

OLD HITTITE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TEXTS: PROBLEMS OF CLASSIFICATION

Stefano DE MARTINO

My task for the project coordinated by O. Carruba on the classification and edition of historical Hittite texts is to complete the edition of the old Hittite historiographical texts.

It must be stated that I use the terms historiography and historiographical, in reference to the Hittite documents of which I am about to speak, in the wake of other colleagues, namely, A. Archi, H. Klengel, H.G. Güterbock, J. van Seters¹; actually, the term "historiography" is widely used throughout the Oriental world and, to illustrate this, I refer to the recent book "Historiography in the Cuneiform World", which is a collection of the papers from one of the sessions of the 45th Rencontre Assyriologique.

However, I am aware of the debate among scholars with regard to the opportunity of using such definitions for ancient texts of pre-classical world, but I will not deal with this now, as it was already clearly examined and studied in depth by J. Klinger just recently in the last Congress in Würzburg².

One of the problems in the study of old Hittite historiographical texts is the classification of such documents. Indeed, many Hittitologists have already been faced with this issue; I refer here to the contributions written by A. Kammenhuber, H. Cancik, H.A. Hoffner, E. von Schuler, J. Van Seters, G. del Monte, S. Heinhold-Krahmer, and J. Klinger³. I must say that, so far, my conclusions have followed H.A.

¹ A. Archi, *Athenaeum* 47 (1969), 7-20; H. Klengel, *Klio* 51 (1969), 5-14; H.G. Güterbock, in: *History, Historiography and Interpretation*, edited by H. Tadmor - M. Weinfeld, Jerusalem 1984, 21-35; J. van Seters, *In Search of History*, New Haven-London 1983, 101-126 (*Hittite Historiography*).

² *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, StBoT 45, 272-274.

³ See A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958), 136-155; A. Archi, art. cit.; H. Cancik, *Mythische und historische Wahrheit*, Stuttgart 1970; Id., *Grundzüge der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtschreibung*, Wiesbaden 1976; H.A. Hoffner, *Or* 49 (1980), 284-332; E. von Schuler, *RIA VI* 7/8 (1983), 68-71; J. van Seters, op. cit.; G. del Monte, *L'Annalistica ittita*, Brescia 1993; S. Heinhold Krahmer, *BiOr* 54 (1997), 149-155; J. Klinger, art. cit. 272-291. See now also S. de Martino, *Studia Mediterranea* 12, Pavia 2003.

Hoffner's work very closely, whose essay "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites" remains a milestone in the field of studies on the Hittite historiographical production.

As we know, the Hittites classified those historiographical compositions, which modern scholars define as "Annals" or "Deeds" or "*Res Gestae*", by the term *pešnatar*⁴. It should be pointed out that the definition *pešnatar* is found in the *colophons* of texts, each of which has a different structure and formal aspect; in fact, these are: the Annals of Hattusili I, in which the narration is organised by means of a precise chronological scansion from year to year, despite their brevity; the Annals of Tuthaliya I/II⁵, where the stress is not placed so much on temporal detail (only once is the term *wittantanni* "in the subsequent year" found in the text KUB XXIII 11 III 23), but more on the geographic itinerary covered by the king during the course of his expeditions⁶; the Deeds of Suppiluliuma I, written by Mursili II, and the Comprehensive Annals of Mursili II, which are much more developed than the two aforementioned texts, and richer in detail with a deeper narrative structure; lastly, *pešnatar* is found in the text of Suppiluliuma II KBo XII 38 II 14' (CTH 121) in reference to the inscription, drawn up by order of this sovereign to celebrate the exploits of his father Tuthaliya IV.

At the same time, however, common elements may be recognised in these documents, independently from the major or minor narrative process of each of them, i.e. the chronological organisation of the exposition, the content related to military feats achieved by the Hittite sovereign during the course of his reign, which are described in sequence, the mention of the areas or cities attained, the progress and results of battle, and the booty plundered.

Unfortunately, among the various historiographical texts of the Old Kingdom, only the Annals of Hattusili I have kept the *colophon*, thus we do not know how the scribes of Hattusa classified the other documents that have been handed down to us. Anyway, those elements previously mentioned are seen in the following texts: the tablets catalogued by E. Laroche under the numbers 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15; in addition, the narration in the fourth column of the *Sammeltafel* KUB XXVI 71 (CTH 39); this text seems to be independent from the text of Ammuna⁷ written in the first column and it has an annalistic structure. The text has been dated to the Old Kingdom, assuming that the fourth column would also be attributed to Ammuna⁸.

⁴ See now CHD. P 328-329; H. Roszkowska-Mutschler, FsPopko 289-300.

⁵ Cf. KUB XXIII 18 Rev. IV: LÜ-na-t[ar].

⁶ See S. de Martino, Eothen 5, 18-22.

⁷ See S. de Martino, Studi e Testi II, Eothen 10, 77-81.

⁸ See E. von Schuler, Kaššäer 185; H.A. Hoffner, art. cit. 305-306; CHD L-N 392; R. Beal, Thleth 20, 347.

Nevertheless, such dating can also be conjectured in the event that the annalistic document may be different from that of Ammuna, based on the fact that it is written on the same *Sammeltafel* that conserves two old Hittite compositions, the one by Anitta and that of Ammuna⁹, and since there is mention of Lilli, who perhaps is the same personage that also appears, as Lelli, in the Edict of Telipinu¹⁰.

Lastly, even the text KUB XXVI 74 (CTH 10.1) may be considered as belonging to the historiographical genre under study; however, it does not seem to have any relation to KBo III 45 and KBo XXII 7 (CTH 10.2), as the latter presented rather like an edict, analogous to KBo III 27 (CTH 5) in the formulary.

The texts just cited represent a group of documents that are, in some ways, homogeneous. I have deliberately left out from said group of *pešnatar*-texts other narrations with historical content, like the text of Anitta (CTH 1) and the text of Zalpa (CTH 3), for example. Both, in fact, for different reasons, present specific aspects of structure, content and style. The first text, given that it came close to the annalistic production of the Old Kingdom¹¹, has also been considered a compilation of three edicts¹², and is definitely the result of the reprocessing, done in the time of Hattusili I, of more ancient inscriptions¹³. The second, instead, is characterised by a literary, legendary prologue, which - as H. Hoffner pointed out¹⁴ - distinguishes it from the rest of the historiographical Hittite production. Peculiar characters also show up in the text of Ursu (CTH 7)¹⁵, which rather suggests it might belong to anecdotal literature, such as the "Palace Chronicle" (CTH 8), and the text of Puhanu (CTH 16), the interpretation of which still remains extremely problematic, despite it being the subject of in-depth analyses¹⁶.

Furthermore, I concur with H.A. Hoffner¹⁷ in cataloguing KBo III 60 (CTH 17)¹⁸ to the document type that the scholar defines: "Narratives of one or more military operations within a single year".

⁹ On the possible criteria that drove the Hittite scribes to place different texts on one and the same tablet, see L. Mascheroni, FsPugliese Carratelli 131-146.

¹⁰ See S. de Martino, loc. cit., for a possible attribution of the document to Telipinu.

¹¹ See A. Archi, art. cit. 10-12; Id., CANE 2369; H.A. Hoffner, art. cit. 292-293; H.G. Güterbock, History and Historiography cit. 22-24.

¹² See G. Steiner, FsTÖzgüç 53-73.

¹³ See O. Carruba, StBoT 45 cit. 51-72.

¹⁴ Art. cit. 291.

¹⁵ See the observations regarding H.A. Hoffner, art. cit. 299.

¹⁶ See O. Soysal, Hethitica 7 (1987), 172-253; Id., Hethitica 14 (1999), 109-137; See Haas - I. Wegner, GsImparati 353-358; G. Steiner, GsImparati 807-818; S. de Martino - F. Imparati, FsHoffner, 253-263.

¹⁷ Art. cit. 332.

¹⁸ On this text, see now S. de Martino, FsPopko 77-86.

Lastly, the typological organisation remains in doubt for fragmentary texts in the time of Telipinu KBo XII 8 and 9 (CTH 20) that narrate this sovereign's exploits, as they are presented analogously to what may be read in the Edict¹⁹.

In the group of old Hittite documents that I have indicated as possibly belonging to the genre of the *pešnatar* texts, three textual sub-typologies might be identified and, if we wish to keep them distinct and use simple and easy definitions, they could be called respectively: 1) Annals, 2) *Res Gestae*, and 3) *Res Gestae* of the sovereign author of the document with a review of his predecessors' exploits.

1) Typical of an annalistic text, obviously, is the fact that the exposition of events is scanned year by year: clearly defined as Annals is the text of Hattusili I, as well as the text written in the fourth column of KUB XXVI 71. As mentioned, we do not know exactly which sovereign this text can be attributed to, however, if it were truly to be dated to the Old Kingdom, it would constitute one further proof²⁰ - next to the Annals of Hattusili I - that the annalistic genre had been inaugurated, not in the Middle Kingdom, as G. del Monte²¹ holds, or in the Imperial Age, as A. Kammenhuber²² wrote, but already in the old Hittite period.

2) Even the *Res Gestae* cover a wide chronological area wherein the narration follows the temporal sequence of events. Nevertheless, these texts, when compared with the Annals of Hattusili I and those conserved in KUB XXVI 71, are characterised by a more articulated exposition and by a greater abundance of detail. In the texts, the narration related to a new year is not introduced by the expression *wittantanni*, nor by formulas of the type "in the first year. . . , in the second year. . . ", but by the phrase *mān parā šiyati*, "as soon as (nature) sprouted", that is, "when it became spring"²³. As Ph. Houwink ten Cate has pointed out²⁴, this formula may be seen as a distinctive stylistic trait of the old Hittite *Res Gestae*; as to the meaning and function in the exposition, it refers to the expression *maḥḥan(=ma) ḥamešḥanza kišat* "when

spring came", which is found with a certain regularity in the Comprehensive Annals of Mursili II at the beginning of a new year's narration, and occasionally even in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma written by Mursili²⁵ and in the Ten Years' Annals²⁶.

Belonging to the *Res Gestae* sub-typology, in my opinion, is the narration of Hattušili I, related to the military campaigns fought against the Yamḥad reign (CTH 14-15); the texts of CTH 13, attributed by scholars to Hattušili I, or Muršili I; and KUB XXXI 64 + (CTH 12), dated to Mursili I or Hantili I.

3) Lastly, the distinctive characteristic of the third text type is the fact that the narration is not exclusively an account of the events that happened during the reign of the sovereign who is author of the text, but also during the reigns of his predecessors. Here I refer to the texts KBo III 57, KUB XXVI 72 (CTH 11) and KUB XXVI 74 (CTH 10.1). As we know, the first one, which conserves the name of the king Hantili, is dated either to Hantili I or Hantili II, while the second one has been attributed, albeit hypothetically, again to Hantili I²⁷, but it could also be one of his successors.

H.A. Hoffner had already shed light on these compositions to show analogies with the text CTH 83, a historiographical work of the Imperial Age; it is dated to Hattusili III²⁸ and narrates the main events of the reigns of Suppiluliuma I, Arnuwanda II, and Muršili II, and also the exploits of the young Tuthaliya, then GAL *MEŠEDI*, who is presented as the protagonist of heroic actions in military campaigns conducted by the river Zuliya. Indeed, the emphasis this Imperial Age document places on exalting Tuthaliya's conduct, which is dedicated to all but a good part of the work, may induce the belief that this text had been composed in the difficult period when Hattusili III tried to impose Tuthaliya to inherit the throne. The Hittite sovereign, in fact, might have wanted not only to show the courage and the military achievements of Tuthaliya, but, above all, to make he and his son appear as the direct and legitimate successors of the Hittite Imperial dynasty of Suppiluliuma I, appropriately presenting Tuthaliya's feats next to those of his glorious predecessors. In other words, the reference to the past could be functional to give authoritative legitimacy to Hattušili III, who was not legitimate, and to his successor.

Going back to the texts KBo III 57 and KUB XXVI 72, it is really the comparison with the aforementioned narration by Hattusili III that induces me to attribute their composition to Hantili I, rather than to Hantili II; in fact, with said document, Hantili I might have wanted to give an image of himself, if not as a legitimate king, at least

¹⁹ See O. Carruba, FsGüterbock 1964, 77-79; I. Hoffman, THeth 11, 63-68.

²⁰ H.A. Hoffner, art. cit. 306, writes about this text: as "the sense of temporal sequence, the full data on geographical points in the king's and his officials' itineraries, the inclusion of personal names and pertinent details about the activities of the king's lieutenants combine to give the impression of a highly competent historiographic technique".

²¹ The Annalist 12-13; it recalls that this scholar considers the Annals of Hattusili as a cento created "tagliando e incollando brani 'storici' di antiche iscrizioni reali".

²² Saeculum 9 (1958), 144, 154 n. 101.

²³ CHD Š. 20.

²⁴ Cf. Ph. Houwink ten Cate, Anatolica 11 (1984), 61.

²⁵ Fr. 28, KUB XIV 12 III 24, see H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956), 96.

²⁶ At the beginning of the fourth year.

²⁷ See F. Pecchioli Daddi, OA Misc I (1994), 76.

²⁸ See K. Riemschneider, JCS 16 (1962), 115.

as a sovereign who meant to keep alive the leadership of his illustrious predecessors, Hattusili I and Mursili I, whose exploits he would have emulated. Diversely, if the text had been written by Hantili II, the reference to his then remote predecessors would not have appeared very comprehensible on the part of this king. In the edict, KBo III 45 (and duplicate KBo XXII 7, CTH 10.2), also probably by Hantili I²⁹, the figure and the conduct of Mursili is harshly stigmatised, and even the pronunciation of his name is forbidden, but this does not invalidate the dating proposed here for KBo III 57 and KUB XXVI 72. In fact the edict could fit in well with the initial stage of Hantili I's reign, when this sovereign wanted to affirm his own authority and intimidate the supporters of the defunct king. The historiographical text under study here might, instead, belong to a subsequent time in which the sovereign tried to shake off the stigma of illegitimacy, perhaps also in view of the designation of his son Piseni to inherit the throne.

In conclusion, it seems to me that to try to reply to this question, which was already raised by J. Klinger³⁰ at the last congress in Würzburg on the origin of historiographical genres in the Hittite culture, I prefer to follow the thesis sustained by H. Hoffner³¹ and H. Cancik³² and other scholars, on the continuity between the literary production of the Old Kingdom and that of the Imperial Age. On the basis of what is observed, it also appears likely to hold that the three historiographical sub-typologies documented in the Old Kingdom and analysed herein continue throughout the subsequent age: the Annals and the *Res Gestae* with the annalistic texts of the Middle Kingdom, the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, the Ten Years' Annals, the Comprehensive Annals of Mursili, and with the Annals of Hattusili III (CTH 82). Instead, the typology of the *Res Gestae* with a review of the past, the type like the one here attributed to Hantili I, would be drawn from Hattusili III in the historiographical composition of the CTH 83.

To identify a line of continuity between the Old Kingdom and the Imperial Age does not mean to say that the historiographical genres have not undergone development and change over the course of time. There is absolutely no doubt, in fact, that the texts of the Imperial Age show a composition technique that is much more sophisticated and a narrative depth that is greater than that found in other more ancient texts.

²⁹ See lastly S. de Martino, *Hethitica* 11 (1992), 21.

³⁰ Art. cit., 272-291.

³¹ Art. cit. 321-322.

³² *Mythische und Historische Wahrheit* cit. 49.