

Altorientalische Forschungen	25	1998	1	34–53
------------------------------	----	------	---	-------

PHILO H. J. HOUWINK TEN CATE

An alternative Date for the Sunassuras Treaty (KBo 1.5)*

1. Introduction

Professor Dr. H. Klengel was the first scholar to remark that the attribution of the Sunassuras Treaty to the reign of Suppiluliumas I need not have been the correct and thus final solution. As the foremost historian of the past decades who spent so much time and effort on the description how the Hittite 2nd millennium data should be integrated into the history of the Ancient Near East in general and more in particular with respect to the history of Syria, he will be pleased, I hope, to read this renewed attempt to come to grips with the major problem which he brought to the attention of his colleagues in a note added to an article devoted to a closely related, but quite different subject, the history of Isuwa!¹ I shall treat this attribution problem against the background

* The abbreviations used are those of the CHD and HW². For KBo 1.5 see E. F. Weidner, PD 1 no 7, 88–111. I am not fully convinced by the treatment of R. H. Beal, Or 55 [1986] 424–445. Because – understandably from his point of view – in his excellent thesis THeth 20, 1992, Beal occasionally refers to his attribution of KBo 1.5 to Tudhaliyas II as if it constitutes a proven fact and he has already been followed by a considerable number of scholars, I will make use in this contribution of Akkadian texts and fragments published in KBo 28 (1985, and thus after Beal's article had been written and submitted) in order to plead for the alternative option of dating the treaty in the reign of Tudhaliyas III. In a parallel article I shall elaborate on the prosopographic details concerning the Early Empire monarchs in the light of recently published new evidence, more specifically addressing the problems of the equation Tasmisarri = Hattusilis II (?) and the descent of Suppiluliumas I. Finally, I am indebted to Dr. Th. P. J. van den Hout, Dr. W. H. van Soldt and Drs. P. M. Goedegebuure for their generous assistance in solving various, technical problems.

¹ Cf. H. Klengel, OA 7 [1968] 65¹⁰: “Die Zuweisung des Vertrages in die Zeit des Šuppiluliuma ist noch nicht gesichert; eine frühere Datierung ist nicht auszuschließen“. Although Professor Klengel was not always credited for this justified remark, the idea was quickly taken up by others, cf. M. Liverani, OA 12 [1973] 269 (“al meglio nella prima parte del regno di Suppiluliuma; Oltre certo non si può scendere; mentre una datazione un po' più alta non può al limite essere esclusa.”); G. Kestemont, Diplomatie, 1974, 351⁽²⁸⁾ (“le traité entre le Hatti et Sunassura III de Kizzuwatna (PDak 7), s'il ne date pas du règne de Suppiluliuma, ne peut en être trop éloigné”), 428³⁰⁴ (the second half of the reign of Tudhaliyas III), 507 (the end of his reign). For

of the history of the Early Empire Period because now, just as before, the historical prologue of the treaty renders it advisable to do so: the king who concluded this treaty – now known to have been named Tudhaliyas, cf. G. Wilhelm, FsOtten 2, 362–364 – takes the incorporation of Kizzuwatna during the time of his grandfather as his starting-point for a survey of recent relations between the two countries. The same also applies to his main opponent, the Hurrian king, who is quoted in this prologue with a similar reference to his own grandfather (I 14–15). The title already intimates that I shall plead for G. Kestemont's attribution of the treaty to Tudhaliyas III, cf. note 1. I think that I can argue that this alternative accords better with the general contents of KBo 1.5 and its likely predecessor, the 'simple agreement' KBo 28.110 +² KBo 28.75 (cf. below sub. 2. together with the notes 8 and 9) and with the historical context of the two agreements, as this setting can now be reconstructed both from the correspondencies and differences between what in fact are now four sources (cf. 2.) and from the data of the historical prologue of KBo 1.5. Points of reference with other data are defined in the subsequent sections concerning the initial (3.) and the final phase (4.) of the Early Empire Period, respectively.

The Status quo of the Interpretation of KBo 1.5: First of all I want to be specific about my proviso which stands in stark contrast to the strongly defended position of R. H. Beal in this matter: I beg to differ of opinion with him concerning the fixed, unchanged nature of the borders of the state of Kizzuwatna. Within this reconstruction it was not the independent state of Kizzuwatna of late Old Hittite times, but the town of Kizzuwatna with its surroundings which, during the lifetime of Arnuwandas I and Tudhaliyas III, continuously remained in Hittite hands.² During recent decades there has emerged a very strong and actually almost irresistible *communis opinio* that one should reckon with the existence of only a single king Sunassuras of Kizzuwatna. During approximately the same period there gradually evolved a well-founded conviction that, while the ascription of the renowned Akkadian Sunassuras treaty to Suppiluliumas I might not need to have been definitive, the badly preserved Hittite Sunassuras fragments (for which see below sub 2.) and the presumably final

the linguistic evidence concerning the dating of KBo 1.5 cf. J. W. Durham, Diss., 71–72, but see, too, this author's comments on his reasons for distinguishing only three 'periods' in 'Boğazköy Akkadian', 86–89: there he argues that the main changes took place during the reign of Suppiluliumas I (and one might add "during a relatively late phase of his reign"), remarking about KBo 1.5, "in the case of the treaty with Sunassura, CTH 41, the "dating MBoAkk" is based on the observation that Kizzuwatna is not known to be independent in any document of the reign of Suppiluliumas I, unless it would be this very treaty.", o. c., p. 89. The point as such returns in Beal's treatment where he writes: "The only reason for assuming that Kizzuwatna was again independent under Suppiluliuma I is the Sunassura treaty, and this treaty does not even mention Suppiluliuma.", l. c., 437.

² See A. Goetze, Kizz., 78 (regarding Tudhaliyas III) and O. R. Gurney, CAH II 1, 1973, Chapter XV, 681 (mentioning Hattusilis II).

treaty KBo 1.5 might appropriately all be dated to the lifetime of the Kizzuwatnean ruler bearing this name, showing, as in fact they do, his gradual transition from an independent ruler to a Hittite vassal who – among other prerogatives – retained the title of king.³ These developments culminated in 1988 in G. Wilhelm's highly important article, "Zur ersten Zeile des Sunassura-Vertrages", *FsOtten* 2, 359–370. Taking its starting-point from the collation which furnished the very valuable reading ^{NA}KISIB ^m*Tudh*all[i]ia (to which I already referred above) for the beginning of the heading of the treaty, the article contains a detailed bibliography and a concise general treatment of the Sunassuras treaties.

In my opinion the second point, the attribution of the Hittite Sunassuras fragments to the same Hittite and Kizzuwatnean rulers who also concluded KBo 1.5, cannot be combined with the first, the return to the original assumption of merely a single Kizzuwatnean ruler bearing the name of Sunassuras. Kestemont's ascription of KBo 1.5 to Tudhaliyas III inevitably requires that, in accordance with C. Kühne's support for the distinction between a Sunassuras I being a contemporary of Tudhaliyas II and a Sunassuras II living during a rather late phase of the Early Empire Period, the first point must again be relinquished.⁴ Although I do concede that this distinction must be presented in the form of

³ In more recent decades the late Professor A. Kammenhuber, *Arier*, 37, 65⁽¹⁹⁹⁾, 98²⁹⁸ and 99 was the first to plead for a single Sunassuras of Kizzuwatna. She did so, still being convinced that KBo 1.5 should be attributed to Suppiluliumas I, denying that the linguistic characteristics of the Hittite Sunassuras fragments KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 and KUB 36.127 render it advisable to separate those from KBo 1.5 by assigning them to the Earliest phase of the Empire Period, i. e. to the reign of Tudhaliyas II, but also distancing herself from the notion that AT 14 provides support for an earlier Kizzuwatnean king of the same name. In these three points she was followed by H. M. Kümmel in his treatment of the lemma Kizzuwatna, *RIA* V [1980] 628. For a more favourable approach to AT 14's value for a synchronism between a or the Kizzuwatnean king Sunassuras and the Mittanian king Sauštatar see G. Wilhelm, *GGKH*, 42, R. H. Beal, l. c., 430–431^(31–33) and A. M. Jasink in P. Desideri and A. M. Jasink, *Dall'età di Kizzuwatna alla conquista macedone*, Torino, 1990, 74; see in last instance also J. Klinger, *StMed* 9, 248. See below sub 4., note 34 for the fact that Klinger also adheres to Beal's dating of KBo 1.5 and that Jasink shows a clear preference for the same solution. Thus also the second point, the attribution of the Hittite Sunassuras fragments to the same Hittite and Kizzuwatnean rulers who also concluded KBo 1.5, as endorsed by H. M. Kümmel, was advocated by A. Kammenhuber. A convincing argumentation for the latter of the two was later offered by G. F. del Monte, *OA* 20 [1981] 214–221, but he hesitated to make a final choice between the two chronological options of that time, either Tudhaliyas II (who will have been a much younger contemporary of Sauštatar) or Suppiluliumas I, cf. l. c., 221. That step was finally taken by R. H. Beal.

⁴ Cf. C. Kühne, *CRRAI* 25 (1978; publ. date 1982) vol. 1, 220 and especially 264²³⁵ as well as vol. 2., Pl. XXXIV. He maintains Sunassuras I, but dates the Hittite fragments to the first half of the 14th Century B. C.; see, too, M. Astour, *Hittite History and Absolute Chronology of the Bronze Age*, 1989, 53–54 and Chart 4 on 77; J. Freu, *Hethitica* 11 [1992] 50.

a tentative proviso, viz that the wording, the sign forms and the manner of writing allow for this later dating of KBo 1.5, it has, I think, the advantage of a possible return to the original placement of Talzus, his predecessor, in the intermediary generation between the grandfather and the grandson and thus in Early Empire instead of in late Old Hittite times.⁵

The fairly recently published KBo 28.110 +⁷ (1985) in all likelihood constitutes a draft (or a copy?) of a simple agreement which must have preceded the Akkadian Sunassuras treaty. Large sections of the beginning and the end as well as the major part of the middle of KBo 28.110 +⁷ can be restored after the presumably later treaty (see below sub 2.). In this respect it should be borne in mind that first E. F. Weidner inferred from formal variations in the usage of personal forms and incongruities in the contents of the later treaty that CTH 41 constitutes a disparate text which must go back to different sources and that later V. Korošec (on two occasions) argued on legal grounds that, while the middle section of the treaty (I 49 up to and including III 36) is formulated on a basis of parity, both the beginning, the historical prologue I 5–37 and the first part of the inner core of the treaty I 38–48, and the end of the treaty III 37–IV 39 bear the character of a vassal treaty.⁶ Both the beginning and the end of KBo 28.110 +⁷ reflect the same stage of the past as KBo 1.5, but the parts in between indicate that now one of the sources, inherent in the reasoning of both scholars, has become available.

Concerning the variation in the usage of personal pronouns and the personal endings of the predicates, it is of importance to note that with KBo 28.110 +⁷ we now possess a source for verbal forms in the 1st and 2nd person singular and that the simple agreement may very well have inspired the fairly numerous verbal forms of the 1st person plural of the later treaty as well.⁷ Moreover, those parts of KBo 28.110 +⁷ which can be restored after KBo 1.5 secure that especially the sections of the latter which, according to Korošec, render the treaty in essence a vassal treaty can already be recognized in KBo 28.110 +⁷.

⁵ For Talzus see R. H. Beal, l. c., 432⁽³⁹⁾; contrary to what is suggested in the note there is no further treatment of the placement of Talzus in 440–441⁴⁵. In the Chart on p. 443 Talzus can be found as a contemporary of Huzziyas II.

⁶ Cf. M. Liverani, OA 12 [1973] 267–297 (concerning KBo 1.5 as a whole and thus including the middle section seemingly based on parity which was later recognized by Korošec), but note already V. Korošec, HSV, 1931, 6–7^(4–6). In his two last contributions the late Professor Korošec in a masterful manner succinctly proved his point on purely formal and legal grounds, CRRAI 28 [1981] = AfO Beiheft 19, [1982] 168–172 and Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slovenica (Classis I: Historia et Sociologia, Dissertationes XIV, 1983) 29–39 and 54–56 (henceforward Kor. 1 and 2). For Weidner's remark concerning the disparate character of the treaty, see PD 1, 101³, continued on the next page.

⁷ For 1st person plural predicates see KBo 28.110 + Obv. 3" (?), Lower Edge 42" (= KBo 1.5 III 39), Rev. 47" (= III 45), Rev. 63" (= IV 26), 65" (IV 28). See, too, KBo 1.5 III 9 and 13.

A first comparison between KBo 28.110 +⁷ and KBo 1.5 leads to the following results: while, as was already recognized by H. Winckler, MVAeG 18.3 [1913] 80, KBo 1.5 lacks the customary God-list, the ‘simple agreement’ is in fact more complete. Although most lines are broken off at their beginning and end, the final part of the historical prologue, in the continuation presumably large parts of its main body of provisions, and finally the end of the text are in fact preserved. The heading of KBo 1.5 which shows a structure based on parity (I 1–4) is lacking, as far as the simple agreement is concerned. However, at the end of the text where KBo 1.5 gives its border description, KBo 28.110 +⁷ shows the, for a simple agreement, characteristic curse into which a short God-list is incorporated.

2. A Comparison between the three Akkadian Parallel Versions

In 1985 H. M. Kümmel published in the section of KBo 28 devoted to the treaties with Kizzuwatna (nos 105–110) two parallel versions of KBo 1.5, KBo 28.106 and KBo 28.110, the whole of which (no 106 for which see below) or parts of which (no 110) had earlier been referred to as duplicates of that main copy, cf. H. M. Kümmel, RIA V [1980] 627 (KBo 28.106) and CTH, p. 9 no 41 (KBo 28.110). Later in that same year G. F. del Monte noted that KBo 28.75 belonging to the section of the volume destined for Akkadian letters could be restored after KBo 28.110, its ll. 1’–6’ corresponding to KBo 28.110: 69”–74” and thus indirectly to KBo 1.5 IV 34–39. His wording suggests that he was thinking in terms of another parallel version.⁸ Apparently del Monte overlooked the fact that there actually is no overlap whatsoever between the two and did not notice the likelihood of a direct join for the ll. 2’/70” with the ensuing result that for the time being – until this likelihood has been checked against the fragments themselves – no additional 3rd parallel version needs to be instated.⁹ In the Introduction to KBo 28, VII, the late Professor Kümmel characterized the original KBo 28.110 in the following manner: “Vertrag zwischen Kizzuwatna und Hatti, die Namen der Kontrahenten sind nicht erhalten. Nach den inhaltlich sehr engen Parallelen zu KBo I 5 wurden die Tafelfragmente 106/a und 2556/c bisher als Duplikate dazu in CTH 41 I aufgeführt, S. demnächst ZA.” Unfortunately the tragic traffic accident which cut short his brilliant scientific career prevented Professor Kümmel from carrying out this intention himself.

⁸ See G. F. del Monte, OA 24 [1985] 263–264 and with respect to his characterization of KBo 28.75 as being another parallel version the bottom of p. 263; see, too, idem, JAOS 108 [1988] 307 where del Monte refers to no 75 as constituting a “treaty with Kizzuwatna”.

⁹ In principle one should try to keep the count of parallel versions at the lowest number possible. The point where the fragment no 75 joins to the broken tablet are the two final signs of *a-nu-um-me-e-am* in ll. 2’/70”. Cf. the Addenda to the notes.

KBo 28.110 +² 75 Rev. 57"–73": Rev. 57" "[And] on account of this I made [you] (to) a king. 58" [If a powerful enemy (lit. enmity) of some sort ris[es] up against you, 59" all the soldiers [of] 'My Majesty' will g[o] to your support. 60"–61" [And] if a [po]werful enemy (lit. enmity) of some sort rises up against 'My Majesty', (if) we choose (viz select) you, a[ll] your soldiers 62" may go [t]o my support! 63" [A dif]ferent matter: the tablet of the Oath (to the God), viz the treaty, which has been made, let us effac[e it]! 64" [The w]ord of the Hurrian let us reject (it)! Because (now), more[over], 65" you are not [his servant] of the Hurrian (any-more), let us [make] another tablet! 66" [A d]ifferent matter: if I, 'My Majesty', cause a tablet to be brought, 67" (if) on the tablet on which words are plac[ed] and the messenger – the words 68" which he answers to you from his mouth – if the words 69" of the messenger [cor]respond to the word[s olf the tablet 70" this (afore-mentioned) messenger trust him! But [if the words] 71" of his mouth [of the m]essenger do not cor[respond] to the words [of the ta]blet, 72" you may not trust [the mes]senger and on account of thes[e (afore-mentioned) w]ords 73" yo[u] may not admit (lit. take) [evil into] your [h]eart!"¹⁰

Historical comments: L. 57" contains the flattering usage of the title of king for Sunassuras II (?) which harks back to the ll. 14'–15' of the simple agreement and to the ll. I 38–39 of KBo 1.5. However, in the main body of that treaty the title of king is never repeated, while both in the beginning and the end the Hittite partner to the treaty is referred to as 'Great King'.¹¹ The ll. 58"–62" constitute the only passage of the simple agreement which can be compared with a section of that part of KBo 1.5 which shows the character of a pseudo-parity treaty. The corresponding passage of KBo 1.5, II 63–III 6 (cf. for III 2–6 R. H. Beal, THeth 20, 119), is both far more detailed and thus complicated and less based on parity. Both passages deal with defensive cooperation in, for each country, dangerous situations. In contrast to KBo 1.5, KBo 28.110 +² starts out with the Kizzuwatnean partner. Moreover, viewed as whole, KBo 28.110 +² forms an ideal intermediary link between the Hittite 'drafts' for a presumably older agreement (for which see below) and KBo 1.5. The ll. 63"–73" are almost identical to KBo 1.5 IV 25–39 with the highly significant difference that the treaty adds the interdiction of maintaining any form of diplomatic contacts with the Hurrian for Sunassuras II (?), IV 28–31 (for which

¹⁰ Reading for l. 57" [i] LUGAL *ki-na-an-na-ma e-pu-uš[-ka]*: for the ll. 58"–62" see del Monte (note 8), 265 who also gave the corresponding passage of KBo 1.5 II 63–69, l. c., 265–266; I owe the translation of *nu-ut-tu-ka* (Rev. 61"), transliterated by del Monte, but passed over in his rendering, to Dr. W. H. van Soldt who referred to the CAD, *sub voce* *atû* 2. a., end of the section on p. 520 a; the ll. 69"–73" were earlier treated by del Monte, l. c., 264 on the basis of KBo 28.75: 1'–5', as restored after KBo 28.110 Rev. 69"–73" (in his comments del Monte rightly stressed the superiority of KBo 28.110 (+²) over KBo 1.5 and its more archaic character). The restorations of the ll. 63"–68" are based on KBo 1.5 IV 25–28 and 32–35.

¹¹ Cf. KBo 1.5 I 49 and 55 and especially in that part of the border description (IV 52–66) which describes the traditional border: IV 53, 56, 59 and 65; see Kor. 1, 169.

see below). In my opinion G. Kestemont rightly stressed that the long series of additions to KBo 1.5, starting with III 37, each introduced with the usage of *šanitam*, “a different matter”, and on the occasion of the first example ushered in with one of the fairly numerous declarations of ‘intent’ which characterize both agreements, must have resulted from the presumably extended and prolonged negotiations between the partners, in his and my opinion Tudhaliyas III and Sunassuras (II?). While Kestemont thought of III 37-IV 19,¹² a comparison between the simple agreement and the possibly final treaty would now lead, as far as the intermediary period is concerned, to III 48-IV 21 and IV 40-66. Although not preceded by *šanitam*, the border description, with its clear division between a newly constituted border (IV 40-51) and a traditional one (IV 52-66), cf. A. Goetze, Kizz., 49⁽¹⁹¹⁻¹⁹²⁾, may thus have belonged to the points on which agreement was reached during a fairly late stage of the proceedings.

In the translation of J. W. Durham this declaration of ‘intent’ runs as follows: “Hattiland and the country of Kizzuwatna shall be intermingled, they shall continue to practice comradeship with respect to each other.”, III 35-36, cf. Diss., 398. It is, I think, of considerable importance to note that both the first and the last of these ‘partial accords’ are already represented in KBo 28.110 +², Obv. 40”-49” = III 37-47, dealing with offensive cooperation against the Hurrian to the benefit of Kizzuwatna in the border regions between Kizzuwatna and Hurri-land (Obv. 40”-Rev. 46”) and the joint warfare in Hurri-land itself (Rev. 47”-49”), equalling III 37-44 and III 45-47 respectively,¹³ and Rev. 63”-73” = IV 25-28 and 32-39, treating the manner in which these negotiations would need to be conducted, implying clearly, “Only the written word counts!”. It thus would seem that, after initial soundings (for which KBo 28.71 might qualify, cf. the remarks by the editor in the Introduction to the volume, VI), both the first and the last agreement have been retained for later consultation and also actually retrieved in the excavations. See below for the fact that this may also apply to one of the most important intermediary ‘accords’ which details that the Hittite ‘Great King’ will never fail the ruler of his recently recovered vassal

¹² Cf. G. Kestemont, *Diplomatique*, 455⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾: “En PDaK 7, III 37-IV 19, le train de dispositions concerne invariablement des questions relatives à une guerre avec le Hurri.”

¹³ The subject of KBo 28.110 +: 43”-45” is a traditional one which basically already occurs in the earlier parity treaties with Kizzuwatna from late Old Hittite times promising an equal partition of movable assets within the booty but which, in this case, the tenor being “each captor may keep what he has won”, recurring in KBo 1.5 III 40-42 (but see, too, II 29-30, 31-32, 37-38, 39-40, 49-50, 51-52, 59-60 and 61-62), can better be compared with KUB 3.21 (part of the Tunip treaty for which see note 34 sub 4.), ll. 11’-13’ and 15’-17’ = E. F. Weidner, PD 2, 140-143. In the first case (45”-46”) = III 43-44 the territorial gains together with their assets will be assigned to Kizzuwatna, but in the case of joint warfare in Hurri-land itself, the Hittite king will do whatever he wishes, 47”-49” = III 45-47. See for these Early Empire passages G. Kestemont, o. c., 397⁽¹⁹²⁻¹⁹³⁾.

kingdom, KBo 28.106, the close parallel version of KBo 1.5 III 52-IV 1/2, another highly important discovery of the late Professor H. M. Kümmel, cf. above.

So far two proposals have been put forward regarding the treaty mentioned in KBo 28.110 +² Rev. 63" and in KBo 1.5 IV 25–26. V. Korošec wrongly thought of an earlier treaty between the same two rulers from which his parity-based part of KBo 1.5 would have been derived. In my opinion G. Wilhelm rightly chose for the treaty to which the clearly interconnected Hittite Sunassuras fragments KUB 36.127 and KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 must have pertained.¹⁴ According to the *communis opinio* these pieces already favour the Hittite partner, although, from a formal point of view, they still preserve the characteristics of a treaty which is based on parity between the two partners. Because these Hittite fragments should preferably be viewed as 'drafts'—all the remainder of the roughly contemporaneous material, including KBo 19.40 which mentions the name of Sunassuras II (?) in l. 6' and would seem to have dealt with matters concerning fugitives, are written in Akkadian – I personally feel inclined to side with C. Kühne in thinking that neither KUB 36.127 nor KUB 8.81 + should be considered as a later 'library copy'.¹⁵ In consequence I would like to view also KBo 28.110 +² and KBo 1.5 as constituting 'originals' in the sense of contemporary copies rather than younger copies. Just like festival texts, some treaties also are strongly archaized, presumably being based on linguistically older predecessors. Treaties should therefore preferably be dated on the grounds of historical data in combination with their linguistically youngest forms and 'manners of writing'.¹⁶ Moreover, there still is a second related problem. While the simple agreement would seem to touch upon subjects which are in fact treated in the later treaty,¹⁷ in Rev. 65" and IV 28 both refer to a new and thus probably final treaty. In other words an unexpected event, e. g. the sudden death of Sunassuras II (?), may have prevented the conclusion of that final treaty, cf. below sub 4.

¹⁴ Cf. Kor. 1, 169, 171; Kor. 2, 32, 34; and G. Wilhelm, FsOtten 2, 369^(55–56).

¹⁵ Cf. note 4 above, but also consult J. Klinger and E. Neu, Hethitica 10 [1990] 139 for a different evaluation of the same paleographic data. On account of the possible synchronisms (cf. above, note 3), these authors, too, chose for a single ruler Sunassuras and an attribution of KBo 1.5 to Tudhaliyas II.

¹⁶ I am aware of the fact that especially KBo 28.110 +² shows a fairly large number of archaisms (cf. note 10). It is possible that this draft (?) or this first parallel version in a sequence of 'proposals' will have been considerably modernized in the course of the presumably prolonged negotiations. That it was not meant to be final follows, I think, from the fact that both partners to the agreement remain unidentified.

¹⁷ Cf. KBo 28.110 + Obv. 19' [a-wa-a]t? [Z]AG.ḪI.A ù a-wa-at ri-ik-si₁₇-i₁₇-im, "[the affair] of the borders and the affair of the agreement", 20' [a-wa-a]t ni-iš DINGIR-lim, "[the affair] of the Oath", 21' [ša ZAG].ḪI.A a-šar-šu-nu-ma, "and the place [of] their [border]s", and finally 22' [LÚ MEŠ] mu-un-na-ab-du-tim, "[the] fugitives". The question of the fugitives is dealt with in KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 II 11'–III 18' (?) and KUB 36.127 Rev. 3'–19' (?), while the subject presumably also occurs in KBo 19.40: 4'–5'.

The conclusion must needs be that the two treaty partners negotiated about the terms of what in essence is a vassal treaty, although Sunassuras II (?) is treated with the utmost respect: the Hittite partner assigns to him the title of king; when Sunassuras II (?) enters for his regular visit to the Hittite court, all the Hittite grandees rise from their seats; he is not obliged to pay the customary tribute (Obv. 14'–18' = I 38–44). In a preceding passage the earlier parallel text and the treaty indicate that in a recent past both countries had been slighted by Mittanian behaviour which had affected Kizzuwatna in particular and that both countries now were “freed” from the Oath, viz the treaty, which had bound both or one of them to Mittani (Obv. 8'–12' = I 32–36). A notable divergency between the two texts is that the treaty adds that “The (inhabitants of the) country of Kizzuwatna will at no time in the future shift (allegiance) to Hurri-land!” (III 48–49, another ‘sententia’); the passage in the treaty continues with a description of the obligation on the part of the Hittite king not to react, to the detriment of Kizzuwatna, to any advances on the part of the Hurrian king (III 50–63, now also represented in the also earlier parallel version KBo 28.106). E. F. Weidner, PD 1, 104⁴ already rightly remarked that, after a single reference to “the Hurrian” in III 50, only in the subsequent ll. of the treaty III 51–63 (51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60, 61 and 62) is “the Hurrian king” regularly referred to as such and not – rather contemptuously – designated as “the Hurrian”. With a single exception, presumably “[the Mitt]ani[an]” (the broken beginning of Obv. 5', cf. H. M. Kümmel, the Introduction to KBo 28, page XVIII and D. Oshida and A. Kammenhuber, BMECCJ 8 (1995), 21127 contra G. F. del Monte, RGTC 6/2, sub voce, 106), this also applies to KBo 28.110 +², everywhere else the reference is to the “Hurrian”. This likely usage of “[the Mitt]ani[an]” may be significant since this name of the (Hurrian) state occurs in very few texts from the time before Suppiluliumas I, cf. KUB 36.127 Obv. 7', 11' and 13' and the prayer KUB 24.3 + KUB 30.12 Obv. 21'. Presumably these three texts were only slightly older. In combination with the remarkable rendering KUR ^{URU}Ki-i]z-zu-ua-ta-nt^{KI} (KBo 28.106: 6' and 7'), only known from the (late Old Hittite) parity-based Paddatissus treaty KUB 34.1+: 6', 14', 22' (all three without the postpositional determinative) and ibidem, ll. 19' and 27' (with this determinative), the point raised by Weidner in my opinion proves that the scribes did in fact use older text material from late Old Hittite times. Such an assumption paves the way for an explanation of the presence of unmistakable archaisms in the preceding parallel versions which, nevertheless, cannot be separated from the historical reality reflected in the prologue of KBo 1.5 and the preserved remnants of its equivalent in KBo 28.110 +². Finally and most importantly, the contents of KBo 28.106 and KBo 1.5 III 50–63 are clearly connected with, and presumably counterbalanced by the added stipulation of IV 28–31 in the treaty concerning the interdiction of maintaining any diplomatic contacts with “the Hurrian” on the part of Sunassuras II (?). Other notable divergencies are that – within a wider evaluation of the differences between

the two versions – the treaty not merely reckons with Hurri-land as a potential enemy, but adds Arzawa, specifies the number of troops that Kizzuwatna should contribute for a campaign against either one of both potential enemies, and that the later (final?) treaty not merely reckons with the provisioning of the Kizzuwatnean army as long as it performs garrison duties in Hittite territory or takes part in a joint campaign, but also makes allowance for the journey needed to reach its Hittite ally (Rev. 54”–56”, as compared with IV 19–24). It is difficult not to conclude that both kings must have been fully aware of the fact that the other party needed his cooperation. Apparently both kings knew how to drive a hard bargain.

3. The Dynastic Marriages in late Old Hittite and Early Empire times

Most scholars will agree, I think, on the point that apparently during the first phase of the Early Empire Period the two Hittite military commanders Tudhaliyas (II) and Arnuwandas (I), the former of whom must have been related to the Old Hittite Dynasty,¹⁸ only established an additional power base in Kizzuwatna after the older of the two had ascended to the Throne in Hattusa. Since in particular regarding the incorporation of Kizzuwatna a highly tentative proposal has already been put forward by R. H. Beal (see below sub 4.) I shall try to argue for an equally tentative, alternative hypothesis on that subject in this section. This counter-proposal can be based on a few passages which in my opinion have not yet been correctly interpreted or have not yet been convincingly restored.

With the proviso that KBo 16.24 + 25 has rightly been attributed to Arnuwandas I,¹⁹ the passage IV 14–16 contains a strong indication that, after the

¹⁸ This would seem to follow from the reference to “my father” (see already F. Cornelius, *FsOtten* 1, 56⁽⁹⁾) in KUB 23.16 III 2’, a historical fragment which H. Otten, *Königshaus*, 33⁴³ (continued on 34) tentatively attributed to Tudhaliyas II. The king himself is mentioned in l. 7’, while his name Tudhaliyas (broken) occurs in l. 13’. If this updating can be maintained, it inevitably entails that his role as the ‘first founding father’ of the Empire Dynasty must have resulted from his military and political successes. Concerning KUB 23.16 III see now, too, S. de Martino, *Eothen* 4 (1991), 12^(44–49), R. H. Beal, *THeth* 20, 27–28^(106–107), 321¹²²⁵, 333⁽¹²⁶⁹⁾ and 410–411⁽¹⁵⁴⁵⁾ as well as J. Klinger, *ZA* 85 [1995] 95 and 98.

¹⁹ Regarding the attribution of KBo 16.24 + 25 see F. Pecchioli Daddi, *AANL* 34 [1979] 51–58; A. M. Rizzi Mellini in her introduction to the text edition, *FsMeriggi* 2 I, 509–515/553; and especially S. Košak, *AnSt* 30 [1980] 31–39 (with their bibliographic references to the preceding literature). While Pecchioli Daddi chose for Suppiluliumas I and Rizzi Mellini would seem to lean towards an attribution to Arnuwandas I, also reckoning with Tudhaliyas II, Košak preferred a dating to Tudhaliyas II, but did not want to exclude Arnuwandas I (both within option ‘B’ of Gurney-Košak). Contrary to my earlier opinion (*Records*, 78; I would like to retract all three proposals with which I tried to substantiate the existence of Tudhaliyas III), I now choose for Arnuwandas I. His father-in-law Tudhaliyas II had become involved in the conflict between Huzziyas II and the faction led by Muwattallis I (see note 33). For a recent bibliography on this text see S. de Martino, *Eothen* 4 [1991] 5⁷ continued on 6 and note for his own opinion, *ibidem*, 11 (Arnuwandas I).

killing of Huzziyas II by Muwattallis (I), his father Tudhaliyas (II) was bound by an Oath to the former king to cooperate with those who took revenge for this murder by killing, in their turn, the usurper Muwattallis I: ¹⁴ [*iš-ḫa-na(-a)-aš-ua² u*]t-tar A-BI ^{dUTU}[-ŠI š]ar-la-a-it nu-ua-ra-aš-ta [*iš-du-ua-a-ti*] ¹⁵ [^mMu-u-ua-at-ḫa-al-li-iš ^mḪu-uz-zi-an ku-en-ta A[-NA A-BI ^{dUTU}]-ŠI-ma-aš-ši] ¹⁶ [*me-na-ab-ḫa-a)n-da NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM-ŠU e-eš-ta*] [. . .], ¹⁴ “The father of ‘[My] Majesty’ [r]ectified (or perhaps more literally, removed) [the ma]tter [of the bloodshed]. So [it became known]”: [Muwatt]allis killed Huzziyas, but f[or the father of] ‘My [Majesty]’ ¹⁶ there existed his Oath in regard to him, viz to Huzziyas.”²⁰ The remainder of the paragraph cannot be plausibly restored.

For the moot problem concerning the relationship between Arnuwandas I and his presumed sister Asmu-Nikkal we now possess the highly elegant solution independently proposed by C. Kühne and R. H. Beal: Arnuwandas I is likely to have been a Hittite ^{LÜ}*antiyant-* who, presumably in a sort of parallelism to Tudhaliyas II, married the daughter of Nikkal-madi, Asmu-Nikkal, becoming at the same time the adopted son of Tudhaliyas II.²¹ I wonder whether one might suggest that the fact that in her own seal SBo I no 77 (A–C) = BoHa V no 152 (a–c) Asmu-Nikkal merely refers to her mother Nikkal-madi may indicate that her mother had been married before. Even Asmu-Nikkal herself may have had a son from an earlier marriage, cf. below for the tentatively restored passage KUB 48.106 Rev. 18’–20’. Such an earlier marriage on the part of Asmu-Nikkal might explain the curious phenomenon that, while it is in fact highly likely that Asmu-Nikkal was the mother of Tasmisarri = Hattusilis II (?), with respect to this Hurrian prince no certainty can be achieved concerning the corresponding ‘fatherhood’ of Arnuwandas I. Thus I would like to maintain that both Nikkal-madi and Asmu-Nikkal may have entered into an earlier marriage.

In the recent past S. de Martino rightly remarked that Kühne and Beal had not reckoned with the rather frequently occurring DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU of Tudhaliyas II mentioned in KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42:²² after a single reference to Tudha-

²⁰ For the restoration of the beginning of l. 14 see KUB 11.1 IV 19’ = I. Hoffmann, Theth 11, 52–53, *išḫanaš(ša) uttar*, and for the meaning of the predicate consult S. de Martino, Eothen 4 [1991] 10³⁹; cf., too, J. Puhvel, HED 2, 307 and A. Kammenhuber, HW² II, 1988, 120 a; the restoration of *išduwāti* at the end of the line has been freely chosen, but see E. Neu, StBoT 5, 78 for the plene writing. For the restoration of *menabḫanda* at the beginning of l. 16 see the CHD L–N, 281b–282a, meaning 3, “in regard to, toward”, in combination with forms of *link-* and *lingai-*.

²¹ Cf. C. Kühne, l. c. (note 4), 223 and 263–264²³¹ and R. H. Beal, JCS 35 [1983] 115–119. In the meantime their solution would seem to be confirmed by the evidence of the ‘Cruciform Seal’, cf. A. M. and B. Dinçol, J. D. Hawkins and G. Wilhelm, IM 43 [1993], 92–93.

²² See S. de Martino, Eothen 4 [1991] 17⁽⁷⁹⁾–18^(80–81); for KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42 see the excellent text edition of G. Szabó, THeth 1, 1971. Note, too, Bo 6600 = KUB 57.39 (MH/MS), referred to by Szabó, o. c., 9¹³ (on p. 10), the Obverse of which may have been a shorter version of the text edited by Szabó, while the Reverse shows no direct parallels, cf. Th. P. J. van den Hout, BiOr 47 [1990] 426. This ritual fragment mentions Ziplantawi(ya)s in the abbreviated form of her name, cf. Obv. 5’ and 6’.

liyas, Nikkal-madi and their children (I 18–19), the ritual consistently makes mention of these DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU, either “his sons” or “his children”, in listings of the form “the lord together with his wife and his sons” or “his children”, I 25–26, 33–34, 35–39; II 11, 14, 33, 34, 40, 43; III 4’–5’, 29’, 31’, [35’], 53’ and 56’. However, the highly elegant solution can remain intact and the passages concerned can retain their full value through the application of the translation “their” and “his children” and the implied interpretation that this wording would specifically refer to Asmu-Nikkal and her likely ^{LÜ}*antiyant*. This is in fact possible because the ritual shows a clear opposition between on the one hand Tudhaliyas (II) and “his children” and on the other his sister Ziplantawi(ya)s and “her children”: I 23–24, 27–28, 34; III 20’, 23’ (?) and 34’.

With Ziplantawi(ya)s and her unknown and presumably no longer living husband we touch upon the likely third example of a Dynastic Marriage of this period which has not yet been recognized so far. The ritual frequently refers to the curses and the black magic which his sister had spoken and applied to the detriment of her brother and his family in a restricted sense. The offerings are meant to cleanse the royal family, while the Gods are requested to turn those curses and that black magic away from them. They should “hold” Ziplantawi(ya)s and her children instead! Earlier research has already succeeded in establishing that this conflict concerned a succession to the Throne. In his recent treatment M. Hutter pointed to the two passages of KBo 15.10 + I 33–37 and III 33–39 which vouch for the fact that the well-being of the whole country was at stake. But so far it has generally been thought that this meant a succession to the Throne of Hattusa.²³ Admittedly this third Dynastic Marriage must of necessity have been the reversed counterpart of the first: Just as his father-in-law had done during the preceding generation, Arnuwandas (I) had married a Kizzuwatnean princess; but the Hittite princess Ziplantawi(ya)s would need to have been given in marriage to a Kizzuwatnean prince at approximately the same point in time when Tudhaliyas (II) married Nikkal-madi. My main con-

²³ Cf. H. Otten, *Quellen*, 115/(19), already referring to KUB 36.111 + 57/g = KBo 20.34, but see, too, *ibidem* 105/9⁽¹⁾, a passage which explains his interpretation of the contents of KBo 20.34 at that time (1968) which became outdated in 1987 through his own publication *Königshaus*, cf. note 18 and again below note 33: it was not Nikkal-madi, but Tudhaliyas (II) who belonged to the ancient dynasty. G. Szabó, o. c. (note 22), 88–89 supplied useful comparative material for Otten’s description of the setting of KBo 15.10 +. Sh. Bin-Nun, *THeth* 5, 1975, 257–258 was the first scholar to deduce that the court intrigues would have actually concerned a succession conflict in Hattusa. She suggested that the husband of Ziplantawi(ya)s might have been killed during an earlier stage of the conflict which in her opinion took place before the accession of Tudhaliyas II in Hattusa. Without a reference to Bin-Nun – and thus presumably independently – M. Hutter, *AOF* 18 [1991] 34–35^(10–17) drew the same conclusion. In his treatment also Hutter referred to KBo 20.34, but, as far as I know, no scholar so far has commented upon the fact that it actually is Ziplantawi(ya)s who is mentioned in this fragment as being a or the queen.

tention is that this Dynastic Marriage, which just as the marriage between Tudhaliyas (II) and Nikkal-madi must originally have accompanied a late Old Hittite parity-based treaty, both forming part of a double Marriage Bond, was later – during the intermediary period – strengthened by the related, but again reversed marriage of a Hittite military commander, in that case now qualified for the succession of a Kizzuwatnean ‘Great King’ because he, too, had married a Kizzuwatnean princess.

Fortunately the single point which to my knowledge can be adduced in favour of the choice for Hattusa, the fact that at no point of the ritual is Tudhaliyas (II) ever referred to as having already won royal status, is counterbalanced by the addition of the title of queen to the name of Ziplantawi(ya)s in KBo 20.34 Rev. 13’ and by the appearance of the name of her son ^mAttāis in the preceding l. 12’. The latter would seem to have been her rival candidate for the Throne in question: (at the end of l. 12’) ^mAt-ta-a-i (and in the subsequent l. 13’) [ŠA ^{MUNUS}Z]i-ip-la-a[n-ā]a- ui₅(ia) MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU.NITA, cf., too, ll. 4’–5’. A. Ünal, BMECCJ 3 [1988] 66⁹⁴, at the very least, already hinted at a parallelism between KBo 15.10 + and KBo 20.34, indirectly referring to these two rituals as presumably very early examples of this genre mentioning the name of the patient or offerer (EN.SISKUR) and thus the person or persons benefitted by these ceremonies. Admittedly not without considerable hesitation E. Laroche already proposed a Hurrian etymology for the name of Attāis.²⁴ Of course I feel inclined to view this detail as a further confirmation of the likelihood that the contested succession did involve the subsequent generation to which also Arnuwandas (I) and Asmu-Nikkal belonged and bore on Hurro-Luwian territory and thus probably on Kizzuwatna. The intermediary ll. 6’–11’ of KBo 20.34 refer to the offerings of Attāis.²⁵ In my opinion the combined evidence of both rituals, KBo 20.34 describing the corresponding counterpart to the ceremonies of KBo 15.10 +, renders it fairly likely that the court intrigues will not have been aimed at a succession in Hattusa, but rather at an accession to power in the capital of Kizzuwatna.

²⁴ Cf. Laroche’s “Les Noms des Hittites: Supplément”, Hethitica 4 [1981] 11 no 195 where he also referred to KBo 17.104 II 7 and 2029/g: 8 (for the indirect join between the two see CTH no 395.2 + premier supplément, 1972, 107). In the meantime two more texts have been assigned to this CTH number, cf. KUB 57.79 (= 1. D.) and KUB 58.94 (1. E.), in accordance with Th. P. J. van den Hout, BiOr 47 [1990] 428 and BiOr 48 [1991] 584, respectively. CTH no 395. 2. (KBo 17.104 (+)) and .3. (KBo 20.34) are rituals in which Attāis is the EN.SISKUR (I agree with A. Ünal against M. Hutter, l. c., 35¹⁷). Laroche’s comment was: “Nom hourrite *attay* “père”?”, cf. the Addenda to the notes.

²⁵ For the ll. 7’–8’ see the CHD Vol. L–N, *maškiške*-, 210 b, (referring to Attāis), “he is showing reverence and giving presents to you (gods). So be mild to him in return.” (cf., too, *miu*- A, 307b where “mild” is replaced with “gentle/pleasant”) and for the ll. 10’–11’ *lukki/a*-, 79a, “Torches, two sets of nine – they light nine on this side, and they light nine on this side.” See H. Otten, ZA 72 [1982] 283 and M. Hutter, l. c. (note 23), 35¹⁵ for the fact that concerning these passages the qualification OH/MS should be replaced with MH/MS.

A third fragment which may be of considerable relevance to the background of the conflict in a wider sense is the highly enigmatic historical text KUB 48.106 (MH/MS) of which only the Reverse has been preserved.²⁶ I decided to include it in this section because it seems to refer to the additional queen of this period (Rev. § 1', l. 2' and § 3', ll. 16' and 19') and my explanation of this figure may offer a new clue to a better understanding of this fragment as a whole and especially of the third paragraph which by its first editor A. Ünal, SMEA 24 (1984), 99–100 was already referred to as being a “crux interpretum”. In my opinion Professor Ünal rightly characterized the fragment as a text which “protokollartig über Erbangelegenheiten und Intrigen berichtet”, while he also already determined that all persons involved would in his opinion need to have belonged to the highest circles of the land. The difficulty lies in the fact that, with a single highly notable exception, the Hittite ‘Great Queen’ Ka(t)teshabis, all the other persons are not identified by name. My guess would be that the text constitutes a very early example of the genre ‘declaration in court’ and that all the necessary details will have been provided on the lost Obverse, just as this happens in the two final lines of the Reverse, also showing that the text must have continued on another tablet.

The badly preserved § 1' may offer for l. 2' where signs become available ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL [DUMU].NITA',²⁷ while, in addition to the customary direct discourse (here *-wa* in ll. 3' and 4') the paragraph evidences the involvement of ‘My Majesty’ in ll. 3' and 5'. I assume that the main speaker of the text, perhaps a princess and in that case presumably Asmu-Nikkal, has addressed the son (?) of the queen with the words, to which she returns in l. 7' of § 2'. This paragraph has been dealt with by G. Beckman, FsOtten 2, 36³⁰–37^(31–32) whose translation I here repeat with minor adaptations clarified in the note: ⁶ “In respect to such matter of the field as [he (?)], . . . mistreat[ed] me, ⁷ I spoke [to him (?)] in the afore-mentioned (?) manner. And [besides (?), from the presence of ‘My Majesty’ he (?) return[ed], and he spoke to me as follows: “ ‘My Majesty’ has releas[ed] the fields.” ⁹–¹⁰ I (then) spoke as follows: “Whatever field he has released, I have freed (literally, detached) (it) in the following way]: for the sake of the cattle (and) the sheep of the poor man he (viz, ‘My Majesty’) has released it ¹¹ – so (that) the cattle (and) the sheep of the poor man will survive. ¹² Because the fields of the deer are not dear to ‘My Majesty’ (and) the field ¹³ of a man is dear [to him], it will come to pass (that) he

²⁶ Earlier partial treatments are – in chronological order – E. O. Forrer, Forsch. 2, 2 (VAT 6700), V. Souček, MIO 8 [1963] 382 (10'–11', 14'), cf. the Introduction to KUB XLVIII, VII; H. A. Hoffner, BiOr 35 [1978] 246 (ll. 12'–13') and E. Neu, FsMeid, 177, 186⁶² on p. 187 (l. 12'), cf. G. Beckman, FsOtten 2, 36³⁰ and 37³¹.

²⁷ For the form of the sign UŠ (= NITA) see Rüster-Neu, HZL no 132/4 and Rev. 21' of this text in the personal name Kurusti.

will finally restrain (?) ¹⁴ that (despicable) one! But now I releas[e] it (for) the cattle (and) the sheep of the poor man!" ²⁸

Concerning § 3' I shall present the translation in accordance with Professor Otten's revision of Ünal's treatment of the ll. 15'–18' (as far as up to the last signs introducing the final clause which Otten omitted from his treatment), cf. ZA 80 (1990), 226^(16–19)–227^(20–23). Then I continue with the transliteration and translation of the final clause for which only Ünal's first treatment is available (differences with respect to the earlier treatments being again specified in the note). Once more a few introductory remarks are in place. In § 3' l. 15' 'My Majesty' vanishes out of sight. We learn that, during the events described in § 3' he stayed in (the town of) Kizzuwatna, the capital of the, in the preceding period independent state of Kizzuwatna. This is told in a very casual manner, as if it concerns a routine matter not in need of any explanation. The discovery that the woman bearing the Hattic name of Ka(t)teshabis must be identified with the 'Great Queen' of presumably Hatti-land of KBo 32.197 Rev. 11 is due to Professor Otten, l. c., 226. This, in my opinion, decisive discovery renders it readily comprehensible that the princely speaker of the text – somewhat arbitrarily I chose for a princess and i. c. for Asmu-Nikkal, but note the ll. 18'–20' – had to address his or her request to the mother who, in her turn, needs to have been a "queen in waiting" and thus would need to be equated with Nikkal-madi because it looks as if Ka(t)teshabis was ruling as a Tawananna with a 'Great King' who belonged to the subsequent generation. The absence of 'My Majesty' explains her role in the proceedings of the paragraph: ¹⁵ "But furthermore, because 'My Majesty' stayed in (the town of) Kizzuwatna, I repeatedly spoke ¹⁶ to my mother (as follows): "Take hold of the child (or, the son) of the queen and [bring it (or, him) ¹⁷ [to] (the town of) Anzu[ra]!" But my mother flew into a rage against me and she [was angry] with me [and she] ¹⁸ made obeissance [to] Ka[t]teshabis and Ka[t]teshabis passed judgement on me in a detailed inquiry (declaring), *nu-ua-a-z* ¹⁹ [*tu-e*] (or, [TUR]-RU) DUMU-*an ma-ab*–*ba-an* *Ü-UL da-a-at-ti nu-ua-a-z ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL ni-ua-ra-al-li-in* DUMU-*an le-e* ²⁰ *da-a-at-ti*, "Just as you do not take up (viz receive) [yo]ur (or, [the young]) child (or, son) (for your household), you [may not] take up (viz receive) [the child] (or, son) of the queen, (who is, i. c. the child) all[ien] (literally, not yo[ur own])!" ²⁹

²⁸ Cf. G. Beckman, FsOtten 2, 36–37 together with note 31; in l. 6' I prefer *bu-u-ua-ap*–[*p*]*i*²–[*iš*?] because Beckman continues with *nu-uš-ši*³; for the end of line 9' I choose for *ki-i[š-ša-an]* and for the beginning of l. 12', in accordance with E. Neu, for *a-li-ia-n[a-a]š*, while at the end of l. 14' I prefer a 1st person singular of the present tense *tar-na-ab-bi*, cf. V. Souček. In this way both predicates in l. 14' show usage of *praesens historicum*. With respect to my translation of *kiššan* in the beginning of l. 7', I follow J. Friedrich, HE 1, 1960, § 252.

²⁹ Restoring [*ki-iš-ša-an*] at the end of l. 15', *an-da* at the end of l. 16' and continuing at the end of l. 17' in the following manner, *nu-ua-mu-uš-ša-a[n ša-a-it na-aš]*, restoring the required [*A-NA*] at the beginning of l. 18'. Ünal already restored [*tu-e*] for

I am operating upon the assumption that it would be unwise to decide already now that the child or the son whom the speaker wanted to be abducted and to be brought to his or her homebase, would need to have been Attāis, the son of the queen Ziplantawi(ya)s. We do not know whether KUB 48.106 preceded the two rituals and, if it did, how much time had elapsed. Nor can we be certain who actually was the political opponent most clearly referred to in § 2', ll. 13'–14'. We have a difficult choice between the queen Ziplantawi(ya)s, her husband, the originally independent ruler of presumably Kizzuwatna, and Attāis, the likely rival candidate for the Throne of Kizzuwatna. However, it can be added to the comments already given by Otten, l. c., 227²⁰ that Anzu[ra], with which he replaced Ünal's reading of ^{URU}Anku[wa], was located in Luwian territory, cf. KUB 35.123 (+), as edited F. Starke, StBoT 30, 251. Moreover, it can be maintained with a considerable degree of confidence that, while § 2' attests to a fundamental disagreement on a governmental issue, the rights of access to pasture, § 3' describes a failed political intrigue, either aiming at the possibility of exercising political pressure or conceivably even meant to prepare an adoption in the future. Additionally, with the proviso that my preference for a female speaker would have been correct, the final clause of § 3', ll. 18'–20' might offer support to the assumption that Asmu-Nikkal might have entered into an earlier wedlock before her ^{LU}*antiyant-* was given in marriage to her.

But it is of considerably greater importance that the 'conclusions' concerning 'the Great Queen' Ka(t)teshabis and 'My Majesty' of KUB 48.106 are in perfect correspondence with the data from the historical material adduced by Professor H. Otten in his treatment of the last late Old Hittite king Muwattallis I. It would suit the structure of § 3' if Ka(t)teshabis, according to Otten, l. c., 227 a new Hittite 'Great Queen' around the turn of the 15th to the 14th Century B. C., were to be equated with "the queen, your mother," of KUB 34.40 II 8' and 12', the queen in distress, apparently the wife of an earlier late Old Hittite 'Great King'.³⁰ At the time of the events described in this fragment, she would already have survived her husband (presumably Zidantas II (?)), her son (?) Huzziyas II and the usurper Muwattallis I, the former "commander of the royal bodyguards", but she would still have been threatened by Muwas, a partisan

the beginning of l. 19'. My alternative in the text is grammatically inferior, but reckons with the possibility that, instead of *el*, *-RU* would need to be preferred. At the end of the line I replace Ünal's reading *İR-a[n]* with *ni-ua*l, cf. the example of *İR* in l. 21' of the next paragraph. The restoration of the continuation follows from the context. For the restored (:) *niwaralli-* see the CHD L-N, 460 a–b, "probably a negative compound with Luwian *waralli-*, "own, proper", referring to D. J. Hawkins and A. Morpurgo, JRAS 1975, 129; see now, too, F. Starke, StBoT 31, 452¹⁶³² for further references, also concerning *waralli-*. If rightly restored, this would be the oldest example, at the same time showing the original meaning.

³⁰ Cf. H. Otten, Königshaus, 29–30 in the context of his treatment of Muwattallis I, 28–34.

of the killed usurper, cf. ibidem II 12'–13' and 9'–10', respectively.³¹ With the proviso that Tudhaliyas (II), during the reign of the husband of Ka(t)teshabis already married to the Kizzuwatnean princess Nikkal-madi, was the prince who ascended to the vacant Throne of Hatti-land after the killing of Muwattallis I, a future succession alluded to in KUB 36.104 II 22'–23',³² he would need to have been the ^dUTU-ŠI of KUB 48.106 Reverse during a later stage of his career. During a very early stage of his kingship – in accordance with KUB 23.16 III 1'4'–16' Tudhaliyas II would have defeated the Hurrian auxiliaries of Muwas, being supported in winning this victory by Kantuzzilis who, in unison with Himuilis, had earlier killed Muwattallis I.³³ So far there is no indication whatsoever that Kizzuwatna would have been conquered by military means. On the contrary, Kizzuwatna would seem to have been taken over by a succession of three 'Diplomatic Marriages' after a time of crisis during which Hurrian Forces had even tried to intervene in Hatti-land. Presumably these marriages finally resulted in a sort of peaceful unification of the two countries. After the Hittite 'Great Queen' Ka(t)teshabis had died and the aspirations of Ziplantawī(ya)s and of Attāis, her son, had been thwarted, a former Hittite military commander, married to a Kizzuwatnean princess, would seem to have ruled in each of the two capitals, the father ruling as 'Great King' in Hattusa, the 'son' starting out as a vassal king in the capital Kizzuwatna of the formerly independent country of that same name.

This tentative hypothesis suits the wording of KBo 1.5 I 5–6: *pānānum ana pa'ni a]bīia māt Kizzuwatni ša māt Hatt[i i]bbasi*, "Ehemals, zur Zeit meines Grossvaters ist das Land Kizzuwatna das des Landes Hatti geworden.", cf. G. Wilhelm, FsOtten 2, 36850. This translation which differs considerably from the rendering preferred by R. H. Beal, l. c., 443⁽⁴⁴⁾, "Formerly, in the time of my grandfather, Kizzuwatna was (on the side) of Hatti.", was, I think, rightly quoted by J. Klinger, StMed 9, 242–243⁽²⁵⁾. But in any case, neither of the two translations can easily be reconciled with the historical situation to be presumed for KUB 36.108, the parity-based Kizzuwatna treaty, drawn up in Hittite, between Zidantas II and Pilliyas II, a clear example of a peace treaty after earlier border conflicts.

4. The Date of the Sunassuras Treaty

Within this reconstruction, based on a 'short list' of Early Empire kings, the reader is now confronted with the choice for either Tudhaliyas II, as advocated

³¹ See Otten, o. c., 29–32.

³² Cf. in last instance S. de Martino, Eothen 4 [1991] 6–10 for a first attempt to determine the sequence of the events described in CTH no 271 and, concerning KUB 36.104 II in particular, l. c., 8–9; see, too, O. Carruba, SMEA 18 [1977] 188–191 for this fragment. De Martino already suggested that *a-pu-u-un* in l. 13 refers to the prospective successor.

³³ Cf. Otten, Königshaus, 33⁴³ on p. 34.

by R. H. Beal who has already been followed by an impressive number of scholars,³⁴ or for Tudhaliyas III, as originally proposed by G. Kestemont, as the Hittite king who concluded both the simple agreement KBo 28.110 +² and the presumably full-fledged treaty KBo 1.5. Dr. Beal's option was based on the following argumentation: "No treaty between Huzziya II and a king of Kizzuwatna has yet been found. We do know however that Huzziya's predecessor Zidanta II had a treaty with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna, who at another point in his reign became a tributary of Baratarna of Mittanni. If the filiation of these three kings is normal, that is father to son (for which there is no evidence pro or con), one would have a reconstruction as follows. Under Tudhaliya's grandfather (Zidanta II) Kizzuwatna had a treaty with the Hittites. Later Pilliya led Kizzuwatna into the Mittannian camp, becoming a tributary of Baratarna. During the father's generation (Huzziya II and Talzu(?)) Kizzuwatna remained in the Mittannian camp, and there was no treaty with the Hittites. When Sunassura came to the throne he was a tributary of Sauštatar. After a while, however, he returned Kizzuwatna to the Hittite fold. Thus the relations between Hatti and Kizzuwatna under kings Zidanta II to Tudhaliya II would mirror the pattern of Kizzuwatna being Hittite under the current king's grandfather, being subsequently lost to Mittani, and being regained by Hatti under the current king that one sees in the Sunassura treaty.", cf. Beal, l. c., 444–445 together with the notes 89–92. In this well-considered reconstruction of the historical developments, however, Beal omitted to make mention of the fact that the pseudo-parity treaty KBo 1.5 shows evidence of earlier border conflicts between the two parties. This point accords better with the attribution of this treaty to Tudhaliyas III than to his renowned grandfather, cf. my treatment sub 3. of the three Dynastic Marriages. Besides, it is in fact more likely that Huzziyas II and Tudhaliyas II will have been brothers.

At this end of my argumentation I want to recall that in the original German edition of his book on the Hurrians, "Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurriter", Darmstadt, 1982, 42–44 G. Wilhelm still reckoned with the likelihood that Suppiluliumas I would have referred in the Sattiwaza treaty Obv. 10, "Zur Zeit des Vaters des Königs des Landes Hatti hat sich das Land Isuwa empört", mentioning his father (by adoption?) in this passage, to the same

³⁴ See G. Wilhelm, FsOtten 2, 370, but see, too, 368 where three alternatives are distinguished (in my opinion the conditions, on p. 367 stipulated for an attribution to Tudhaliyas III, can in fact be met); J. Klinger and E. Neu, Hethitica 10 [1990] 139 together with the notes 155^{25–27}; A. M. Jasink, o. c. (note 3), 58, 68–69, 78 and passim; R. H. Beal himself (see the note to the title), THeth 20, 117⁽⁴²⁸⁾, 119⁽⁴⁸²⁾, 246⁽⁵²⁹⁾, 198–199⁽⁷⁸⁰⁾ and 209; S. de Martino, La Parola del Passato 47 [1992] 95–96; J. Klinger, StMed 9 [1995] 235–248 (an article in which he rightly dated the archaic Tunip treaty KBo 19.59 + KUB 3.16 (+) 21 to the first phase of the Early Empire Period), 235¹, 237¹¹, 238, 242⁽²¹⁾ and 243⁽²⁵⁾. Finally, D. Oshida and A. Kammenhuber, BMECCJ 8 [1995] 202, 205 and 210⁽²⁴⁾–211^(25–28). Among these authors Jasink, o. c., 58 and Oshida and Kammenhuber referred to KBo 28.110, but its contents were not evaluated in detail.

insurrection of Isuwa which is brought to notice in I 8–9 of the historical prologue of KBo 1.5 in the description of the king's dealings with the Mittanian king of his time. In the sequel the Tudhaliyas of the treaty even quotes his Mittanian contemporary verbatim in order to construe a diplomatic precedent for his own, Tudhaliyas III's (?), behaviour towards Kizzuwatna (Obv. 2'–5' = I 25–29). In his later article Wilhelm retracted this proposal of long standing, viewing both incidents as vaguely similar, but in their details rather different, cf. G. Wilhelm, *FsOtten* 2, 365–367. The comparison as such, but not the identification, actually goes back as far as H. Winckler's first article on the tablets from the Hittite capital, cf. *MDOG* 35 [1907] 32–33. If needs be, however, the point may be retained because this first mention of an event which took place during the reign of the predecessor in the Sattiwaza treaty may need to be restricted to the mere insurrection of Isuwa itself, both sources varying in the sequel of their stories. The prologue of the Sunassuras Treaty continues the development of the diplomatic precedent by relating how the Hittite king had defeated Isuwa and how the Mittanian king had refused the extradition of fugitives from Isuwa who had fled to his country (I 10–20).

Fortunately one of the fairly recently published Maşat letters, no 96 Rev. 15'–22' provides reliable evidence that Isuwa did belong to Hittite territory during presumably part of the reign of Tudhaliyas III: “^{15'–16'} Du wirst kommen (und) du [wirst gehen] um die Truppen zu mobilisieren. ^{17'} [Die Truppen der Länd]er des Oberen Landes,” and – as the penultimate item of a series – in l. 20' “des Landes von Isuwa” and the final clause ^{21'–22'} “(Und) was auch immer [Trup]pen des Oberen Landes (sind), mobilisiere sie alle!”, cf. S. Alp, *HBM*, 300–301. The so-called ‘Concentric Invasion’ of KBo 6.28 + Obv. 6–15 mentions after the Gasgaeans and Arzawean enemies the attacks of Arawanna on Kassiya (obv. 10), of Azzi(-Hayasa) (Obv. 11–12) – noting specifically that the enemy sacked all the regions of the Upper country and stating that Samuha (from which the grandfather of the ‘Deeds’ repeatedly campaigned) became the border town – as well as the attack of Isuwa on Tegaram(m)a (Obv. 12), cf. A. Goetze, *Kizz.*, 21–22. The Maşat letter which I just adduced is likely to stem from the time when (Azzi-)Hayasa had begun (or, renewed) its military activities, cf. *ibidem*, Rev. 12'–13', “It will come to pass (that) [you will set out] for the country of (the town of) Haya[sa]!”³⁵ Apparently shortly afterwards the country of Isuwa started its rebellion against Tudhaliyas III by attacking the country of Tegaram(m)a.

Admittedly with the proviso that the military success of the Hittite king would have been short-lived and that later Isuwa would have been recaptured by his

³⁵ It is well-established that during the reign of Tudhaliyas III military campaigns against the country of Hayasa were a fairly regularly occurring phenomenon, cf. not only the example presumably alluded to in Fr. 2, but also those mentioned in the Fr. 10–11 and 13 which, in view of the participation of Suppiluliumas (I), must be dated at the end of the reign.

Mittanian contemporary (cf. I 20–23 of the prologue), the flight of numerous inhabitants of a large number of Anatolian regions (the so-called Isuwa list) to Isuwa, twice enumerated in the sequel of the Sattiwaza treaty (Obv. 11–13 and again in 19–23) within the context of two successful military campaigns of Suppiluliumas I himself, is indeed likely to have taken place during a fairly late stage of the reign of Tudhaliyas III. There follow no less than three more references to the fact that the series of events had begun during the reign of his father, Obv. 13, 16 and 19–20.

According to this reconstruction of the historical events mentioned in the prologue of KBo 1.5, the Sunassuras treaty needs to be ascribed to a fairly late phase of the short reign of Tudhaliyas III since the invasion from the side of Armatana, the last entry in both Isuwa listings, is again mentioned as the one but last entry of the so-called ‘Concentric Invasion’, KBo 6.28 + Obv. 13–14, “From that side the Armatanean enemy [came] and he too sacked the Hittite countries and he [mad]e Kizzuwatna, the city, his [frontier]”, cf. A. Goetze, *ibidem*. In my opinion H. G. Güterbock rightly placed the fragments 23 and 24 of the ‘Deeds’, presumably describing the Hittite countermeasures against this Armatanean attack, after the death of the ‘grandfather’ (not mentioned from fr. 15 onwards) and before Fr. 25 dealing with the first Isuwean campaign of Suppiluliumas I.³⁶

Within this reconstruction the summing up of these data and my own considerations necessarily implies that, e. g. after the death of Sunassuras II (?), notwithstanding the stipulation of the treaty that the Hittite king would recognize Sunassuras II’s choice of successor and offer protection to him (I 52–54), the country of Kizzuwatna would have been reunited with Hatti-land, presumably being entrusted to the “priest” of Kizzuwatna who, in my opinion, had already been installed in the town of Kizzuwatna during the reign of Arnuwandas I.³⁷

³⁶ Cf. H. G. Güterbock, JCS 10 [1956] 82–84 and the General Comment, 119–120.

³⁷ But note the difference of opinion concerning the geographical scope of the area ruled by this priest in (the town of) Kizzuwatna: according to Beal, l. c., 429–430^(57–59) and THeth 20, 320–321^(1225–1227) it encompassed the whole country of Kizzuwatna which, from a point in time during the reign of Arnuwanda I onwards, would have been annexed to Hatti-land, the title of ‘priest’ being “in this case equivalent to that of appanage king”. Addenda to 38⁽⁹⁾ and 46⁽²⁴⁾; In the meantime Dr. Th. P. J. van den Hout and Dr. Karasu tried to verify the ‘join’, concluding that it would seem to be possible in theory, but cannot be put into practice since the remaining parts of KBo 28.110 have already been glued together, the glue leaving no room to insert the fragment (September 1996). Also in 1996 appeared A. Ünal’s “The Hittite Ritual of Hantitaššu from the City of Hurma against troublesome Years”, Ankara 1996: cf. 20⁽³⁵⁾, 85 and 97–89 for the data mentioned above in 46²⁴ (Ünal prefers ^mAtta-) and see 15–16 and 56–58 for his general opinion on KBo 17.104(+) and KBo 20.34 (: “a very different version of this group of rituals”; “it has scarcely anything in common with the ritual group of Hantitaššu”).