

Altorientalische Forschungen	23	1996	1	40 – 75
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

PHILO H. J. HOUWINK TEN CATE

The Hittite Dynastic Marriages of the Period between ca. 1258 and 1244 B.C.*

§ 1. Introduction

This article deals with the connections between the three Dynastic Marriages alluded to in the draft of the letter of Puduheba(t) to Ramses II concerning the marriage negotiations in the period leading up to his wedlock with the first Hittite Princess in 1244 B.C., KUB 21.38, and KUB 26.88, presumably again a Hittite draft of a diplomatic missive. Although the problem undoubtedly was noted and has already

* The abbreviations used are those of the CHD Volume L-N 4 (1989), XV-XXX. The chronology conforms with C. Kühne's adaptation of the Boese-Wilhelm rearrangement, cf. CRRAI 25 (1978, publ. date 1982), vol. 2, XXXIV accompanying vol. 1, 203-264. When I asked Professor J. A. Brinkman for his current opinion on the dates of the three Kassite Kings playing a major role in my argumentation, he very kindly wrote back: "The dates for these Kings that you want to use clearly fall within the realm of possibility, though I would not consider these the optimum dates for Babylonia." (letter of 2-2-1994). I conclude from the text material added to this letter, the final section of a paper delivered at the meeting of the American Oriental Society in Atlanta on March 26 1990, that Professor Brinkman's optimum dates still are: (+5/-5 years) Kadasman-Turgu (1282-1264), Kadasman-Enlil II (1263-1255) and Kudur-Enlil (1254-1246 B. C.). Concerning this study, an attempt to explain why it lasted a considerable period of time before the 'Eternal Treaty' was followed by the cognate Dynastic Marriage, the shortening of the duration of the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II from 14 to 8 years, a highly important result of Professor Brinkman's chronological studies, constituted an indispensable or even decisive prerequisite.

The recent appearance of Professor E. Edel's magisterial volumes, "Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache (ÄHK I-II, submitted on 16.4.1986), Opladen 1994 (and thus occasionally reflecting literature which appeared after 1986) led to a shortening of the original scope of this article. On a number of points, in the text of the (sub)sections 2., 3.2., 4., 6.1., 6.2. and 6.4. but also in the notes 1, 2, 10, 13, 20-21, 34, 50, 57 and 59, I both profited from and reacted to this highly important and, at the same time, very stimulating *opus magnum*, really the result of a lifetime's unflagging interest in and arduous work on these beautiful diplomatic letters. However, on other points I refrained from hasty changes in my own position or quick reactions to Professor Edel's important discoveries and his numerous, brilliant new ideas.

once been addressed¹, it has not yet been convincingly shown, I think, why it lasted no less than 13 years before the 'Eternal Treaty' of 1258/7 B.C. (21st year of Ramses II) was followed by the cognate Dynastic Marriage of 1245/4 B.C. (34th year of his reign). In addition to KBo 1.10 + KUB 3.72, a copy of the Akkadian letter addressed by Hattusilis III to Kadasman-Enlil II, also KUB 26.88, probably destined for the same Kassite King, sheds important new light upon this matter.

Apart from its value for the reconstruction of the international scene of this period, the subject is also of some importance since the participants in these marriages, children and children-in-law of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t), thus became involved in the international politics of those years.

At the same time I would like to offer a new solution for the enigmatic title DUMU.MUNUS GAL used for the daughters of the reigning Hittite couple of this period², in this manner rounding off my personal attempt to incorporate important parts of the new 13th Century evidence, either produced by, or recovered in

¹ I refer to the fact that, within a different chronological framework, but already reckoning with the likelihood that Urhi-Tessub's flight to Egypt after instead of before the 'Eternal Treaty' must have caused an interruption of the good relations between both countries, F. Pintore separated the small Hittite part of the 'dossier' in time from the Akkadian letters with their 'double track' character studied by Professor Edel. In Pintore's opinion the Hittite part represented a first failed attempt to come to an agreement about the Dynastic Marriage. His detailed treatment suggested that both the form and the contents of the Hittite part allow for an interval of no less than roughly 9 years, cf. F. Pintore, *Il Matrimonio Interdinastico nel Vicino Oriente durante i Secoli XV-XIII*, Roma 1978, 33-45 and especially 39 together with notes 184-186 (162) and 45. In the meantime Edel's edition already disposed of this solution.

² The suggestion that the usage of this title would be typical for this period was first put forward by A. Kammenhuber in the detailed treatment in THeth 7, 147-149 in which she also compared this title with LUGAL(.).GAL and MUNUS.LUGAL(.).GAL (cf. below sub 4. together with note 18 for the similar approach of I. Singer) and at the same time referred to the 'daughter of first rank' known from the succession rulings of Telebinus, as adduced by me sub 4.: "Demgegenüber hatte ich wörtlich "Großtochter, Großprinzessin" übersetzt und mir darunter einen Titel wie "Kronprinzessin" für die älteste Prinzessin vorgestellt, die ja nach heth. Recht (TelErl) erbfolgeberechtigt war, wenn kein Prinz vorhanden war." The latter point ("Kronprinzessin") is unacceptable because the title was shared by at least two daughters of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t). In a similar manner I also object to the translation of ^{LU}*tuhukanti-* with "crown prince" in its interpretation as 'heir designate', cf. ZA 82 [1992] 262-264. I. Singer's approach (see below sub 4. together with note 18) wisely eliminated the connotation of age which prevailed for Kammenhuber and still plays a role of some importance for Professor Edel, be it more on the male side and thus concerning the DUMU.NITA GAL, cf. below sub 4. together with the notes 20 and 21. From a historical point of view it is highly unlikely that either the Princess who was sent to Babylonia or the first Hittite bride of Ramses II might have been the eldest or the one but eldest daughter of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t). Their marriage took place in ca. 1274 B.C.

the wake of the highly successful excavations of Dr. Peter Neve in the Upper City of Hattusa, into the well-established 'certainties' of earlier research.³

The sections 2. and 3.1. and .2 are devoted to the marriages of Tudhaliyas (IV) and Nerikkailis (2. and 3.2.) and their unnamed sister who became the bride of presumably the Babylonian King Kudur-Enlil (3.1.). Section 4. touches upon the marriages of Gassul(iy)awiyas and Kilusheba(t) while dealing with the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL and with its male replica DUMU.NITA GAL. Section 5. perfunctorily deals with the vassal king of Amurru Sausgamuwas before the treatment of the main subject, the political implications of the Dynastic Marriages arranged by Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t) during the reigns of the three Kassite Kings which, taken together, in my opinion explain the delay referred to in the beginning of this section (6.1.–4.). I hope to show how in a highly systematic manner, during this interval, key-positions first in the capitals of the two most important border provinces of the Empire itself, Amurru and Isuwa, but later also at the court of one of the other three major powers were filled by daughters of the Hittite royal couple before the final diplomatic triumph, a first marriage with the Pharaoh, was achieved. Within this section I shall deal with two more Hittite drafts which might be added to the 'Babylonian dossier', KBo. 18.19 and KUB 23.92 (6.2. and 6.4.).

§ 2. The Dynastic Marriages of Tudhaliyas (IV) and Nerikkailis

As it has been noticed before, there is in KUB 21.38 a marked contrast between what Puduheba(t) notes about the Princesses und Princes, presumably both 'of second rank' (see below sub. 4), whom she had found in the Palace on her arrival in Hattusa and what she remarks about the Princesses who came from elsewhere, in this manner commenting indirectly upon the Hittite Princess who married these prospective daughters-in-law of herself, the Queen. Of course it is of importance to characterize the context of both passages. In the former passage she refers in the preceding lines Obv. 57–59 to her own fertility, saying that "she gave birth to sons and daughters", as was apparently appreciated by the Hittites and well-known to the addressee; in the sequel to the latter passage Obv. 50–52 she elaborates upon the praise and reputation originating from Diplomatic Marriages. About the former group of children of Hattusilis III she writes: "Ferner als ich damals in (mein) Haus kam, da gebaren in meiner Hand (= unter meiner Aufsicht) die Königstochter, die ich in (meinem) Haus vorfand, und ich [zog] sie (die Neugeborenen) [groß]; auch jene, die ich bereits geboren vorfand, [zog ich groß] und machte sie zu Generälen." (translation of Obv. 59–62 by E. Edel, *ÄHK* no 105 (L 2), cf. I, 220–221 with a minor adaptation

³ Cf. "The Bronze Tablet of Tudhaliyas IV and its Geographical and Historical Relations", Review article of StBoT Beiheft 1, ZA 82 [1992] 233–270 (I) and "Urhi-Tessub Revisited", BiOr 51 [1994] 233–259 (II), followed by page or paragraph number.

concerning 1. 60). But, again from a female point of view, in what is in fact an earlier passage the remarks about the latter: “Die Tochter des Landes Babylon und [die Tochter des Landes] Amurru, die ich, die Königin, aufgenommen habe, gereichten sie mir vor den Leuten des Landes Hattusa etwa nicht zum Ruhm? Darum habe ich es getan. Ich habe eine Fremde, die Tochter eines Großkönigs, zur Schwiegertochter genommen.” (Obv. 47–49, again translated by E. Edel, o.c., *ibidem*⁴). The Hittite Princes in question who married these alien women are now again considered to have been Tudhaliyas and Nerikkailis.⁵

This opposition strongly suggests that Tudhaliyas (IV) and Nerikkailis must have been full brothers and are likely to have been born out of her own marriage with Hattusilis III. These are two out of the total of three earlier Dynastic Marriages in the letter of which Puduheba(t) would seem to have been particularly proud.

§ 3.1. The Hittite Princess at the Babylonian court

The third example of a previous Dynastic Marriage mentioned in KUB 21.38 concerns the wedlock between an Hittite Princess and a Babylonian King alluded to in Obv. 55: “Hat er (viz. der König von Babylonien) nicht des Großkönigs von Hatti, des mächtigen Königs, Tochter zur Frau genommen?” (translation by H.G. Güterbock, SBo I, 8).⁶ The paragraph as a whole (Obv. 53–56) is devoted to the special importance to be attached to Dynastic Marriages within the highest elite of ‘Great Kings’. In the sequel Güterbock rightly concluded: “Hier ist also von einer Ehe zwischen einem Babylonischen Herrscher und einer Tochter Hattusilis die Rede; für unsere Frage (viz. Güterbock’s treatment of the second wife of Suppiluliumas I, the Babylonian Princess who thus became Hittite Queen) ist das nur als Beispiel für einen umgekehrt gelagerten Fall von Bedeutung.”⁷ Then Güterbock turned to KUB 26.88, a badly broken, but highly interesting letter (cf. now A. Hagenbuchner, THeth 16 no 312, 422–424).

⁴ The solution for the main problem concerning this passage, the recognition of the negated clause of 1.48 as a rhetorical question, is due to H. Otten, cf. J. Friedrich, HW¹, 1. Ergänzungsheft, 1957, 8.

⁵ In more recent years, first F. Pintore and later G.M. Beckman and I. Singer suggested on the basis of KUB 21.38 Obv. 47–49 that Tudhaliyas IV married a Babylonian Princess, cf. F. Pintore, o.c., Appendix 1, NE 3 together with the references, G.B. Beckman, JCS 35 [1983] 109–110^(56–58) and I. Singer, UF 23 (1991), 330–332 together with notes 12–17. Apparently these scholars were unaware of the fact that, witness H.G. Güterbock, SBo I, 8–9, this idea was first proposed in the prewar period by E. O. Forrer in his treatment of the lemma *Assyrien* in RLA I, 260 a. It should be added at this point that Beckman and Singer both added new, supporting evidence. See below sub 6.3., especially note 46.

⁶ In an earlier passage 258 a of the same lemma (cf. note 5) Forrer inferred from this passage that Kadasman-Turgu married a daughter or half-sister of Muwatallis II. In more recent years also this hypothesis returned in an argued form in Pintore’s study, o.c., Appendix I, EN 3 together with references.

⁷ Apparently G.M. Beckman drew the same conclusion, cf. his treatment quoted above note 5.

Making an admittedly eclectic choice out of earlier comments on this letter⁸, I think that I can now build a case for the interpretation of this fragment as constituting part of a Hittite draft of a letter of Hattusilis III addressed to Kadasman-Enlil II concerning the third Dynastic Marriage which offers further confirmation of the hypothesis that KBo 18.1 Rev. 7 refers to a 'foreign' DUMU.MUNUS GAL, another Babylonian Princess married to Tudhaliyas IV (cf. I. Singer, as referred to in note 5). The argumentation consists of the following steps: ¹) the letter was meant to be sent by a Hittite King to a foreign 'Great King' who was his junior in age and experience; ²) the extant lines point to a dating from the time of Hattusilis III onwards; ³) it is rather likely that the letter was addressed to Babylon, a point which means that the father and son referred to on the side of the addressee can readily be equated with Kadasman-Turgu and Kadasman-Enlil II respectively.⁹ If the validity of this reasoning is accepted, the inevitable interpretation is that the general content of the letter was a rather forceful and probably unsuccessful attempt on the part of the writer, Hattusilis III, to convince the addressee, Kadasman-Enlil II, that he should accept a Hittite Princess at the Babylonian court.

According to the empty spaces above all the preserved paragraph-dividers of both Obverse and Reverse, KUB 26.88 constitutes an early draft in the process of preparing the diplomatic missive. The following clauses are more or less clear: (Obv.) "I wrote [to] your father [...but] he [w]rote [to me]: "I have no daughter!" And to (or: from) [another] King [...]" (3'-4'); "But because we are humans, as soon as [... I said], "Then he will concern himself on my behalf with (the matter of) a *marriage alliance*^a as well." (5'-6'); "But now regarding this evil (deed), you, my beloved son, [played a (foul)] tr[ick] on me!^b" (7'); (Rev.) "[You may not openly re[buff] me] (lit. "you may not in front of yourself send me off home")! My enem[ies]^c overheard us [...]. You, my brother, may not openly re[buff] me! But if you, my brother, openly re[buff] me in this matter [...and if] you say, "Because he (Ramses II?) has given land to you (viz. has made a territorial concession to you (??))^d, [I will not grant (??) it (viz. your request (??)) [and] you shall not give your daughter to my son!", should [I] then to (or: from) someone else, an enemy ..[...?]" (4'-9'). Towards

⁸ While Hagenbuchner's treatment contains a highly useful reference to the text restoration of Obv. 7' proposed by A. Goetze, Tunn., 35 which apparently appeared too late (1938) for perusal by H.G. Güterbock, she, on her part, failed to notice Güterbock's observations.

⁹ Ad¹⁾: Cf. Güterbock, SBo I, 8-9 in the distinction he makes between the marriage negotiations which took place in the past between the writer and the father of the addressee (Obv. 3'-4') and the current negotiations between the writer and the addressee himself (Rev. 4'-9'); see, too, Obv. 7' in a minor adaptation of Goetze's proposal. Ad ²⁾: cf. Hagenbuchner, o. c., 424 where she prefers a dating of the letter from the reign of Hattusilis III onwards based on a paleographic argument – important since it concerns a draft – in combination with one indication concerning grammar and two regarding 'manner of writing'. Ad ³⁾: cf. the reference to Babylonia in Obv. 2' and compare the phrase (*um-ma-a*) *a-mi-lu₄ ni-i-nu* of KBo 1.10 + Obv. 9 (CTH 172) with *an-za-a-aš-ma-an-na-aš* UN.MEŠ-uš (*ku-it*), "(Because) we are humans", in Obv.5' of the fragment.

the end of the preserved part of the draft the writer announces that he will send a man to have a look at his (the future bridegroom's) house (Rev. 10').¹⁰

In view of the fragmentary state of the letter and the uncertainties concerning its interpretation, I merely want to emphasize the chronological implications of this letter regarding the order and dating of two of the three Dynastic Marriages mentioned in passing in KUB 21.38: ^{a)} the letter indicates that the negotiations to win for the Prince Tudhaliyas a 'Babylonian spouse' (the term is borrowed from I. Singer) started during the reign of the father of the addressee, in my interpretation Kadasman-Turgu; ^{b)} the time of the ultimately successful conclusion of these transactions remains totally unclear; ^{c)} the negotiations regarding her 'antipode', a Hittite Princess at the Babylonian court, would have begun during a period of friction occurring during the reign of the son, in my opinion presumably Kadasman-Enlil II. Probably one may gather from the manner in which KUB 21.38 Obv. (54-55) is phrased (the passage refers to the Babylonian King) that the third Kassite King, Kudur-Enlil who acceded to the throne in 1248 B.C. (?), had finally accepted this marriage proposal.

§ 3.2. The age difference between Tudhaliyas (IV) and Nerikkailis

If, as I believe necessary, one takes exception to the usage of any argument directly bound up with either one of the two solutions which have now been proposed for the identity of the enigmatic "older brother" mentioned in the Prologue to the Bronze Tablet (Nerikkailis as the son from an earlier marriage of Hattusilis (III), Kuruntas as his stepson), the remaining evidence concerning the lifespan of Nerikkailis is very vague. Unfortunately the Bentesina Treaty constitutes the main historical source for his year of birth. In a fairly general manner his name is connected with the main activities of his father Hattusilis (III) with respect to the re-

¹⁰ See the transliteration and translation of A. Hagenbuchner, o. c., 422-423 used here with minor changes to be indicated in this note. ^{a)} The tentative translation "marriage alliance" chosen for *kušaznatar* is based on the assumption that it would ultimately constitute another derivation of ^{MUNUS/LU} *kuša-*, "bride, bridegroom", see the remarks on the part of F. Starke and E. Neu concerning *kušezziyawar* as a verbal noun of the verb *kušiezziya-*, "to give in marriage", derived from the same stem, cf. E. Edel, *ÄHK* II, 349 together with note 321; see, too, below sub 4 together with note 21. ^{b)} Regarding Obv 7' I adopted Hagenbuchner's division into two clauses but changed the interpretation of *ku-it*; in the second clause I made use of Goetze's text restoration *ku-ḫi-ia-ti-in ku-up-ta*, but, following Hagenbuchner's interpretation of DUMU-*IA(-mu)* as an apposition to the subject of the second clause, I took *kupta* as 2nd person singular of the preterite.

^{c)} At the beginning of Rev. 5' I read ^{LU.MES} *KÚR-IA-an-na-aš*, a new proposal which entailed my explanation of *-za peran arḫa uija-*, as already clarified in the text. ^{d)} I assume, a point which is in fact rather speculative, that the curious remark in Rev. 8', the allusion to the fact that a third party had given land to the writer (see already Hagenbuchner, o. c., 423), refers to the territorial conflict presumably concerning Zulapa between Hattusilis III and Ramses II dealt with in II sub 3. and below sub 5. note 28. This would mean that Hattusilis III was successful in his negotiations with Ramses II.

gion around Nerik which can be dated to the reign of Urhi-Tessub = Mursilis III.¹¹ That he might have been younger than Tudhaliyas can only be argued by attaching considerable importance to the fact that, after in §10 b of the 'Apology' the achievements of Hattusilis III have abundantly been praised, the description of Urhi-Tessub's counteractions to curb the rising influence of his uncle immediately sets in with §10 c.¹² This might indicate that Nerikkailis would have been born during a late phase of the reign of Urhi-Tessub. Regarding the duration of his life, it may be remarked that a discovery of I. Singer has rendered it perhaps likely that, towards the end of his life, he would have been a contemporary of Hammurapi of Ugarit and of Suppiluliumas II.¹³ If this holds true, it agrees better with Nerikkailis being a son of Puduheba(t) than having been born from an earlier marriage of Hattusilis (III) and being already a married man soon after the latter's accession. Although, taken by itself, it is now rather likely that the first efforts to acquire a 'Babylonian spouse' for Tudhaliyas did in fact take place in the aftermath of the Babylonian Treaty and still during the reign of Kadasman-Turgu, the same would also seem to apply to the planned marriage of Nerikkailis with the Amorite Princess.¹⁴ Therefore, while it can be established with certainty that Kuruntas must have been considerably older than Tudhaliyas, I cannot disprove, merely try to render it unlikely that also Nerikkailis would have been older than the future Hittite King. But an entirely new situation would emerge if those schol-

¹¹ See, too, H. Klengel, AOF 16 [1989] 186 together with note 8.

¹² See H. Otten, StBoT 24, 20-21, §10 b III 46'-54', as immediately followed by the description of Urhi-Tessub's countermeasures in ibidem, 20-23, §10 c III 54-72.

¹³ Cf. Dr. Th. P. J. van den Hout in his dissertation of 1989 in his treatment of Nerikkailis, 106 (3.e.) and 111, referring to RS 34.129, 15, to I. Singer, Tel Aviv 10 [1983] 10¹⁴ and to what is now W. H. van Soldt, AOAT 40 (1991) 221-223. The consequence of the change in reading proposed by Singer, ^mNi-ir-ga-i-li instead of ^mNi-ša-ab-i-li, would need to be, reckoning with the proviso of his being identical with the well-known Nerikkailis, that the latter lived on into the reigns of Hammurapi of Ugarit and the Hittite 'Great King' Suppiluliumas II. However, E. Edel concludes from the two parallel letters KUB 3.27 (=ÄHK no 26) Rev. 17'-19' and KUB 3.58 + (=ÄHK no 27) Obv. 11'-14', cf. I, 72-73 (D 7 and 8) and II, 121-122, that a first (?) Nerikkailis died after he had found Urhi-Tessub. This inference entails that apparently a second Nerikkailis belonging to the subsequent generation played an important role during the reign of Tudhaliyas IV, cf. KBo 28.28 = ÄHK no 80 Obv. 4', cf. I, 188-189 (H5) and II, 286 and 366. Although Edel does not elaborate upon this notable point, the reader is forced to assume that for this general period the author must have reckoned with the existence of two persons known by the name of Nerikkailis, the latter, witness the added title, unmistakably a Prince. In the past first F. Imparati, RHA 32 [1974] 142-144 and later also A. Hagenbuchner, SMEA 29 [1992] 111-126 already reckoned with the possibility or even the likelihood that two Princes, the former a son of Hattusilis III and the latter a son of Tudhaliyas IV, bore this name.

¹⁴ See II sub 3. together with notes 45-46 (I now date the Bentesina Treaty to the period after the 'Eternal Treaty', while I think that *li-iq[-qé]* (Obv.19) should be emended to <i>le-eq[-qé].

ars would prove to have been right who operated with two Princes known by the name of Nerikkailis and if the former of these two, a son of Hattusilis III, would have died in the course of the events which ultimately led to Urhi-Tessub's stay in Egypt (cf. note 13).

§4. The title DUMU.MUNUS GAL as applied to Gassul(iy)awiyas and Kilusheba(t)

The parallel case regarding Gassul(iy)awiyas is equally difficult to argue for since again the Bentesina Treaty itself constitutes the main historical source for this Princess. Also regarding her some scholars have assumed that she was born from an earlier marriage of Hattusilis (III) preceding that with Puduheba(t).¹⁵ With the likely exception of the Oracle text KUB 5.20 + KUB 18.56, all the other cuneiform texts in which either her name or the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL in a usage behind which her name may be hidden occurs are disputed as far as their interpretation and attributions are concerned.¹⁶ This problem arises from the existence of her namesake and grandmother Gassul(iy)awiyas, the first wife of Mursilis II. Regarding her case I hope to objectify my line of reasoning by concentrating on the Prayer KBo. 4.6. This Prayer was, after all, first attributed to the second Gassul(iy)awiyas from the time of Hattusilis III as early as 1925.¹⁷ This approach entails an endeavour to determine the most likely original meaning of the title

¹⁵ Cf. I. Singer, UF 23 [1991] 330 together with note 10 referring to A. Kammenhuber, THeth 7, 149 but also to the contrary opinion of H. Otten, Puduhepa, 29 regarding not merely Gassul(iy)awiyas but also Nerikkailis. I side with Professor Otten.

¹⁶ In KUB 5.20 + KUB 18.56 the 13th Century Gassul(iy)awiyas is found in I 36 (see, too, DUMU.MUNUS in II 19) together with Huzziyas (II 10, 14 und 29) and Tasmisarrumas (I 2, 15, 21 and II 6). In addition to KBo 4.6 (the name in Rev. 21' and 24'; the title in Obv. 16' and 18') another 'disputed' text is KUB 22.70 (merely usage of the title in Obv. 29,72 and 83). At this moment the text is usually attributed to the reign of Tudhaliyas IV in accordance with A. Ünal's excellent text edition THeth 6, 51–52, in which case the title would apply to the 'Babylonian spouse' of this King, cf. I. Singer, l.c.; 330–332 (see sub 6.3). Other examples are the small and unrewarding oracle fragment KUB 50.103 (her name in Rev. 3') and the historical fragment KBo 22.10 (the name in the genitive in III 7', accompanied by a Hannuttis, also attested in both centuries, in III 6' and a Duthaliyas in III 8'). See for this material apart from Singer, l.c. also J. Tischler, Gass., 55–64 and J. de Roos, JEOL 29 [1985–1986; publ. date, 1987] 76–81. The three authors also deal with the Hieroglyphic attestation of the 13th Century Gassul(iy)awiyas in SBo I 104 (title RE-GIS.FILIA).

¹⁷ Cf. J. Friedrich, AO 25 [1925] 19⁽²⁾. But since the attribution of KBo 4.6 to the granddaughter Gassul(iy)awiyas still is contested, cf. A. M. and B. Dinçol, J. D. Hawkins and Gernot Wilhelm, IM 43 [1993] 98^(32–39), I add at this point that ascription of this text to the time of Mursilis II offers a beautiful example of the meaning originally advocated by H. G. Güterbock on the grounds of this very same text (see note 19), a meaning which, at least in my personal opinion, remains valid for part of the examples (see the end of this section). Fortunately sufficient 13th Century evidence would remain available, cf. the continuation.

DUMU.MUNUS GAL which, apart from its presumptive usage for Gassul(iy)awiyas, also occurs with another Princess, Kilusheba(t) of Isuwa, about whom it is fairly likely that she was in fact a daughter of Puduheba(t). Regarding this title, my basic assumption is that it has a parallel in the Akkadian of Ugarit, viz. in western peripheral Akkadian, in the designation of the unfortunate wife of King Ammistamru II of Ugarit, the daughter of Bentesina and Gassul(iy)awiyas, DUMU.MUNUS^{MUNUS} *rabīti*, usually rendered with “the daughter of the Great Lady”. Recently I. Singer dealt with all this material, DUMU.MUNUS GAL, DUMU.MUNUS or *bitti*^{MUNUS} *rabīti* and ^{MUNUS} *rabītu*. in his highly useful article “The Title ‘Great Princess’ in the Hittite Empire”.¹⁸

In this recent treatment I. Singer rightly argued, I now think, against the hypothesis that the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL would have been used to denote “a king’s wife who is not reigning as Tawananna”¹⁹, this notwithstanding the fact that the five examples dealt with in his study, Kilusheba(t) (witness the hieroglyphic rendering of the title), Gassul(iy)awiyas, ‘Tudhaliyas’ spouse’, also Gassul(iy)awiyas under her disguise as ^{MUNUS} *rabītu* in the example from Ugarit, even the first Hittite bride of Ramses II, actually either were Queens or were destined to become Queens in the future. The term must indeed originally have had a more general meaning which Singer renders with “Great Princess”, explaining this as daughter of a ‘Great King’, comparing the construction with LUGAL GAL, ‘Great King’ and MUNUS.LUGAL GAL, ‘Great Queen’. Personally I consider this comparison to be neither convincing nor compelling, unconvincing since DUMU.MUNUS GAL lacks the clear connection with ‘Great Kingship’ of the other two expressions and not compelling because there exists no male replica DUMU.NITA GAL meaning Prince of a Royal Family with ‘Great Kingship’ status. Like in the preceding part of the Amarna age (cf. EA no 11, Obv. 22 = W. L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters*, 21), the connotation surmised by A. Kammenhuber and I. Singer for DUMU.MUNUS GAL still is expressed with ŠA LUGAL GAL DUMU.MUNUS (cf. KUB 21.38 Obv. 49 and 55 = E. Edel, *ÄHK* no 105 (L 2), cf. I, 220–221). In those cases in which DUMU.NITA GAL, the male replica of DUMU.MUNUS GAL, occurs, in first instance KUB 26.53: 9’, a fragment rightly assigned by P. Meriggi, WZKM 58 [1962] 98–99 to the ‘Egyptian dossier’ of the Hittite diplomatic correspondence, the context unmistakably indicates a Dynastic Marriage, (see now A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 16 no 232, 341–342 and E. Edel, *ÄHK* no 107 (= L 4), cf. I, 224–227 and II, 320 and 346–349). Similarly but admittedly in a less cogent fashion, this also applies to the second occurrence of DUMU.NITA GAL in KUB 57.125 Obv. 20 discovered and adduced by Professor Edel. Edel treats KUB 57.125 as *ÄHK* no 108 (L 5),

¹⁸ I. Singer, *UF* 23 [1991] 327–338.

¹⁹ Cf. H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 32 [1973] 137 ⁽⁶⁾. In the final report on the Korucutepe excavations (ed. M. N. van Loon) vol. 3 [1980] 129, Güterbock ended his treatment of the title with the brief conclusion: “The combination of GREAT and DAUGHTER may be taken to mean “princess”. The broadest and clearest survey of the discussion so far can be found in J. de Roos, l.c., 81–83.

cf. I, 226–227 and II, 349–351 and returns to this letter in volume II, 320 in his general description of the Hittite part of the ‘dossier’ in which he characterizes KUB 26.53 and KUB 57.125 in the following manner: “L 4 und L 5 folgen höchstwahrscheinlich auch wieder unmittelbar aufeinander. Es ist in diesen beiden Fragmenten die Rede von der Einsetzung eines Thronfolgers in Hatti.” E. Edel views KUB 26.53 as having been sent by Ramses II to Hattusilis III, KUB 57.125 as the immediate answer of the Hittite King. In the Chart on p. 145 of his second volume, in which Professor Edel presents his current ideas about the chronological sequence of the Akkadian and Hittite letters concerning the first Egyptian marriage, and in his treatment of FHL 98 (+²) KBo 28.42 = ÄHK nos 49 and 50 (E 16 (+²) 17), cf. I, 130–135 and II, 203–205 and more in particular in II, 204 and 348, Professor Edel suggests that KUB 26.53 might constitute (part of) the Hittite translation of the, in his opinion, connected Akkadian letter(s) (the, from II, 348 deviating formulation used in II, 204 clearly is a mistake). It must be added at this point that the corresponding passage in Akkadian actually ist broken off.

I merely quote Edel’s transliteration and translation of (part of) the 11. KUB 26.53: 4’–5’ and the whole of the 8’–9’ since they are particularly relevant to the problem under discussion, while the remainder of the fully restored 11. 2’–9’ is highly dependent on the presumed connection with E 16 (+²) 17 to which I just referred, cf. the 11. 2’ and 5’–7’. With respect to KUB 57.125 Obv. I restrict my quotation to that part of the letter for which (at best) slightly under one half of each line has been preserved. Concerning the rest of the letter merely one third or one quarter of each line is legible, while the state of preservation of the letter heading is even worse. The passages concerned run as follows: (KUB 26.53) 4’ [ANA DUM]U.MUNUS-*kán ku-ua-pí-ì-an* SAG.DU-*i* [I-NA KUR ^{URU}HAT-TI li-el-bu-ua-an-zi] 5’ [nu-mu EGIR-p]a *ú-e-bu-ua-ar Ú-UL nam-m[a...]*, and 8’ [nu-za-kán DU]MU-KA *ku-iš šal-li-iš šal-li pí-di* [ŠA KUR ^{URU}HAT-TI e-ša-ri] 9’ [nu-za m]a-a-an ŠA DUMU.NITA GAL-*ma Ú-UL i-[la-li-ua-zi na-at-mu pa-a-ì]*, “Sobald [man der To]chter Öl aufs Haupt [gießen wird im Lande Hattusa], 5’ [gibt es für mich] keine [U]mkehr mehr!”, and 8’ “Dein Hoher [So]hn (Thronfolger), der [sich] auf den Thron (die Hohe Stelle) [des Landes Hattusa setzen wird] – 9’ [w]enn er aber die (Würde) des Hohen Sohnes nicht er[strebt (?), so gib sie mir]!”²⁰ And after (KUB 57.125) 1. 5, [ŠEŠ-*IA-mu ku-it TÀŠ-PUR* ^{LÚ}TE-MU-*ua-at-ta*] *ku-ši-iz-zi-ia-u-*

²⁰ Apparently it escaped the attention of both A. Hagenbuchner and E. Edel that KUB 26.53: 4’–5’ was dealt with by B. Landsberger, *FsDavid II (Symbolae iuridicae et hictoriae Martino David dedicatae)* edited by J. A. Ankum, R. Feenstra and W. F. Leemans, *Tomus alter*, Leiden 1969), 79⁴ continued on 80–81; see now, too, W. L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore-London 1992, 22⁷ where all the Amarna examples dealt with by Landsberger are enumerated and more recent literature concerning this ‘first act of betrothal’ regarding the Ancient Near East in general has been added. The passage in question (example^f) was added to the material collected by Landsberger by H. G. Güterbock. Within my interpretation of this fragment the restored “im Lande Hattusa” in KUB 26.53:4’ would need to be replaced with “in the country of Egypt”.

aš AŠ-PUR, “[Was du, mein Bruder, mir geschrieben hast: ‘Einen Boten] zum Vollzug der Vermählung habe ich [dir] gesandt’ and an unclear passage which stretches from 1.6 up to and including 1. 14 ¹⁵[*ma-a-an-kân* EGIR-*an-da* ŠEŠ]-*IA ku-ua-pí me-mi-aš* ZI-*n[i]* ¹⁶[*an-da na-at am-mu-ug-ga* EGIR-*p*]a še-ik-kal-lu ¹⁷[*ma-a-an-ma-kân* EGIR-*an-da* A-NA ŠEŠ]-*IA ku-ua-pí me-mi-aš* ¹⁸[ZI-*ni* Ū-UL *an-da nu-mu zi-ik*] a-pád-da-*ia* EGIR-*pa* ŠU-PUR ¹⁹[*nu ku-it-ma-an* A-NA ŠEŠ]-*IA* ^{MUNUS} ^dIŠTA]R-*nu-un* DAM-SŪ *na-a-ūi*, *pi-i*[*h-hu-un*] ²⁰[ŠA DUMU.NITA GAL-*ma-za ku-iš i-la-li-ā* ^a*zi* DUMU.NITA GAL ^{LÚ}GURUŠ ²¹[*e-eš-du*
..... ŠE]Š-*IA* x [, ¹⁵“[Wenn] meinem [Bruder hinterher] einmal eine Sache im Sinn ¹⁶[ist, so will auch ich das ane]rkennen; ¹⁷[wenn aber mei]nem [Bruder hinterher] einmal [keine] Sache ¹⁸[im Sinn ist, so] schreibe du [mir] auch das zurück, ¹⁹[solange ich meinem Bruder die Sausk]anu noch nicht als Gemahlin gege[ben habe]! ²⁰[Wer aber die (Würde) eines Hohen Sohnes (Thronfolgers) erstre]bt, [der sollte] ein jugendlicher Hoher Sohn (Thronfolger) ²¹[sein! Du, Ramses, bist dafür zu alt. Ich würde sie aber gerne einem zukünftigen Sohn] meines [Brud]ers [und meiner Tochter geben]!”²¹

Merely taking exception to the restoration of the final clause of KUB 26.53: 9' and to the interpretative rendering of KUB 57.125 Obv. 21, which are both closely bound up with Professor Edel's interpretation of the historical background to this phase of the negotiations (in the event that a ^{LÚ}*tuhukanti*-, in my view 'heir presumptive' as used to be the *communis opinio*, would decline that position, Ramses II himself would have wanted to become the successor, an option which Hattusilis III, preferring the possible son of Ramses II and his first Hittite bride, would have ruled out in a highly tactful manner), I would very much prefer to connect both fragments with a planned marriage, necessarily of the *taranza* type, of the partly Egyptian and partly Hittite Princess, born from Ramses II's marriage to his first Hittite bride. I refer to KBo 8.12 (=ÄHK no 66), KUB 3.83 (=ÄHK no 67) and KBo 1.23 (=ÄHK no 68), together E 33–35, cf. I, 162–167 and II, 249–257, as well as the Hittite fragments KBo 18.23 (=ÄHK no 109), KUB 23.105 (=ÄHK no 110) and possibly also KBo 18.21 (=ÄHK no 111), together L 6–8, cf. I 228–233 and II, 320–321 and 352–355. With the exception of KUB 23.105 (cf. P. Meriggi, l.c., 99¹⁸) all these Hittite fragments were added by Professor Edel to his group E 33–35. Although I agree with Professor E. Edel (and Dr. F. Starke) that in KUB 26.53 the subject of the 11. 8'–9' in all likelihood refers to the ^{LÚ}*tuhukanti*- of the period in question (see below at the end of the subsection 6.4.), I do not believe that DUMU(-KA *ku-iš*) *šalliš* actually is a synonym for that title, nor that it may be

²¹ For the verb *kušiezziya**- at the end of 1.5 see above sub. 3.1., note 10, sub^a). See the Preface of ÄHK I, 7 and II, 349 together with the notes 317 and 318 for the close cooperation between Dr. F. Starke and Professor E. Edel concerning the small Hittite part of the Egyptian 'dossier'. I disagree with Dr. Starke concerning the presumed Luwian character of ^{LÚ}*tuhukanti*-. Political terms are more likely to have been taken over by Luwian from Hittite, while I see no reason why the ultimate origin from Hattic should be called in question.

equated with the sumerographic expression DUMU.NITA GAL, which in my opinion signifies “son of first rank” (see below). Also concerning KUB 57.125 Obv. 20, the two examples, the first restored and the second preserved with a notable apposition, should, I think, be interpreted as “son of first rank”. In both passages I would prefer to translate ŠA DUMU.NITA GAL with “the matter of (or, the concern for) a ‘son of first rank’, viz. concerning KUB 26.53: 8’–9’, “Your large (or, distinguished) [son who [will seat himself] on the throne (lit., in the elevated place) [of Hatti-land], [if he [does] not ch[erish] (the concern for) a ‘son of first rank’, [in that case the planned marriage can be annulled] (or words of a similar tenor)!” and regarding KUB 57.125 Obv. 20–21, “[But he who cherishes [(the concern for) a ‘son of first rank’], he [must be] a ‘son of first rank’, an adolescent (or, a youth), [himself]!” (restoring *apāšila*, *ēšdu* at the beginning of 1.21). In my opinion there can be little doubt that both letters, the first a translation from Akkadian and the second a Hittite draft, are fully devoted to the important subject of Dynastic Marriages, while I am convinced that at the time in question, presumably towards the end of the reign of Hattusilis III and thus approximately a decade later than the two groups E 33–35 and L 6–8, recognized by Professor Edel, even a double marriage bond with Egypt constituted the ultimate goal of the negotiations, at least as far as the Egyptian correspondent was concerned. I assume that this attempt ultimately failed, while I feel comparatively certain that the Hittite Princess of KUB 57.125 Obv. 19 (whose name is read and restored by Professor Edel as [Sausk]anu) actually was the second daughter of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t) married off to Egypt (cf. sub 6.4. together with note 59).

Singer concluded that KBo 4.6 “on the basis of its ductus must be dated to the 13th Century, i. e. to the second Gassul(iy)awiyas”, referring in this respect to the conclusive arguments of J. de Roos in two recent treatments of this matter. Feeling unconvinced, however, by the latter’s suggestion that one might separate the name from the title, attributing them to two separate Prayers for the second Gassul(iy)awiyas and an unnamed DUMU.MUNUS GAL, whom the Roos identified with Kulisheba(t), Singer ends his treatment with the remark, “All in all, it seems better to return to the traditional interpretation which considers the alternation between Gassul(iy)awiyas and DUMU.MUNUS GAL as an interchange between her name and her title.” However, while I agree with Singer that the two daughters of Hattusilis III carried the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL, Kulisheba(t) and Gassul(iy)awiyas, I beg to differ of opinion with him regarding the meaning of the title.

Along the lines of the treatment accorded to the example from Ugarit by F. Pintore in his important study on the Dynastic Marriages of the Ancient Orient during the Late Bronze Age²² and referring to the recent translations of W. L. Moran of the Amarna Letter 29, 11. 8, 63 and 67 where an adjectival usage of *rabītu* in *aššatu rabītu* is again rendered as “la femme de premier rang” and “the principal

²² Cf. F. Pintore, o. c., 84 and note 489 (178).

wife” in French and English respectively²³, I would expect a daughter from a marriage with such a “wife of first rank” to have been called “daughter of first rank”. On account of E. Neu’s equation GAL = *ḫantezzi(ya)*²⁴, we are led immediately to the syllabic rendering of the title in the “Proclamation of Telibinus”, § 28, A II 38, DUMU.MUNUS *ḫantezziš*, “daughter of first rank”, viz. “daughter born from the principal wife”. The parallel from Ugarit shows a substantival usage of ^{MUNUS}*rabitū* contrasting with the adjectival *ḫantezziš* of Hittite. In my opinion DUMU.NITA GAL of KUB 26.53: 9’ and KUB 57.125 Obv. 20 (referred to above) similarly constitutes the young logographic replica, meaning “son of first rank”, of the *ḫantezziiaš(-pat)* DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-*RU* and the DUMU.LUGAL *ḫantezziš* of the same paragraph, A II 36–37. Taken together with the *tān pedaš* DUMU-*RU*, this “Prince of the first rank” returns as a DUMU.LUGAL DUMU.NITA in 1. A II 38, thus implying the existence of DUMU.NITA *ḫantezzi(ia)š* for already Old Hittite times. In my opinion KUB 26.53: 2’–9’ deals with the point that a planned Dynastic Marriage of the *taranza* type can be revoked if the bridegroom is unwilling to install her, the future bride, as his ‘principal wife’ (see below sub. 6.4).

Therefore, on account of the usage of this title in both Hittite cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic writing and in all of its occurrences, including the foreign DUMU.MUNUS GAL of KBo 18.1 Rev. 7, the ‘Babylonian spouse’ of Tudhaliyas IV, I would like to regard Gassul(iy)awiyas – on a par with Kilusheba(t) – as having been born from the marriage between Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t). Regarding Gassul(iy)awiyas I have already indicated that she must have been a ‘principal wife’ of Bentesina, presumably replacing in that respect the mother of Sausgamuwas (see below sub 5.). Concerning Kilusheba(t) of Isuwa my treatment implies that I consider her to have been the daughter, rather than the sister of Puduheba(t), but I hesitate to pronounce an opinion on the moot question who was her husband; at first sight it seems attractive to view Ari-Sarrumas as such, but the situation may have been more complicated. She might have been married to Ali-Sarrumas. It is practically certain that she must have been the mother of Ehli-Sarrumas.²⁵ The fact that, during the first decade of his reign, Tudhaliyas IV was a contemporary of Ehli-Sarrumas of Isuwa proves that also Kilusheba(t)’s marriage must have taken place during the middle phase of the reign of Hattusilis III, viz.

²³ Cf. W. L. Moran in his translation of the Amarna Letters in the French (Paris 1987) and English (Baltimore and London, 1992) editions concerning no 29, also referred to by Pintore (see the preceding note), ll. 8 (179, 92), 63 (182, 94) and 67 (183, 94), respectively. This solution is not new, cf. e. g. J. Nougayrol, PRU IV, 131.

²⁴ Cf. E. Neu, StBoT 25, 87³⁰⁰; E. Neu and Chr. Rüster, StBoT Beiheft 2, 214 no 242 and StBoT 35, 19 (“Erster”). Neu’s original example shows substantival usage.

²⁵ See for the main evidence H. G. Güterbock, JNES 32 [1973] 137–140 and for the wider implications J. de Roos, l. c., 74–83; for the possibility that not Ari-Sarrumas but rather Ali-Sarrumas might have been her husband see K. K. Riemschneider, OLZ 70 [1975] 259 and H. Klengel, OrAnt 15 [1976] 88; but see, too, Th. P. J. van den Hout, Diss, in his treatments of Ehli-Sarrumas (135–136), Naninzis (206–207) and Ari-Sarrumas (227) and, in last instance, I. Singer, l. c., 328⁽³⁾.

between 1258 and 1244 B.C. and actually closer to the beginning of that period than towards its end. Finally, the case for the Hittite Bride of the Marriage Stele as a possible loan-translation (which would need to have reached Egypt in a transmission by way of peripheral Akkadian), originally added to the group by J. de Roos in a fairly general and, at the same time, highly cautious manner, later to be strongly endorsed by Singer, is in fact rather uncertain since the Egyptian word in question, *wrt*, in more recent years is also considered by some Egyptologists to possess the possible connotation of an indication of rank, like the replica's in other languages of the Ancient Near East.²⁶

Apparently a marriage with such a high-ranking Princess, in a type of society prevalent in the Ancient Near East in which court harems were a widespread phenomenon²⁷, constituted, at least in the Hittite application, a royal privilege accorded not merely to allied, foreign 'Great Kings', but also to Kings of vassal-states like Amurru and Isuwa which were situated in the most strategically located areas of the Empire itself. There are many more examples from both earlier and later periods. In fact a justifiable approach is to maintain as a 'rule of thumb' that, when the attestation concerns either a major foreign power or an important vassal-state, such a Princess probably already functioned as Queen, or was likely to do so in the near future. But the situation must have been totally different before a marriage had taken place, during the time the Princess was still living in her own home country.

§5. Sausgamuwas

Regarding Sausgamuwas I can be short. Personally I consider it to be a fortunate consequence of my alternative proposal for the date of the Bentesina Treaty that it involves recourse to a letter – KUB 3.56 (Rev. 12'–15') – which shows him as a young man travelling to Hattusa at the time when the marriage of his pre-

²⁶ Cf. J. de Roos, l.c., 81⁶⁰ and I. Singer, l.c., 333–334. My Egyptological colleague M. S. H. G. Heerma van Voss very kindly provided me with the following information concerning *wrt*: "There is in fact good reason to think of an indication of rank: In the *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden) III (1987), 466 W. Seipel translates the title of the Hittite Princess which she received on the occasion of her marriage with Ramses II with "Große Königliche Gemahlin". He sees in it an indication of rank, not of age. He argues that during the 18th (and 19th) Dynasty only the real Queen could be addressed in this way ("eine einzige Frau") not a concubine. Similarly B. Schmitz, o. c., III (1979, a later fascicle), 661 note I, renders concerning a Princess *s3t-nswt wrt* ("vereinzelt in N. R.") as "Größte (variant *tpjt* "Erste") "Königstochter", reserving "Älteste K." for *s3t-nswt smst* ("A. R. 1. Zwischenzeit"). (translation into English of a passage in a letter of 5-8-1993).

²⁷ See for Ancient Orient in general W. von Soden, *Einführung in die Altorientalistik*, Darmstadt, 1985, 68 and, as far as Anatolia is concerned, A. Goetze, *Kl.*, 1957², 94-95 and A. Ünal, *THeth* 6, 44 (together with bibliographic references); see, too, II sub 4. together with note 57.

sumed mother would not yet have been consummated.²⁸ This would effectively, although admittedly with an excessive use of logical force, remove the necessity to consider whether, through his own marriage with a presumably much younger daughter of Hattusili III and Puduheba(t), Sausgamuwas in fact married the sister of his own natural mother.²⁹ Actually the author responsible for the first part of this twofold configuration of hypotheses, H. Klengel, already in an equally efficient manner discarded the need to consider the second part, defended by C. Kühne, by his recent suggestion that, witness his Anatolian name, Sausgamuwas would have been born during the period of his father's exile in Hakkissa at the court of Hattusilis (III).³⁰ It would now seem that, in the absence of a suitable successor from his marriage with Gassul(iy)awiyas, his predecessor Bentesina made use of an special prerogative accorded to him by the treaty and selected a son from an earlier marriage with his preceding 'principal wife'.³¹ Through the new marriage bond between Sausgamuwas and a younger daughter of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t), the continuation of the ties between both dynasties had already been guaranteed for a long time to come.³²

§6.1. Introduction to the historical evaluation of the Dynastic Marriages

All that remains to be accounted for is the evaluation of the Dynastic Marriages arranged by Puduheba(t) and Hattusilis III during the reigns of Kadasman-Turgu, Kadasman-Enhil II and Kudur-Enlil. I refer to the marriage bonds with Amurru,

²⁸ Cf. II sub 3. together with note 38 (I now date the Bentesina Treaty to the period after the 'Eternal Treaty' but still during the reign of Kadasman-Turgu in the aftermath of the conflict concerning Zulapa and the Flight of Urhi-Tessub to Egypt; at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty the marriage of Gassul(iy)awiyas to Bentesina was not yet consummated). See E. Edel, ZA 49 [1950], 206 and W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 1971², 219-220 for the notion of a geographical conflict shortly after the 'Eternal Treaty'; regarding Zulapa see E. Edel, *Fs Alt (= Geschichte und Altes Testament, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 16*, Tübingen 1953), 38-39, W. Helck, *o. c.*, 140 and 297 as well as H. Klengel, *Gesch. Syr. II*, 215 and 241¹²².

²⁹ It should be added at this point that H. Klengel as well as C. Kühne treated his part of this twofold configuration of hypotheses in a very cautious manner: H. Klengel, *Gesch. Syr. II*, 313 and C. Kühne, UF 5 [1973] 180-182 (with the pertinent discussion mainly in note 68). After the configuration had one come into existence, it acquired a sizable degree of support, among others also from myself. The new situation would result in a fortunate agreement with J. Nougayrol's opinion that the manner in which in the sources from Ugarit the relationship between Sausgamuwas, the sons of the unfortunate wife of Ammistamru II and she herself is phrased, warrants that she must have been a half-sister of Sausgamuwas, cf. PRU IV, 131.

³⁰ Cf. H. Klengel, AOF 18 [1991] 234.

³¹ See in this respect the Bentesina Treaty, Obv. 25-27 = G.F. del Monte, *Mursili-Niqmepa*, 180-181; see, too, Obv. 34-36 = del Monte, *o. c.*, 182-183.

³² See II sub 3. together with note 36 and here below sub 6.4. together with note 59.

Isuwa, Babylonia and Egypt. A double marriage bond was the issue in two cases which involved the exchange of Princesses, Amurru and Babylon. With Egypt only a single bond was possible since, as is well-attested from the Amarna Age onwards, Egypt was merely interested in receiving Princesses from elsewhere, but usually unwilling to admit the corresponding counterpart, the marriage of an Egyptian Princess to a foreign ruler.³³ Also the marriage bond between Babylonia and Egypt attested by both KUB 26.89 11. 9'-14' and KUB 21.38 Rev. 7-11 deserves consideration.³⁴ This example shows that the old coalition of 1258 B.C. between Anatolia, Babylonia and Egypt, no doubt forged by Hattusilis III in order to curb the rising influence of Assyria, was again fully operative by ca. 1245 B.C. This evaluation will be made subject to the following constraints: I use the chronological scheme advocated by C. Kühne; I still adhere to two of the results of the highly fruitful studies of M.B. Rowton of ca. 1960 concerning the Hittite diplomatic correspondence of this period; I reckon with the possibility that the marriageable age of Hittite Princes and Princesses would have begun when they were between 12 and 15 years old;³⁵ and, finally, following H.G. Güterbock I want to interpret KUB 21.38 Obv. 53-56 in the strictly literal sense: not a Babylonian Prince who later became King of Babylonia, but a Babylonian King married a daughter of the reigning Hittite couple.

³³ According to Pintore's study of the Dynastic Marriages referred to sub 1. note 1, 78-79 there are for the period taken into consideration no certain examples of Egyptian Princesses who were married off to foreign Western Asiatic rulers. See, too, EA no 4, ll. 6'-7', "From time immemorial no daughter of the King of Egypt is given to anyone" (translation by W. L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters*, 1992, 8).

³⁴ The ll. Rev. 7-8 of KUB 21.38 referring to a Babylonian Princess staying at the Egyptian court were first adduced by E. Edel, *Fs Alt*, 38. See now *ÄHK* no 104, cf. I, 214-215 (L 1) and no 105, cf. I, 222-223 (L 2) and II, 322 and 343. For the comparison between KUB 26.88 and KUB 21.38 in general and the Babylonian Princess at the Egyptian court, see already H. G. Güterbock, *SBo* I, 9.

³⁵ For C. Kühne's adaptation of the Boese-Wilhelm chronological rearrangement see the note to the title. Perhaps it may be added that these new 13th Century dates, although probably not yet absolute in the strict sense, more generally provide a highly useful framework for the Hittite diplomatic correspondence of this period (see regarding the 'Assyrian dossier' already S. Heinhold-Kramer, *AfO* 35 [1988] 79¹ and 88⁽¹¹⁸⁾ and A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 15, 163^(21, 22)). In this particular respect I refer to M. B. Rowton, *JNES* 19 [1960] 16-18 and *JNES* 25 [1966] 243-249 (the death of Kadasman-Turgu and the accession of Kadasman-Enlil II probably fall after the 'Eternal Treaty'; *KBo* 1.10 + dates from after 1258 B.C.; it cannot have been written before halfway into the reign of the Babylonian King Kadasman-Enlil II). So far the problem of the marriageable age has received very little attention. While H. Otten supposed that Puduheba(t) would have been 15 in the year of her marriage to Hattusilis (III), E. Edel chose for 20, cf. *Puduhepa*, 1975, 32 and *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof* (henceforward, *Ärzte*), 1976, 29 respectively. Presumably in view of Puduheba(t)'s synchronism with the Ugaritic King Niqmaddu II W. H. van Soldt, *AOAT* 40, 1991, 10⁽⁸⁹⁾ sided with Professor Otten; see, most recently A. Hagenbuchner, *SMEA* 29 [1992] 116⁽²⁴⁾ who, referring to the Middle Assyrian Laws § 43, ll. 25, 29 and 31, reckons with a minimal marriageable age of 10 years for the Hittite male as well.

§6.2. The Babylonian 'dossier'

The small Babylonian 'dossier' now presumably consisting of at least four pieces shows, I think, that during the middle phase of his reign Hattusilis III maintained diplomatic contacts with three successive Babylonian Kings: witness KUB 3.71 with Kadasman-Turgu (1275–1258² B.C.) with whom, according to KBo 1.10 + KUB 3.72, addressed to the former's successor Kadasman-Enlil II (1257–1249² B.C.), he concluded a Treaty which preceded the 'Eternal Treaty' of 1258 B.C. (see for the contacts with Kadasman-Enlil II now, too, KUB 26.88) and presumably also with Kudur-Enlil (1248–1240² B.C.), in conformity with the data contained in KUB 26.89 ll. 9'–14' and KUB 21.38 Rev. 7–11, as mentioned above. Sub. 3.1 I already concluded that the Babylonian King who married a Hittite Princess (KUB 21.38 Obv. 55) is likely to have been Kudur-Enlil. At this point I would like to add that it is attractive to assume that the fourth item of the 'dossier', the fragment found in Dūr Kurigalzu which is the single preserved remnant of the Hittite royal correspondence of the 13th Century B.C. found outside of Hattusa, merely consisting of a letter heading and greeting formulae of a message sent by a Hittite 'Great King' to a 'Great Queen', Queen of Babylonia, was sent to the daughter who had departed in order to affiliate with the Babylonian court. In this manner the fourth item of the 'dossier' would have been suitably taken care of.³⁶

The badly preserved KUB 3.71 nevertheless provides sufficient information to secure that the mutual relations between the two countries were rather good during that part of the reign of Kadasman-Turgu. The letter may have been received after the Babylonian Treaty and before the estrangement ensuing from the later international crisis. Good relations would also seem to have prevailed during the reign of Kudur-Enlil, if my interpretation of the Dūr Kurigalzu fragment is correct. About the time of the transfer of power from Kadasman-Turgu to Kadasman-Enlil II, the Bentesina treaty (in or shortly after 1258 B.C.) resulted in the arrangement of a double marriage bond, the presumably very soon concluded marriage between Bentesina himself and Gassul(iy)awiyas and the, in my opinion, planned marriage between Nerikkailis and a daughter of Bentesina which may have been a matter of a more distant future (cf. sub 3.2 together with note 14 and sub. 5. together with note 28). As has been indicated above sub. 4., also the marriage of Kilusheba(t) to the King of Isuwa must have taken place during the middle phase of the reign of Hattusilis III and therefore between 1258 and 1244 B.C. While the double marriage bond with Amarru secured the borderline with Egypt, Kilusheba(t)'s marriage must have been meant to strengthen the frontier towards Assyria.

³⁶ For the original 'dossier' including IM 50966 (cf. Taha Baqir, Iraq 8 [1946], Pl. 18, fig. 13 and ibidem, 89–90 and especially 93), see A. Hagenbuchner, THeth 15, 170–172 and THeth 16, 281–302, nos 204–206. I venture to go one step further and surmise that also in Babylonia a 'daughter of first rank' would have been brought to the Royal Throne. This would seem to follow from her title MUNUS.LUGAL GAL in the letter heading and to be confirmed by KUB 21.38 Obv. 55 (see sub 3.1.).

Concerning the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II my contention is that the rather detailed information of KBo 1.10 + KUB 3.72, extensively studied around 1960, and the general tenor of the new addition to the 'dossier', KUB 26.88, both attest to highly strained relations between the two countries in the aftermath of an, in my opinion, originally restricted geographical conflict possibly concerning Zulapa which – after the subsequent flight of Urhi-Tessub to Egypt – quickly developed into a, temporarily, serious international crisis. It has not been noted so far that, witness the rather recently acquired enlargement of the Bentesina Treaty KBo 28.117 + KBo 1.8 + Rev. 6' (1985), during the period this Treaty was concluded Babylonia was reckoned to belong to the potentially hostile countries (cf. G. F. Del Monte, *Mursili-Niqmepa*, 184–185). Within this reconstruction the passage offers support to the claim that the relations between Hattusa and Babylonia had markedly deteriorated in the wake of the international crisis. M. B. Rowton who still reckoned with a duration of Kadasman-Enlil II's reign lasting for 14 years, in his time estimated that the long and relatively well-preserved letter KBo. 1.10 + could not be dated before approximately halfway into the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II because during the interval between his accession and this letter Kadasman-Enlil II grew from child to adolescent or to the age of a grown man.³⁷ In my opinion the interval as such is of greater importance than the manner in which it is expressed (cf. "In jenen Tagen war mein Bruder (noch) klein." (KBo 1.10 + Obv. 34), as compared with M. B. Rowton's paraphrases, see A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 16 no 204, 282 and 289).

Just like in EA no 17, 1.12 = W. L. Moran, o. c., 41 Tusratta refers to himself as "young", "When I sat on the throne of my father, I was young," witness both versions of his Annals, Mursilis II was called "young" and "a boy" by his enemies right after his accession to the throne. His first wife Gassul(iy)awiyas gave him four children (3 boys and 1 girl) and among those were two sons, Muwattallis II and Hattusilis III, about whom we know that the difference in age between them must have been considerable. Nevertheless Gassul(iy)awiyas died before the end of the first decade of the reign of Mursilis II had been reached. Apparently either age was a variable entity, more or less "in the eyes of the beholder", or Kings were generally supposed to be mature men with a fairly large military and administrative experience, cf. Moran, o. c., 42¹ together with bibliographic references.

I believe that after the likely failure of KUB 26.88 Hattusilis III must have decided to renew his diplomatic initiative in exactly the same ordering of political steps which he had followed before 1258 B.C., first trying to improve the relations with Babylonia and only later approaching Egypt with the intention of rounding off his diplomatic endeavours with a Dynastic Marriage with that country which could only be given form in the acceptance of a Hittite Princess by and at the Egyptian court. It is not impossible that his offer in KUB 26.88 was made in pre-

³⁷ Cf. M. B. Rowton, *JNES* 19 [1960] 16–17 and *JNES* 25 [1966] 246 together with notes 23 and 24.

paration for a future demand for a Babylonian Princess, the request which had already once before been unsuccessful. I assume that to acquire a 'Babylonian spouse' for presumably Tudhaliyas (IV) initially must have had the highest priority, but up till this point I am unable to specify exactly when this request was granted, although it must have happened before 1245 B.C. (see above sub 2. and 3.1.).

So far I have not dealt with the question whether KUB 26.88 would have preceded or followed KBo 1.10 +. Because the writer in KUB 26.88 Obv. 7' at least once refers to the addressee as "my beloved son" (see, too, Obv. 10' and 16' for DUMU-*IA* in broken contexts but in Obv. 10' presumably referring to the son of the addressee), elsewhere addressing him more deferentially as "my brother" (Obv. 8', 9' and 12'; Rev. 6', 7' and 12'; possibly to be restored in Rev. 7' and 13'), I reckon with the probability that it may have been the earlier of the two. Moreover, KBo. 1.10 + Obv. 21–24 evidences that the first letter to Babylonia after the death of Kadasman-Turgu elicited a highly indignant answer from the vizier Itti-Marduk-TI.LA. In support of this contention Hattusilis III produces a passage from this reply which is quoted verbatim, cf. Obv. 23–24. It is therefore at least conceivable that not merely the formal argument mentioned above but also the contents of KUB 26.88 better agree with a dating of this draft to the first rather than to the second half of the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II. On the whole KBo 1.10 + clearly evidences that the relations between the two partners to the Treaty of Alliance had become and still were extremely cool, but, at least in my opinion, the letter shows no signs of indignation or downright tactless behavior on the Babylonian side.

If one is willing to incur the risks involved in making a not merely eclectic but even biased choice among the fairly large number of diplomatic drafts (or translations from incoming letters?) referring to Dynastic Marriages of Hittite Princesses which might fit the retrospective evidence dealt with so far as well as the contents of KUB 26.88, two other drafts of the corpus recently edited by. A. Hagenbuchner may be selected as being possibly relevant to the first part of the double marriage bond aspired for and finally acquired by Hattusilis III, KBo 18.19 = THeth 16 no 160, 207–212 and KUB 23.93 = ibidem no 310, 418–420. From a paleographic point of view both drafts can be dated to the middle of the 13th Century B.C. With a considerable degree of confidence KBo 18.19 can be included in the 'Babylonian dossier': a Dynastic Marriage with Assyria can be ruled out, a point which is reinforced through the manner in which the Left Edge of the Rev. 1.4 indicates that the addressee is unlikely to have been King of Assyria;³⁸ an attribution to the 'Egyptian dossier' need not to be considered at all; the possibility of involvement of Ahhiyawa in the proceedings, as cautiously suggested by. A. Hagenbuchner, is

³⁸ The sequence *nu-mu* LUGAL KUR *Aš-šur* would not have occurred in this form, I think, if the addressee (*ŠEŠ-IA*) would have been King of Assyria. See already H. Klengel, AOF 2 [1975] 59⁽⁶⁰⁾; Klengel also already suggested that this letter might be attributed to the 'Babylonian dossier', i. c., 59⁽⁶¹⁾ referring in the note to Kadasman-Enlil II as a possible addressee. See, too, S. Heinhold-Kramer, AfO 35 [1988] 95¹⁹¹.

in my opinion rather far-fetched. As far as can be determined, the contents of the badly preserved draft, largely concentrating on either Anatolian matters or on countries belonging to the Hittite zone of northern and central Syria, render it rather likely that Hattusilis III was the writer and a Babylonian King (Babylonia is referred to in Rev. 38'), either Kadasman-Enlil II or Kudur-Enlil, his successor, was the addressee. Inclusion of KUB 23.93 in the 'dossier' may point to a rather late date during the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II for KBo 18.19.

KBo 18.19 refers to a marriage of apparently the daughter of the Hittite writer, cf. Obv. 11', *nu-ua-aš-ši* DUMU.MUNUS-*IA* DAM-*an-ni nam-ma pí-ib[-hi]*, "[I will] still give my daughter in marriage [to him]", as compared with Rev. 30', *nu-u)a-aš-ši* DUMU.MUNUS *a-pé-e-da-ni* UD.K[AM-*ti pí-ib[-hi]*], "on that day I shall give] the daughter (or: the girl) to him".³⁹ The two passages mutually supplement one another. Taken together, they secure that the first part of the agreement concerning the exchange of the Princesses had not yet taken place, but that the offer of Hattusilis III still stood. In my opinion the speculative agreement hypothesized in the preceding sentence may actually be alluded to in one of the relatively better-preserved passages of the letter. Obv. 14'–17', which according to A. Hagenbuchner refers to a joint Oracle Investigation of the writer and the addressee. A. Hagenbuchner, o. c., 209–210 assumes that in Obv. 14'–24' successively two religious subjects would have been dealt with, first a presumably joint Oracle Investigation (Obv. 14'–17') and in second place the fact that a number of persons wanted to address a prayer (Obv. 18'–24'). These possible, but certainly not inevitable choices force her to question the attribution of KBo 18.19 to the diplomatic letters advocated in the Introduction to the volume, IV. Instead of reading and restoring in 11. 14' and 15' *an-da* IR-*u-e[-en]* and in 1.17' *an-da* IR-*ua-ar* from IR "bitten, verlangen, durch Orakel vermitteln" (cf. E. Neu, StBoT Beiheft 2, no 77), she should have opted, I think, for *an-da ir-u-e[-ni]* and *an-da ir-ua-ar*, in other words for an interpretation which is based on the reading of verbal forms derived from *anda ar*–⁴⁰, as used in one of the Divorce Laws of the 1st series, §31 according to the interpretation preferred by J. Friedrich and duly mentioned by A. Kammenhuber, "übereinkommen". In a note (3) the former adds "Wörtlich 'hineinge-

³⁹ The preceding sentence in Rev. 29' shows a compound subject consisting of ŠEŠ-*IA am-mu-uq-qa*, "my brother and I", indicating that the enclitic personal pronoun -*ši* must refer to a third party, presumably either the son (cf. KUB 26.88) or possibly but less likely (see below for KUB 23.93) the brother of the addressee.

⁴⁰ Actually Hagenbuchner is inconsistent, twice restoring a 1st person plural of the preterite, but translating, in her analysis the second occurrence with "Wi[r werden] eine Orakelfrage <dazu> stellen." (o. c., 207 and 209). Within the interpretation as a diplomatic letter a joint Oracle Investigation is highly unexpected, while *anda ar*-(/er-) is fairly common in Hittite. A verbal noun *eruar**, although not yet attested, is, taken by itself, what would need to be expected for Late Young Hittite: see N. Oettinger, *Stammbildung*, 43–48 (verbal class II 1 b) and especially, o. c., 47 where the same author dealt with the influence of the verbal class II 1 c (48–56) on the spreading of *e* in the verbal paradigm of *ar*-(/er) dealt with in detail, o. c., 403–404; some verbal nouns of class II 1 c

langen'. Oder wörtlich zu verstehen: '(in das gemeinsame Haus) hineingelangen?'.⁴¹ Also the equally literal interpretation of *anda ar-* preferred by E. von Schuler, TUAT I 1, 1982, 102, "und sie (dann) zusammenkommen", would seem to be possible regarding the letter; it could imply a (tentative) meeting between either the two rulers themselves or between representatives of both Kings. Concerning the meaning of *arkuuar* the author might also have made use of HW², 309 a sub voce *arkuui-* "sich entschuldigen (rechtfertigen)' bei Menschen" and ibidem, 311 b sub voce *arkuuar* "b) 'Rechtfertigung, Verteidigung, Entschuldigung'". According to the preceding letters KUB 26.88 and KBo 1.10 + (in the presumed chronological order), both parties had a lot to explain to one another or to apologize for. As will become clear from the continuation of my cursory treatment, also the 11. Obv. 25'–28' referring to some sort of presentation (see, also, o. c., 209) fit the general context of a planned Dynastic Marriage, possibly already leading up to a double marriage bond, rather well.

In the past the writer wrote to the addressee, *an-da-ma-an-ua ir-u-e[-ni]*, "Let us come to an agreement!" (or: "Let us come together!"). Apparently the addressee on one occasion wrote back, *an-da-ua ir-u-e[-ni]*, "We will come to an agreement!" (or: "We will come together!"), cf. Obv. 15'. My basic assumption concerning this passage is that in the sequel the writer would have mentioned that the addressee had not returned to the subject of this agreement or meeting. He continues by saying that problems with the Gasgaeans will require his personal attention in the present year, presumably preventing him from taking an initiative regarding this point.⁴² Is it a coincidence that in the remainder of the long paragraph there follow no less than three references to the sons of presumably the writer (Obv. 18', 21' and 24')? The name of Tudhaliyas occurs in Rev. 36'. It seems as if the relations between the two countries were improving. It is even possible that in this continuation of the Obverse the writer suggests that Babylonian 'emissaries' might meet with these sons in the capital. A tantalizing series of likely sub-

show the required *e*-vocalism thus offering support to *eruar** cf. *hē(-e)-šu-ua-aš* (Oettinger, o. c., 50 and E. Neu, GsKronasser, 121¹⁴, 125 and 126), (*ša-ra-a*) *a-še-šu-ua-aš* (Oettinger, o. c., 51 and Neu, l. c., 128) and, in addition to *ša-ra-ap-pu-ua-aš*, also *ša-ri-ip-pu(-u)-ua-aš* (Oettinger, o. c., 54 and Neu, l. c., 137). The evidence for a 'glide' *u* after *r* and before *ua(r)* is very rare.

⁴¹ Cf. J. Friedrich, HG, 26-27 and J. Friedrich – A. Kammenhuber, HW² I, 213 b; see ibidem, 209 b for another example of *ir-u-e-ni* for this verb. The pertinent passage of § 31 runs as follows: *takku LÚ-aš ELLUM GĒME-ašša šeleš nat anda aranzi nanza ANA DAM-ŠU dāi nuza É-ir Û DUMU.MEŠ ienzi*, "Wenn ein freier Mann und eine Unfreie (in einander) verliebt (?) (sind) und sie übereinkommen und er sie zu seiner Gattin nimmt und sie sich ein(en) Haus(stand) und Kinder schaffen".

⁴² Where I.16' becomes available one might restore and read ...*Ú-UL ma-an-g)a' ha-at-ra-iš*, "... you (or: [my brother]) [not at all] wrote." I must add that the manner in which the next clause begins with KUR.ME[Š] *Ga-aš-ga-ua-mu* is rather peculiar. The change of speaker is merely indicated with the particle *-ua(r)* of direct discourse, but no verb of speaking (or writing) has been added at this point. Concerning I.17' I follow the text restorations proposed by Hagenbuchner.

jects and direct or indirect objects as well as of preserved predicates prompts this impression: (11. 18'–24') "But the sons...They will meet with your [emissaries] ...what they see (and) what they do... what the sons are saying...and I will address (?) a plea to... "Because I [must go] to...he who addresses a plea..." [those who] will address their plea [will address it] to [my] sons..." The remainder of the Obverse is devoted to the planned presentation of either things or persons to others (Obv. 25'–28').

Attribution of KUB 23.93 (=A. Hagenbuchner, THeth 16 no 310, 418–420) to the 'Babylonian dossier' is considerably more difficult to argue for since merely two paragraphs of the 3rd Column have been preserved. Nevertheless also this draft needs to be taken into consideration. The treatment by Hagenbuchner suggests the restoration of the personal name of Hesnis for 1. 17' and she remarked in her commentary (p. 419) that the manner in which the first preserved paragraph is phrased may indicate that an older brother of the addressee might have preceded him as Ruler over the country, pointing out that – among other possibilities concerning 13th century Babylonian kings – this might have happened concerning the succession of Kadasman-Enlil II by Kudur-Enlil. In my opinion the attribution to the 'dossier' mainly hinges upon the possible text restoration of the personal name since a Hesnis is known to have been a son of Hattusilis III and Pudeheba(t); also in KBo 18.134 he is involved in a matter concerning Babylonia (cf. THeth 16 no 6, 12–13), while, witness KBo 18.48, *ibidem*, no 5, 7–12, Hesnis played a major role in an important Syro-Mesopotamian matter of this general period. In his recently published text edition of the Egyptian 'dossier' Professor E. Edel restores the name of Hesnis in KUB 3.43 + (=ÄHK no 6) Obv. 7', cf. I, 26–27 (A 5) and II, 46; KUB 3.39 (=ÄHK no 59) Obv. 9', cf. I, 150–151 (E 26) and II, 237. According to the manner in which the addressee is acknowledged as a peer (ŠEŠ-IA in III 3', 12' and presumably to be restored in III 7'), the erasure at the end of the first paragraph and – above all – the general contents with the unmistakable reference to a messenger in III 12', KUB 23.93 must, I think, be characterized as a draft of a diplomatic missive rather than as a private letter, a possibility which A. Hagenbuchner, *o. c.*, 419 does not want to exclude. The first sign of the personal name in III 17' can be identified with the presumably young form of *hi*, *HI* (E. Neu, StBoT, Beiheft 2, no 335) with two instead of the usually three or more high 'obliques' on the left side of the sign, followed by an admittedly less secure *eš*, *EŠ*. Limiting the choice to the attested names beginning with either *hi* or *hé* and further reckoning with the likelihood that, on account of the paleographic evidence as well as the contents of this small piece, one may attempt an identification with one of the rather numerous high functionaries known from this period, one inevitably ends up with the three Hurrian names, all three carried by Princes, He/isnis, He/ismi-sarrumas and [H]e/ismi-^dU, the latter being a hapax, as far as Hattusa is concerned. A minor indication in favour of Hesnis can be found in the fact that 3 out of the total of 23 attestations mentioned for this name in Th. P. J. van den Hout, *Diss.*, 231–235 (spread over 14 texts) show the same form of *hi*, present in KUB

23.93 III 17', one for each possibly distinct person recognized by the author, KUB 48.123 I 19' (1.h.), KUB 38.37 III² 5' (2.b) and KUB 44.24 VI 12' (3.b.). This form is not attested for Hesmarrummas, as far as the attestations from Hattusa and Egypt are concerned, 5 attestations in 3 texts, two from the Hittite capital and one ultimately stemming from Egypt (with three attestations), cf. *ibidem*, 138–143. As already indicated above, the hapax regarding Hesmi-^dU is insecure at this point. Presumably, the historical evidence concerning Hesnis's rate of representation in the texts from the capital and his political role (see already above) is of greater importance. The Egyptian references to Hismarrummas (KUB 3.34 Obv. 8', 19' and Rev. 15') establish that he visited Egypt in wintertime during a period of grain shortage in Anatolia (after one or possibly two years of failed crops?) and was expected (after his return) to go to the southern coast of Anatolia in order to be present at and to exercise supervision over the unloading of the Egyptian ships carrying the cereal supplies as agreed upon during his visit, cf. E. Edel, *FsAlt*, 54–55 and *Ärzte*, *passim* and especially 86–87 and see now for all the details E. Edel, KUB 3.34 (=ÄHK no 78), cf. I, 182–185 (H 3) and II, 49³¹ (presumably “Vs.” is a mistake for “Rs.”) and 274–282. Hesmi-^dU (KUB 48.88 Rev. 1') is usually identified with a Prince of this name known from the texts of Ugarit and Emar and presumably belonging to the Royal family of Carchemish, cf. H. Klengel, *AOF* 2 (1975), 60–61 and A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 16 no 13, 18–20 together with bibliographic references. Therefore, although somewhat hesitantly, I tend to agree with A. Hagenbuchner, as long as no argumentation to the contrary on other, more general historical grounds or a better proposal for the reading of the personal name are brought forward.

The main point to be derived from attribution of KUB 23.93 to the ‘Babylonian dossier’ would be that the contents of the fragment might indicate concerning the aforementioned agreement or meeting that it would actually have been reached or would have taken place, leading to the implementation of the first part of the double marriage bond shortly after the accession of Kudur-Enlil. In view of the minor detail, the fact that the writer refers to his, or rather her intention of “washing” something – the direct object is broken off, but the verb requires an inanimate direct object – I would like to believe that Puduheba(t), not her husband ordered the sending of this message. My highly tentative interpretation of KUB 23.93 leads to the following ‘result’: ² “Lo, conform to the man[ner in which previously] ³⁻⁴ your brother had passed [on the matter of the daughter (?)] to my brother, I do [not want] ⁵ to abandon it! As soon as I shall wash ⁶ [...], [I will assign] it to [...(personal name)] ⁷ and he will bring it to its destination and hand it ⁸ over to [my] broth[er]. Lo, [my daughter (or: her name)] ⁹⁻¹⁰ is [here] with me. And in no way will I let her go [merely] empty-handed, [my] daughter! ¹¹ And [she] will come likewise (viz. like this earlier consignment or, as has been agreed upon with your (late?) brother)!” (III 2'-11').⁴³

⁴³ This interpretation is based on the following readings and restorations GIM[-an ka-ru-ū] (1.2'), [ŠA DUMU.MUNUS *pa-ra-a*] (1.3', cf. CHD L-N 3, 262 b-263 a for (-za) *parā*

Actually it is not certain that A. Hagenbuchner rightly reckons with the possibility that the third party ("your brother" in 11. 3' and 14') might have been a just deceased predecessor. The matter is dependent on the text restoration chosen for the end of III 14' in the second paragraph of the draft. I hesitate between an expression for "death, fate, demise" and a more neutral "message": ¹² "The messenger whom my brother sent [off] ¹³ in se[cret] (?) (or: down (?)) to me, the mat[ter for] which ¹⁴ he arrived, [the death (or: the message)] of your brother, ¹⁵ surely superseded (?) (it) and [he lingered here] ¹⁶ and [he] even [did not yet set out] again thereto (where you are). ¹⁷ And H[es]nis will... him [back home]!" (III 12'–17').⁴⁴ In restoring "message" instead of "death" one might surmise that a rather commonplace incident had taken place: a Babylonian messenger, possibly the third party ("your brother"), would have come home in Babylonia after the messenger referred to in III 12' ff. had already left for Anatolia, while in the meantime a new Babylonian messenger (cf. the personal name of III 6'?) would have arrived in Hattusa; the preparations for the dowry would already have been set in motion (III 8'–11'), but beforehand another Babylonian 'request' needed to be taken care of (III 5'–8'). It might have concerned the required present in connection with the accession to the Throne.⁴⁵ One might even suppose that this different 'request' had actually been transmitted by the messenger who tarried in Hattusa, possibly waiting for the answer of the Babylonian King to the more important

mema-, "to pass on, divulge, reveal"), [*le-e*] (l. 4'; for the meaning of *lē* with the pres. fut., "I do not want to" see CHD L-N I, 55 a–b), *šE[š-I]* (l. 7'), [*DUMU.MUNUS-I*] (l. 8'), *ša-an-na-pi-li-ān-pāt* (l. 9'; for ll. 9'–10' see CHD L-N 2, 175 b (*manka*)) and *DUMU.MUNUS-I* (l. 10'). The CHD translated "In no way will I let him/her go[...] emptyhanded". In view of the continuation I choose for "her": an apposition to either the subject or the direct object after the predicate occurs more often in Hittite.

⁴⁴ Regarding the ll. 12'–14' I have adopted the transliteration and the text restorations proposed by A. Hagenbuchner, o. c., 418. As indicated in the text, I hesitate regarding the end of l. 14' between a word like *henkan* or *aggatar* or one of the pair *uttar* or *memiāš*. Since Hagenbuchner rightly remarks that merely the ll. III 7'–14' of the fragment are almost fully preserved (o. c., 419), my suggestion concerning the ll. 15'–17' are meant as rough approximations of the likely tenor of the remainder of the draft: working backwards from the preserved beginning of l. 16' containing *apiia*, I assume the presence of *ka-a* for l. 15', subsequently choosing for the predicate *iš-ta-an-d/ta-a-it* and an introduction of this clause with *na-aš-kán*. For the end of l. 16' I expect *nawi* in combination with 3rd person singular of either *pāi-* or *tiannāi-*. Concerning l. 17' I abstain from an explicit suggestion since any proposal would anticipate on the role of Hesnis.

⁴⁵ Cf. A. Goetze, *Kl.*, 1957², 98⁽⁶⁾ with a reference to KBo I.14 Rev. 5'–10': "(But) when I assumed kingship, you did not send me an ambassador, still it is customary that – kings assume [kingship, and the kings, his peers send him the proper [pres]ents (on that occasion), a royal gown, fine [oil] for anointing. But you did not do such a thing today.", cf. idem, *Kizz.*, 28–29. This passage might explain the "washing" of KUB 23.93 III 5'–6' since clothes can be washed. From the legal point of view these presents symbolize the recognition of the new king by his 'brother' in a foreign major power, cf. G. Kestemont, *CRAI* 25 (1978; publ. dat 1982), vol. I, 270 together with note 6 (277).

proposal which had reached him by means of the earlier messenger, who might have been the brother himself, but in any case would need to have conveyed or confirmed the message that the Hittite Royal Family was still interested in the Dynastic Marriage. The tense of III 2'–4' (–*za* [*parā*] *meman harta*) renders the restored direct object of 1.3' to a confidential matter of a more distant past, but this does not imply that the enigmatic brother would need to have died in the meantime. Apparently the fragment constitutes a Reverse and thus the main subject will have been dealt with on the Obverse of the tablet. This would explain why the question of the marriage bond returns in a rather casual manner among other affairs of presumably lesser importance. My underlying assumption is of course that this third party (“your brother”) would have been a brother of the new Babylonian King who, functioning as a sort of Babylonian counterpart to the Hittite Prince Hennis, would have been involved in the secret negotiations between the two countries concerning the first part of the double marriage bond. In that case it would not be necessary to postulate that Kadasman-Enlil II himself already would have yielded to the Hittite demand, while also the assumption that the two successive Babylonian Kings would need to have been brothers might so be avoided. Both options concerning “the brother” share the common denominator that the Hittite royal couple would have used the Babylonian request for recognition in order to renew their efforts to become affiliated with the Babylonian court.

This, as yet rather tentative chronological reconstruction of the actual events possibly involves two implications: firstly, at some time and preferably during the second part of the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II, a presumably younger brother might, but certainly not *must* have replaced a son of the Babylonian King as the prospective bridegroom and, secondly, quickly afterwards and thus still within the first or second year of the reign of Kudur-Enlil the ‘Babylonian spouse’ of Tudhaliyas (IV) would need to have left for Hattusa. From the Hittite point of view the nucleus of any marriage agreement with Babylonia must have consisted in her arrival at the Hittite court. At the same time, however, I also consider it rather likely that Kudur-Enlil’s marriage with a daughter of Hattusilis III and Puduheba(t) was, at least in part, meant to constitute the precedent for which it was used by Puduheba(t) in her draft KUB 21.38.

§6.3. The Babylonian Princess at the Hittite court

After ‘Tudhaliyas’s spouse’ had arrived in Hattusa, she might still be referred to by a circumlocution based on her country of origin, cf. “the daughter (or: the girl) of Babylonia”. This designation is used in the Oracle text KUB 6.5 (11. 27', 29' and 33') and returns in a slightly modified form in the Letter KUB 57.123 Obv. 12–13. Apparently a disease of “the daughter of Babylonia” gave rise to or formed part of an Oracle Investigation. The example in question constitutes one of those cases in which the subject of an Oracle Inquiry returns in the listing of the KIN oracle results, cf. A. Archi, OA 13 [1974], 116–117 concerning the 11.

29'–34'.⁴⁶ On account of the bad state of preservation of KUB 57.123, but presumably also in consequence of the specific character of this letter, addressed by a member of the royal family to the king, the passage in question is not very informative, cf. A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 16 no 14, 20–22. Daki-Sarrumas writes to 'His Majesty' (presumably Hattusilis III) about a number of issues clearly all well-known to both the writer and the addressee and among these "[the affair (or: the illness?) of 'the daugh]ter of Babylon'" [had] "not yet [come to an end (?)]". However, the writer adds "But [now] she wi[ll] quickly come from up here!". Unmistakably the Oracle Investigation KUB 22.70 in which she is referred to as DUMU.MUNUS GAL constitutes the main source for the wife of Tudhaliyas IV (otherwise merely known from the fragmentary letter KBo 18.114 Obv. 6' with the proviso that this wife of a Tudhaliyas would need to be identified with the Queen mentioned in 1. 3'). The excellent text edition published by A. Ünal, *THeth* 6, made even more valuable through the finishing touch on the DUMU.MUNUS GAL added by. I. Singer, is rather informative regarding the frictions at the Hittite court between on the one hand the queen-mother and on the other her son and her Babylonian daughter-in-law.

Since apart from the two veiled references in the letters KUB 57.123 Obv. 12–13 and KBo 18.1 Rev. 7, the former presumably still stemming from the period before and the latter from the period after the accession of Tudhaliyas IV, the 'Babylonian spouse' of Tudhaliyas IV was totally eclipsed by her mother-in-law Puduheba(t), as far as the evidence of historical texts and of seal impressions is concerned, we can merely hope to spot here in additional Oracle texts. Three more Oracle texts, all of them already mentioned by A. Ünal, *THeth* 6, 103, might be relevant, although no absolute certainty can as yet be reached. The poorly preserved MUŠ oracle KUB 49.1 deals in IV 5'–9' with the ordering of the King's activities during the major part of the new calendar year: will he go first to Kummanni, then to Hattusa and presumably afterwards to Nerik and, finally again to Kummanni? The text refers in 1. IV 16' of the subsequent section to both "the Deity of Arusna", well-known from KUB 22.70, and a DUMU.MUNUS.X[, while in the next line her recovery from a possibly mortal illness would seem to be alluded to; perhaps one might restore for 1. 16' *DUMU.MUNUS L[UGAL]KUR' Kar-^dDu-ni-ia-as²*], "the daughter of the K[ing] of Babylonia²". A. Ünal already restored *L[UGAL]* and the continuation would be in line with the proposal of I. Singer who appar-

⁴⁶ For KUB 6.5 see, too, A. Ünal, *THeth* 6, 103 and especially G. M. Beckman. *JCS* 35 [1983] 110⁽⁵⁸⁾ and I. Singer, *UF* 23 [1991] 332¹⁵ where this author also points to KUB 6.13 + KUB 18.62: 7', another Oracle text in which the wife of Tudhaliyas (IV) might be referred to as DUMU.MUNUS, presumably to be understood here as elsewhere in the meaning of "Princess". The passage in question which does refer to the Babylonian God Marduk (II.5' and 6') as the God whose anger must be appeased has been dealt with by A. Kammenhuber, *Or* 59 [1990] 194–195. Also KBo 24.120 should be added to the group.

ently overlooked this passage.⁴⁷ It is rather likely that in the again following and presumably final paragraph an alternative ordering, in which a visit to Nerik would have preceded the replica to Kummanni, is put to the test. According to KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 11'–15', again a poorly preserved MUŠ oracle, the recovery of a ^{MUNUS}GIG-*aš*, a female patient, was dependent on SISKUR.MEŠ, “offerings” or “rituals”, to be performed by ‘His Majesty’ himself to or for Hebat of Kummanni.⁴⁸ The SU oracle KUB 46.37 using extispicy refers first in an unspecified manner to the recovery from a potentially mortal illness, *na-aš a-pi-iz-za TI-eš-zi*, “will he (or: she) stay alive in that way?”, in Obv. 30', 32' and 34'⁴⁹ before it mentions a ^{MUNUS}GIG-*la*-, “a female patient”, in Obv. 48' and 49'. Thereafter the recovery of this female patient, presumably a close relative of the reigning Hittite King, is referred to – of course again in Oracle questions – in Rev. 39, ^{MUNUS}GIG-*la-aš a-pi-iz-za TI-eš-zi*, and Rev. 42, ^{MUNUS}GIG-*aš*? *ki-i-iz-za TI-eš-zi*, “will the female patient stay alive in that way” or “by this means?”. An intermediary passage, Rev. 3–14 treated by A. Ünal, THeth 6, 47–48, is interpreted by this scholar as a descrip-

⁴⁷ Cf. KUB 49.1 IV 5'–9' in the part of the paragraph where the question is formulated; presumably about half of each line has been preserved; the strong emphasis on Kummanni is not surprising since the town is already mentioned in l.3 of the Obverse: 5' ^dUTU-ŠI *kiš-an DÜ-zi A-NA MU-ti-kán X[-* 6' *nu-za INA^{URU} Kum-man-ni SISKUR.MEŠ DÜ-zi nu-za DINGIR-LUM⁷ na-aš INA^{URU} Kum-man-ni pa-iz-zi na-aš-kán XX* [8' *nu-kán^{URU} HAT-TI UGU ú-iz-zi nu-za EZ[EN.MEŠ DÜ-zi...* 9' *nu^{URU} Ne-ri-ik ḫar-pi-uš nu INA^{URU} Kum-man-ni*. The order of the plans for the year is up to the second journey to Kummanni identical with the proposed travelling schedule of KBo 16.98 II 11–16 (see for this passage Th. P.J. van den Hout, ZA 81 [1991] 292–293; see, too, note 49). After a highly puzzling first line the next paragraph for which already very few signs at the beginning of each line are preserved continues with 16' DINGIR-LUM^{URU} *A-r[u-u]š-na DUMU.MUNUS L[UGAL²KUR²Kar^dDu-ni-ia-aš* 17' DINGIR-LUM^{URU} *ma¹ḫu-eš-ki-iz-zi*; A. Ünal suggested the interpretation “Was dies betrifft, [d]aß [X] die Gottheit von Ar[ulsna (wegen der) Tochter des K[önigs² festgestellt wurde]: wird sie, o Go[tt], am Leben bleiben?”, o. c., 103. In the Turkish edition of his book, AnYayın 343, Ankara, 1983, 75 Ünal used the text restoration L[UGAL² in his transliteration.

⁴⁸ See KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 11' ^dUTU-ŠI *kiš-an DÜ-zi A-NA GIDIM-kán BE-LU-ḪI.A GAL* [12' *INA^{URU} Kum-man-ni-ma-za SISKUR.MEŠ pi-an ar-ḫa DAB-an-ḫa-ri* (cf. A. Kammenhuber, HW² I, 275 b) 13' *nu^dḪē-bat KASKAL-an-zi* ^dUTU-ŠI *ma-za SISKUR.MEŠ BAL¹-an-ti* 14' *ma-a-an-ma^{MUNUS}GIG-aš a-pi-iz-za TI-eš-zi* 15' *ua-an¹ ar-ḫa ti-ia-zi...* [Also regarding this paragraph about one half of each line has been preserved.

⁴⁹ It is possible to surmise that in these passages the nom. sing. of the Enclitic Pronoun far from being unspecified would refer to the King who regularly is the subject of the predicates and about whom we know that he was ill not merely during the time of the transfer of power from Hattusilis III to Tudhaliyas IV, with an overlap in lifetime between the two monarchs, cf. Th. P.J. van den Hout, ZA 81 [1991] 274–300, but also at the time during which the Oracle Inquiry KUB 22.70 was carried out and thus after the death of Hattusilis III (see note 50). But since the Oracle inquiry KUB 22.70 offers no clue about the period during which it was performed and because this type of travelling arrangement may have been a routine matter and the agreement between KUB 49.1 IV 6'–9', 18'–21' and KBo 16.98 II 11–16 is incomplete, I abstain from advocating this option.

tion of a planned cultic journey which would lead the King to Nerik (and further to Tumanna), to Kummanni and finally to Adaniya and Arusna (see now RGTC 6/2, 1992, 13-14, and 18 for the most recent bibliography concerning the latter two towns). Especially the reference to Arusna is highly interesting since it corresponds to the evidence of KUB 22.70 (see below).

The fact that two of these texts are MUŠ oracles renders it at least legitimate (see below ad ²⁾) to consider the option that, as was already intimated by Ünal, o.c., 47 regarding KUB 49.1 and KUB 46.37, all three should in one way or another be connected with KUB 22.70.⁵⁰ In his magisterial treatment of the MUŠ oracle type Professor E. Laroche, RA 52 [1958], 150–162 described it as a three dimensional variant of the KIN oracle type, specifically adapted to Royal Hittite use, in which, as in the KIN oracle, the designations of the aquatic animals moving around in the water basin (perhaps eels rather than snakes) were often adjusted to the subjects of the Inquiry:⁵¹ this explains the presence of the MUŠ DIN-GIR-LUM^{URU} *A-ru-uš-na* in KUB 49.1 IV 13', of the MUŠ^{URU} *Kum-ma/n-ni* in ibi-

⁵⁰ It has not been noted so far that KUB 50.123, also showing young *li* and presumably a slightly older parallel version since l.3' omits the somewhat cumbersome *du-ud-du-uš bal-zi-ia-u-ua-an-zi* of KUB 22.70 Rev. 46 and the ll. 12'-15' differ from ibidem Rev. 54 ff., duplicates for its ll. 3' up to and including 11' KUB 22.70 Rev. 46–53. The redating of KUB 22.70 to the 13th Century and more specifically to the reign of Tudhaliyas IV by the München group of Hittitologists, in my opinion strengthened by the addition of this 'parallel version', entails the further consequence that two Queens, not merely, witness KUB 14.4 II 3'-8', the Babylonian Tawanannas, but also the Hittite Tawananna Puduheba(t) (cf. KUB 22.70 Obv. 74 and 79), maintained connections with the É^{NA} *bekur*^d LAM-MA. So far I agree with A. Ünal, o.c., 110, but I would still like to hold on to the fairly general conviction that this institution must have constituted a sort of Mausoleum, cf. F. Imparati, SMEA 18 [1977] 24–38 and 58 with bibliographic references to both H. Otten and H. G. Güterbock. Since the involvements of both Queens took place after their husbands had died, it is only logical to assume that both Suppiluliumas I and Hattusilis III were venerated at this institution and that the same would eventually also apply to both Queens after they would have become Goddesses. Numerous passages attest to the fact that Hattusilis III greatly admired his grandfather, cf. e.g. KBo 6.28 + Obv. 16–25, KUB 19.9 I 7'–25', KBo 1.8 + Obv. 4–6 and 28–30; witness the letter from Ramses II NBC 3934 Obv. 13'–15' = A. Goetze, JCS 1 (1947), 241, 243 and 244, the point was even known in Egypt, cf. now E. Edel, ÄHK no 22, cf. I, 54–55 (D3) and II, 79 and 81.

⁵¹ Cf. E. Laroche, RA 52 [1958] 159–162 and especially p. 160 (regarding the denominations in general): "On distinguera, parmi ces dénominations, plusieurs groupes de personnes, d'objets et de concepts définissant, dans leur ensemble, la sphère d'intérêt de l'oracle royal hittite."; (p. 161 after the treatment of the locations and the objects derived from the sphere of Kingship and Palace sub C) an enumeration of "(D) Notions physiques, morales ou religieuses" about which Laroche remarks): "Ce groupe rappelle la liste traditionnelle des bienfaits dont les prières et les rituels magiques demandent aux dieux l'accomplissement, en faveur de la famille royale."; (and, finally, a part of the sentence with which the brilliant scholar brought his treatment of this type of Oracle to an end on p. 162): "l'ancienne lécanomancie savante des magiciennes hittites, questionnée avec tant de sérieux par les souveraines du second millénaire".

dem IV 25' and of the MUŠ^D *Hé-bat*, possibly to be found in KUB 49.1 IV 12' (the reading was proposed by A. Archi in the Introduction to the volume, but there still follow two illegible signs) and fairly often occurring in KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 8', 9', 15', 17', 18' and 19'. As was indicated above, the Goddess of Arusna plays a role in KUB 49.1 IV 13'–17', while the SISKUR.MEŠ in Kummanni are referred to in KUB 49.1 IV 6' in a fairly general manner and more in detail (also mentioning Hebat) in KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 12'–13'. In the fairly well-preserved, but also with difficulty legible SU Oracle text KUB 46.37, the time during the year at which the SISKUR.MEŠ in Kummanni should be performed by the King, either in the spring or in the autumn or – possibly – in both (?), would seem to constitute one of the subjects dealt with in the preserved beginning of the text, cf. Obv. 2' and Obv. 6' versus 34'. The fairly numerous references to the two types of SISKUR.MEŠ, either the SISKUR.MEŠ *sec* or the 'great' variant, as well as to the Goddess Hebat vouch for the subject of this part of the investigation.⁵² Within this general context the option of a short visit to Nerik, "in counted days", is put to the test, cf. Obv. 37'–38'. Intuitively I feel tempted to conclude that all three Oracle texts share a common point of interest which, witness the prominence of the Oracle question whether "the female patient will stay alive" towards the end of both KUB 46.37 and KBo 23.117, might have concerned the ill health of the presumably royal relative and thus, possibly but this is of course still tentative, of 'the Babylonian spouse'. For someone who wants to defend the hypothesis of a close unity in general contents and purpose concerning these three Oracle texts it is a comforting thought that even the wording used to describe alternative options open to the King occasionally is identical: ^dUTU-ŠI *kiš-an* DÙ-zi, "Will 'His Majesty' act in the following manner?", cf. KUB 49.1 IV 5'; KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 11'; and *nu kiš-an-ma* DÙ-zi, "Or will he act in this manner?", cf. KUB 49.1 IV 18', KUB 46.37 Rev. 3 (*nu kiš-an-ma*¹ DÙ-zi).

The possible or even likely connections with KUB 22.70 have already been pointed out by A. Ünal. The DUMU.MUNUS GAL, for Ünal instead of a daughter or stepdaughter of Puduheba(t) rather her daughter-in-law, in his opinion belonged to, or even led the group of opponents of the ruling Queen Puduheba(t) while also cheating the Goddess of Arusna and thus sharing the responsibility for the anger of this Deity with 'His Majesty' and the Queen (o. c., 25, 47 and 51–52). I. Singer's conclusion regarding the identity of the DUMU.MUNUS GAL, a Babylonian Princess, and "the overall atmosphere of tension between the queen (i. e. Puduhepa), on the one side, and the king (Tudhaliya) and his spouse (the Great Princess of Babylon), on the other," as Singer phrased it (l. c., 332) can be elaborated upon in one, rather important aspect. It is interesting, I think, that – admittedly among other 'affairs' – the two affairs or intrigues in which the DUMU.MUNUS GAL was implicated have not yet been totally clarified during the

⁵² Both types of SISKUR.MEŠ are mentioned in KUB 46.37 Obv. 2', 10', 14', 15' (GAL) and 16'; the Goddess Hebat in Obv. 26', 37', 41', 45' and 46'.

Investigation. I refer to the declaration of one of the accused, Ammat(t)allas, the apparently perfidious female servant of the 'Deity of Arusna', according to which the DUMU.MUNUS GAL would have secretly escorted her (upwards) to the Palace (Obv. 29–32 and 72) and to the declaration of Narus, a female witness, that Ubazitis would have confided to the Queen that the DUMU.MUNUS GAL had interchanged "the anyhow rather few utensils" for others (which presumably were less valuable) sending those to the Goddess of Arusna (Obv. 82–85). These offenses as such have been confirmed in the Inquiry and thus the King was held responsible for them, but the question of guilt, as specified by one of the accused and a witness, had not yet been established. Apparently those points required further investigation in one or two separate Inquiries which may have concerned the Queen or the DUMU.MUNUS GAL, probably the latter.

The Deity was angry at the King because she had not been consulted concerning his own illness but the King was also implicated in the long series of misdemeanours against the 'Deity of Arusna' enumerated in what aptly characterized by A. Ünal as the summary ("Resümee"), Obv. 71-Rev. 3 (o.c., 32), presumably mainly since, in last instance, 'His Majesty' was responsible for all the Cults in the whole country. Tudhaliyas IV was obliged to ask for mercy on two occasions, during the process of this Investigation and presumably again during a visit to her sanctuary in Arusna (o. c., 26, 35 and 47). The Queen is very often mentioned in the Inquiry and through her, in the eyes of the Goddess of Arusna undue favoritism for the rock-sanctuary of ^dLAMMA (see note 50 above) she undoubtedly had set the whole series of events in motion. But perhaps one may not exclude that she has been to some extent a repentant sinner. She had cursed the perfidious Ammat(t)allas referring to the Goddess of Arusna (Obv. 7–8, o. c., 24), while it is not unlikely, I think, a point about which I disagree with Ünal, o. c., 26–27 and 28, that – earlier than the King – she may have chosen the side of the Goddess of Arusna concerning the affair of Pattiya and the latter's daughter (Obv. 35, 44–47, 67–70, 79–81, 85–86). In his, on the whole very convincing analysis Ünal did not sufficiently reckon, I believe, with the fact that during the final stage of the Investigation representatives of the sanctuary in Arusna must have been present in the Hittite capital, cf. *nu apēl šA DINGIR-LIM UN.MEŠ-uš kuyēš kâ*, "Jener Gottheit Leute, die hier sind," (Rev. 61) and that this group is likely to have been finally headed by Hepamuwas (Rev. 13–16 and 66–67; o. c., 26). Witness the latter passage she has already been invited and on both points it is promised that her opinion will be decisive. My guess would be that the Queen managed to change sides in time, later using the opportunity the Inquiry may have offered to her in order to prepare her comeback to the Palace in the capital from which she had been expelled (Obv. 16). After I. Singer's intervention I no longer believe that it can be maintained that Pattiya would have been the mother-in-law of the King and her daughter his wife, but, with this important reservation and the minor adjustments suggested above, Ünal's characterization of her role in the proceedings, o. c., 26–27 still is very informative.

The joint behaviour of the presumed married couple, Tudhaliyas IV and the DUMU.MUNUS GAL, would surely have put both of them in debt to the Deity of Arusna. But the involvement of Hebat of Kummanni is more difficult to account for. I can merely point to the fact that in a 'Sammeltafel' of Oracle investigations of this general period KBo 16.98 mention is made of an Oracle Investigation involving a vow pronounced by the Queen, presumably Puduheba(t), to a number of Deities headed by Hebat of Kummanni concerning a Plague which either had already broken out or was feared to do so among detachments of the Army (I 1-9).⁵³ This admittedly vague indication may be combined with the references to a Plague in the MUŠ oracle KBo 23.117 I, 11. 4 and 13 the former of which is reinforced by the mentioning of a MUŠ *benkan* in the subsequent line of the paragraph.

The tentative approach advocated here requires an opposition between on the one hand the SU oracle KUB 46.37 and on the other the two MUŠ oracles KUB 49.1 and KBo 23.117. Fortunately this point does not represent an insurmountable obstacle at all since¹⁾ the two MUŠ oracles may very well constitute a series consisting of two tablets, in which case KUB 49.1 would need to precede KBo 23.117, and because²⁾ the single fully preserved but not yet securely dated MUŠ oracle IBoT 1.33 clearly shows that a MUŠ Inquiry can be used as a sort of countercheck or rather as a 'second opinion' of sorts concerning Oracle results which had earlier been reached by means of other Oracle techniques. Ad ¹⁾ The question of the ordering is actually very simple. The first series of MUŠ.MEŠ used in KUB 49.1 I 4-24 (accompanying the first four, short questions, unfortunately all of them broken off and therefore practically unintelligible) offers sufficient examples of either direct or indirect allusions to events of the Cult Calendar of the Year in or near the capital to ensure that the Inquiry was meant to encompass the major part of a full year, viz. from the first month in March-April up to and including the eighth month during the Autumn.⁵⁴ Ad²⁾ Witness IBoT 1.33:83-84 Mezzullas and the

⁵³ This 'Sammeltafel' of Oracle Investigations starts out with this Inquiry, cf. I 1-2; the Vow by the Queen is referred to in I 3-4, while *benkan*, "fate, death, plague" is mentioned in I 6. The far better preserved Column II first deals with an Oracle Investigation concerning the Deity Saumatari or Gaitana which is likely to be alluded to in the Vow KUB 15.19 Obv. 3'-10'/13', cf. J. de Roos, Diss., 1984, 242¹; for the remainder of Column II, cf. Th. P. J. van den Hout, as quoted in the notes 47 and 49. For the text as a whole see P. Cornil and R. Lebrun, *Hethitica I* (1972), 1-14.

⁵⁴ See apart from the MUŠ EZEN.MEŠ *tarnaš* (KUB 49.1 I 8': cf. the cubic measure *tarnaš* and *tarnatt*-, "ration"?), and the possible example MUŠ MU-TI, if rightly understood as "the snake of the year" instead of "the snake of Death" in KUB 49.1 IV 11' and KBo 23.117 Rev. (IV) 6', 10' and 16', MUŠ *pu-ru-ul-li* (I 5) and MUŠ *pu-ru-ul-li (-ma)* ŠA^E *be-eš-ti* (I 22), a Festival of the New Year, cf. O. R. Gurney, Schweich, 38-39 and 62; MUŠ AN.TAḪ.SUM^(SAR) in I 6 and presumably also in IV 12'(?), the Festival of the Spring, and, finally, MUŠ ITU.8.KAM, "the snake of the eighth Month", the month in which the *nuntarriyašhaš* Festival began, the Festival of the Autumn, in I 7. The MUŠ^{URU} *Ne-ri¹-ik¹* *bar¹-pi-uš* (I 17, cf. IV 9') refers to a Harvest Festival in Nerik.

(other) MUNES.MEŠŠU.GI had reached a conclusion concerning the Evil Portents which were occurring in Kummaha (11. 1, 89 and 95) implying that the fourth and eighth year of the ruling King's reign would be unfavourable: "Voici ce qu'ont déclaré Mizzulla et les magiciennes: "Pour Mon-Soleil la 4^e (et) la 8^e années sont mauvaises." – En sera-t-il ainsi, comme (le dit) la magicienne: qu'il soit adverse." (11. 83-84, cf. E. Laroche, 1. c., 154, 158). According to the preceding 11. 21-24 and 35-38, this result was now modified; as far as the King himself was concerned, these years would be favourable. In my opinion the 11. 89-91 constitute a decisive turning-point in the text: "But these evil portents which occur, whatever they may be, let them not be taken into account. But if the days of My Majesty may be (so) – if I shall not experience humiliation and degradation let (the oracle) be favourable!" (1. c., 155 and 158, as adapted to the CHD L-N 1, 87a). The purport of this part of the proceedings clearly is that these evil portents may signify whatever they signify, but that they will not affect the royal prestige.

In the subsequent paragraph the subject of the Oracle question is widened to the well-being of the Hittite countries (1.95). Thereafter the well-being of the Person of 'His Majesty' is put to the test (1.101), while in the one but last paragraph it is asked whether the Deity will bring bodily harm to 'His Majesty' (11.106-107) and the final paragraph deals with the question whether the year of (his) Death (I.111) is already nearby. In a highly characteristic manner the (first) 'snake' "called by name" to move to the first location of the basin is, with few exceptions – MUŠ SAG.DU ^dUTU-ŠI in 11. 4, 102. 107 and 112, MUŠ SAG.DU KUR *HAT-TI* (I. 96) in the paragraph devoted to the well-being of the Hittite countries – always abbreviated as MUŠ SAG.DU, a designation which recurs in other MUŠ Oracle texts, devoted as this type of Oracle text apparently was to the personal interests of the ruling Hittite King in the long line of his predecessors and successors.⁵⁵ I tend to think that, completely conform to Laroche's succinct characterization of this type of Oracle (note 51), a MUŠ Oracle will have served to refine the results achieved by the application of other Oracle techniques or else, but this is decidedly more tentative, will have been used in order to define the general direction of future Oracle Inquiries or of other types of Investigations. As shown above, the first possibility may be exemplified by IBoT 1.33. The second option might apply to KUB 49.2 +?,⁵⁶ the third alternative may be present in KUB 22.38 which presumably led

⁵⁵ Also in KUB 49.1 the MUŠ SAG.DU (^dUTU-ŠI) regularly occurs first in a series of 'snakes', cf. I 4, 10, 15, 20 and 26; IV 10' and 22', while in KBo 23.117 Obv. I, presumably under the influence of the subject dealt with, witness the opposition with *henkan* and MUŠ *henkan* (11. 4 and 5), he or she is relegated to second place after the MUŠ ^dU TI, "the snake of the Storm God of life", cf. I 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 (actually fully restored). In the Rev. (IV) of that tablet the subject dealt with required that the MUŠ^d*Hebat* occupied the first position in the series (see above in the text).

⁵⁶ For the possible but not actually necessary indirect join between KUB 49.2 showing the upper part of a first Column and KUB 18.6 showing the lower part of a first and the upper part of a fourth Column, see A. Archi in the introduction to KUB L. His argumentation was based on the fact that both MUŠ oracles show the same denominations for

to the Investigation attested by the 'Protocol of the requisition' KUB 15.5 + KUB 48.122, as studied in II, sub 5. This MUŠ oracle presumably stemming from a late phase of the reign of Urhi-Tessub is, on paleographic grounds (consistent usage of old *li*), earlier in time than either KUB 49.1 and KBo 23.117 or KUB 49.2 +², while – notably enough – towards the end two other techniques, KIN and MUŠEN, are employed to confirm the final auspicious result acquired by means of the MUŠ procedure, cf. for the last mentioned point in first instance A. Kammenhuber, *THeth* 7, 27⁵⁰. The present examples KUB 49.1 and KBo 23.117 do not allow for a judgement since in both cases not enough text has been preserved in order to decide what the relationship in time towards KUB 46,39 is likely to have been, i. c. whether the MUŠ oracles preceded or followed the SU oracle. What can be established is that an illness of a royal relative of Tudhaliyas IV who is likely to have been his wife constituted the background to the two Oracle Investigations, presumably being both contemporaneous with and related to KUB 22.70.

the snakes (see below). My own contention that this MUŠ oracle should be connected with the group of texts and fragments dealt with by Th. P. J. van den Hout in his article, "Hethitische Thronbesteigungsorakel und die Inauguration Tudhalijas IV." (see the notes 47, 49 and 53) rests on three formulaic correspondencies, all three concerning a, in this MUŠ oracle presumed, but actually to be restored EZEN₄, *ašannaš*, the Festival of Inauguration, which is preserved for KUB 18.36: 19' and 20' (cf. l. c., 279–280 and the commentary on 281⁽¹⁷⁼⁾; the Hittite word hiding behind the Sumerogram is a noun common gender): (in the order of the text implied by Archi's proposal) the usage of *zaluganu*, "to postpone", in KUB 49.2 I 6' (in the 1st person plural of the present, while all the examples of *zaluganu* and *parā arḫa zalukeš* in the texts and fragments of van den Hout are in the preterite; this also applies to his examples of MU *wahnu*-), as compared with KUB 18.36: 12'(279), KUB 6.9 + KUB 18.59 II 13 (282), KUB 49.73:5' (284) and KUB 16.20: 1' and 9' (284–285): the use of *pi(r)an arḫa ūl* (still followed by the remnant of a sign in the Column-divider) *peššiya* in KUB 18.6 I 9'–10', as compared with KUB 22.13:5' where the same predicate (with both 'local adverbs'), partly preserved, might be restored for the ll. 4'–5' (286); and finally *-za-kan eš*- (M.-P.) in KUB 18.6 I 10'–11' for which the parallels in the material treated by van den Hout require the restoration here or the inference from the context of a LUGAL(-u)-iz-na(-an)-ni, "for Kingship", in comparison with KUB 18.36: 2'–3' (restored) and 11' (279), KUB 6.9 + 18.59 II 14–15 (282), KUB 49.73: 6'–7' (restored; 284), KUB 16.20: 2' (restored; 284), 10' (285), KBo 2.2 I 31–32 (290) and KBo 16.98 II 12 (292).

But the presence in both fragments of the MUŠ *ŠUM LUGAL(-UT-TI)*, "the snake of the name (viz. Our 'title') of Kingship", in KUB 42.2 I 9', 19'; II 10' and III 7'; KUB 18.6 I 5' (the long form), 17'; II 3 and IV 9 carries more weight, as far as the connection with the large van den Hout group is concerned, since this appellation would seem to be highly appropriate for a MUŠ oracle regarding a royal Inauguration. The MUŠ *ariyašeš-naš*, "the snake of the Oracle Investigation", also attested by both fragments (KUB 49.2 I 20'; KUB 18.6 I 23' and IV 11), may have been chosen on account of a possibly preceding Oracle Inquiry which might be referred to in KUB 18.6 I 8'–9'. But I should not want to exclude the alternative that this very same Investigation might have triggered the name-giving of the second MUŠ as well as this reference to an Oracle Inquiry in the present tense.

§ 6.4 A historical evaluation of the Dynastic Marriages

Viewed in isolation from the more intimate details gleaned from the diplomatic correspondence of the period, the main developments can be summarized as follows. After Hattusilis III and Ramses II had reached an agreement about their dispute, the Hittite relations with Babylonia markedly deteriorated, presumably because the Babylonians felt that they had merely been used in order to enhance diplomatic pressure upon Egypt. After approximately four to five years the Babylonians had also restored their diplomatic relations with Egypt, but they were still far from friendly towards Hattusilis III. While it is certain that their first reaction to this renewed diplomatic initiative had been extremely cool, it is at least possible that Kadasman-Enlil II persistently declined the overtures of Hattusilis III. The diplomatic drafts KUB 26.88, KBo 18.19 and KUB 23.92 allow for the interpretation favoured by the retrospective evidence that the first part of the double marriage bond with Babylonia came about through the likely linkage between the Babylonian need for the Hittite recognition of Kudur-Enlil's accession and a renewed Hittite offer to strengthen the diplomatic relations by means of a Dynastic Marriage. Thus it would seem that only after the accession of Kurdur-Enlil did Hattusilis III manage to achieve a diplomatic success which he succeeded in repeating with Egypt, in doing which he surpassed the successes of former and contemporary Mittanian and Babylonian Kings.

During the negotiations with Ramses II, Puduheba(t) and Hattusilis III expressed their desire that the Hittite Princess should receive the rank of the Pharaoh's 'principal wife', viz. The Egyptian replica of the title of Queen. The request was granted, a point which would seem to be confirmed by the Egyptian sources.⁵⁷ According to Egyptologists the new Queen temporarily played a role of some importance during the subsequent phase of his reign.⁵⁸ Thus, for presumably a rather short period thanks to the unceasing diplomatic efforts of the royal Hittite couple, the political conditions for the survival of the Empire, viz. good diplomatic relations with two out of the three other major powers, would seem to have been guaranteed. The claims in the sections 1., 4., 5. and 6. That the foreign and domestic policies of Hattusilis III, as evidenced by the conclusion of the State Treaties and the subsequent creation of an intricate webwork of Dynastic Marriages, were guided by general principles receives support from the evidence of

⁵⁷ See now KBo 28.23 (=ÄHK no 43) Obv. 39-41, cf. I, 108-109 (E 10) and the less well-preserved parallel letter to Hattusilis III KBo 1.9 + (ÄHK no 42) Obv. 39'-41', cf. I, 102-103 (E 9) as well as the comments in II, 168, 172 and 175. For the point as such see already E. Edel, IF 60 (1949), 76. The manner in which the Egyptian consent was phrased was already made known by E. Edel in JKF 2 (1952-1953), 268; see, too, E. Edel apud F. Pintore, o. c., note 182 (162). See regarding the Egyptological confirmation also above sub 4. Note 26.

⁵⁸ See, too, K. A. Kitchen, *Pharaoh Triumphant. The Life and Time of Ramesses II*, Cairo 1990, 83-89, 95 and 110.

the next decade concerning Dynastic Marriages: according to the Egyptian 'dossier' presumably still during the reign of Hattusilis III a second Hittite Princess followed the example of her sister; before his enthronement in Amurru as the successor of Bentesina, also Sausgamuwas married another daughter of the former ruling Hittite couple.⁵⁹ The marital side of their common policy doctrines would seem to have been a major concern of Puduheba(t). Her specific responsibilities in this respect are confirmed in their domestic application by an interesting passage of the recently published 'Bronze Tablet': "Und was (betrifft, daß) auf der Vertragstafel meines Vaters folgendermassen ausgeführt ist: "Welche Frau die Königin dir zur Ehe geben wird, deren Sohn wird er im Lande Tarḫuntašša zur Königsherrschaft nehmen" – als man die Vertragstafel ausfertigte, da hatte Kurunta aber jene Frau vor dem Angesicht meines Vaters noch gar nicht genommen. Ob aber jetzt Kurunta jene Frau nimmt oder ob er sie nicht nimmt, jene Angelegenheit wird nicht (weiter) aufgegriffen. Welchen Sohn auch immer Kurunta für richtig hält – ob es ein Sohn jener Frau (ist) oder der Sohn einer anderen Frau – welcher Sohn (also) dem Kurunta nach dem Herzen ist (und) welchen Sohn Kurunta für richtig hält, selbigen soll er im Lande Tarḫuntašša zur Königsherrschaft einsetzen; den Kurunta wird in dieser Angelegenheit niemand anweisen." (translation of StBoT Beiheft 1, § 19 II 84–94, pp. 20–21 by H. Otten). Apparently not merely Kuruntas but also Tudhaliyas IV felt less inclined to follow Puduheba(t)'s directives in this respect than Hattusilis III, her husband, normally did during his reign. Already in my first contribution on the history of this period I reckoned with the possibility that this passage refers to a *taranza* marriage, cf. I, 241¹² together with the bibliographic reference for that type of wedlock. As intimated above sub 4., I would like to propose now that this curious passage offers the explanation for the contents of KUB 26.53:2'–9' and KUB 57.125 Obv. 20–21. Of course I am aware of the fact that Professor Edel, in contrast to B. Meissner, ZDMG 72 [1918] 62–63, F. Pintore, o.c., 11 together with 146¹¹, 78, 126–127, 140–141 together with 192⁸¹¹ and G. Kestemont, OLP 12 [1981] 73–78 (with in each case differing nuances), does not believe that KBo 1.23 (=ÄHK no 68), cf. I, 166–167 (E 35; of course by far the superior treatment) and II, 254–257, was meant to lead to an Anatolian marriage of the newly born daughter of Ramses II, cf. ÄHK II, 256, but his reasoning is based on the proviso that in that case the future bridegroom would need to have been a vassal of the Hittite 'Great King' of the period concerned. An 'heir

⁵⁹ Professor Edel decisively argues that KUB 3.68 (=ÄHK no 73) in Obv. 15–19 alludes to the marriage between Ramses II and the second Hittite Princess, cf. I, 174–175 (F5) and II, 264–267. ÄHK no 73 is one of the so-called *insibja* letters which can be dated to the period between the 42nd and the 56th year of the reign of Ramses II, viz. between 1237/6 and 1223/2 B.C. This point prompted me to date KUB 26.53 and KUB 57.125 to one of the last years of the reign of Hattusilis III. Cf., too, K. A. Kitchen, o.c., 92–95 and 110; H. Klengel, Syria 3000 to 300 B.C., 1992, 168–169 and 172–173. For the chronology of the events concerning Sausgamuwas, see, too, II sub 3. together with the notes 36 and 37.

presumptive' to the Hittite Throne would have been an entirely different matter. This possibility may have been raised by the Egyptian ally and was perhaps not immediately turned down by the Hittite royal family, although Kuruntas, as possibly witnessed by this passage, for obvious reasons would seem to have persistently declined to consider this Egyptian offer and Hittite assignment. Admittedly the tenor of both KUB 26.53: 2'-9' and KUB 57.125 Obv. 20-21 indicates that the Hittite royal couple eventually tried to scale down their counter proposal to a young Prince, who, as a 'son of first rank', might still be expected to succeed in due course to e. g. the vassal kingship presently occupied by his father. Although in the long run Professor Edel's rebuttal would thus seem to be justified, I still think that a solution which simultaneously offers the opportunity to explain another mysterious passage deserves serious consideration. Moreover, after the selection of Tudhaliyas (IV) to become the 'heir presumptive', the whole situation concerning Kurunta's role as the prospective bridegroom of the Egypto-Hittite Princess would in any case have had to be reconsidered.

My treatment leads to the chronological conclusion that the Hittite evidence is best served by the dating of the eight years of the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II between the 'Eternal Treaty' of 1258/7 and the first marriage of Ramses II to a Hittite Princess in January 1244 B.C., beginning ideally with Ramses II's 22nd year and ending with his year 30, viz. between 1257/6 and 1249/8 B.C. Hopefully this tentative synchronism between, Hattusa and Babylonia on the one side and Egypt on the other, can play a role in future chronological discussions. But it should be acknowledged that, in addition to being tentative, this 'synchronism' is also highly indirect since to a large extent it 'translates' Hittite reality, as (re)constructed from often broken texts, by means of the current estimate concerning the duration of the reign of Kadasman-Enlil II, into the terms required by the lowest chronological option regarding the dates of Ramses II.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ After the well-known synchronism between Kadasman-Turgu and Adad-Nêrârî I of the seventies or sixties there are no indisputable synchronisms between Egypt and Mesopotamia nor between Kings of Babylonia and Assyria until the twenties of the 13th Century B.C., cf. S. Heinhold-Kramer, AfO 35 [1988] 95¹⁹⁵ together with bibliographic references. This entails that for the time being Ancient Historians need to reckon with (or even to rely upon) the Hittite evidence for the intermediary period.