten 17f., Archi, SMEA 18, 13f., 16, Imparati, JESHO 25, 226, this does not mean that the *ILKU*-fields belonged to the palace. In the modern United States of America, land on which the owner has ceased paying taxes falls to the government. This does not mean that the government owns the land of a paid-up taxpayer. Therefore, the argument that a LÚ^U*ILKI* was a dependant of the palace is baseless.

⁴⁷ KBo 6,11 i 21–23 (Law § 112), w. dupls. KBo 6,10 i 24–26, KUB 29,24: 1f., ed. HG 64f.

GIŠTUKUL-man, he bears the *luzzi*. But if someone buys the fields (only) in large part, he does not bear *luzzi*. If he cuts off (a field) in the waste-fields, or if the men of the city give him (a field), he does *luzzi*.”⁴⁸ This text shows that GIŠTUKUL-fields are saleable and divisible, though the *luzzi*-tax/service,⁴⁹ which goes with the field, is not divisible. *luzzi* is usually found together with *šahhan* and seems to be something expected of virtually every Hittite household. A different law explains who does the *luzzi* on a field which is held as dowry. It is not called a GIŠTUKUL-field and therefore probably was just an ordinary field. Again if he had received the whole field as dowry, he had to do *luzzi*; but if he had received only a portion, he did not have to do *luzzi*. Again, while this ordinary field was divisible, the *luzzi* apparently was not.⁵⁰

§ 5. Regarding the *luzzi* owed by the GIŠTUKUL-man, another law (no. 52) reads, “The servant of a ‘stone-house’ (mausoleum), the servant of a royal prince, or a *BĒL ŠUPPATI*, who holds a field among the GIŠTUKUL-men, must bear *luzzi*.”⁵¹ Again one sees that GIŠTUKUL-men have fields and must do *luzzi*.

§ 6. A final law (no. 53) about GIŠTUKUL-men reads: “If a GIŠTUKUL-man and his associate (*LÜHA.LA*) have common property (lit. are/sit together) and they do not get along and they divide their estate (*É*), if there are ten slaves (lit. heads) of his range/rural holdings (*gimra-*), the GIŠTUKUL-man takes seven and the associate takes three slaves. They divide the cattle and sheep of his range/rural holdings (*gimra-*) in the same way. If someone has a royal grant with a title deed (lit. tablet) or if they are dividing inherited (*?*, *karuili-* lit. “former”) fields (*A.ŠĀ.ĪI.A*), the GIŠTUKUL-man takes two-thirds of the grant and the associate takes one-third.”⁵²

This law indicates that a GIŠTUKUL-man, sometimes at least, operated with an associate *LÜHA.LA*. Other people whom the laws mention as having associates are the *ukke*-people, priests of the holy cities of Nerik, Arinna, and Ziplanta⁵³ and the weavers of Arinna.⁵⁴ These people are mentioned in the laws

⁴⁸ KBo 6,2 ii 45–48 (Law § 47B, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,3 ii 65–68 (NS), ed. HG 32f., CHD 3/3 s. v. *mekki* adv. a 2’. “in the waste fields” = *A.ŠĀ.ĪI.Akulei*. For this translation see R. Beal, *OrNS* [1988] (forthcoming).

⁴⁹ For *luzzi*- see most recently CHD 3/1 90f. and *Imparati*, *JESHO* 25, 235ff. (with differences of opinion); earlier see NBr 54–59, Goetze, *KI* 108f., Hoffner, *Diss.* 304–311, *Imparati*, *Leggi* 228, 235f., E. Laroche, in: *BiOr* 23 [1966], 60 (decrying the use of feudal terminology).

⁵⁰ KBo 6,2 ii 38–42 (Law § 46, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,3 ii 59–63 (NS), ed. HG 30–33.

A. Archi, *FsOtt* 18 and F. *Imparati*, *JESHO* 25, 226, claim that an *ILKU*-field cannot be sold. This statement is unsupported by evidence. Law no. 39, which they cite as proving their point, only indicates that someone who is working a field belonging to another person may cease paying the *šahhan* and abandon the field, but he cannot sell that field. F. *Imparati* also argues (p. 227) that since the texts say nothing about inheritance of *ILKU*-fields, this land was not inheritable. One can just as well turn this argument from silence on its head and argue that the selling of *ILKU*-fields is not mentioned in the Laws because there was nothing unusual about it. More importantly it is nowhere forbidden.

⁵¹ KBo 6,2 iii 5–6 (Law § 52, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,3 iii 7f. (NS), ed. HG 34f.

⁵² KBo 6,2 iii 7–11 (Law § 53, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,3 iii 9–14 (NS), ed. HG 34f.

⁵³ KBo 6,2 ii 58–62 (Law § 50, OS), ed. HG 32f.

⁵⁴ KBo 6,2 iii 1–4 (Law § 51, OS), w. dupl. KBo 6,3 iii 3–6 (NS), ed. HG 34f.

to clarify the point that while the *ukke*-people, priests and weavers are themselves exempt from *luzzi*, their associates and relatives are not.⁵⁵ One should note that the *ukke*-people, priests and weavers are important enough to get tax exemptions and have jobs of greater importance than farming and providing for the necessities of life.

This law also shows that when a GIŠTUKUL-man and his associate broke up, their field slaves and grazing animals were divided up more or less two-thirds/one third, with the GIŠTUKUL-man getting the larger share. Their land was also divided on a two-thirds/one-third basis. However, exactly what land is being divided according to this law is not entirely clear. Since the text says that "if someone has a royal grant with a title deed or has inherited(?) land," it seems that such land could have originally belonged to either the GIŠTUKUL-man or the LUḪA.LA. Since only royal grant land and inherited(?) land is said to be divisible at the break-up of the association, presumably land bought or brought into cultivation by one or the other of the associates on his own would not have been included. It is not clear whether the GIŠTUKUL fields were included among the "royal grants with a title deed" and "inherited(?) land". However, we saw above (§ 4) that all or part of a GIŠTUKUL-field was alienable; therefore, it seems possible that the GIŠTUKUL was included and thus was subject to the division that took place should a GIŠTUKUL-man and his associate break up the association. The fact that the GIŠTUKUL-man received the larger portion of the division reflects either the larger portion that he was expected to have contributed originally to the association, or the greater importance that the state placed on his future economic well-being.

§ 7. An Old Hittite land grant included parcels taken from lands belonging to the Palace in Zantananta, a sacred *ḫuwaši*-stone shrine, and a number of GIŠTUKUL-men.⁵⁶ These GIŠTUKUL-men appear to have been associated with the *ḫuwaši*-stone sanctuary.

§ 8. Another Old Hittite land grant included a parcel of meadow belonging to two GIŠTUKUL-men.⁵⁷ It is unclear whether the GIŠTUKUL-men mentioned in these two land grants remained to work for the new owner.

§ 9. A further Old Hittite reference to GIŠTUKUL-men occurs in well preserved, but unfortunately obscure, context. In the first translatable paragraph, the text reads, "You are oppressing the GIŠTUKUL-men and they have begun to oppress [...]. Is this the way you have kept my father's word? ... Tā, the chariot-fighter (LUIŠ) ⁵⁸ from Kuluppa, customarily takes (five particular provision carriers and the enumerated provisions). He took one *kapunu*-measure of field. § When my father calls assemblies, he will seek wrong-doing (*gullakuwan*) in you (pl.): 'Is it not your provision carriers? You have been oppressing your provision carriers, giving the king cause for anger. § You are a GIŠTUKUL

⁵⁵ Cf. also Imparati, JESHO 25, 236f.

⁵⁶ SBo 4 (=LS 4) obv. 13f., 15f., 17, 19f., and restored in 14, ed. K. K. Riemschneider, in: MIO 6 [1958], 362f. This text is dated by D. F. Easton, in: JCS 33 [1981], 41, to Muršili I.

⁵⁷ SBo 2 (=LS 2) obv. 19, ed. Riemschneider, MIO 6, 356f., dated to Ḫuzziya I or II? by D. F. Easton, JCS 33, 24, 41.

⁵⁸ For this title see Beal, Ph.D. Diss. (see n. 1) 74–82.

and he is a GIŠTUKUL.' When my father lets you go to your house(s), has he not inscribed a tablet for you, just as he customarily writes for you DUGUD-men? You are going to your land. You are not going to seek (to avenge) the blood of the poor. You are not going to question his provision bearers. You do (it) for the wealthy man. You (sg.!) go to his house. You (sg.) eat. You (sg.) drink. And he pays you (sg.). You (sg.) take the court fee (? *šiēt*) of the poor man, (but) you (sg.) do not investigate his case. In this way you have carried-out the words of my father? . . .'⁵⁹

This text is not entirely clear. Several people (second person plural verbs) are being criticized by the text's writer. Since the king says to them, "You (sg.) are a GIŠTUKUL and he is a GIŠTUKUL", they are apparently GIŠTUKUL-men. Under these GIŠTUKUL-men are other GIŠTUKUL-men whom the accused are allegedly oppressing. This shows that some GIŠTUKUL-men were of higher rank than others. The accused are also referred to as being of the class/rank of LÜDUGUD. The LÜDUGUD is known to be, at least sometimes, if not always, a military officer of relatively low rank.⁶⁰ These LÜDUGUDs who were also GIŠTUKUL-men appear to have had judicial duties at their homes apparently involving rich and poor persons, other GIŠTUKUL-men, and a chariot-fighter. Note also that the LÜ "man" is optional. The terms "man of the GIŠTUKUL" and "GIŠTUKUL" appear to be interchangeable.⁶¹

⁵⁹ KBo 22, 1: 3–31 (OS), translation modified from an unpublished tr. of H. A. Hoffner, cf. ed. Archi, FsLaroche 45–48 (tr. differs), w. comments by E. Neu, in: AfO 31 [1984], 99 and with lines 24–30 ed. Melchert, Diss. 172f. Line 28: *piyanazziatta* = *piyanazzi* (>*piyanai*-) + *-a* + *-ta* following Archi, Fs Laroche 47, Melchert, Diss. 172f., and H. A. Hoffner, against E. Neu (>*piyanazzi*- (mid.)) and N. Oettinger, Stammbildung 81 n. 64 (either *piyanazziya*- mid. or *piyanai*- act. + *-at* + *-ta*). The only other reference that E. Neu cites to a verb *piyanazzi*-, KUB 40,76:8, is a restoration, which even if accepted could still be *piyanai*- + *-an* + *-da*. F. Starke, StBoT 23, 33 translates the sentence in question, „Es wird reichlich zugeteilt“. „Court fee“ is my translation of the hapax *šiēt*; it is based solely on context. H. C. Melchert, Diss. 173f., F. Starke, StBoT 23, 176 and E. Neu, AfO 31, 99, relate *šiēt* to the rare Old Hittite pronoun *ša-/šia-* (for which see most recently, StBoT 26, 167 w. n. 489). H. C. Melchert took it as the instrumental, used adverbially with the meaning “by that, thereby”. He translated the sentence, “But you thereby abandon(?) (emending *da-a-at-ti* to *da-a-la!-ti*) the poor man.” While the translation fits the context, it requires an emendation and even so leaves the unsatisfactory spelling *dālati* instead of *dālatti*. F. Starke takes *šiēt* as a nom./acc. neut., presumably on the analogy with *apat* or *kuit*. He translates the sentence, “und das Seinige (d. h. die Habe, der Besitz) des Armen”. This has now been accepted by H. C. Melchert, Phon. 126. F. Starke's translation makes tolerable sense. However, the abuse of power, using one's position to appropriate the possessions of the poor, does not seem to fit the immediate context of this text. This section seems more concerned with official inaction for fear of offending one's rich friends. Perhaps my understanding of the meaning as “court costs” can be derived from F. Starke's “das Seinige”, that bit of one's property that it costs to initiate a case. In Assyria, this seems to have been one sheep. E. Neu, AfO 31, 99, suggests an endlingless locative, with a translation of the expression: “(jem.) dorthin (mit)nehmen”. “Carry-out” lit. “make the rounds of”, “complete” *arḫān* = part. of *arḫai-/irḫai*- following Neu, AfO 31, 99. Differently, H. A. Hoffner: “Is this the way you hold the word of my father as a limitation (on your conduct)?”; A. Archi: “vous aurez violé la parole du père.”

⁶⁰ See Beal, Ph. D. Diss. (see n. 1) 525–541.

⁶¹ The term GIŠTUKUL is taken literally by F. Starke, StBoT 23, 38 “du (bist) eine Waffe” and E. Neu, AfO 31, 99 (“Werkzeug (oder Waffe?)”). Cf. line 3 with LÜ and line 21 without

§ 10. The ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men are mentioned in Hattušili I's bilingual testament in broken context concerning the revolt of palace servants and others in support of Prince Huzziya. They are mentioned in proximity to the seizure of fields, but the context is sufficiently broken that little sense can be made from the passage.⁶²

§ 11. There may be another reference to the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men in military context. In the text describing Hattušili I's siege of Uršu, one reads that, "One officer/general (LÚ.GAL) will go and a few troops will go [...]. The officers/generals (LÚ.MEŠ.GAL.GAL) and the overseer of the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men do not stand at their posts."⁶³ Unfortunately the ^{GIŠ} is not actually a ^{GIŠ} but a PA, a very similar sign. Since PA.KU means nothing as it stands,⁶⁴ it seems possible that we have a second reference to ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men (or in this case their overseer) in military context.

§ 12. ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men are also mentioned in a text describing Muršili I's(?) Syrian wars. The sentence in question reads: "Some were [...] -men, [...] ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men, some were [...] -men" The context appears to be military. Two lines earlier, the city of Haššu (on the Euphrates) is mentioned. One line after the mention of the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men the town of Tegarama (= ? modern Gürün in the Anti-Taurus, on the Kayseri-Malatya road) is mentioned. The previous paragraph mentions several times the Hurrians, one of the most important of the enemies of the Hittites of this period.⁶⁵ Thus it seems that this text mentions the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men in military context, but the context is so fragmentary that it is impossible to know what they are doing.

§ 13. A fragment of an Old Script offerings and festival text has a line which reads "[...] ^{GIŠ}TUKUL (and) one quiver of a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL [...]"⁶⁶ The usual meanings of ^{GIŠ}TUKUL without LÚ are "(generic) weapon" and "mace". A "mace" does not have a quiver, and the phrase "a quiver of a weapon"⁶⁷ is not

LÚ. The term appears with and without LÚ in duplicates of the Laws (above § 2), KBo 6,2 + KBo 19,1 ii 23 (OS) (with LÚ) and KBo 6,5 iv 1 (OH/NS) (without LÚ), cf. Otten – Souček, AfO 21, 3. For a New Hittite reference without LÚ see below § 38.

⁶² KUB 1,16 + KUB 40,65 iii 3f., translit. C. Kühne, in: ZA 62, 257, discussion on p. 259.

⁶³ KBo 1,11 obv. 35–36, ed. H. G. Güterbock, in: ZA 44 [1938], 118f., G. Beckman (forthcoming), omitted in A. Kempinski's edition in ÄAT 4.

⁶⁴ H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 118f., 127, suggested the reading. He rejected emending to UGULA LÚ.MEŠSIPA! (=PA.LU!) "overseer of shepherds" because of the military context, and because he then thought that ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man was a military title. A letter from Gezer in Akkadian, which is written in a ductus very similar to the Siege of Uršu text, and which mentions an LÚUGULA SIPA, has caused A. Kempinski, in: IEJ 22 [1972], 186, to revive the reading UGULA LÚ.MEŠSIPA! in the Siege of Uršu text. As shepherds can be expected to have an overseer, one need not emend the Siege of Uršu text to correspond exactly to the Gezer text. Thus one is left with the choice of shepherds or ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men in military context in the Siege of Uršu text.

⁶⁵ *Hurlaš URU Ūššu* [...] / *Hurlan kattan* [...] / *Hurlašša memma* [...] / *U LÚ.MEŠ URUTa* [...] § *Hurlaš ANA URUL[a-...]* / *ANA KUR Takšanna x[...]* / *kūš URU Hamša* [...] / *URU Haššuwaš URU x[...]* / *x-rāš URU x[...]* / *utneya kū-x[...]* / *x-ḫurummaš x[...]* / *kē LÚ.MEŠ x[...]* / *x LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL kē LÚ.MEŠ ...* / *kē-ma [LÚ.MEŠ ...]* / *x URU Tagarami x[...]* KUB 31,64 ii 27–37 (CTH 12, OH/NS). Note also that Takšanna was plundered by Hattušili I on his way to Haššu (KBo 10,1 obv. 27).

⁶⁶ KUB 43,29 ii 11 (CTH 662,7, OS). The date is according to K. K. Riemschneider, KUB 33 p. v. n. 2. It is not included by E. Neu in StBoT 25.

⁶⁷ Even "the quiver of an arrow" is meaningless. What other sort of quiver is there?

very meaningful. We saw above that LÚ can, on occasion, be omitted in the phrase LÚ GIŠTUKUL “GIŠTUKUL-man”.⁶⁸ Reading the phrase in the offerings text as “[a] GIŠTUKUL-man [brings in?] one quiver of a GIŠTUKUL-man” yields good sense. The text mentions in addition to cultic personnel, officials such as the “mayor” (*HAZANNU*) and “administrator” (*AGRIG*) of Hattuša. It also mentions “the place of the troops”.⁶⁹ It may also mention the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man.⁷⁰ If this text does indeed refer to GIŠTUKUL-men, then it provides evidence for a GIŠTUKUL-man having a quiver, and for some connection between some GIŠTUKUL-men and the military.⁷¹

§ 14. A GIŠTUKUL-man also occurs in an Old Hittite festival. He hands a *zeri*-vessel to the king. Shortly thereafter he takes a *teššummi*-vessel back. Then as the king leaves to return to the palace, the GIŠTUKUL-man bows and takes various things for himself.⁷²

§ 15. In another festival a GIŠTUKUL-man again gives a cup to the king. In the same context a *MEŠEDI*-guard is mentioned.⁷³

§ 16. A similar festival fragment mentions a GIŠTUKUL-man with the king and an overseer of *MEŠEDI*-guards.⁷⁴

§ 17. GIŠTUKUL-men continue to be mentioned in Middle Hittite texts. In the Instructions for a Governor of a Border Province one reads, “What fields of runaway GIŠTUKUL-men and what *pētta* (“allotments”) are empty, let them all be written down for you. When they give transplantees, allocate a place for them immediately.”⁷⁵ This text essentially parallels the laws quoted above (§§ 1, 3).¹ Again GIŠTUKUL-men are associated with fields. Also, when one disappears, the king replaces him with a transplantee.

§ 18. A treaty with the Kaška deals with the case “[if a slave] flees from Hatti to a friendly Kaškan city with the goods of his master, or if a GIŠTUKUL-man flees with the goods of his associate (LÚTAPPU), . . .”⁷⁶ Lest one think that this shows the GIŠTUKUL-man to be a slave, one should note the reciprocal clause, “if a friendly (Kaškan) slave comes from there (Kaška), [to Hatti] with his master’s goods, or if a (Kaškan) free man (LÚELLU) comes with his associate’s goods, . . .”⁷⁷ Thus in these reciprocal clauses, a Hittite GIŠTUKUL-man is paralleled with a Kaškan free man. As in the law quoted above (§ 6), the GIŠTUKUL-man is seen to have an associate.

⁶⁸ § 9 w. n. 61.

⁶⁹ KUB 43,29 ii 8, iii 3, 12 respectively.

⁷⁰ Ibid. ii 3, see below § 47.

⁷¹ The primary weapons of the Hittite army appear to have been spears and bow and arrow.

⁷² KBo 17,74 ii 29–33 (CTH 631,1, Storm Festival, OH/MS), ed. StBoT 12, 20 f.

⁷³ KBo 20,70 ii 7 f. (CTH 630), cf. Mestieri 31.

⁷⁴ [. . .]-*ma ēšzi* LÚGIŠTUKUL G[AL-ri] / [. . . UGU]LA LÚMEŠMEŠEDI *harzi* LUG[AL] / [. . .]x *aruwaizzi ta*[. . .] § KBo 14,82 ii 6–8.

⁷⁵ KUB 31,84 iii 66–69 (MH/NS), ed. E. Laroche, in: RA 43 [1949], 73, Alp, JKF 1, 121, Dienstanw. 50, M. Marazzi, in: VO 2 [1979] 83 f. (all tr. differ); for *pētta* see most recently J. Puhvel, in: Heth. u. Idg. 213 f.; for *ša-an-na-a-at-ta-ya* read *ta!-an-na-a-at-ta-ya* with Alp.

⁷⁶ KUB 23,77: 52 f. (CTH 138, MH/MS), ed. HAB 130, Josephson, Part. 165, tr. Kaš-käer 120.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 54–56, ed. HAB 130, Josephson, Part. 165, tr. Kaš-käer 120.

§ 19. The first preserved paragraph of another instruction text discusses what percentage of a household's man-hours must go for palace service. It is not clear whether this has to do with their job or with their occasional state service. The following paragraph reads, "If at some time you re[enter] a city, call in the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men and the elders. Say this to them: 'Are the doormen corrupt? Are the [men] of the estate corrupt? Do they take wine for themselves? Do they pour out water before [. . .]? Do the guardsmen keep taking [. . .], and . . . [and] giving [them to] the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men? [If] a gardener gives something to a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man, [. . .].'"⁷⁸ It is interesting to see the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men in the company of the elders being questioned in judicial matters. It reminds one of the Old Hittite instruction text that was quoted above in § 9, where ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men who were also ^{LÚ}DUGUDs played a role in judicial proceedings. It seems that, like the elders, the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men are somehow responsible for keeping an eye on the behavior of the gardeners and other workers. Considering the previous paragraph in the text, it is possible that this inquest has to do with palace service. Unfortunately, little more can be said.

§ 20. A Middle Hittite instruction text reads, "Whenever he stands at the door-lock in the palace, the doorman counts off (i.e. calls the roll of) the ^{GIŠ}TUKULs as follows. The doorman steps down from the gate and says in Hittite, 'News, news!' Those who sleep up on the palace step forward and the doorman calls them in Ḫattic by title (lit. by name)." There follows a list of professions written in Ḫattic and Hittite. These include the cupbearer, waiter, cook, clown (^{LÚ}ALAN.ZU_x), two cult functionaries, the water provider(?), tent-keeper, scepter bearer, tailor(?), runner, lookout-runner, and the *duddušhiyala*-.⁷⁹ This heterogeneous group of professions seems to be the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men who are referred to in the opening statement. What these people have in common seems only to be that they are "those who sleep up in the palace" and presumably are palace employees.

⁷⁸ KBo 16,54:16–28 (CTH 266, NS), ed. Riemschneider, *ArOr* 33, 337f.: 8–20, tr. CHD 3/2:197.

⁷⁹ *mān* INA É.GAL-LIM zakkiti artari nuza ^{LÚ}Ī.DU₈ / ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.MEŠ EGIR-an kiš-šan kappūzi ^{LÚ}Ī.DU₈-kan / ^{IŠTU} KÁ.GAL katta tiezi nu nāšili kiššan tezzi ḫalugaš ḫalugaš § nu INA É.GAL-LIM kuiēš šer šēšanzi / nat parā tianzi ^{LÚ}Ī.DU₈-ma-aš-kan ḫa[tti]li / lamnit ḫalziššai § (The Ḫattic column will be omitted below) ^{LÚ}SAGI-aš/^{LÚ}GIŠBANŠUR-aš / ^{LÚ}MUḪALDIM-aš / ^{LÚ}ALAN.ZU_x § ^{LÚ}GALA / ^{LÚ}zikipuriyatallaš / ^{LÚ}akuttarra[š] [coll. H. G. Güterbock apud HW² 54] / ^{LÚ}GIŠZA.LAM.GAR[-aš] § ^{LÚ}GIŠPA[-aš] / ^{LÚ}GADA.TAR[-aš] / ^{LÚ}KAŠ₄.E[-aš] / ^{LÚ}NI.ZU ^{LÚ}KAŠ₄.E[-aš] / ^{LÚ}dudduš-ḫiyalla[š] § KBo 5,11 i 1–20 (CTH 263, MH?²/NS), translit. in part LTU p. 12, see also CHD 3/1:95 (7'a'). For the occurrences of ^{LÚ}akuttarra- see HW² 54 ("Tränker"); for the translation see H. G. Güterbock, in: *FsOtt* 85f. s. v. ÍL ("Wasserträger"). For the translation "tailor" for ^{LÚ}GADA.TAR, I follow F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri* 53f., 618. This translation is based on a literal reading of the two signs making up the Sumerogram: GADA "linen" and TAR "to cut". Note, there is a lexical text that gives the equation (Sum.) ^{LÚ}GADA.TAR = (Akk.) nu'u "barbarian" = (Hitt.) *dam-pupiš* "barbarian" (KBo 1,30 i 9). However the relevance of the lexical text is questionable because in the list in question in KBo 5,11, all of the titles appear to be professions and "barbarian" is not a profession. Perhaps just as the Sumerogram ^{LÚ}NI.ZU is attested in both the meanings "thief" and "lookout", ^{LÚ}GADA.TAR was used for both "tailor(?)" and "barbarian". Alternatively, A. Archi's, in: *OA* 12 [1973], 221, suggested translation, "profani", while not a profession, if understood in the sense of "unskilled person", at least has some chance of being correct.

§ 21. Among the people included in the estate given by Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal to the Queen's attendant (^{SAL}SUḪUR.LAL) are 91 people, among them "six GIŠTUKUL-men, two cooks, one fuller, one Hurrian-garment maker, one leatherworker, and a horseherd."⁸⁰ F. Sommer⁸¹, noting that the total number of people listed after the GIŠTUKUL-men adds up to six, the very number of GIŠTUKUL-people mentioned, argued that the six GIŠTUKUL-men were the same as the cooks, fuller, garment-maker, leatherworker and horseherd.

§ 22. F. Sommer pointed out another text which reads, "afterwards 3 GIŠTUKULs, a cook, a [. . .], and a custodian."⁸² If F. Sommer is correct that only one profession is to be restored in the break, then we see the words "three GIŠTUKULs" followed by three professional designations. In which case, these two coincidences make it likely that the cooks, fuller, garment-maker, leatherworker, horse-herd and custodian are GIŠTUKUL-men.

§ 23. There are several later texts that are set up in a manner similar to the previous two. One cult inventory reads in broken context, "[. . .] vanquished with a weapon (GIŠTUKUL) [. . .] one exorcist, one scribe, [. . .], one wickerworker, two singers, [. . .] twelve GIŠTUKUL-men seiz[e(d?) . . .]"⁸³ Here again, it is unclear whether the exorcist, scribe, wickerworker and singers together with those professions lost in the break comprised the twelve GIŠTUKUL-men, but considering the two previous examples, it seems likely. They are said to be taken with a weapon and are therefore likely to be transplantees.

§ 24. The royal substitution ritual reads, "Afterwards [they . . .] the ceremony/customs of kingship for the substitute (lit. new) king. [Two people] from each single GIŠTUKUL, two lords of the cup(?), two chamberlains, two cooks, two waiters, and two bakers [who] are [. . .]. They give him (something) to eat and drink."⁸⁴ The Middle and New Hittite texts discussed in §§ 20–24 all seem to show that a large and diverse number of professions could fall under the rubric GIŠTUKUL.

§ 25. There are several other passages in cult inventories that refer to GIŠTUKUL-men. One mentions "[two] GIŠ[TUKU]L-men, one cook, one baker, one [. . .]"⁸⁵ In the above examples, the various professionals who are listed after the GIŠTUKUL-men are thought to comprise the GIŠTUKUL-men. That will work in this example only if the partially broken number can be read "three" rather than "two".

§ 26. Another cult inventory has, "On the other hand a priest [. . .], a custodian, (and) a GIŠTUKUL. A singer to him [. . .]"⁸⁶ In this text it appears that the GIŠTUKUL is a separate entry, not referring to the professions mentioned

⁸⁰ KBo 5,7 rev. 13, repeated in the totals in rev. 41f. see also obv. 27. 32, (=LS 1), ed. K. K. Riemschneider, in: MIO 6 [1958], 344–54. For the translation of SUḪUR.LAL see H. G. Güterbock, in: JAOS 103 [1983], 159.

⁸¹ HAB 124f.

⁸² KUB 10,59:4f., translit. Mestieri 30, cf. HAB 124.

⁸³ KUB 38,35 rev. 6–9, translit. HAB 123 (as Bo 2863).

⁸⁴ KBo 15,2 iv 20–24, w. dupl. KUB 17,31 i 21–23 (CTH 421), ed. StBoT 3, 62f.; KUB 17,31 i 22 has GIŠTÚG for GIŠTUKUL, which makes little sense.

⁸⁵ KBo 12,56 i 10, translit. Mestieri 30.

⁸⁶ KUB 42,100 iii 10f. (CTH 525), ed. G. del Monte, in: OA 17 [1978], 183, 186, but reading 1 instead of ^m in line 11 with F. Pecchioli Daddi, Mestieri 31.

beside him. If this is true, then some custodians were GIŠTUKUL-men (§ 22) and some were not.

§ 27. One finds GIŠTUKUL-men also in post-Old Hittite festivals. "They have two GIŠTUKULs run 'before' the wooden yoke. The female ushers(?) (SAL.MEŠ *BURRŪTIM*), female musicians(?): (SAL.MEŠ *katruš*), and the [SAL/LŪ] *x-n¹uhunniš* go in front. The male-dancers and the prostitutes go in front."⁸⁷ In this text the people of the various professions cannot be the same as the two GIŠTUKULs.

§ 28. A single GIŠTUKUL-man is mentioned in broken context in a festival.⁸⁸

§ 29. The Middle Hittite land grant of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal, already quoted above (§ 21), also mentions a plot of forest/orchard (GIŠTIR), which belonged to a GIŠTUKUL-man who was a golden chariot fighter.⁸⁹

§ 30. A New Hittite text, the treaty between Tudḫaliya IV and the appanage king Ulmi-Tešub, mentions a GIŠTUKUL of a golden chariot fighter: "Toward Šinnuwanta-town, Mt. Lūla is the border. Ninainta-town remains to the Ḫulaya-River Land. The GIŠTUKUL of the golden chariot fighter, which is to the rear, remains to His Majesty."⁹⁰

§ 31. Several lines later this treaty mentions "from the edge of the village Šara-x-x-wa, to whatever place he makes the GIŠTUKUL(-estate) extend (lit. he carries) (this territory) remains to the Ḫulaya-River Land."⁹¹ The GIŠTUKUL-estates referred to in this treaty would have to be fairly substantial lands in order to be mentioned in such a boundary treaty.

§ 32. A particularly interesting text for the study of the GIŠTUKUL-man is the donation-vow of Puduḫepa, queen of Ḫattušili III. Various families are to be dedicated to the goddess. The paragraph concerning one woman, head of the household, named Mamma, to whose household a prisoner of war will be added, ends with a sentence which one may translate in three different ways. (1) "She/he stands (as) a milk-producer for her/his GIŠTUKUL(-service)." (2) "(A?) milk-producer stands as her GIŠTUKUL(-person)." (3) "She/He stands as a milk-producer for her GIŠTUKUL(-person)."⁹² It would appear either that

⁸⁷ KUB 10,91 ii 6–9 (CTH 699,5, NH?), translit. *Mestieri 434*. Contra F. Pecchioli Daddi, there is no room for MEŠ to be restored (so copy and coll. H. A. Hoffner).

⁸⁸ KBo 30,171:9.

⁸⁹ KBo 5,7 (=LS 1) rev. 10, ed. Rienschneider, MIO 6, 348f. For LŪIŠ KŪ.SIG₁₇ see Beal, PhD Diss. (see n. 1) 82–87.

⁹⁰ URUŠinnuwantaza-ma-šši ḪUR.SAG Lūlaš ZAG-aš URUNinaintaš-ma-kan ANA KUR Ḫulaya āššanza GIŠTUKUL LŪIŠ KŪ.SIG₁-ma-kan-kuiš EGIR-an naškan ANA dUTU-ŠI āššanza KBo 4,10 obv. 26f., tr. Geogr 67.

⁹¹ . . . IŠTU ZAG URUŠara-x-xwa-ma kuedani pedi GIŠTUKUL arnuzzi natkan ANA KUR Ḫulaya āššan KBo 4,10 obv. 30f., tr. Geogr. 67 ("to whatever place he carries the weapon(?)").

⁹² ANA (M:Ø) GIŠTUKUL-ma-šši EPIŠ GA artari KUB 56,1 i 7 (S), copy StBoT 1 VII, w. dupl. KUB 31,73:13 + KUB 31,63 rev. 10 (M), copy StBoT 1 V, (CTH 585), ed. (M only) Laroche, RA 43, 61, 64, and ed. StBoT 1, 28f. H. Otten und V. Souček (p. 44) understand that the provision of milk is the GIŠTUKUL-duty of Mamma and her household. They translate (p. 45 n. 4) "für das GIŠTUKUL (etwa Handwerk?) steht ihm?/ihr? (wem? dem "Hause" oder der Gottheit?) ein Melker (zur Verfügung)." H. G. Güterbock, CRRAI 18 (see n. 32) 95, translated "Für das Handwerk (steht) ihm Melker" i.e. | "als sein Handwerk ist Melker festgestellt/verzeichnet/bestimmt."

the GIŠTUKUL-service of her household (either that of herself or that of the prisoner who has been assigned to her) consisted of milk-producing or that (s)he was the associate of a milk-producer who was a GIŠTUKUL, or that (s)he was the associate who produced milk for a GIŠTUKUL-person, whose own GIŠTUKUL-service was irrelevant to the text. The professions mentioned in the paragraphs concerning other heads of household, all males, were a baker in one case⁹³, a milk producer in another,⁹⁴ and a beekeeper in a third.⁹⁵ If one accepts either translations (1) or (2), then milk-producers, bakers and beekeepers were GIŠTUKUL-people.

§ 33. Another text deals with Tudhaliya IV's reorganization of the cult in the northern part of the kingdom. One paragraph reads, "in Durmitta Province in Lihšina-town, His Majesty gave the following to the Stormgod: fifty houses including five hundred transplantees, one village, three abandoned villages, former priests; three houses including thirty transplantees in Hadduhina-village, men of Azzi; . . . three houses including thirty transplantees, oxherds; . . .; total sixteen houses including 160 transplantees. Later his majesty gave fifty(?) cows and four hundred sheep including 120 goats. They do GIŠTUKUL. The threshing floor does 150 measures of seed."⁹⁶ We have seen before that transplantees often were settled and made GIŠTUKUL-men. Therefore, one would assume that the subject of "they do GIŠTUKUL" is the 160 transplantees, although the immediate antecedent is the animals. One presumes that they owe their GIŠTUKUL to the god.

§ 34. A somewhat different paragraph in the same text reads, "In [GN, His Majesty] gave [the following for DN]: twenty cows and one hundred sheep. They do the GIŠTUKUL. The King of Tummanna gives [. . .]."⁹⁷ Here there

E. Laroche's translation "... l'enseigne des laitiers se dresse" is impossible due to the position of the enclitics. If these had been two logograms in a construct relationship at the beginning of a Hittite sentence, the enclitics should have attached to the second word of the construct chain since in the underlying Hittite syntax this word would have been the first word of the sentence. In the sentence under discussion, they attach to the first of the logograms, thus showing that this is not a construct chain, and so cannot be translated "the sign of the milker". Furthermore there is no evidence that GIŠTUKUL ever means "sign".

⁹³ KUB 56,1 i 14 (S), copy StBoT 1 VII, w. dupls. KUB 31,63 rev. 14 (M), KUB 31,75: 3 + KUB 31,58 rev. 4 (J), ed. Laroche, RA 43,61, 65:17 (tr. differs, see previous note), StBoT 1, 30f.

⁹⁴ KUB 56,1 i 19f. (S), copy StBoT 1 VII, w. dupls. KUB 31,63 rev. 18 (M), KUB 31, 75:7 + KUB 31,58 rev. 8 (J), KUB 31,51 rev. (iv) 3 (D) (copy StBoT 1 II), ed. Laroche, RA 43, 61, 65:21, StBoT 1, 30f. See above n. 92.

⁹⁵ KUB 56,1 i 25 (S), copy StBoT 1, VII, w. dupl. KUB 31, 58 rev. 11 (J), ed. Laroche, RA 43, 61, 65:24, StBoT 1, 30f. See above n. 92.

⁹⁶ KUB 48,105 + KBo 12,53 obv. 19–21, 24, 26–28, ed. A. Archi – H. Klengel, in: AoF VII [1980], 144, 147f., see also obv. 10–13, rev. 20–22.

⁹⁷ KUB 48, 105 + KBo 12,53 rev. 23f., ed. Archi – Klengel, AoF VII, 146, 149. A translation "They (officials) make twenty cows and one hundred sheep GIŠTUKULs" would fit this passage, the passage in § 35 and most of the passages in § 33. However, in KUB 48,105 + KBo 12,53 obv. 13 there is no object pronoun referring back to the animals which are the object of the previous sentence. This makes it somewhat more likely that the animals are the subject of the verb "they do/make". The two translations would mean much the same thing.

are no transplantees to be the antecedent of the “they” in the sentence “They do the GIŠTUKUL.” The only clear antecedent is the animals. In fact, in all of the examples in this text, the animals are the immediate antecedent.

§ 35. One should note a similar text, which twice has animals immediately preceding GIŠTUKUL. This text starts a paragraph: “The 47 ‘houses(?)’ of the GIŠTUKUL, including 473 transplantees, twenty transplantees are of [...], ... seventy transplantees [are ...], ten are of the GIŠTUKUL [...]x of Ališa-town [...], ten transplantees of the house of [...] of Šapinuwa-town, [...] 95 cattle including eighty cows d[o(?)] GIŠTUKUL (acc.). [x+]7 cattle, however, are of the deity, 501 sheep, including [...], ‘x’ sheep, however, do GIŠTUKUL. [...] dried and milled (cereals) [...].”⁹⁸ Here the people seems to be involved in the GIŠTUKUL, but curiously the animals are said to “do GIŠTUKUL”.

§ 36. A list of fields mentions three fields belonging to Šunaili amounting to “one GIŠTUKUL”.⁹⁹

§ 37. In the New Hittite period, as in the older periods, one finds transplantees being made into GIŠTUKUL-men. A section of Muršili II’s treaty with the tributary king Targašnalli reads: “Then the transplantees, whom I carried off because I, My Majesty, defeated Arzawa, I made into [GIŠ]TUKUL[-men].”¹⁰⁰

§ 38. Muršili II’s treaty with tributary king Kupanta-Kurunta has a passage identical to that quoted from the Targašnalli treaty.¹⁰¹ However, the expected LÚ.MEŠ “men” is not to be found.¹⁰² Thus it seems that in the New Hittite Period, as in the Old Hittite Period (see §§ 2, 9), these people could be called GIŠTUKUL-men or simply GIŠTUKULs.

§ 39. The New Hittite revision of the Laws, the so-called “Parallel Version” has sections concerning the GIŠTUKUL-men. In one section (parallel to that quoted above in § 4) we read: “If someone buys all the fields and pastures of a

⁹⁸ 14. [x] GIŠTUKUL-aš 47 ‘BI’TUM ŠÁ-ŠÚ 4 ME 73 NAM.R[A ...]

15. ‘20 NAM.RA’ma Š[A Mo]x-a-pal-la-a 70 NA[M.RA ...]

16. 10 NAM.RA ŠA GIŠTU[KUL? o]x URU A-li-ša x[...]

17. 10 NAM.RA ŠA É ‘x’-aš URU Ša-a-pi-nu-w[a ...]

18. ‘95’ GUD ŠA.BA 80 GUD.ÁB GIŠTUKUL-an ‘i’-[ya-an-zi ...]

19. [x+]7 GUD=ma ŠA DINGIR-LIM 501 UDU ŠA.B[A ...]

20. [x] UDU=ma GIŠTUKUL! i-‘ya’-an-zi x[...]

21. [...]x tar-ša-an ma-al-l’a’-an’ [...]

(Then lower edge) HT 4:14–21 (CTH 237,2).

⁹⁹ KUB 8,78 vi 1–15 (CTH 239,2), ed. V. Souček, in: *ArOr* 27 [1959], 32f.

¹⁰⁰ KBo 5,4 rev. 50f., ed. SV 1, 68f., translit. Mestieri 33.

¹⁰¹ KUB 6,48 i! 9–ii! 1, ed. SV 1, 148f., translit. Mestieri 33.

¹⁰² The text has [o(o)]x GIŠTUKUL.HI.A. “x” ends in a final broken vertical. J. Friedrich, SV 1:148 uncertainly restored [LÚ.MEŠ-y]a GIŠTUKUL.HI.A. This restoration is unlikely to be correct, however. Presumably the underlying phrase was literally “man of the GIŠTUKUL”, the word GIŠTUKUL, being the genitive, would have come first in the Hittite sentence and so would have received the enclitic. Even if the LÚ.MEŠ was considered a determinative, one does not put enclitics on determinatives. While it is possible that LÚGIŠTUKUL became a set phrase and the enclitics were attached to the second word, it seems more likely that instead of J. Friedrich’s restoration, one should restore a plural acc. pron., either [a-pé]-‘e’ or [ke]-‘e’. Note that the parallel passage from the Targašnalli treaty (cited above § 37) also has a lacuna before GIŠTUKUL.MEŠ and so could have had similar phrasing but with the LÚ.MEŠ.

GIŠTUKUL-man, and the (former) owner of the fields and pastures perishes,¹⁰³ he (the new owner) shall do whatever *šahhan* the king establishes for him. But if the owner of the fields and pastures is alive or his house (=family) still exists, whether in this land or in another land, he (the new owner) shall do no *šahhan*.”¹⁰⁴ Having to continue doing/paying *šahhan* for GIŠTUKUL-land even after one has sold it sounds like a disincentive to sell GIŠTUKUL-land. Unfortunately the text does not indicate whether the new or the old owner must do the GIŠTUKUL-service.

§ 40. A similar law reads, “If someone buys all the fields of a GIŠTUKUL-man, they ask the king, and whatever *luzzi* the king says, he shall do. If he further buys someone else’s fields, he bears no (further) *luzzi*.”¹⁰⁵

§ 41. Another law in this text seems to substitute the word “free man” (LÚ *EL[LUM]*) for what in the Old Hittite passage (above § 1) was “GIŠTUKUL-man.”¹⁰⁶ J. Friedrich suggests that this is a corruption of the text by the scribe.¹⁰⁷ This section and the section which follows it are too fragmentary to tell whether or not LÚ *ELLUM* consistently replaces LÚ GIŠTUKUL since no further examples of either are preserved.

§ 42. One curious, but unfortunately fragmentary, text reads, “formerly [. . .] were foot GIŠTUKUL-men; to us [. . .].”¹⁰⁸ Matters discussed on this side (obverse) of the tablet seem to be political rather than religious (as on the reverse). It seems easiest to understand this as meaning “GIŠTUKUL-foot(-soldiers)”. Thus, while this text may suggest, it unfortunately does not prove a connection between the GIŠTUKUL-man and the military.

§ 43. From Meskene, ancient Emar, a territory in the Hittite appanage kingdom of Kargamiš, comes an interesting land grant text. A royal prince grants the estate of Abirašap to Abirašap’s nephew. In return the nephew must “carry the GIŠTUKUL of his uncle”.¹⁰⁹ As in many of the other texts one does GIŠTUKUL-duty in return for land. It seems that a rather normal succession from a presumably childless man to his nephew was possible only with the approval of a royal official.

§ 44. A sentence in another as yet unpublished Emar text reads, “Let them carry the GIŠTUKUL of (the King of) Kargamiš for the sons of my wife.”¹¹⁰ In this text, someone else is being asked to do the GIŠTUKUL for this man’s (step)-sons. The most likely explanation is that he wants his (step)sons to inherit his GIŠTUKUL, but as they are still minors, someone else must do it for them until they come of age.¹¹¹ Note in both §§ 43 and 44 that people serve as GIŠTUKUL-

¹⁰³ *ḫarakzi*. HG 57 “ausscheidet”.

¹⁰⁴ KBo 6,4 iv 15–20 (Law § XXXVII), ed. HG 56–59.

¹⁰⁵ KBo 6,4 iv 30–34 (Law § XXXIXb), ed. HG 58f.

¹⁰⁶ KBo 6,4 iii 14–20 (Law § XXX), ed. HG 54f., for the reading *EL-[LUM]* rather than *EL-[KI]* see HAB 130.

¹⁰⁷ HG 55 n. 9. This could not, however, be a case of a misdrawn sign as the signs are far too dissimilar.

¹⁰⁸ [. . .]x *karū* LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL GÌR.MEŠ *ešir nunnaš* / [. . .] KUB 40,110 obv. 4 [CTH 832, MH?/NS?).

¹⁰⁹ HCCT-E 5, ed. A. Tsukimoto, in: ASJ 6 [1984], 65–67.

¹¹⁰ HCCT-E 16:11, quoted by A. Tsukimoto, ASJ 6, 68.

¹¹¹ Cf. in the Laws of Hammurapi, in the section dealing with land allotments to soldiers.

men for the king of Kargamiš (not the Great King) and live in Emar. What the bearing of the GIŠTUKUL consisted of is unfortunately not mentioned.

§ 45. Another Emar text records that a certain Kitta from Emar enslaved himself, his father and his house, probably because of debt, to Hišmi-Tešub, brother of Ini-Tešub, King of Kargamiš. Hišmi-Tešub then got a sealed tablet recording the transaction from his brother. When both Kitta and his father were enslaved they appealed to the king. Ini-Tešub tells Hišmi-Tešub that he should know the oath (*mamitu*) of Emar. So Ini-Tešub reverses himself and orders that while Kitta shall remain a slave, his father shall be freed, and furthermore his children shall be free and inherit their grandfather's house and any house that Kitta makes while a slave. Furthermore, they should carry the GIŠTUKUL of the king *kirkirdana*.¹¹² The editor, D. Arnaud, suggests emending the hapax *kirkirdana* to the Hurrian word *kirkirrana*, which seems to be a type of war material, perhaps a type of armor.¹¹³ Perhaps bearing/wearing/making *kirkirrana* is the GIŠTUKUL-job associated with this household. Why did Ini-Tešub overturn the tablet that he himself had sealed? Perhaps the law was that a person could enslave himself but not his father and his progeny for debt servitude. If this was the case, why did the king seal an illegal tablet to start with? One wonders if it is because of the wish of the king that the GIŠTUKUL-service should continue that caused the king to reverse the tablet and save the household of Kitta from debt servitude.

§ 46. A fourth Emar text concerns a man who marries the daughter of an apparently sonless widow, Ištarte, and as a married-in son-in-law, brings a dowry with him and is adopted as son by the girl's mother.¹¹⁴ Then it turns out that he has contracted a sizeable debt which he is unable to repay and so must serve as his creditor's debt slave. This is contrary to the purpose of the marriage arrangement which was intended to provide a son to live with and work for the widow. According to the court's decision, he may take his wife with him but the dowry that he brought remains with his mother-in-law as brideprice. The text continues, "you may enter the house of another as servant/slave, you may hold?/enjoy the usufruct of? the king's GIŠTUKUL, but how can you take the daughter of Ištarte without payment?"¹¹⁵ Here, it seems that "the GIŠTUKUL

Here one reads (§ 29) "If his (a captured *redû* or *bā'iru* soldier's) son is (so) young that he is unable to carry out the obligations (*ilku*) of his father, a third part of the fields shall go to his mother so that his mother might raise him." Since a previous law (§ 27) envisions that a prisoner of war's field (in the absence of a son) will go to another person who can carry out the obligations, one assumes that in § 29 the remaining two-thirds of the field will also go to someone who can carry out the obligations. See G. Driver — J. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws* vol. 1, Oxford 1952, 117 f.

¹¹² D. Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays d'Astata/Emar*, Paris 1986 (Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, Synthèse 18, vol. 6: Textes Sumériens et Accadiens), no. 18. Cf. *ibid.* no. 19.

¹¹³ D. Arnaud, (see n. 112) 30, cf. Gl. Hourrite s. v. *karkarni* and M. Salvini, KUB 47 viii no. 100 who compares Urartian *qarqarani*.

¹¹⁴ Such a man would be called in Hittite an *L^uantiyant-*. For a discussion of this type of marriage see R. Beal, in: JCS 35 [1983], 117–119 w. nn. 23, 26, w. previous bibliography.

¹¹⁵ D. Arnaud, (see n. 112) 47f. no. 33. The verb of the sentence *ù GIŠTUKUL ša LUGAL-ri ta-kil* is unclear. "Hold" from *kullu* should be *tukâl*, while "enjoy the usufruct of"

of the king” means “royal service”. He may support himself by serving a private individual, or by entering royal service.

In summary, the GIŠTUKUL-man was someone who held a category of field, a GIŠTUKUL-field (§§ 1–5, 17). It was usually farmland, but meadow (§ 8) and orchard/woodland are also mentioned (§ 29). In return for this field the GIŠTUKUL-man had to do GIŠTUKUL-service (§§ 1–2), not to mention the *šahhan* (§§ 3, 39) and *luzzi* (§§ 4–5, 40) that seem to have been obligations of all otherwise unexempted Hittites. One might acquire a GIŠTUKUL-field by inheritance (§§ 43–44, 45?), sale (§§ 4, 39–40), by appointment by the king (§§ 1, 3, 17, 37–38, and perhaps 46), or by taking over a vacant GIŠTUKUL field (§ 1) and agreeing to do the GIŠTUKUL-service that went with the field (§ 1). A GIŠTUKUL-man was allowed to sell all or part of his field (§ 4, 39–40).¹¹⁶ In New Hittite times at Meskene, the transfer of GIŠTUKUL-fields to a nephew required royal approval (§ 43). Also at Meskene royal approval was required for someone else to do the GIŠTUKUL-service of holders of a GIŠTUKUL-field who were minors (§ 44). Should a GIŠTUKUL-field fall vacant, the king would assign a transplantee to take it over, to become a GIŠTUKUL-man, and to do the GIŠTUKUL-service (§§ 1, 3, 17, 35, 37 and perhaps 23, 33). It seems that the continuity of GIŠTUKUL-service was more important to the government than the continuity of *šahhan* (§§ 1–2).

The nature of GIŠTUKUL-service is not entirely clear. While the Sumerogram LU GIŠTUKUL literally means “man of the weapon”, there are only a few references connecting the GIŠTUKUL-man to the military. These include the Siege of Uršu text (§ 11), a poorly preserved Old Hittite annals fragment (§ 12), and one other text (§ 42). The “quiver of a GIŠTUKUL-man” may be mentioned in an Old Hittite offerings text, which also mentions “the place of the troops” (§ 13). Several texts mention that one type of military personnel, golden-chariot-fighters, had GIŠTUKUL-estates (§§ 29–30). One also finds GIŠTUKUL-men who were LÚDUGUDs¹¹⁷ and who were in charge of other lower ranking GIŠTUKUL-men (§ 9). Some of these high ranking GIŠTUKUL-men seem to have had judicial or oversight duties (§§ 9, 19?). The vast majority of references, however, refer to GIŠTUKUL-men holding a wide variety of distinctly non-military occupations. These include priests and cult functionaries and others such as cooks, bakers, chamberlains, cupbearers, waiters, scepter-bearers, water-providers, tent-keepers, tailors (?), fullers, garment-makers, custodians, runners, lookouts, horse-herds, beekeepers, and milk-producers (one of the last perhaps being a woman) (§§ 20, 21–23?, 24, 32?). While some holders of these

from *akālu* should be *takkal*. D. Arnaud opts for taking it from *kullu*. The word GIŠTUKUL also occurs in D. Arnaud (see n. 112) 118, no. 112, which reads: “Whoever among the three sons of Asdaḫi does not honor his father and mother (i.e. Asdaḫi), has no right to the dowry of my wife. Twenty (shekels) of silver as release money for his head (he shall pay) to [Asdaḫi], my wife. Let him take his GIŠTUKUL and let him place his garment in a stool and let him go where he wants.” (lines 12–18). The word GIŠTUKUL in this context seems most likely to mean “weapon”.

¹¹⁶ Presumably either the seller or the buyer had to continue to do the GIŠTUKUL-service, but unfortunately the laws do not mention the circumstances in which one or the other had to do it.

¹¹⁷ Sometimes, if not always a military rank, see Beal, Ph.D. Diss. (see n. 1), 525–541.

professions are attested as being ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men, there is some evidence that all members of a profession were not automatically ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men (§§ 26, 27?).

^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men apparently worked for the king, though not necessarily always the Great King (at Meskene, it was the king of Kargamiš §§ 43–44), and did not necessarily live in the capital (§ 20 did, §§ 43–44 did not). Some ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men may have worked for private or institutional overlords (§§ 7–8, 32–35).

Apparently many ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men had associates (^{LÚ}ḪA.LA/^{LÚ}TAPPU) (§§ 6, 18), as did others, such as the priests and weavers of certain holy cities (cited under § 6). The associate's duties are not stated. The associates were clearly subordinate, for if the association broke up, the associate only received three-tenths of the moveables (§ 6).

References to ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-men

Related to the question of what is a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-man is the question of what is a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-man. ^{LÚ}^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA literally means “man of the long weapon”. It seems again worthwhile to discuss the references to this term.

§ 47. There are only two possible references that antedate the New Hittite Period. The one reference in Old Script occurs in broken context in an offerings and festival text.¹¹⁸ The text mentions cultic personnel as well as the “mayor” (^ḪAZANNU) and “administrator” (AGRIG) of Ḫattuša.¹¹⁹ It also mentions a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL and a “quiver (of?) a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL”¹²⁰ as well as “the place of the troops”.¹²¹ The reference to ^{LÚ}.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL(?)¹²² ^{GÍD.DA-TI}M(?)¹²³ is not clear, however, due to the effaced state of the tablet. The ^{LÚ}.MEŠ and the ^{GIŠ} signs are clear but the copy shows a TUKUL sign that is not quite a TUKUL, and only three winkelhakens of the signs GÍD.DA are preserved. Furthermore the lacuna is a bit on the small side to accomodate the restoration. Thus this may be a reference to something else entirely.

§ 48. The other Old Hittite reference comes from a new Hittite copy. The context is historical. “When Ḫakkarpili went to Zalpa, . . . he said to them: ‘The King gave this to me. He holds evil [for me in his heart(?)]. Begin hostilities! He fills [. . .]. Let the sword cut [. . .] down with his posterity.’ And Kišwa said, ‘He is victorious [. . .] fr[om GN] to Mt. Tapazili. They defeated [. . .]. I will demand the ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA. Let him give [. . .] and many.’ Thus spoke Ḫakkarpili, ‘will demand [. . .] from the king.’ He (Kišwa?) replied: ‘We will [. . . as follo]ws. His weapon (^{GIŠ}TUKUL) [against?] us [. . .].’”¹²³ The context and the lack of the ^{LÚ}.MEŠ seem to indicate that the implement rather

¹¹⁸ KUB 43,29 (CTH 662,7, OS), the date is according to K. K. Riemschneider, KUB 43 p. v. n. 2. It is not, however, included by E. Neu in StBoT 25.

¹¹⁹ KUB 43,29 ii 8, iii 3 respectively.

¹²⁰ See discussion above § 13.

¹²¹ KUB 43,29 ii 11, iii 12 respectively.

¹²² KUB 43,29 ii 3.

¹²³ KBo 3,38 obv. 26–35 (CTH 3,1, Zalpa text, OH/NS), ed. StBoT 17, 8f. (“ . . . -Geräte”).

than the person is meant here. While one cannot be sure, in the context of the preparations for war, and considering the usual meaning of GIŠTUKUL is “weapon, mace”, it seems most likely that in this text a GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA is a type of weapon.

§ 49. All the remaining references are New Hittite. The most important New Hittite references come from treaties between Muršili II and his tributary kings. “If a fugitive comes from Hatti like a fugitive, pick him up and extradite him to me. If someone of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or a free/noble (LÚ^UELLU)-man, comes as a fugitive from Hapalla to Hatti, I will not give him back to you. It is not right to give a fugitive back from Hatti. But if he is a farmer or a weaver (or) a leatherworker, whatever kind of workman (EN QÁTI) he is, (if) he does not ‘bring’ work, and he flees and comes to Hatti, I will pick him up and give him back to you.”¹²⁴ From this text it seems clear that while there was a difference between a “freeman/noble” and a GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man, these two seem to have had much more in common with each other than either did with ordinary artisans or farmers. That is, the fundamental difference seems to have been between the LÚ^UELLU and GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men on one side and the artisans and farmers on the other. This treaty paragraph also reminds one of the passage from a Middle Hittite treaty with the Kaška in which the term GIŠTUKUL-man for the Hittites is paralleled in the reciprocal section by the term LÚ^UELLU for the Kaška (see above § 18, cf. also § 41).

§ 50. A cult inventory reads: “In Walma the king places the following for the gods: One house including ten transplantees (NAM.RA), GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA[-men]; one house including sixteen transplantees of mountain men; one house including ten transplantees, slaves/servants (İR.MEŠ) of Mr. Innarā; one house including four transplantees of the priest (LÚ^USANGA); one house including ten transplantees, weavers of the king. Total five houses including fifty transplantees. There are fifty sheep from before. Fourteen oxen including four plow oxen the King of Tummana will give.”¹²⁵

§ 51. A later paragraph in the same text reads, “[In GN] the king placed the following [for the gods]: two houses of twenty transplantees, GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA; [. . . UK]U.UŠ[-troops(?)] of the king; one house including ten transplantees of spear-men.”¹²⁶

§ 52. A passage in another text is similar. The heading of the paragraph is broken away. It begins, “ten transplantees of [. . .]/ten transplantees of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA . . . /ten transplantees of the shepherd of the house(?) [of . . .]/ten transplantees of the town of Hatar [. . .]/ten transplantees of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA [. . .]/ten transplantees of the land of Išmiri[ka . . .]”¹²⁷

§ 53. Yet another text has in broken context, “thirty transplantees, ten transplantees GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA . . .”¹²⁸

¹²⁴ KBo 5,4 obv. 35–40 (Targ. § 7). ed. SV 1 58f.; and parallel KUB 6,44 iv 35–45, w. dupl. KUB 19,54 i 1–7 (Kup. § 23), ed. SV 1 140f.

¹²⁵ KUB 48,105 obv. 31–35, ed. A. Archi – H. Klengel, in: *AoF* VII [1980], 144, 148 (differently).

¹²⁶ KUB 48,105 rev. 3f., ed. Archi – Klengel, *AoF* VII, 145, 148.

¹²⁷ KUB 26, 54:1–6 (CTH 237,1), translit. HAB 123 and Mestieri 34.

¹²⁸ KUB 51,47 obv. 18, translit. HAB 123 (as Bo 838). It is possible to read the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA] of this text as GIŠTUKUL-*l*[i].

It is unclear whether the professions listed in the texts cited in §§ 49–52 are the professions in which these transplantees will serve the deity. That is, do the gods have their own GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men and spear-men? This might be possible, but do the gods also have their own “weavers of the king” and “[. . . UK]U.UŠ?[-troops(?)] of the king”? Can one be simultaneously the king” and “of the deity”? On the other hand, it seems more likely that this text indicates the professions held by these transplantees before they were given to the deity. This also involves the problem of whether the word “transplantee” (NAM-RA) can refer not just to those uprooted from their recently conquered homeland and transported to and settled in Hatti, but also to persons living in Hatti who have been uprooted and transported to a different part of Hatti. Thus it is not clear from these texts whether these people were GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men until given to the gods or became GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men on being given to the gods.

§ 54. One very fragmentary reference from the Tiliura edict reads, “[. . .]/ taken with a weapon (GIŠTUKUL) [. . .] / the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men wh[o(m) . . .]/.”¹²⁹ This calls to mind the reference quoted above § 23, where it seems that men “taken with a weapon” were settled as GIŠTUKUL-men. Thus perhaps the Tiliura edict gives evidence for transplantees carried off from a conquered land being made into GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men.

§ 55. The royal confirmation of the will of general Šaḫurunuwa contains a passage which reads, “The towns of Ḫarinima, Waššanza, Wiyanawanta, Ḫattuša, W[a- . . .], Lī, Šallešša, Murašši, [. . .] and the sheep-pens (GIŠSÚ-PU-RI^{HIA} which the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men held, these belong/remain to Šaḫurunuwa.”¹³⁰ It seems probable, considering the past tense of the verb, that the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men held these pens etc. before they were acquired by Šaḫurunuwa.¹³¹ The text, however, does attest to the fact that the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men held [. . .] and sheep-pens.

§ 56. A section of a text known as “the cult of Tešub and Hepat of Aleppo” mentions GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men in a list. This list has the form “GN, so and so has/holds”. For example, “GN, the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men of the town of Katapa have/hold.”¹³² Several lines later the same people “have/hold” a different city.¹³³ Others “having/holding” GNs include, “PN, the wood-tablet scribe”, “the weavers”, PN₂ and the merchants”, “the men of the palace of Šapinuwa”, “the men of the palace of Šulupašši”, “the GAL *MEŠEDI*” (one of the highest military and political officers of the state), “PN₃ son of PN₄”, “PN₅ son of PN₆”, “PN₇ the chariot-driver”, “PN₈ son of PN₉”, and “the men of *ḫekur* Pirwa”.¹³⁴ Thus this list includes military personnel, both high and relatively low, as well as civilians. These are probably the people responsible for

¹²⁹ KUB 21,29 i 24f. (CTH 89, Ḫatt. III), tr. Kaškäer 146 (“Bauern(?)”).

¹³⁰ KUB 26,43 obv. 15–17, w. dupl. KUB 26,50 obv. 5f. (CTH 225, Tudḫ. IV), ed. F. Imparati, in: RHA 32 [1974], 24f.; note the collation by H. Ehelolf, cited by F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB 123, but missed by F. Imparati, which fills in part of the lacuna in F. Imparati’s edition.

¹³¹ Accepted by F. Sommer, HAB 123.

¹³² KBo 14, 142 iv 13, translit. Mestieri 33.

¹³³ KBo 14,142 ib 16, translit. Mestieri 33.

¹³⁴ KBo 14,142 iv 5–18, also probably iv 21–23.

the sacrifices in these places.¹³⁵ It is unclear whether or not these people also own these villages.

§ 57. A similar, but less well preserved text also includes GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men in its list. The list also includes an [UGULA] *LIM* (a military officer)¹³⁶, a chariot-driver, and a carpenter.¹³⁷

§ 58. A cult inventory also mentions a GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man. Each paragraph of the text refers to a deity, the number of festivals celebrated to this deity and when they are to be held. It then continues, “One ox, two measures (*PARISU*) of flour, and two *PIHU*-vessels of beer the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men customarily give.”¹³⁸

§ 59. The term occurs in several other texts as a means of identifying a person. “The woman *Huwattanza* of the house of Mr. *Muwalani* the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man in *Dupizal[ma]*.”¹³⁹ “[One female singer of the house of Mr. . . .]-*nati* the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man . . .”¹⁴⁰ [. . .]a of *Pazzu*, the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man . . .”¹⁴¹ “One female singer, village/town of *Waddumatwa*, of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA.”¹⁴²

§ 60. A text of unknown nature mentions scattered throughout what remains of this text, the palace, queen, city, lord, Stormgod, and governor as well as the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man. Unfortunately no connected sense can be made from this fragment.¹⁴³

In summary the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man, literally “man of the long weapon” is mentioned exclusively in New Hittite texts, with the possible exception of two questionable Old Hittite references (§§ 47–48), one of which is in Old Script (§ 47). Like the GIŠTUKUL-man, the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man is in some way like a freeman/noble (*LÚELLU*) (§§ 18, 49). The *LÚELLU* and the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man are to be distinguished from ordinary artisans and farmers (§ 49). New GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men, like new GIŠTUKUL-men, may have been created when transplantees were resettled, but the evidence is not clear (§§ 50–53). The evidence is also unclear whether the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man worked for himself, the king and/or the gods. GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men occur in contexts which list together both military and civilian personnel

¹³⁵ V. Souček – J. Siegelová, in: *ArOr* 42 [1974], 45, argue that these are the places responsible for the cult of the Weathergod of Aleppo.

¹³⁶ For this officer see Beal, Ph.D., Diss. (see n. 1) 516–524.

¹³⁷ KBo 22, 218 obv. 2–9, esp. obv. 6.

¹³⁸ [URU]x-*ha-aš-x* 3 EZEN.HIA 1 EZEN *zé-ni* 1 EZEN [. . .] 1 GUD 2 UDU.HIA 2 P[A Z]ÍD.DA 2 DUG KA.DÜ LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA [SUM-*kán-zi*] . . . § HUR-SAGŠi-ni-pa-la-x x EZEN.HIA 1 EZEN *zé-ni e-x* [. . .] 2 PA ZÍD.DA 2 DUG K[A].DÜ LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA SUM-*kán-zi* [. . .] . . . § [URU . . . x EZE]N. HIA 1 EZEN *zé-ni* 1 EZ[EN . . .]/[. . . DUG K]A.DÜ LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL. GÍD.DA¹ [SUM-*kán-zi* . . .] . . . KBo 13,231 obv.? 4f., 8f., 13f. (CTH 530).

¹³⁹ KBo 10,10 iii–iv 15 (CTH 235,1), translit. Mestieri 34.

¹⁴⁰ [. . .]x-a Š[A] mPazzu LÚ GIŠTUK[UL.GÍD.DA . . .]/[. . .]x-ta 1 SALŠİR URU*Ašašha-x*[. . .] / [. . .]-*nati* LÚ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.[D]A 1 SALŠİR URUx[. . .] / [. . .] mTuttu 1 SALŠİR Š[A] x-daya É N[A₄. . .] / [. . .]-*entašša* 1 SALŠİR [UR]U[?]*Šišarman* [. . .] / [. . .UR]U *Armatana* [. . .] / Š[A] mPiy[a . . .]x-enkel[. . .] KBo 12,67 + KUB 31, 60: 8–14, esp. line 10.

¹⁴¹ KUB 31,60: 8, translit. in previous note.

¹⁴² HT 2 ii 15f., translit. Mestieri 34.

¹⁴³ KBo 13,150 esp. line 8 (CTH 832).

(§§ 56–57). The duties of a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-man, other than providing offerings on a festival (§ 58) are never mentioned. The ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-implement itself is mentioned only once. It is found in an Old Hittite composition (in New Script copy) in military context (§ 48). It therefore may have been a weapon. ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-men are occasionally mentioned in different places in the same text as ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men,¹⁴⁴ which makes less likely the possibility that the two were mere graphic variants of one another.

References to the EN/BĒL ^{GIŠ}TUKUL/BĒL LÚ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL

The term EN ^{GIŠ}TUKUL means literally “lord (i.e., owner) of a weapon”. Does this have anything to do with the LÚ^{GIŠ}TUKUL, literally “man of the weapon”? It should be remembered that the term by extension could also mean “master of a ^{GIŠ}TUKUL(-estate/job)”. The references will be discussed below.

§ 61. The term occurs in the Old Hittite anecdotes text: “I was a *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.”¹⁴⁵ The context is otherwise broken and unclear.

§ 62. In Middle Hittite texts the term is relatively common. In the Madduwatta text, the king quotes part of Madduwatta’s tributary treaty with the Hittites. “[If someone] of Hatti comes as a fugitive [to you], whether he is a *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL [or a . . .], do not conceal [him].”¹⁴⁶ This recalls the extradition clauses in other treaties which mention either ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-men or ^{GIŠ}TUKUL.GÍD.DA-men (§§ 18, 49).

§ 63. An instruction text reads, “[If] an EN ^{GIŠ}TUKUL takes it into his mind [to steal . . .], they blind him and [. . .]. Whatever he has taken they give it all a second time.”¹⁴⁷

§ 64. PN the *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL is mentioned in the Instructions against Mita of Paḫḫuwa. The exceedingly fragmentary context which surrounds the phrase may indicate that this person was an enemy of the Hittites.¹⁴⁸

§ 65. A *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL is mentioned in broken context in the “Instructions for a Governor of a Border Province”. He is mentioned in a context with servants (SAG.GEMÉ.İR.MEŠ), cattle, plowing and springtime.¹⁴⁹

§ 66. A New Hittite list of households mentions EN ^{GIŠ}TUKULs. “mPN_{1–4} [. . .], ¹PN_{5–7} [. . .] including ¹2? men, 2 male children, the EN ^{GIŠ}TUKUL for

¹⁴⁴ KBo 5,4 obv. 35–40 (our § 49) and *ibid.* rev. 51 (our § 37); see also our §§ 33 f. and 50 f.

¹⁴⁵ § [. . .m. . .]šun ^mKilentiunn-a AḫI LUGAL [. . .]

[. . .] šer-ma LUGAL-i-ma arandati [. . .]

[. . .] AḫIYA takkaniasšaš parḫuššuš [. . .]

[. . .] ūk *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL ešun āppa-ma tak[. . .]

[. . .-ḫa]ḫat āppa-ma LUGAL-uš DUMU-aššan pa-x[. . .] §

KBo 3,35 (=BoTU 12B) i 6–10 (CTH 8B, anecdotes, OH/NS).

¹⁴⁶ KUB 14,1 obv. 34 f. (MH/MS), ed. Madd. 8 f. (“Waffen-Herr”).

¹⁴⁷ KUB 13,9 iv 5–8 (CTH 258,1, instr. Tudḫ. II), ed. E. von Schuler, in: FsFriedrich 448, 451 (tr. EN ^{GIŠ}TUKUL as “Eigentümer von Kleinbürgerland(?)”).

¹⁴⁸ KUB 23,72 obv. 3 (CTH 146, MH/MS), tr. Gurney, AAA 28, 33 (tr. *BĒL* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL as “master craftsman”).

¹⁴⁹ KUB 13,1 iv 25 (CTH 261, MH/MS), translit. Dienstanw. 62.

him¹⁵⁰ is his 'x', a female miller [... m/fP]N₈ and mPN₁ [...] § mPN₉₋₁₀ 2 [male] chi[ldren ...] fPN₁₁₋₁₂ 2 female children [...] a female miller, a plow ox, 2 cows, [...], fPN₁₃₋₁₅ [...], an EN GIŠTUKUL, a brewer [...] PN₉ and [...]."¹⁵¹

§ 67. Another text has a fragment of a very similar list, reading: "[...] male children, an EN GIŠTUKUL, a brewer [...]."¹⁵²

These texts remind one of the lists of families given to temples, which, since they include GIŠTUKUL-men and GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men, were quoted above. The texts are rather cryptic and sufficiently broken to make any interpretation very uncertain. It seems possible to translate, "the EN GIŠTUKUL is a brewer". Alternatively taking the most complete part of § 66 as a paradigm one could translate "His (lit. to him an) EN GIŠTUKUL is a brewer." (Cf. similarly above § 32). Or one person in the household was an EN GIŠTUKUL and another was a brewer. The parallelism with other lists of households and the fact that in the text cited in § 67 the people seem to be totaled as SAG.DU "head",¹⁵³ a term often used of dependents, are the only evidence that these people might have worked for a temple or the king.

§ 68. A fragmentary unpublished text reads, "[...]x seven EN GIŠTUKULs / [...] was picked u[p(?)] / [...] one] singer, one cook, one baker(?) / [...]x] brewer, one x-man/."¹⁵⁴

§ 69. An equally broken text, perhaps an instruction text, reads enigmatically, "if [then(?)] he sleeps there, but if [...] of a BĒL GIŠTUKUL [...]."¹⁵⁵

§ 70. A further reference to a BĒL GIŠTUKUL is found as usual, in broken context. The preceding paragraph describes sacrifices to various deities. After the paragraph line we find auspices watching. A falcon is mentioned. Another line reports that "it/he sat elsewhere on the GIŠTUKUL." Two lines later "that GIŠTUKUL (acc.)" is referred to. In between, the EN/BĒL GIŠTUKUL is twice mentioned.¹⁵⁶ The GIŠTUKUL referred to here could be a GIŠTUKUL-field on

¹⁵⁰ F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri* 34, assumes that the -šī "for him" is to be read -LIM, an Akkadian phonetic complement. The problem is that EN GIŠTUKUL's presumed Akkadian equivalent, *bēl kakki* does not end in -l-.

¹⁵¹ KUB 48,117:5-14.

¹⁵² KUB 42,82: 8 (CTH 237,8).

¹⁵³ KUB 42,82: 5, 10, 13.

¹⁵⁴ 74/c iv 7-10, translit. HAB 128. Baker(?) is here written LŪNINDA rather than the expected LŪNINDA.DŪ.DŪ. A reading LŪGAR = *šaknu* seems inappropriate in this context.

¹⁵⁵ *nu mān* / [...] *ap*] *iya šeši mān ŠA BĒL GIŠTUKUL=ma* / [...] KBo 22,235 rev. 7 f.

¹⁵⁶ [...]x-izzi-pat 3 UDU pāi ŠA.BA 1 UDU ANA dI[M]
[...]UDJU? ANA dUTU 1 MÁŠ.GAL ANA dLAMMA

[...] LŪ.MEŠMUŠE]N.DŪ=ma-kan ÍD-az šarā uškanzi nuzan a-x[...]
[...]x LŪ.MEŠMUŠEN.DŪ (erasure) ANA GIŠTUKUL.ĪIA SŪR.DŪ.A[MUŠEN. ...]
[...]x *kattan walkat parā* [...]
[...]x *damēta ANA GIŠTUKUL ešat nu* [...]
[...]*aluš ANA EN GIŠTUKUL i-x*[...]
[...]x-anza *nikan BĒL GIŠTUKUL x*[...]
[...]-zi *apūn GIŠTUKUL* [...]
[...]-lu-u[š?]

KUB 49,3 ii 4-13.

which the augury was conducted.¹⁵⁷ In which case the *BĒL/EN GIŠTUKUL* would be the possessor of the estate and thus *EN GIŠTUKUL* would be a synonym or virtual synonym of *GIŠTUKUL-man* (*LÚGIŠTUKUL*). On the other hand, perhaps this is a ritual. Someone, perhaps the one for whom the ritual is being performed, sets up his weapon and it is around this weapon that the actions of birds are observed. Further texts of this type are needed for us to know if the *BĒL/EN GIŠTUKUL* mentioned in this text has anything to do with the *BĒL/EN GIŠTUKUL* in the other examples cited above.

§ 71. One further example is important. This comes from the Middle Hittite “Instructions for Governors of Border Provinces” and is again in broken context. Following a paragraph describing the governor’s duty toward newly resettled transplantees, it reads, “at [that time?] the *BĒL LÚ GIŠTUKUL* [. . .]s fields, orchard, garden [. . .]. The ‘lord of the palace’ [. . .]s oxen and sheep.”¹⁵⁸ Unlike all of the previously cited examples, this person’s title is not literally “the owner/master of the weapon”, but “the master of the *GIŠTUKUL-men*”.¹⁵⁹ As we have seen above, settled transplantees often were made into *GIŠTUKUL-men*. In this text we see a “master of *GIŠTUKUL-men*” mentioned immediately after the settlement of transplantees. Furthermore he is mentioned having something to do with field, orchard and garden. In this context, one wonders if the “master of the *GIŠTUKUL-men*” is some sort of official in charge of overseeing these transplantees, now become *GIŠTUKUL-men*. On the other hand, the formation is odd. No other Hittite official has a title *BĒL/EN LÚ(MEŠ)X*.¹⁶⁰ For this reason, it is perhaps better to assume that the scribe wrote the *EN* of *EN GIŠTUKUL*, then changed his mind and wrote *LÚGIŠTUKUL*, forgetting to erase the *EN*.

In summary, since all references to the *EN GIŠTUKUL* are in fragmentary context, all inferences drawn from them must be considered very tentative. An *EN GIŠTUKUL* is mentioned in the context of a treaty as a possible fugitive from Hatti (§ 62). This is reminiscent of extradition clauses in treaties which mention either *GIŠTUKUL-men* or *GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men*. The *EN GIŠTUKUL* also occurs in lists of people, which bear a resemblance to lists of people who are being given to a temple (§§ 66–68) and who often include *GIŠTUKUL-men* or *GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men*. In these contexts, in fact, the *EN GIŠTUKUL* seems to be similar to the ordinary *LÚGIŠTUKUL*. One wonders if the “man of the *GIŠTUKUL*”, who seems as a matter of course to have held a *GIŠTUKUL-*

¹⁵⁷ Perhaps supporting ‘this!’ are two lines on the reverse: [. . .]*xMUŠEN=ma BÀD-ešni ešari* [. . .] / [. . .]*x URU-ri anda uškizzi našma* [. . .] “The [. . .]-bird sits on the wall. He looks [. . .] into the city or [. . .]” KUB 49,3 iii 5–6.

¹⁵⁸ KUB 13,2 iii 42f. (MH/NS), ed. Dienstanw. 49 (“der Herr eines(?) Kleinbauern(?)”).

¹⁵⁹ Actually “master of the *GIŠTUKUL-man*”. However the plural *MEŠ* is often left out in phrases such as *GAL LÚMEŠEDI* (KUB 2,5 ii 20) beside the technically more correct *GAL LÚMEŠMEŠEDI* (KUB 11, 13 v 9); *GAL LÚKARTAPPI* (KBo 18,4 obv. 2) versus *GAL LÚMEŠKARTAPPI* (KBo 12,135 vi 12); *GAL LÚSAGI* (KUB 20,70 vi 8) versus *GAL LÚMEŠSAGI* (KUB 10,13 iv 16); *UGULA LÚGIŠBANŠUR* (KUB 20,70 vi 7) versus *UGULA LÚMEŠGIŠBANŠUR* (KUB 20,28 i 15); *UGULA LÚIGI.MUŠEN* (KBo 24,129 i 9) versus *UGULA LÚMEŠIGI.MUŠEN* 24, 126 obv. 16).

¹⁶⁰ The closest one comes is *EN.ERÍN.MEŠ*, however there is no *LÚ* in this phrase, and *ERÍN.MEŠ* means “troops” and is not a professional designation.

field and performed GIŠTUKUL-service, could also have been called a “master of a GIŠTUKUL-(field/job)”. In addition there may have been an official called “the master of the GIŠTUKUL-men” (EN LÚ GIŠTUKUL) (§ 71), who if he existed, may have had some sort of oversight responsibilities over GIŠTUKUL-men.

The meaning of LÚ GIŠTUKUL, LÚ GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA and EN GIŠTUKUL

It is certainly true, as F. Sommer pointed out, that the GIŠTUKUL-man and the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man as seen in the majority of our texts have nothing whatsoever to do with the military. Furthermore many GIŠTUKUL-men can easily be shown to have a GIŠTUKUL-duty to perform some very unwarlike professions. However, contra F. Sommer, GIŠTUKUL-men do seem on occasion to occur in military context. GIŠTUKUL-men are found in a text dealing with Muršili I's(?) wars in Syria (§ 12).¹⁶¹ Unfortunately this text is too fragmentary to know exactly what is occurring in it. An overseer of GIŠTUKUL-men may well be mentioned in the Siege of Uršu text, if one accepts an emendation (§ 11). A third Old Hittite text, published long after F. Sommer's work, shows that some GIŠTUKUL-men held a rank above other GIŠTUKUL-men. Furthermore the specific higher ranking GIŠTUKUL-men mentioned are said to be LÚDUGUDs, a title referring sometimes, if not always, to a military rank. The text itself, however, is not otherwise military (§ 9). An Old Hittite offerings text mentions “the quiver of a GIŠTUKUL”. This text later mentions “the place of the troops”, which further points to the idea that the GIŠTUKUL with the quiver was a military person (§ 13). In New Hittite times the GIŠTUKUL-estates belonging to golden-chariot-fighters (LÚIŠ KÙ.SIG₁₇) are twice mentioned (§§ 29, 30). Two other texts have a vaguely military ring to them (§§ 42, 43). Unfortunately none of these texts is entirely conclusive. It remains the case that the majority of references to GIŠTUKUL-men are in non-military context.

Were the GIŠTUKUL-men “craftsmen/artisans”? It is easily demonstrable that there were craftsmen who were GIŠTUKUL-men. A tailor(?), fuller, leatherworker (§§ 20–21), wickerworker (§ 23), cooks, and bakers (§ 24) seem to have been GIŠTUKUL-men. However, one also finds waiters, chamberlains, exorcists, scribes, custodians, scepter-bearers, cupbearers, runners, lookouts, clowns, and cultic functionaries (§§ 20, 21, 23, 24). None of these could be called “craftsmen” or “artisans”. Thus as F. Sommer himself realized, the translation “craftsman/artisan” is inadequate. Only a translation such as “someone who does something professionally” will fit this diverse group of people. We have also seen that LÚDUGUD-officers and golden-chariot-fighters could be GIŠTUKUL-men. Who, then, is excluded by a translation “someone who does something professionally”? In this context one should note text § 26, which lists a priest, [. . .],

¹⁶¹ This text, then unpublished, was cited by F. Sommer, HAB 122, as Bo 479. However he cites only the single badly broken line in which the word occurs, the surrounding military context was either not given to him by H. Ehelolf or was left unquoted by F. Sommer.

a custodian (and) a GIŠTUKUL-man, apparently as separate entries. We saw above that custodians could be GIŠTUKUL-men (§ 22), while here a GIŠTUKUL-man, and a custodian appear side by side. If the entries are indeed separate, then some custodians were GIŠTUKUL-men and some were not.

What then made a GIŠTUKUL-man different from any other? It seems that the clue lies in the Laws. A GIŠTUKUL-man was most obviously a man who held a category of field, in return for which he had to do GIŠTUKUL-service, over and above the *šahhan* and *luzzi* which he and all other non-exempted Hittites were expected to do. It is these GIŠTUKUL-services that show the great diversity seen above. The other noticeable characteristic of GIŠTUKUL-men is that they seem often to have had subordinate "associates" (^{LÜ}HA.LA/^{LÜ}TAPPU). It seems that these two characteristics of the GIŠTUKUL-man may provide the clues to the solution of the problem. A GIŠTUKUL-man seems to have been someone who performed a particular job for the king (or an institution or private magnate in the case of those given in land grants). Instead of being paid directly in money or rations for his labor (a system bureaucratically demanding if done on a large scale, especially in a pre-monetary society), the GIŠTUKUL-man was paid in land. From this land he was expected to support himself and his family.¹⁶² In some cases a man's duties might have allowed him the time to farm it himself. Alternatively, members of his family might have farmed it for him. Another obvious possibility is that he could have share-cropped his field. The person who did the farming in return for a percentage of the yield would have been the man known as "the associate" (^{LÜ}HA.LA/^{LÜ}TAPPU).

It could be argued that since the GIŠTUKUL-man could sell his field, the land could not belong to the king. However, since the duty went with the field, the king continued to get his work. Perhaps, as long as the king got this work, he did not try to regulate who performed it. This may have been changed by New-Hittite times, for Emar documents show that permission of the government in Kargamiš was necessary to pass one's GIŠTUKUL-land to a nephew or in getting someone else to do the GIŠTUKUL of a minor son who had inherited GIŠTUKUL-land (§§ 43–44). A sale of part of the land presents more of a problem. As long as the original holder continued to do the work, there would be no problem as far as the government was concerned. The problem would arise if something were to happen to the GIŠTUKUL-man, in which case the king would get back a field reduced in size. One may presume that this happened rarely enough that the king was not overly concerned. Perhaps this lack of concern has to do

¹⁶² See already Goetze, in: NHF 28, Diakonoff, MIO 13, 336 w. n. 66; idem, Oikumene 3, 50. F. Imparati, JESHO 25, 226–230, comes to the exact opposite conclusion, namely that GIŠTUKUL-men were ordinary villagers and *ILKU*-men were those who had received land grants-in-pay. For discussion of some of her arguments see above nn. 45, 46, 50. A. Goetze's further statements about the GIŠTUKUL-man deserve comment. He claims that "their production satisfied the needs of the country, both military and civilian; a surplus may have been handed over to merchants" for export. This is, in my opinion, far fetched. One suspects that while many government employees were paid via the GIŠTUKUL-institution, others may have received rations. Furthermore, there were artisans (*BEL QATI*), workers, (^{LÜ}KIN), etc., who do not seem to have been GIŠTUKUL-men. It seems highly likely that much of Hittite non-luxury production was done on a local private basis.

with the fact that land at the Hittite king's disposal seems to have been plentiful. (Witness the large number of transplantees brought to Hatti.) Thus if the king wished to install a new GIŠTUKUL-man in a field that had been diminished by its former holder, the king could merely add a piece of land from elsewhere. The exact legal rights of a GIŠTUKUL-man to the land are far from clear and the evidence that the field was a land grant-in-pay seems to be too strong to overrule. Thus it seems that many people working at a large number of jobs for the Hittite government received land allotments instead of pay.

How did the term GIŠTUKUL-man, literally "man of the weapon", come to be employed for people with such varying professions? Since the army is usually one of any government's largest sets of employees, the system of land grant-in-pay has always been a favorite way of supporting troops. It is administratively easier to support troops in this manner than it is by direct rations/pay (although some potential for rapidity of mobilization is lost). It also provides a better quality of soldier, free to campaign in any season, than does the levy of the general citizen body. A system of land grants-in-pay was the basis of the army of Hammurapi of Babylon.¹⁶³ It was also employed on a small scale by the Neo-Assyrian kings.¹⁶⁴ The Achaemenid Persians used a form of this system known as a *hadru*-association.¹⁶⁵ The Hellenistic form was known as a *klerouchy*.¹⁶⁶ Byzantine Emperor Heraklius introduced a system of land grants-in-pay into his empire.¹⁶⁷ A system of this sort was also used in China.¹⁶⁸ The late Byzantine *pronoia*,¹⁶⁹ the Ottoman *sipahi-timar*,¹⁷⁰ the medieval Islamic *iqṭāʿ*,¹⁷¹ and the medieval European *fief* were all variations on this theme. It seems likely that the land grant-in-pay

¹⁶³ For the Babylonians as well as the Hittites see Diakonoff, *Oikumene* 3, 50f. For land grants to Old Babylonian troops see R. Harris, *Ancient Sippar: A Demographic Study of an Old Babylonian City (1894–1595 B.C.)*, Leiden 1975, (PIHANSt 36), 101, 109–111. See also S. M. Voth, *Analysis of Military Titles and Functions in Published Texts of the Old Babylonian Period*, Ph.D. Diss., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1982, (Univ. Microfilm no. 8222517), 63 § 3.

¹⁶⁴ J. N. Postgate, *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire*, Rome 1974, (Studia Pohl, Series Maior 3), 223.

¹⁶⁵ M. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Firm and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, Leiden 1985 (PIHANST 54), 25f. = idem, *Management and Politics in Later Achaemenid Babylonia: New Texts from the Murašû Archive*, Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Michigan, Ann. Arbor 1974 (Univ. Microfilms no. 74-25336), 15; and G. Cardascia, *Les Archives des Murašû, une famille d'hommes d'affaires babyloniens à l'époque Perse (455–403 av. J.-C.)*, Paris 1951, 8; idem, in: *Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique*, Paris 1977, (Colloques Nationaux du CNRS 936), 1–10.

¹⁶⁶ G. T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge 1935, 114–118, 148ff.; G. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies*, Wiesbaden 1978 (Historia Einzelschriften 30), 51f., discusses whether there was a military obligation for holders of a *klēros*.

¹⁶⁷ G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, New Brunswick 1969, 97f.

¹⁶⁸ E. Balazs, *Le traité économique du "Souei-Chou"*, Leiden 1953, (Études sur la société et l'économie de la Chine médiévale 1) 143–147. See also Ph. Kuhn, *Rebellion and Its Enemies in Late Imperial China*, Cambridge, Mass., 1970 (Harvard East Asian Series 49), 20–22.

¹⁶⁹ A. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire*, Princeton 1977, 4f.

¹⁷⁰ The Ottomans also had salaried Janissaries. For a discussion of the *timar* see H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600*, London 1973, 107f.

¹⁷¹ C. Cahen, "iqṭāʿ", in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 3, Leiden 1970, 1088–1091.

system was introduced into Hatti as a system for supporting a section of the army. Thus it was termed “weapon (service)” (GIŠTUKUL). This system of land grants-in-pay was soon extended to many other people serving the government.¹⁷² Even those serving individuals and institutions were sometimes paid in this manner. Since the system had originated in the military sector, their labor was also termed “weapon (service)”, and they, like their military counterparts, were termed “men of the weapon (service)”,¹⁷³ even though they had nothing to do with the military. We have already noted that there is some evidence for GIŠTUKUL-men in military context. There is also some evidence for holders of two military titles holding GIŠTUKUL-estates. This is still very little evidence on which to posit that the Hittites continued employing troops supported by land grants-in-pay through the period for which we have evidence. It is possible, considering the scarcity of firm evidence, that indeed the system had fallen from use by the military while continuing to flourish in the civilian sphere. On the other hand, Hittite texts say remarkably little about how any Hittite troops were paid. It seems possible that while most of the GIŠTUKUL-men appearing in our texts were doing GIŠTUKUL-service unrelated to the military, others, still comparatively invisible in the texts, were receiving their land for soldiering. Perhaps A. Götze was correct in equating the GIŠTUKUL-man with the *šariku-, šarikuwa(i)-man/soldier. Still, the texts available today present good evidence only for the military origin and civilian usage of the land grant-in-pay system.

What of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man? F. Sommer’s translation “farmer” is still in current use.¹⁷⁴ As mentioned, this translation is based on his understanding of a passage in the Targašnalli treaty. I will translate the crucial passage again here. “If someone of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or a free man comes as a fugitive from Hapalla to Hatti, I will not give him back to you. To give back a fugitive from Hatti is not right. But if **he** is a farmer or a weaver (or) a leatherworker, whatever sort of workman, and he does not [bring(?)] work(?), and he flees and comes to Hatti, I will pick him up and give him back to you.”¹⁷⁵ As we have seen S. Sommer¹⁷⁶ argued that the underlined pronoun “he” must have an antecedent in the nouns “of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or a free man.” He ruled out as possible antecedents the “someone” (*kuiški*) since it is “attributiv-adjektivisch” and “as a fugitive” since it is an adverb. Therefore, he argued, “of the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men or a freeman” is identical in meaning with “farmer or weaver (or) leather-worker, whatever sort of

¹⁷² Note that the Achaemenid *hadru*-system was used to pay craftsmen as well as the military, as may be seen from the names of *hadru* associations (for a list, see Stolper [see n. 165] 72–79 = Diss. 113–118). Also note that Ottoman bureaucrats, princesses and harem women, as well as soldiers, could receive a *timar* or the larger *zi‘amet*, see H. A. R. Gibb – H. Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, vol. 1/1, Oxford 1951, 47f., 150. The medieval European sergeantry-fief, originally a way of supporting servants of all types, was also used to support military personnel, see F. Pollock – F. Maitland, *The History of English Law*, vol. 1, Cambridge 21898, 282–290.

¹⁷³ Diakonoff, *Oikumene* 3, 50f., 87.

¹⁷⁴ HW 284, 297 (“Mann des langen Werkzeuges = Bauer(?)”); Kaššäer 146 i 25; Archi – Klengel, *AoF* VII, 148 obv. 32, rev. 3 (“Bauern(?)”).

¹⁷⁵ See above § 49.

¹⁷⁶ HAB 131.

workman.” However, contrary to F. Sommer, the immediate antecedent to the underlined “he” is the noun “fugitive” (^{LÚ}MUNNABTUM) in the preceding line. Thus there is no reason for the two lines to have same meaning. Furthermore, it seems unlikely in a legal text, which is after all what a treaty is, that the author would have used two different phrases with the same meaning within two lines of each other. To do so would cause confusion. Thus it seems that GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man and “free” man are somehow on a different plane from farmers and various types of artisans, or at least from those who “do not [bring(?)] work(?)”. It thus appears to me that F. Sommer’s attempt to translate ^{LÚ}GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA as “farmer” is very poorly founded.

How then should one understand the term GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man? Unlike the term GIŠTUKUL-man, which is well attested in all periods, there is only one questionable reference in Old Hittite, while all the remainder are New Hittite. At least some GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men appear to have held land (or at least the sheep-pens on land) (§ 55). Some may have originated as transplantees (§ 54). Both of these are characteristics of GIŠTUKUL-men as well. They seem to be differentiated from farmers and artisans (*BĒL QĀTI*), although farmers and artisans who bring(?) work(?) may be a subcategory of GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men and “free” men (§ 49), GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men were also given to deities (§§ 50–63), although it is unclear if they remained GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-men while in the service of the deity. They occur in lists which include both military and civilian personnel (§§ 56–57). The only clue is from a reference in an Old Hittite text to a GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-implement (§ 48). The military context in which this object is mentioned makes it most likely that it was a type of weapon. Perhaps then the Sumerogram GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA originally referred to a type of weapon. A GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man would then have been one who carried this type of weapon. Perhaps they received a special type of land grant-in-pay, and perhaps this was also extended to civilians. One may guess that the title GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man once had military significance, but it is unclear on current evidence whether during the period covered by our texts the GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man always, sometimes, or never was associated with the military.

Finally we come to the “master of the GIŠTUKUL-men” (*BĒL LÚ GIŠTUKUL*) and the “master of a GIŠTUKUL” (*BĒL GIŠTUKUL*). If the former title existed at all, then F. Sommer was probably correct that he was some sort of supervisor over GIŠTUKUL-men and/or their land. All references to the latter are in broken context. Most give a vague impression of its being a variant writing of “GIŠTUKUL-man”. Finally, from Middle Babylonian Alalakh, a then independent state that had earlier been (and was to be later) under Hittite domination, come references to “the *hapiru*-troops of the master of the GIŠTUKULs of the city, of the city GN”¹⁷⁷ A list of names follows. One text totals these as “twenty troops”.¹⁷⁸ Thus at Alalakh, a “master of GIŠTUKULs” seems to have been a military officer. In Hatti, a possible connection with the military can only be shown indirectly through their connection to GIŠTUKUL-men.

¹⁷⁷ AT 180: 1 f., AT 181: 1, AT 182: 1, copies, D. J. Wiseman, in: JCS 8 [1954], 11 f., translit. CAD K 57 b.

¹⁷⁸ Note that among these troops are chariot-troops: ^{LÚ}MEŠEN GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ (AT 180: 24–26), and ERÍN.MEŠ GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ (AT 182: 19–26).

In summary GIŠTUKUL-men appear to have been men who worked for the government or others and received their pay in the form of land whose produce supported them. This type of pay seems to have originally been introduced to pay for army troops, hence the title "weapon-man" for those paid in this way. However, already in the Old Hittite Period, it had been extended so as to provide pay for a vast number of different types of civilian employees, who, since they were paid in the same way as their military counterparts, were also called "weapon-men". It is possible that the use of the system by the military had already ceased by the time of our earliest texts. On the other hand there is some evidence that the military's use of the system did continue, but the evidence is not solid enough to be conclusive. The terms GIŠTUKUL.GÍD.DA-man and EN GIŠTUKUL appear to be related to the term GIŠTUKUL-man, but there is not enough evidence to know how and if they differ.

Concordance of Texts Discussed

TEXT	SECTION NUMBER	TEXT	SECTION NUMBER
Emar 6,18	45	KBo 6,3 iii 7f.	5
Emar 6,33	46	KBo 6,3 iii 9–14	6
HAB iii 3f.	10	KBo 6,4 iii 14–20	41
HCCT-E 5	43	KBo 6,4 iv 15–20	39
HCCT-E 16:11	44	KBo 6,4 iv 30–34	40
HT 2 ii 15f.	59	KBo 6,5 iv 1–6	2
HT 4:14–21	35	KBo 6,10 i 24–26	3
KBo 1,11 obv. ! 35f.	11	KBo 6,11 i 21–23	3
KBo 3,1 i 6–8	(1)	KBo 10,10 iii–iv 15	59
KBo 3,1 i 17–19	(1)	KBo 11,8:26	(1)
KBo 3,35 i 6–10	61	KBo 11,14 iii 11	(1)
KBo 3,38 obv. 26–36	48	KBo 11,72 ii 4	(1)
KBo 4,10 obv. 16–27	30	KBo 12,3 iv 9	(1)
KBo 4,10 obv. 30f.	31	KBo 12,53 obv. 13	34
KBo 5,4 obv. 35–40	49	KBo 12,53 obv. 19–21, 24, 26–28	33
KBo 5,4 rev. 50f.	37	KBo 12,56 i 10	25
KBo 5,7 rev. 10	29	KBo 12,67:8–14	59
KBo 5,7 rev. 13, 27, 32, 41f.	21	KBo 13,150	60
KBo 5,11 i 1–20	20	KBo 13,231 obv. ? 4–6, 8f., 13f.	58
KBo 6,2 ii 19–22	1	KBo 14,82 ii 6–8.	16
KBo 6,2 ii 23–26	2	KBo 14,98 i 14–17	(1)
KBo 6,2 ii 38–42	(4)	KBo 14,142 iv 5–18	56
KBo 6,2 ii 45f.	4	KBo 14,142 iv 21–23	56
KBo 6,2 iii 5f.	5	KBo 15,2 iv 20–24	24
KBo 6,2 iii 7–11	6	KBo 16,54: 16–28	19
KBo 6,3 ii 37–42	1	KBo 16,97 obv. 42	(1)
KBo 6,3 ii 43–47	2	KBo 16,97 rev. 45	(1)
KBo 6,3 ii 59–63	(4)	KBo 17,74 ii 29–33	14
KBo 6,3 ii 65–67	4	KBo 20,70 ii 7f.	15

GIŠTUKUL-institution in Ḫatti

305

TEXT	SECTION NUMBER	TEXT	SECTION NUMBER
KBo 22,1: 3–31	9	KUB 42,100 iii 10f.	26
KBo 22,218 obv. 2–9	57	KUB 42,100 iii 34f.	(1)
KBo 22,235 rev. 7–8	69	KUB 43,29 ii 3, 8, 11, iii 3, 12, 13	47
KBo 30,171:9	28	KUB 46,57 i 14	(1)
KUB 1,16 iii 3f.	10	KUB 48,105 obv. 13	34
KUB 6,44 iv 35–45	49	KUB 48,105 obv. 19–21, 24, 26–	
KUB 6,48 i! 9–ii! 1	38	28	33
KUB 7,46 rev. 6–7	(1)	KUB 48,105 obv. 31–35	50
KUB 8,14 rev. 8	(1)	KUB 48,105 rev. 3f.	51
KUB 8,78 vi 1–15	36	KUB 48,105 rev. 23f.	34
KUB 10,59:4–5	22	KUB 48,117:5–14	66
KUB 10,91 ii 6–9	27	KUB 49,3 ii 4–13	70
KUB 13,1 iv 25	65	KUB 49,3 iii 5f.	70
KUB 13,2 iii 42f.	71	KUB 49,70 rev. 16	(1)
KUB 13,4 i 28f., 33	(1)	KUB 51,47 obv. 18	53
KUB 13,9 iv 5–8	63	KUB 51,53 rev. rt. col. 7	(1)
KUB 14,1 obv. 34f.	62	KUB 56,1 i 7	32
KUB 15,11 ii 31	(1)	KUB 56,1 i 14	32
KUB 18,33 obv. 1	(1)	KUB 56,1 i 19f.	32
KUB 19,54 i 1–7	49	KUB 56,1 i 25	32
KUB 21,29 i 24f.	54	Kup. i 9– ii 1	38
KUB 23,72 obv. 3	64	Law No. 40	1
KUB 23,77:52–56	18	Law No. 41	2
KUB 26,43 obv. 15–17	55	Law No. 46	(4)
KUB 26,54:1–6	52	Law No. 47B	4
KUB 29,24:1–2	3	Law No. 52	5
KUB 31,51 rev. 3	32	Law No. 53	6
KUB 31,58 rev. 4	32	Law No. 112	3
KUB 31,58 rev. 8	32	Law No. XXX	41
KUB 31,58 rev. 11	32	Law No. XXXVII	39
KUB 31,60:8–14	59	Law No. XXXIXb	40
KUB 31,63 rev. 10	32	LS 1 rev. 10	29
KUB 31,63 rev. 14	32	LS 1 rev. 13, 27, 32, 41f.	21
KUB 31,63 rev. 18	32	LS 2 obv. 19	8
KUB 31,64 ii 27–37	12	LS 4 obv. 13–20	7
KUB 31,73:13	32	Madd. obv. 34f.	62
KUB 31,75:3	32	SBo 2 obv. 19	8
KUB 31,75:7	32	SBo 4 obv. 13–20	7
KUB 31,84 iii 66–69	17	Targ. obv. 35–40	49
KUB 36,3 iii 7	(1)	Targ. rev. 50f.	37
KUB 36,114:21f.	(1)	Tel. pr. i 6–8, 11, 17–19	(1)
KUB 38,35 rev. 6–9	23	Bo 3085 i 10	(1)
KUB 40,65 iii 3f.	10	474/c iv 7–10	68
KUB 40,110 obv. 4	42	176/t ii 5f.	(1)
KUB 42,82:8	67		