



## THE PROPAGANDA OF ḪATTUŠILIŠ III

di ALFONSO ARCHI

In contemplating the personality of Ḫattušiliš III, who seems to us the most complex of the Hittite sovereigns (perhaps almost accidentally, in as much as the surviving sources<sup>1</sup> illustrate in various aspects not only the activity of his government but also moments from private life), modern historiography has assumed basically two attitudes. On the one hand, there are those like Gurney<sup>2</sup> who, while not discounting the obvious tendentiousness of the autobiography, nevertheless are inclined to credit Ḫattušiliš with good reasons for his actions. In so doing, they are perhaps unconsciously appealing to the judgement of history, since the epoch of Ḫattušiliš was a period of peace and reorganization for various regions of the realm. Others<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, try to adduce events even as far back as the time of Muwatalliš to demonstrate the patient underground work which Ḫattušiliš must have done to prepare the coup d'état in consequence of which he took his nephew's place on the throne of Ḫattušaš. And in some cases it seems

---

<sup>1</sup>The principal source is the so-called "autobiography" of Ḫattušiliš, studied by A. Goetze, *Ḫattušiliš*, *MVAeG* 29, 3, Leipzig 1925, and completed with new fragments by A. Goetze, *Neue Bruchstücke...*, *MVAeG* 34, 2, Leipzig 1930. See there also an abbreviated version: *KBo* VI 29 (+), and the edict for Mittannamuwaš: *KBo* IV 12. For the complete list of the cuneiform fragments which constitute the various manuscripts, for the duplicates, and in some cases also for the bibliography, in the course of this study see: E. Laroche, *Cat(alogue des Textes Hittites)*, *RHA* 58-60, 61, 1956-58 (the texts above cited in nos. 59-61).

<sup>2</sup> O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, Rev. Ed., Harmondsworth 1964, p. 35ff. See also the ample essay of G. Furlani, *Saggi sulla civiltà degli Hittiti*, Udine 1939, pp. 141-186.

<sup>3</sup> Many scholars, though often only in passing, have concerned themselves with the question. One is referred here to two more organic historical treatments of the period: A. Goetze, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd Ed., Vol. II, 1965, Ch. XXIV, p. 44ff. H. Otten, *Fischer Weltgeschichte*, Bd. III, Frankfurt 1966, p. 156ff.

as though the scholar of Hittite history, usually drawn to note either military victories of the two Muršiliš or the austerity of Telepinuš, or content upon reconstructing the uncertain chronologies of the elusive signs of the Middle Kingdom, does not wish to miss the opportunity owing that he also can even arrive at an historical reconstruction goes beyond the official version. From a comprehensive survey of the which, for the most part, does indeed reflect the version imposed by šiliš, there should emerge a judgement which is at least more complex, or some aspects of the question, less summary.

The autobiography of Hattušiliš is in reality a decree<sup>4</sup> of constitution sacred foundation dedicated to the goddess Ištar of the city of Šamuha. Its part comprises almost the entirety of the text, and consists of a relation of the events which lead to the foundation. In form, the autobiography resembles other decrees of Hattušiliš which have particularly many introductions because they give an exposition of the historical background<sup>5</sup>; it resembles, too, the rather complex decree of Telepinuš<sup>6</sup>. The royal treaties, with historical introductions, belong to a very similar genre. What makes the autobiography a unique document is that the ostensible reason for its composition is only a pretext for propagating instead a certain version of the facts which go beyond those which constitute the terms of the foundation, and which outweigh them in importance. For here are given the events which lead to a coup d'état, and which are to justify it. The task accomplished with such skill that it gives us what is doubtless the most important Hittite literary composition. Almost every phrase is calculated to persuade the reader to accept the version which it wishes to establish, placing him with recurrent themes, and placing it all in a religious key. Hattušiliš I and Telepinuš had also to resolve difficult dynastic problems<sup>7</sup>, their vigorous edicts are set on the human plane, whereas here — and

the contrast is very clear — the religious dimension is sought. First of all, it is constructed on a series of opposing points, sometimes only veiled. These, on the one hand, underline the difficulties faced by the protagonist (and the happy solutions of these, often influenced by supernatural help, attest his own personal value and the constant divine support accorded him). On the other hand, they serve to emphasize his ever-loyal conduct in contrast to the wickedness of his adversaries. Hattušiliš, ailing, is not destined to live long: for him « the years are brief » (in contrast to the « long years » which are constantly invoked for kings); Ištar, however, cures him (I 13-21). He is the victim of the envy of his rivals; but this is provoked by the very favors granted him by the goddess and the king (I 30ff.; II 74ff.; III 54ff.). He is made the object of slander and acts of magic, which he contests by means of a regular trial before the king, and the favorable results demonstrate the rectitude of Hattušiliš (I 33ff.; II 74ff.). He, on the other hand, does not use magic against Urhi-Tešup (III 66ff.), even though the latter recalls from exile Šippazitiš, who had already been convicted of the crime of using magic (IV 3ff.). Hattušiliš reconquers the Upper Region without benefit of Muwatalliš' support, and in spite of being opposed by decisively superior forces (II 20ff.; 35ff.; 48ff.); but he himself does not hesitate to side with his brother against the Egyptians (II 69ff.). He reciprocates the many favors received from Muwatalliš, and after his death, places his son, Urhi-Tešup, on the throne. Urhi-Tešup, on the contrary, is vexatious toward him, but he tolerates this from piety to his brother's memory (III 38ff.; III 62).

Comparing the autobiography with certain north-Syrian compositions, some have wished to see in it elements of epic and fable<sup>8</sup>, but even if some

Cf. H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* XLIV, 1938, p. 94f. Of the opposite opinion is A. Kammerer, *Saeculum* 9, 1958, p. 153 note 94, who relates the document to the annalistic but in addition to the formal point of view — and to understand a composition of any one must keep well in mind the formal aspect — it is also in fact, a decree (conso the choice of the historical events narrated). For a comparison, remember that Telepinuš also dedicated a document in order to clarify at greater length than in the decree (26) his relationship with Huzzišajš, whom he deposed (*KBo* XII 8, duplicate 9; š is cited in I 4 and IV 20 ff.). Despite the fact that he was spared by Telepinuš, when granted to him some landed properties, he was massacred, along with his family, on the initiative of some palace functionaries who were consequently severely punished by Telepinuš.

In addition to the "minor text" of the autobiography, *Cat.* 60, see *Cat.* 58, 61, 63, 65. For a partial transcription and translation in *Sumerian Chron.* 1927ff.

<sup>8</sup> M. Liverani, in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale sul tema: La poesia epica e la sua formazione*, Accad. Naz. dei Lincei, Quad. 139, Roma 1970, p. 861ff., underlines the formal aspect in the use of the number seven, for which reason the expression "for seven years I endured (the abuses of Urhi-Tešup)" (autob. III 63) cannot therefore indicate the period of the reign of Urhi-Tešup (the error in considering it a useful datum for chronological purposes was demonstrated by Liverani in *Studi sull'Oriente e la Bibbia, offerti al p. G. Rinaldi*, Genova 1967, p. 52; but previously H. Otten, *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orient*, ed. H. Schmökel, Stuttgart 1961, p. 358; and now in *Fischer Weltgeschichte*, Bd. III, Frankfurt 1966, p. 159); in addition, drawing a parallel with the inscription of Idrimi (in which, in effect, there are identifiable fabulous aspects: cf. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 118, 1950, p. 20, who relates it to the biblical episode of Joseph), Liverani sees a literary motive also in the description of his youth, difficult and full of adversity, as Hattušiliš presents it. But even if these can be topical elements, they are still of too little significance, and above all, too sparse to allow a generalized judgment on the autobiography: the formulaic use of the number seven, and beginning with eight in a new series, so common in all antiquity in general, for the Hittites, too, belongs to the epistolary style, as for example at Ugarit (see the expression as a token of homage in the letter of a certain Maššaš, *KBo* IX

standard elements were used, it is certainly not possible to assert that the facts were altered in order to fit them into a preconstituted scheme. That they could not have been, is proved, at least for certain aspects, by certain other texts, together with the version of the events given in the decree in favor of Mittannamuwaš, which adheres to the precise situation. It is true that the autobiography can also be reduced to structural schemes and compared with other documents: see the table on the following page. It is doubtful however whether a similar method of research can be justified. Here it is sufficient to have indicated a certain number of correlations arranged in various categories; but to comprehend such a sophisticated text one must go further, following its major themes, and allowing oneself to be guided by the « key words. »

The theme is given by I 5: « I wish to tell of the divine justice (*parā ḫandātar*) of Ištar », and this justice protects Ḫattušiliš, who acts according to it (I 45 and 48); it manifests itself in the crucial moment of a political trial (III 15), or in the struggle with Urḫi-Tešup, which assumes the guise of a divine judgment (IV 18, 23). And in similar situations, when the just cause triumphs, the same expression is sometimes used in the annals of Muršiliš<sup>9</sup>, but not only there: in addition to the sphere of private behaviour<sup>10</sup> one finds it in the prayers. Thus the Sun-goddess of Arinna is « the lady(!) of justice, inspired with divine justice (*ḫannešnaš-az parā*

extended also to the ritual sphere (see *KUB XXXII 130* r 18: J. Danmanville, *RHA* 59, 1956, p. 42; but the eras in Kumarpi are counted as enneads, and in the song of Ullikummi five and its multiples recur often).

As for delineating the years of youth as a period of adversity, as Muršiliš does in his annals, the literary motive will have acted for the purpose of individualizing and underlining such a moment; but behind the literary motive there surely stood a real situation, as the very pragmatic decree for Mittannamuwaš shows: *KBo* IV 12, A. Goetze, *Ḫatt.* p. 40ff. For the rest, let it suffice to recall that in epochs of relative security states ruled by a hereditary monarchy could enter upon a crisis every time the heir was not in a position to receive firmly the succession: compare for Muršiliš I, F. Sommer - A. Falkenstein, *HAB*; the uncertainties and the states of mind which could be seen in such cases are well delineated in the letter of Ḫattušiliš III to Kadašman-Enlil II, *KBo* I 10 (+), *Cat.* 55, transl. by J. Friedrich, *AO* 24, 3, 1925, p. 24ff.: "At that time my brother (the king of Babylonia) was still small, and they did not read the letter to you... Now those scribes are not in life, where are the letters?" (r 17ff.); "At that time my brother was small, and Itti-<sup>d</sup>Marduk-balātu (a functionary of the Babylonian court) is a bad man, how can I accept his word?" (r 34f.); "[I have] heard that my brother has become great and goes to hunt ... [I rejoice] much ... go and sack the country of the enemy!" (v 49ff.). Cf. also the texts cited in *CAD* Š. *šibru* 2b, p. 183f.

<sup>9</sup> A. Goetze, *AM*, p. 285 s. v.  
<sup>10</sup> *KBo* V 1 I 43, *Cat.* 419: F. Sommer - H. Ehelolf, *BoSt* 10, p. 4\* f.  
<sup>11</sup> The inscription of Idrimi of Alalakh is published by S. Smith, *The statue of Idrimi*, London 1949.  
<sup>12</sup> *KBo* III 22, duplicates in *Cat.* 5; transl. H. Otten, *MDOG* 83, 1951, p. 39ff.

TABLE

Idrimi <sup>11</sup>	flight and exile among the Ḫapiru, II. 3-30	return to Alalakh, treaty with Šuttarna, relations with other political entities, II. 30-63	expedition against the Hittite country, II. 64-77	internal administration, restoration of the cults, II. 77-91
Anitta <sup>12</sup>	war against Neša, Ḫattušaš, Zalpuwa, II. 2-54	reconstruction of Neša, restoration of the cults, II. 55-63	war against Šalatiwara, II. 64-72	consignment of the insignia of power on the part of the man of Puruṣhanda, II. 73-78
Ḫattušiliš III	illness, trial of Arma-Dattaš, war in the north and against the Egyptians, I 9-II 79	marriage, nomination to the throne of Ḫakpiš, definitive condemnation of Arma-Dattaš, installation of Urḫi-Tešup, restoration of Nerik, II 79-III 54	enmity of Urḫi-Tešup and war, III 54-IV 40	accession to the throne of Ḫattušaš, well-being in the country, homage of the other sovereigns foundation for Ištar IV 41-89



- [n]u-kán 'Ha-at-tu-ši-li-in IR-KA  
 42 A-NA<sup>URU</sup>Ne-ri-iq-qa ma-aḫ-ḫa-an an-da [ši-ja-it']  
 na-at<sup>UTU</sup>TUL-na GAŠAN-ja ša-ak-ti [ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma]  
 44 EN-ŠU-an pâr-ḫi-iš-ki-it DUMU<sup>MES</sup>LUGAL-ja-an [ma-aḫ-ḫa-an]  
 [ú-]e-ri-eš-kir A-NA<sup>URU</sup>Ne-ri-iq-qa-wa [na-at GAŠAN-JA]  
 46 [ša-a]k-ti a-pa-a-aš-ma a-pi-e-el ḫar-ga-[an]  
 [a-p]i-e-el-la ḫi-in-kán Ū-UL kap-p[u-wa-a-it]  
 48 [nu-wa A-]NA<sup>URU</sup>Ne-ri-iq-qa še-ir ag-ga-tar e[-eš-du]  
 a) or [-q]a

- I [And fo]r the country of Nerik and the cou[ntry] of Ḫ[akpiš]  
 34 he [eng]aged [his] own body and his own [soul]  
 while he made war [agai]nst  
 36 [the Kaška people (?).]  
 38 But when Muwatalliš, [his own brother],  
 became god (i.e. died), he took Urḫi-Tešup, [the son of his  
 brother],  
 40 and esta[blished] him in the kingship.  
 How (Urḫi-Tešup) [pressed (?)]  
 42 Ḫattušiliš, your servant, towards Nerik,  
 that you know, Son-goddess of Arinna, my lady; [and how]  
 44 his lord incited him, [how] the princes  
 urged him: « to Nerik! », [that, my lady],  
 46 you [kn]ow. And he didn't con[sider]  
 his ruin and his death,  
 48 [and « ] for Nerik [let] (there) b[e] death! »<sup>19</sup>.

Now, at that time, what did these two represent — Ištar of Šamuḫa, and the Weather-god of Nerik? For what reasons did Ḫattušiliš base his propaganda on these two divinities, and in so doing, to whom in particular did he address it?

Ištar, who arrived in Anatolia via the Hurrians, has the same terrifying powers as those attributed to her in Mesopotamia: to dispose of living beings at her pleasure. « For men, turn to dust (their) masculinity, (their) virility, (their) health!; take spears, bows, arrows, swords, and bring them to Ḫattušaš; place in (their) hand(s) the spindle and the mirror of a woman, dress them as women and put a veil on them!; deprive them of your favour! From women, take away (their) maternity, love..., and bring them to the

<sup>19</sup> The translation differs from that of A. Goetze, *ANET*, p. 393f. For lines 43-48 cf. V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 13 and note 1.

midst of the Ḫatti country! »<sup>20</sup>. Ištar of the fields is one of the principal goddesses who protect Muršiliš II<sup>21</sup>, and it is one of her hypostases which is honoured at Šamuḫa<sup>22</sup>. This city became a notable cult center when a predecessor of Muršiliš II, Tuthališaš, transferred to it the divinities of Kizzuwatna<sup>23</sup>. This would make one suppose that it was located in a safe zone<sup>24</sup>, but it was more or less at the same time that it was exposed to enemies<sup>25</sup>. Suppiluliumaš I made use of it as a base against the Kaška people<sup>26</sup>, and it is perhaps to this king that we should attribute the construction of that « house of the grandfather of the king » in which a ritual for Ištar of Tami-

<sup>20</sup> (KUB XI 35) (+) KBo II 9 I 25-32, *Cat.* 406 (see F. Sommer, *ZA* 33, 1921, p. 98f.; J. Friedrich, *AO* 25, 2, 1925, p. 21f.). And the divinities associated with the goddess could also be held accountable for such subversions: see KUB XXIV 7 I-II 27, transl. in part by A. Goetze, *AM*, p. 262f. For the influence that the Mesopotamian conception must have exercised in Anatolia, cf. the Accadian prayer to Ištar, with Hittite translation, KUB XXXVII 36 (+) 37 and KUB XXXI 141, *Cat.* 529 and 273; studied by E. Reiner and H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* XXI, 1967, p. 255-266.

<sup>21</sup> The canonical list in the annals is <sup>PU</sup>NIR.GAL EN-JA <sup>PUTU</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Arinna GAŠAN-JA <sup>DU</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Ḫatti <sup>PKAL</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Ḫatti <sup>DU</sup>KARAS <sup>PISTAR</sup>LİL <sup>DU</sup>Jarriš, see A. Goetze, *AM*, p. 322 s. v. <sup>PISTAR</sup>. The same divinities, leaving aside the first, the last and <sup>PKAL</sup>, recur also in the narration of the deeds of Suppiluliumaš I, still compiled by Muršiliš (see H. G. Güterbock, *DŠ*, *JCS* X, 1956, p. 41ff., 75ff., 107ff., fragments 10 l. 7f.; 14 l. 44; 15 l. 8f., etc.

In the annals of Tuthališaš, *Cat.* 85 (on the attribution of which see now Ph. Howink ten Cate, *The Records of the early Hittite Empire*, Istanbul 1970, p. 71f. and 80), the list includes, among the other divinities, <sup>PU</sup>ZA.BA<sub>4</sub>.BA<sub>4</sub> <sup>PISTAR</sup><sup>PSIN</sup> <sup>PU</sup>Lelwaniš: KUB XXIII 11 II 25, III 20.

<sup>22</sup> <sup>PISTAR</sup>SĒRI URU<sup>URU</sup>Šamuḫa: Ištar of the fields of Šamuḫa, KUB XXXII 130 r 1: J. Danmanville, *RHA* 59, 1956, p. 39ff.; cf. E. Laroche, *RHA* 46, 1946-47, p. 95. With Ḫattušiliš and Tuthališaš, Ištar of Šamuḫa is sometimes inserted in lists of divinities along side of <sup>PU</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Nerik, cf. KBo IV 10 r 48; IBoT II 20 (+) (*Cat.* 518,1) 6ff., forming also discrepant lists as in Bo 3136 (see Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 309), where at line 6ff. there occurs <sup>PU</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Nerik <sup>PISTAR</sup>URU<sup>URU</sup>Šamuḫa <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>Ḫaburwa.

<sup>23</sup> KUB XXXII 133, see A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, p. 24f., and H. Kronasser, *Schw.* G., p. 58.

<sup>24</sup> On the geographical position of the city of Šamuḫa, see J. Garstang - O. R. Gurney, *Geography*, p. 32ff.; A. Goetze, *JCS* XIV, 1960, p. 46f.; E. von Schuler, *Kaskäer*, p. 35 note 188. The city is the cult center of diverse divinities who are mentioned with some frequency from the epoch of Suppiluliumaš I: <sup>PU</sup>, see E. Laroche, *RHA* 46, 1946-47, p. 114; Ḫepat, cf. KUB VI 45 I 40 = 46 II 6; Lelwaniš, see especially KBo IV 6 r 21, *Cat.* 280, and cf. E. Laroche, *op. cit.*, p. 75f.; Abaraš, *ibid.*, p. 79; Zappanaš, KBo IV 10 v 1; <sup>PMI</sup>, KUB VIII 71 r 9; KUB XXXII 133 I 8; KBo XVI 97 r 13, v 15, 18; <sup>BĒLAT</sup> AJAKKI, E. Laroche, *op. cit.*, p. 104. For the cult of Ištar of the city of Tamingina at Šamuḫa, see J. Danmanville, *RHA* 70, 1962, p. 51ff. (For <sup>PUTU</sup> cf. KUB XXV 32 + XXVII 70 + 1628/u II 45 and 54: A. M. Dinçol - M. Darga, *Anatolica* III, 1969-70, p. 106f.).

<sup>25</sup> KBo VI 28 r 11f., *Cat.* 58; see A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, p. 21f.

<sup>26</sup> H. G. Güterbock, *DŠ*, fragment 10, *JCS* X, 1956, p. 63 l. 10ff.

ninga<sup>27</sup> was celebrated. At any rate, we know with certainty that Muršiliš was concerned with the cult of Ištar of Šamuḫa: in a ritual for the goddess, Ḫattušiliš, to whom the text has to be attributed, decides to restore some of the cult practices, and therefore states: « If in relation to the past years / they revive the ancient ritual for Ištar primigenia, for Ištar / the powerful (??) they do not revive the ancient / ritual of Muršiliš! To Ištar of Šamuḫa, / for (her) festival, she (is) appropriately invited. Muršiliš, / the father of His Majesty, has celebrated it thus... »<sup>28</sup>. And if Muršiliš had not been particularly devoted to the goddess, certainly he would not have dedicated Ḫattušiliš to her.

The conquest of Nerik and its reconstruction is the culmination of the reorganization of the entire Upper Region. To have taken it from the Kaška people and given it security constitutes one of the greatest achievements of Ḫattušiliš. The sequence of events can be reconstructed thus<sup>29</sup>: Ḫattušiliš, after a series of actions, reconquers large territories in the north; Muwatalliš helps him, and then transfers the capital to Dattašša, leaving all of the Upper Region to his brother, and installing him as king at Ḫakpiš. Nevertheless, Ḫattušiliš does not at first succeed in establishing a lasting order: because he participates in the battle of Qadeš, the capital rebels. Later, at Ḫakpiš, according to the version of it which Ḫattušiliš gives in a text dealing with the restoration of the cult of Nerik, the Weather-god of Nerik appears to him in a dream, and probably invites him to liberate the city. This he will finally succeed in doing only during the reign of Urḫi-Tešup (autob. III 45ff.), reconquering at last for the Hittites the great city-sanctuary which Muršiliš and Muwatalliš had reached, but had been forced to abandon again to the enemy<sup>30</sup>.

From the military point of view, then, the enterprise is quite remarkable,

<sup>27</sup> KUB XII 5, Cat. 412; see J. Danmanville, *op. cit.*, p. 51ff. The ritual is celebrated by a queen, probably Pudu-Ḫepa; if at that period she exercised the office of tawanannaš beside her son Tuthališaš IV, then the building was constructed by Muršiliš.

<sup>28</sup> KUB XXVII 1 I 1-6, Cat. 410: [nu]-kán ma-a-an MU<sup>III</sup>A iš-tar-na pa-an-te-eš nu-kán A-NA <sup>D</sup>IS[TAR] / an-na-al-li an-na-al-la-an SISKUR ḫa-pu-ša-an-zi A-NA <sup>D</sup>IS[TAR] / wa-al-li-wa-al-li-ma ŠA <sup>1</sup>Mur-ši-i-li an-na-al-la[-an] / SISKUR Ū-UL ḫa-pu-ša-an-zi A-NA <sup>D</sup>ISTAR <sup>URU</sup>Ša-mu-ḫa-aš-ká[n] / EZEN<sup>NI</sup> an-da aš-šu-li ḫal-zi-ja-an-za <sup>1</sup>Mur-ši-li-ša-at / A-BI <sup>D</sup>UTU<sup>SI</sup> ki-iš-ša-an i-ja-an ḫar-ta. Line 4f. is translated according to A. Goetze *Tunnawi*, p. 38. The text continues for a number of lines, emphasizing the innovations. J. Danmanville, *RHA* 59, 1956, p. 39ff. is inclined to attribute to Muršiliš also KUB XXXII 130, Cat. 540, in which, on the basis of oracles, it is decided to bring the image of the goddess before the sovereign so that she may become propitious to him, after the performance of the proper rituals. Cf. also KUB XXXII 133, see note 23.

<sup>29</sup> See E. von Schuler, *Kaskäer*, pp. 53-61, cf. V. Haas, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-20.

<sup>30</sup> KUB XXI 8 II 1ff., Cat. 75,3; but the text is rather fragmentary: see V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 9f. and p. 15. Also Tuthališaš IV recognizes that Muršiliš has pushed on up to

and has the greatest religious echoes, since Nerik had been one of the most important sanctuaries ever since the time of the Old Kingdom<sup>31</sup>, the loss of which was also very painful to Arnuwandaš and Ašmunikal<sup>32</sup>. If then, during the first period of the New Kingdom the cult of the Weather-god of Nerik, which was transferred to Ḫakpiš, underwent a decline for obvious reasons in favor of the Weather-god of Zippalanda<sup>33</sup>, nonetheless Ḫattušiliš had in hand an element of the first order to use when he had to present a version of the coup d'état which should justify him and turn the opinion of various sectors in his favor. Simplifying the terms of the struggle, as is done in the prayers, he contrasts the man who restored the glory of an ancient cult-seat to that other who did not hesitate to undo the work. But beyond this immediate contrast, the propaganda makes use of more complex elements, even if they are not always openly stated. The Hittite kingship is bound up with the Weather-god of Nerik (or better, was so in origin), and the text Bo 3138 addresses to him the famous invocation which in *IBoT* I 30 is addressed to the Weather-god of Ḫatti: « The country belongs to the Weather-god... he has made the labarnaš, the King, (his) governor; to him he has given the whole country of Ḫattušaš... »<sup>34</sup>; see again a passage such as: « the [labarn]aš, the king, the tawanannaš, [the queen, and the princes] do you guide (Weather-god of Nerik) »<sup>35</sup>, or even the bonds between the divinity and the important festival of *purulli*<sup>36</sup>. Beyond being protected by Ištar, Ḫattušiliš, in becoming priest of the Weather-god of Nerik (autob. III 60f.), guarantees the original values of the Hittite religion, bound up with the Hattian culture, and does so in a moment when the transference of the capital, with the gods and sacred images (autob. II 52f.), desired by Muwatalliš, would have provoked noticeable difficulties. Certain statements must be seen in the light of the character of the document and the purpose for which it was written. Thus, in the autobiography, Ištar becomes queen of Ḫakpiš, and promises the priesthood of the Sun-goddess of Arinna (that is, the kingship of Ḫatti; III 12f.; IV 14f.); but in the prayers which he addresses to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, Ḫattušiliš, keeping in mind that Nerik is the city sacred to her son, and wishing to justify the coup d'état,

<sup>31</sup> In § 50 of the Laws Nerik is beside Arinna and Zippalanda.

<sup>32</sup> KUB XVII 21, duplicates in Cat. 277; see above all IV 5ff.; transcribed and transl. in E. von Schuler, *op. cit.*, p. 152ff.

<sup>33</sup> See V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 107f.; for the texts regarding the cult at Ḫakpiš, *ibid.*, p. 7 n. 3.

<sup>34</sup> The new text is cited by V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 97f. and note 4, where there is also a translation of the well-known *IBoT* I 30, Cat. 537,1.

<sup>35</sup> KUB XXXI 136 III 2f., Cat. 290,2; transcribed and transl. in V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 196ff.; there too at p. 156 see KUB XXXVI 89 v 49, Cat. 553: "before the countries of the [go]ds he made (his) governor the labarnaš, the king", where again the functions



prefers to conduct the discourse on other religious lines <sup>37</sup>, recalling how much he has done for the city, and that he marched against Ur̥hi-Tešup only when it ran the risk of being attacked. Thus, in establishing the regulations for various festivals at Nerik, Ḫattušiliš presents himself as « the favorite » of the divinity (*NARAM* <sup>DU</sup> <sup>URU</sup> *Nerik*), who « [has made] me [king,] and Pudu-Ḫepa queen » <sup>38</sup>, but in the decree regarding the foundation <sup>NA</sup> *Ḫekur*, he calls himself, with a redundant title, « favorite of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, of the Weather-god of Nerik, of Ištar of Šamuḫa » <sup>39</sup>.

It is true that he is eager to demonstrate his capacity for governing, and the ability with which he reconquered the Upper Region, and then how, as king in Ḫattušaš, was able to guarantee a period of relative peace and prosperity. Unique among the kings of the New Kingdom, and in order to underline the legitimacy of his position, he relates himself directly to Ḫattušiliš I, king of Kuššara, in the titles of his rank <sup>40</sup>. Nevertheless, since, as has been said, his propaganda makes use above all of religious elements, almost as if to institutionalize the moments which carried him to the throne, he makes his son, Tuthaliyaš, who was designated heir, the anointed priest of the God of Nerik <sup>41</sup>, as well as dedicating him to Ištar of Šamuḫa <sup>42</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> See *KUB XIV 7 (+) IV 11ff.*; « If a man for the father (and) the mother raises a son, does not the father (or) the mother give him (the recompense) for the nurse? And does he not take joy in him? I concerned myself with the city of the Weather-god of Nerik, your beloved son; thus, oh Sun-goddess of Arinna... », cf. L. Rost, *MIO* 4, 1956, p. 332.

<sup>38</sup> *KUB XXI 11 r 1, v 5f., Cat. 75,2.*

<sup>39</sup> *KBo VI 28 (+) r 2, Cat. 58.*

<sup>40</sup> « ... the tabarnaš Ḫattušiliš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, son of Muršiliš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, grandson of Šuppiluliumaš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, descendant of Ḫattušiliš, king of Kuššara », thus the titulature in the autobiography, and cf. again those of *KBo IV 12*; *KBo VI 29 (+)*; *KBo 28 (+)*, *Cat. 58*; *KUB XXI 29, Cat. 62*; *KUB XXVI 58, Cat. 65* (sometimes « Ḫattušiliš, man of Kuššara »; but in *KUB XI 35, Cat. 480,1*, he remembers only Tuthaliyaš III). Muwatalliš is neglected since, according to custom, the relation of descendents which is considered, is that from father to son. Tuthaliyaš IV limits himself to going back to Tuthaliyaš III, skipping over Šuppiluliumaš in addition to Muwatalliš; cf. *KBo XI 43* restored with *IBoT III 39*; *KUB XX 63 (+)*, *Cat. 495*. Šuppilulijamaš II stops at Muršiliš II cf. *KBo XII 38* and *41*, but in the « oath of the scribe », *KUB XXVI 32 (+) III 10ff.*, *Cat. 91*, the lineage of Šuppiluliumaš I is recorded as present in Ḫattušaš; cf. E. Laroche, *RA* 47, 1953, p. 72ff.

<sup>41</sup> *KUB XXV 21 III 13ff.*, *Cat. 504,4*; cf. most recently E. von Schuler, *op. cit.*, p. 186f.; *KUB XXXVI 90 r 15ff.*; see V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 176ff.

<sup>42</sup> *Autob. IV 76ff.* In the « minor text », *KBo VI 29 (+)*, there does not however occur the name of the son of Ḫattušiliš, destined to rule the foundation of Ištar. One would be tempted to think that originally Tuthaliyaš was destined for this and that then, when he was ousted to Nerik, it had been left deliberately undertermined which of the other sons of Ḫattušiliš should become the one destined to receive the benefits. But in II. III 1ff. of the « minor text », in the edition reconstructed in A. Goetze, *NBr*, p. 48f., the son destined to the foundation of Ištar seems to administer also the Upper Region, thus

There is no doubt that Ḫakpiš remains the principal centre of the Upper Region until the coup d'état <sup>43</sup>, and that the exaltation of Nerik, restored to its ancient importance <sup>44</sup>, occurred in large part later; but that Ḫattušiliš' great endeavors could not be interpreted simply as a justification *a posteriori* of the version of the events which he had imposed, but that instead the cult of Nerik was sincerely felt, seems indubitably proved from the assiduity with which Tuthaliyaš continued the work of his father <sup>45</sup> (Ḫattušiliš had given also one of his sons, later son-in-law of Bentešina, and *tubkantiš*, the name of Nerikkailiš, literally « he of Nerik. ») <sup>46</sup>. There can also arise an impression of artfulness when we consider that the great number of texts dealing with Nerik all belong, with rare exceptions, to Ḫattušiliš or Tuthaliyaš, and that this abundance of sources stands in contrast to the very rare mentions of the divinity in the other religious and historical documents which are so numerous in connection with his counterpart, the Weather-god of Zippalanda. Nevertheless, a valid justification can be given from the sequence of the events themselves, which made necessary a great work of reorganization for such regions. On the other hand, certain mythological references which recur in the cult of the divinity, even though guaranteed for authenticity by their Hattian origin, could also be a work of the antiquarian at the service of politics <sup>47</sup>.

It would be a mistake, however, to think of Ḫattušiliš only as a restorer of ancient cults, whose interests were limited to the central region of Anatolia, where, for accidental reasons, he had accomplish his first enterprises. If his policy contrasts with that of Muwatalliš, which was decidedly oriented toward Syria <sup>48</sup>, he made use precisely of the military successes of his brother to resolve through diplomatic means alone relations with Egypt, to which he also gave much importance <sup>48bis</sup>. And for maintaining the equilibrium in Syria,

creating the possibility for Tuthaliyaš to reunite the two benefices. Was *KBo VI 29 (+)* then composed when Ḫattušiliš did not have sons of age? The so-called « minor text », having, to be sure, the same propagandistic elements as that of the autobiography, is nevertheless compiled in a rather condensed form and with a rather extensive regulation regarding the norms and privileges of the foundation in honor of Ištar. Thus, as Furlani notes, *op. cit.*, p. 153f., it is probably the true document of the constitution, while the autobiographical text has an eminently apologetic character. For the task of exaltation which Ḫattušiliš undertook in favor of his son, Tuthaliyaš, for the purpose of assuring his succession, see the narration in heroic style of *KUB XIX 8, 9*; *KBo XII 44, Cat. 73*; see K. K. Riemschneider, *JCS XVI*, 1962, pp. 110-121.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *autob. III 59ff.*, *IV 42f.*; in Ḫakpiš he became priest of the Weather-god of Nerik: *autob. III 60f.*; *KBo VI 29 (+) I 25f.*

<sup>44</sup> On the « country of Nerik » cf. V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 6f.

<sup>45</sup> See the texts cited in V. Haas, *op. cit.*, in the indices at p. 337, s. v. Tuthaliyaš IV.

<sup>46</sup> See E. Laroche, *Noms*, p. 130.

<sup>47</sup> See p. 225 in this volume of *SMEA*.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. V. Haas, *op. cit.*, p. 19f.

<sup>48bis</sup> On the political situation in Syria, see now H. Klengel, *Gesch. Syriens III*, p. 229f.

it was certainly a help that he had restored Bentešina to the throne of Amurru, since he was linked in so many ways to Ḫattušiliš. And also, as far as the cults are concerned, in addition to his loyalty to Ištar, one should remember also his interest in Kummanni, the city of the Hurrian Hepat, as testified by the rock reliefs of Tašci and Fraktin, and by the introduction by Pudu-Ḫepa of festivals from the region of Kizzuwatna<sup>49</sup>.

The religious dimension of the propaganda of Ḫattušiliš is not confined to the confrontation with Urḫi-Tešup, which assumes the character of a veritable divine judgment (*ḫanneššar*) in that concise document which is the « minor text »<sup>50</sup>. It involves also the important conflict with Arma-Dattaš. The latter, deprived of the rule of the Upper Region by Muwatalliš, who wished to entrust it to Ḫattušiliš, launched a series of accusations of which Ḫattušiliš was judged to be innocent in a trial presided over by the same Muwatalliš (autob. I 25-65). Such, then, were the origins of the conflict, as is confirmed by another document: « His Majesty and Arma-Dattaš came into conflict and became estranged for this reason, that the Upper Region was given for administration to Arma-Dattaš, but when Muwatalliš, my brother, gave me the Upper Region to administer, Arma-Dattaš began to betray my brother and did harm to me. »<sup>51</sup> And Arma-Dattaš, in his hostility, and profiting from the fact that both Muwatalliš and Ḫattušiliš were engaged against the Egyptians, had recourse to magic, not hesitating even to go so far as to contaminate the city sacred to Ištar: « and filled with incantations Šamuḫa, the city of the Goddess » (autob. II 78f.; compare III 19)<sup>52</sup>. Finding him guilty in a second judiciary trial, Muwatalliš consigned Arma-Dattaš, together with his family, to Ḫattušiliš, who spared their lives, contenting himself with sending them into exile (autob. III 14-30). But Urḫi-Tešup will later take advantage of the hostilities between the two families when, preparing himself to attack Ḫattušiliš, he sends against him in the Upper Region the son of Arma-Dattaš, Šippazitiš, who had been recalled from his exile in Alašija (autob. IV 3-6).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the colophones of the *išuwāš* festival (Cat. 433): KBo XV 52; 60; KUB XL 102; and H. Otten, *BiOr* 8, 1951, p. 225. Pudu-Ḫepa is given the epithets « great queen, queen of the country of Ḫatti, daughter of the city of Kummanni »: KUB XV (+) I 1, transcribed and transl. in *StBoT* I, p. 16.

<sup>50</sup> KBo VI 29 II 1ff.

<sup>51</sup> KUB XXI 17 I 3-9, Cat. 63: <sup>D</sup>UTUŠI <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U-aš-ša ḫa-an-ni-tal-wa-eš-šir / <sup>H</sup>UL-(m)eš-šir-ma-at ki-e-da-ni me-mi-ja-ni / KUR UGU<sup>TIM</sup> ku-it A-NA <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U AŠ-SUM MU-IR-DU-UT-TIM pi-eš-ta GIM-an-ma-mu / <sup>N</sup>IR.GAL ŠEŠ-JA KUR UGU<sup>T</sup> AŠ-SUM MU-IR-DU-UT-TI «-IŠ » / pi-eš-ta <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U-aš-ma-mu-za A-NA ŠEŠ-JA GAM-an / pi-eš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš / nam-ma-mu-kán ḫu-wa-ap-pi-iš-ki-it. KUB XXXI 26, Cat. 64 also would have formed part of this document.

Ḫattušiliš had given to Ištar first half of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš, who had been found guilty of magic (*alwanzatar*)<sup>52a</sup>, and later the other part, when Šippazitiš was definitively defeated<sup>53</sup>. Nonetheless, in composing the document for the foundation, notwithstanding the fact that he had once again shown clemency towards Šippazitiš by pardoning him (autob. IV 36f.)<sup>54</sup>, Ḫattušiliš feels the need to appeal to the Goddess, making it seem that she herself was responsible for the idea of depriving Arma-Dattaš of part of his patrimony, and calling on Muwatalliš as witness and guarantor of his actions: « I did not take [*all of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš*], I took half, and half I restored to Arma-Dattaš; then, before my brother I took possession of Ištar of Šamuḫa, and in Urikina I constructed temples to her, and to her I gave this patrimony of Arma-Dattaš; and as for the question of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš, the Goddess with a dream established the half, and I did not change it. »<sup>55</sup> Now we can be certain that Ḫattušiliš acted legally from the first phase, since for example in the « instructions for priests » the co-responsibility of the family is mentioned several times<sup>56</sup>; and although the edict of Telepinuš (§§ 31 and 32) specifically exempts the entire family from paying with his patrimony in a case in which a prince of the royal family is found guilty in the course of penal proceedings, yet in the autobiography it is specified that at the trial the wife and sons of Arma-Dattaš were also found guilty (II 77 and III 17)<sup>57</sup>.

In fact, the foundation in honor of Ištar permitted the dynasty to bind to itself certain groups, offered a position of prestige to the one in charge (so much so that for a certain period the crown prince himself was delegated to the foundation), and through its constitution (with its effective assignment of the patrimony to the Goddess) it gave to Ḫattušiliš the means of establishing the official version of a conflict which for long years had placed him in opposition to one of the most important families of Ḫatti. In sub-

<sup>52a</sup> On the crime of magic see the §§ 44 b and 111 of the Laws.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. autob. III 29f. and IV 66, in addition to KUB XXI 17 II 1ff., which though fragmentary in its last part, seems to show that there were two different moments in the constitution of the foundation, the first of which was already at the epoch of Muwatalliš.

<sup>54</sup> The fragment 579/d (quoted by H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* NF IX, 1936, p. 321ff.) seems to refer a flight of Urḫi-Tešup with Šippazitiš.

<sup>55</sup> KUB XXI 17 II 1-10: <sup>U</sup>-UL da-aḫ-ḫu-un [na]-at-za ták-ša[-an] / šar-ra-an-za da-aḫ-ḫu-un / ták-ša-an šar-ra-an-ma A-NA <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U / EGIR-pa pi-iḫ-ḫu-un / nam-ma-za-kán <sup>D</sup>LIŠ URUŠa-mu-ḫi / A-[N]A PA-AN ŠEŠ-JA šar-ra-aḫ-ḫu-un / nu-uš-ši ÉMES DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> I-NA URUŠ-ri-ki-na / i-ja-nu-un nu ki-i É <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U a-pi-e-da-ni AD-DIN / nu INIM É <sup>D</sup>XXX<sup>D</sup>U DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> ták-ša-an Ū-za IQ-BI / na-an-kán Ū-UL-pát wa-aḫ-nu-nu-un. Lines 5f. are translated according to A. Goetze, *Tunlawi*, p. 45.

<sup>56</sup> KUB XXXI 26, Cat. 64, where see the duplicates and bibli. transcription and transl.



tituting himself for this family in the government of the Upper Region, he was able to create the premises for his accession. Nonetheless, to wish to be behind the continual appeals to Ištar and in the constitution itself, merely political and propagandistic ends would be to impose an anachronistic point of view upon a very different historical situation, since for the mentality of the time, religious fact was inseparable from practical experience. Thus we should not be shocked to learn, when reading the decree for Mittannamuwaš<sup>58</sup>, in which the context is totally human, that it was Mittannamuwaš himself who cured Hattušiliš of his youthful illness; while in the autobiography one reads of Ištar announcing to Muršiliš: « Brief are the years for Hattušiliš. He does not belong to life. Consign him to me and make him my priest: he will be sound »<sup>59</sup>. The two documents, in such different tones, present two aspects of the same mentality, according to which, if man is free to act and to influence reality, divine favor will assist him, if he is worthy, with constant support<sup>60</sup>.

The decree for Mittannamuwaš already « great scribe » at the time of Muršiliš, for whose family Hattušiliš succeeded in retaining office even under Urḫi-Tešup<sup>61</sup>, or the document in favor of Ura-Dattaš<sup>62</sup>, whose services Hattušiliš rewarded with a gift of landed property, are styled in the form of political treaties, in accordance with which the most important clause consists of the support and reciprocal protection between the sovereign and the « noble », and their respective legitimate descendents (these texts shed particular light on what an important part personal ties played in the structure of the Hittite state). Now the theme which makes up the political part of these, as of other political-administrative documents, is again, almost invariably, the conflict with Urḫi-Tešup, but this time without recourse to motifs of a religious character. The image which Hattušiliš tends to favor is that of Urḫi-Tešup, legally placed by Hattušiliš upon the throne of Hatti<sup>63</sup>, but acting, then, either from foolishness or incapacity, in contrast to the lines laid down by Muwatalliš (when possible he refers back even to Muršiliš), ones of which he presents himself, instead, as the perpetuator, emphasizing at every opportunity the relationship which binds him to his brother<sup>64</sup>. The

<sup>58</sup> KBo IV 12, A. Goetze, *Hatt.*, p. 41ff.

<sup>59</sup> Autob. I 14-17. The contrast between the two versions is such that G. Furlani, *op. cit.*, p. 153f., prefers to think of two different illnesses.

<sup>60</sup> For this view, cf. A. Archi, *Studi in onore di P. Meriggi, Athenaeum* LVII, 1969, p. 17ff.

<sup>61</sup> KBo IV 12 I 29f., A. Goetze, *Hatt.*, p. 42f.

<sup>62</sup> KUB XXVI 58, duplicate in *Cat.* 65.

<sup>63</sup> There are numerous occasions when Hattušiliš makes mention of this legalistic act of his.

<sup>64</sup> Br. Meissner, *ZDMG* 72, 1918, p. 43, and E. Weidner, *Pol. Dok.*, p. 126 n. 2 sec in

logical consequence could not be other than that « those lords whom Urḫi-Tešup sooner or later had chased out » (as will be stated in autob. IV 19f.) finally switch to Hattušiliš' side. This motif of the bonds and continuity with his brother is one of the most frequent in the apology itself: it is directly to Muwatalliš that Ištar appears in a dream to instruct Muršiliš to consign to her the ailing Hattušiliš (autob. I 13f.). In contrast, Urḫi-Tešup recalls from Cyprus Šippazitiš, who had been exiled under Muwatalliš; and Mittannamuwaš, to whom Muwatalliš had consigned Hattušaš himself (KBo IV 12 r 17; when the capital was transferred to Dattašša?) can transfer the office to his son only by the intervention of Hattušiliš<sup>65</sup>. And into this prospective fits well the fragment KUB XXI 33 (*Cat.* 113) in the interpretation given by P. Meriggi: it is a memorandum of an high official who had served as early as the time of Muwatalliš, enumerating the initiatives taken by Urḫi-Tešup in opposition to the directives of his father<sup>66</sup>.

We cannot know, in reality, how much truth there is in Hattušiliš'

---

the phrase *arki abija* <sup>1</sup>*Muwatalli aḫija ana kussī šarrutti iṣabat* ("after my father, Muwatalliš, my brother, took the throne of the kingship") of the treaty of Bentešina (KBo I 8 r 11), a hostile expression of Hattušiliš with regard to his brother's accession to the throne: the classic expression, in fact, uses *wašābu* (cf. line 16 *ana kussī abija attašab*) but Hattušiliš himself employs also *šabātu* to indicate his own accession to the throne: KBo I 14 v 5, *Cat.* 66, cf. A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, p. 28. One should remember, however, that Urḫi-Tešup was the one to bring the capital back to Hattušaš, while the decision of Muwatalliš was at variance with this.

<sup>65</sup> One can of course also maintain that Urḫi-Tešup, not feeling himself supported, sought to surround himself with men faithful to him.

<sup>66</sup> The treatment of P. Meriggi is in *WZKM* 58, 1962, pp. 70-76; I cannot accept the interpretation of R. Stefanini, *JAOs* 84, 1964, pp. 22-30, since I consider the insertion of EN-JA "my lord" not addressed to a divinity (cf. line 9). The objections of H. Klengel, *Gesch. Syriens* II, p. 215f. and 241f. (note 123) are naturally the same as arise in anyone who interprets the fragment in question. On the other hand, the restoration of <sup>1</sup>*Hattušiliš* at the beginning of line 16 is not probable since the whole fragment rests on a contrast between a Muršiliš and the sovereign called EN-JA; however, if one cannot help remaining perplexed in reading that there was a "Manapa-Dattaš affair" also at the time of Muwatalliš — Urḫi-Tešup, it would be still stranger that a Šapiliš — Bentešina episode were already verified at the time of Muršiliš II. One can, however, understand, that here Urḫi-Tešup, contrary to custom, is called with the name of Muršiliš, with whom he ascended the throne, when one thinks that the document could go back to the period immediately subsequent to the coup d'état. And so one could explain that here the responsibility for restoring Bentešina to the throne of Amurru is given to Urḫi-Tešup, if one hypothesizes that he, at the beginning of his reign, had in effect established Bentešina in Amurru again on the suggestion of Hattušiliš (as he had also intervened for the family of Mittannamuwa). So Hattušiliš, could rightly boast later of having restored the throne to him (E. Weidner, *Pol. Dok.*, p. 126 line 17). The functionary who compiled the document would have held to the formal datum.

The history of the reign of Amurru for this period is set forth in its particulars by H. Klengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 307-319.

accusations, but it is certain that he acted loyally towards Muwatalliš, who protected him from his rivals and entrusted to him tasks of great importance. If he were already then planning the coup d'état, he would certainly have tried it at the moment of his succession, all the more since Urḫi-Tešup was not the son of the first wife of Muwatalliš, but of a concubine.

In general it is considered a proof of Ḫattušiliš' conspiracy — truly long-range planning! — that he arranged to receive from his brother the king of Amurru, Bentešina, who had betrayed the alliance with the Hittites by changing to the side of the Egyptians, in order to restore him to the throne after the coup d'état. It seems strange though that Ḫattušiliš could have had this kind of plan so soon after the battle of Qadeš, when Muwatalliš prestige must have been at its height. Moreover, what possible action could Ḫattušiliš have been planning in conjunction with an exile of a country so far from Ḫattušaš (if an exile succeeded in winning back the throne it was almost always by the direct intervention of an external force, given the difficulties at that time, and with such governmental structures, of maintaining and guiding the opposition from a distance), and above all, what help could he expect at the decisive moment of the coup d'état?

The activity of Ḫattušiliš to bind to himself the nobles of the realm with a view to taking over power seems to begin later. In his prayers Ḫattušiliš affirms that he felt isolated: « and (they) abandoned me, my friends (and) my companions », whereas Urḫi-Tešup would have been able to count on a large support: « [and how] his lord incited him (Ḫattušiliš), [how] the princes urged him...<sup>67</sup>. » But when he no longer wishes to use a dramatic tone, while demonstrating that he who is on the side of justice affirms himself among men with the favor of the gods, then it is that the story assumes a different aspect: « Ištar, of Šamuḫa, [my lady,] came to my side, and the [countr]ies to which I wrote: « follow me », all followed me, and the countries to which I did not write, all came to my side »<sup>68</sup> (among these here figure also the Kaška people, who were in almost perpetual struggle with the Hittites: autob. IV 26-29!). Ištar had already appeared in a dream to Pudu-Ḫepa to announce to her: « All of Ḫattušaš will pass to your husband's side », and again to the nobles to inform them that: « I have directed all of the countries of Ḫatti to the side of Ḫattušiliš » (autob. IV 10f. and 21ff.). Now we know how Ḫattušiliš advanced various people, so that these forecasts would be fulfilled: « That Kantuzziliš who was an administrator, he [threatened (me) wickedly] and I fought him; Ura-Dattaš, son of Kan[tuzzili] changed to the side of His Majesty, and I honored him »: and to comprehend the background of the story, this passage is sufficient, even

if fragmentary: « But Ura-Dattaš was Kantuzziliš' son, [and ...] when Urḫi-Tešup, my brother's son, came to the struggle [...] »<sup>69</sup>. Also Ulmi-Tešup, made king at a later time at Dattašša, found himself at the crucial moment at Ḫattušaš, and must have chosen at the right moment the winning party<sup>70</sup>; of LAMA, the sources say only that he was named by Ḫattušiliš first king of Dattašša, but we know with what prudence Ḫattušiliš chose the men in whom he would place trust<sup>71</sup>. Also Mašturiš, king of the country of the river Šeḫa from the time of Muwatalliš, to one of whose daughters he was married, « went over to the side » of Ḫattušiliš (EGIR-an [ti<sub>ja</sub>t]). But to this push to join with his father's troops, Tutḫalijaš IV gave a judgment which was not at all positive, and without mincing terms, declared that Mašturiš promoted a conspiracy (*kupija-tin kupta*)<sup>72</sup>, making use of the same expression which Ḫattušiliš attributes to the exiled Urḫi-Tešup (autob. IV 34).

But we can well believe that at least Ḫattušaš, where Urḫi-Tešup resided, would have offered resistance at the moment of the coup d'état: we are partially informed of it by a decree promulgated by Ḫattušiliš for the population of the city, KUB XXI 37 (Cat. 71)<sup>73</sup>, presenting, for their information, the official interpretation of the events, and binding them by means of an oath to the new sovereign and his descendants.

<sup>69</sup> KUB XXVI 58 r 5-7 (Cat. 65): «<sup>1</sup>Ká[n-t]u-uz-zi-li-iš ku-iš<sup>2</sup> L<sup>3</sup>A-BU-BI-TUM e-eš-ta na-aš<sup>4</sup> [ḪUL-aḫ-ta] / nu-uš-ši ku-ru-ri-ja-aḫ-ḫu-un<sup>5</sup> GAL-PIŠKUR-aš-ma DUMU<sup>6</sup> Kán-t[u-uz-zi-li] / A-NA<sup>7</sup> PUTUŠ<sup>8</sup> EGIR-an ti-ja-at na-an ka-ni-iš-šu-un; *ibid.* in v, but belonging to r, line 4af.: ...GAL-PU-aš-ma DUMU<sup>9</sup> Kán-tu-uz-zi-li e-eš-ta / [.....]kán<sup>10</sup> UR-ḫi-PU-up-aš ku-wa-pi DUMU.ŠEŠ-JA šu-ul-li-ja-at.

<sup>70</sup> KUB XXI 37 r 37, cf. *infra*, p. 205. The treaty which regulates the granting of the province of Dattašša for Ulmi-Tešup is KBo IV 10, Cat. 68, where see *bibl.*; but the text is translated almost completely by J. Garstang - O. R. Gurney, *Geography*, p. 66ff.

<sup>71</sup> LAMA is installed at Dattašša according to autob. IV 62ff., in which A. Goetze, NBr p. 34, following E. Forrer, *Forschungen* I, p. 100, restores at line 62: [nu DUMU ŠE]Š-JA, that is « [and the son of] my [broth]er » (*contra* F. Sommer, *AU*, p. 35 n. 3). The restoration, according to which LAMA would be the son of Muwatalliš, seems to be confirmed by 544/f, studied by H. G. Güterbock, *SBo* II, p. 10f (SBo II text 1).

On the other hand, the hypothesis of Güterbock, *JNES* XX, 1961, p. 86 n. 3 that LAMA is the second name assumed by the same personage at the moment of his installation does not seem to me probable. The treaty of Ḫattušiliš with LAMA is preserved in ABoT 57 (Cat. 69) = KBo IV 10 I 40ff. (Cat. 68).

<sup>72</sup> KUB XXIII 1 (+) II 15-28, Cat. 80; transc. and transl. by O. Szemerényi, *Oriens Antiquus* 9, 1945, p. 113ff.

<sup>73</sup> See P. Meriggi, *WZKM* 58, 1962, pp. 66-68. I have also had the opportunity of discussing with prof. P. Meriggi my interpretation of the text.

For the course of the events cf. also KBo XIV 45 (a partial translation in H. Otten, *MDOG* 93, 1962, p. 75): 1. 3 n[u-mu-kan manijabḫaiš da]š « and he took (away) my possessions »: 1. 5 nu-šši kururijab[ḫun « and [I] fought against him »; 1. 6 n-an-zan



[. . . . .] you do not [give]  
it back to him!  
44 [. . . . .] you do not take it back  
to him!  
[If someone] hears from [someone bad things regarding His  
Majesty,]  
46 [or even . . . . .] but to him in a  
hostile  
[. . . . . someone hea]rs, and him, loyal  
to His Majesty  
48 [. . . . . to] His Majesty someone  
does harm  
[. . . . . one does no]t hide that from [His Majesty!]  
50 [. . . . . and it (to one) of  
another line  
[you do not give, . . . . .] in future all  
the descendants  
52 [. . . . . with regard to the lordship protect  
con]sciously.  
[With respect to this question may the thousand gods be witness:  
the Su]n-god of the sky, the Sun-goddess of Arinna,  
54 [the Weather-god of the sky, the Weather-god of Hatti, . . . . .  
Namn]iš, [H]az]ziš,  
[. . . . .] the  
Weather-god of Ne[r]ik,  
56 [. . . . .] the  
Weather-god of [Šap]inuwa,  
[. . . . .] the Weather-god of [. . .  
58 [. . . . . mountains, rivers, springs of the coun-  
try of Ha]tti

The coup d'état at Hattušaš created certain perplexities in the foreign courts, and Hattušiliš, not hiding his irritation, expressed himself thus in a letter probably directed to a king of Assyria: "Did not [my father] send you fine gifts? When I assumed kingship, you did not send me an ambassador. And it is the custom that kings assume the [king]ship, and (other) kings and their nobles send to him fine gifts, a royal mantle, and pure [oil] for action. But up (until) now, you have not done this »; and soon after, disassociating himself from Urhi-Tešup: « The ambassadors whom you sent at the time of the king Urhi-Tešup had bad experiences. Now... »<sup>74</sup>

Ramesses II also preferred to wait until the situation clarified itself, but under pressure from Hattušiliš he hastened to recognize that « [Certainly the great king] of the countries of Hatti [are you. The Sun-god has granted to you, and the Weather-god has granted to you [to sit in] the country of Hatti, in the place of the father of your father. »<sup>75</sup>. Really, Ramesses would have felt himself obliged to support Urhi-Tešup, being bound to Muwatalliš by a treaty, and to use the words which Hattušiliš in a similar case would have addressed to the Babylonians: « I[f you] do not protect in (his) rulership [the descendant] of my brother (the king of Babylonia), I shall be your enemy: I shall come (?) and conquer Babylonia. »<sup>76</sup>. And in fact the loyal king of Mira, bound feudally to Hatti, turned to the Egyptian king to learn what attitude he would take. Ramesses responds: « Mind, too, that the question of Urhi-Tešup of which [you have written] me, the great king, the king of Hatti, has resolved according to [my (??) wishes (??)] »<sup>77</sup>. Any intervention from the outside would have been unrealizable, and it was too important to the Egyptians to preserve the order established in Syria. When Hattušiliš showed himself capable of handling the situation, there remained no other course but to maintain the peace, and of this peace the queen of Egypt, Nofretari, writes to Pudu-Hepa, recalling the latter's own words: « ... the relationship of beautiful peace, ... the relationship of beautiful brotherhood in which the great king, the king of Egypt (finds himself) with his brother, the great king, the king of Hatti »; and she proceeds, auguring: « (the Sun-god) will grant for eternity the beautiful brotherhood of the great king, the king of Egypt, with his brother, the great king, the king of Hatti »<sup>78</sup>.

But if Hattušiliš could be proud of his loyalty towards Muwatalliš, and if his personal successes and his piety towards the gods supported his belief that he had acted justly, and enjoyed the favor of the gods, nevertheless, in substituting himself by force for the legitimate king, and interrupting the succession from father to son, he had violated a norm of the Hittite social order upon which the kingship was based<sup>79</sup>. Therefore not even his son,

<sup>75</sup> NBC 3934 r 13-15, *Cat.* 567; studied, together with KUB III 22, concerning the same problems, by A. Goetze, *JCS* I, 1947, pp. 241-251.  
<sup>76</sup> Letter to Kadašman-Enlil II: KBo I 10 r 14f., *Cat.* 55; transl. by J. Friedrich, *AO* 24,3, 1925, p. 24ff.  
<sup>77</sup> KBo I 24 r 12f., *Cat.* 56; transcr. and transl. by Br. Meissner, *ZDMG* 72, 1918, p. 43f.  
<sup>78</sup> KBo I 29 r 8-11, 14-17, *Cat.* 577; transl. by Br. Meissner, *op. cit.*, p. 59f., and J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 23f. Cf. again KUB XXI 38 v 13f., *Cat.* 57: "...the country of Egypt and the country of Hatti will become a single country..."  
<sup>79</sup> The succession from father to son constitutes the rule, so much so that, for example,

l protect even a bastard! »<sup>30</sup>.  
 d in a world such as that of the Hittites, where each man took such  
 examine his own actions and those of his relatives in order to avoid  
 avor from the gods or the dead, and gave such scrupulous attention  
 omens, it is very natural to find in mantic literature traces of reas-  
 and more cautious attitudes taken in the period after Hattušiliš.  
 en while he was still living, Pudu-Hepa, knowing how the troubled  
 of the past could expose him to the disfavor of the gods, supplicated  
 Idess of Arinna to take no account of such calumny. KUB XXI 27  
 20:

IR-KA ku-iš <sup>1</sup>Ĥa-at[-tu-ši-li-iš . . .  
 nu-uš-ši-kán PA-NI <sup>1</sup>Ú[r-ḫi-<sup>D</sup>ISKUR-up ku-it] UK[<sup>U</sup>MES-an-na-an-za]  
 an-da-an me-mi-ir ma-n[i-in-ku-wa-an-t]a-aš-wa [ . . .  
 nu ma-a-an <sup>1</sup>Ĥa-at-tu-ši-li[-iš IR-KA]  
 šu-ma-aš DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-aš pí-ra-an [IŠ-TU ŠU<sup>9</sup> DUMU A-]MI-LU-  
 UT-TI i-ja-an-z[a]

KUB XXIII 1 (+) II 26-29, *Cat.* 80: O. Szeméryenyi, *op. cit.*, p. 118f. Surely the  
 ie of Urhî-Tešup is mentioned again as a warning in the extremely badly damaged  
 .1. 54 of KBo IV 14 53, *Cat.* 92: R. Stefanini, *Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*,  
 ottava, Rendiconti, vol. XX, 1965, p. 49f. and 75.

20 has made denunciation(?) for evil,  
or someone (has) given: has given to the gods  
22 for the evil of [Ha]ttušiliš . . .

And Tuthalijaš, who evidently did not consider resolved the important differences which his father had had with his political adversaries, but feared their unfavorable consequences on the religious level, often concerned himself with them in order to neutralize any danger. *KUB XVI 32 (Cat. 222)*:

II 14 A-NA <sup>DUTU</sup><sup>SI</sup> ku-it A-NA DUMU<sup>MES</sup> 'Ūr-ḫi-<sup>D</sup>U-up :<sup>SISKUR</sup>ma-an-  
ta[l-li]  
IGI-an-da ar-ḫa BAL-u-an-zi UL SIxŠA-at UL-aš ku-it [ḪUL-aḫ-  
ḫu-un]  
16 ḪUL-aḫ-ta-aš ku-iš UKÛ-aš na-aš nu-u-wa ku-it TI-za nu [a-pi-el  
ku-it]  
ZI-za UL wa-ar-ši-ja-an-za nu <sup>SISKUR</sup>ma-an-tal-li ar-ḫa B[AL-u-an-zi]  
18 a-pi-iz UL SIxŠA-at  
A-NA <sup>DUTU</sup><sup>SI</sup> ku-it A-NA DUMU<sup>MES</sup> I DXXX.<sup>D</sup>U <sup>SISKUR</sup>ma-an-tal-l[i]  
20 IGI-an-da ar-ḫa BAL-u-an-zi UL SIxŠA-at UL-aš k[u-it]  
ḪUL-aḫ-ḫu-un ḪUL-aḫ-ta-aš ku-iš UKÛ-aš na-aš nu-u-w[a ku-it]  
22 TI-za nu a-pi-el ku-it ZI UL wa-ar-ši-ja-a[n-za]  
[nu] <sup>SISKUR</sup>ma-an-tal-li-ja ar-ḫa KIN-an-zi a-pi-iz U[L SIxŠA-at]  
24 [<sup>UR</sup>]<sup>U</sup>Ki-i-ú-ta-an-kán URU-an A-NA 'GAL.<sup>P</sup>U ar-ḫ[a da-an-zi?]  
[n]a-an A-NA GIDIM SUM-an-zi 'Ka-ta-pa-DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup>-iš [(...)]  
26 [w]a-tar-na-aḫ-ḫ-an-za nu GIDIM a-pa-a-aš :ar-šu-l[a(-) . . .  
MA-ME-TUM ŠA A-BI <sup>DUTU</sup><sup>SI</sup> ku-it A-NA INIM 'Ūr-ḫi-<sup>P</sup>[U-up]  
28 [SI]xŠA-at nu AMA.DINGIR MA-ME-TUM ar-ḫa KIN-an-zi nu  
A-N[A DUMU<sup>MES</sup>?

[<sup>1</sup>U]r-bi-<sup>DU</sup>U-up I-NA <sup>URU</sup>Ne-i-ja I URU<sup>L</sup>[<sup>UM</sup>(...)]

30 [pa-ra-]a<sup>??</sup> SUM-an-zi

4 As is was not established (with oracles) for His Majesty to make offering according to the *manta*[*lli*] ritual in favour of the sons of Urhi-Tešup, as [I] [did no harm] to them;  
6 (but) the man who did do harm to them, as he (is) still living, and [as his] soul (is) not placated, then (it is) through his (fault) (that) it was not established to of[fer]

8 the *mantalli* ritual.

As it was not established (with oracles) for His Majesty to make offering according to the *mantalli* ritual in favour of the sons of Arma-Dattaš, a[s] I did not harm to them; (but) the man who did do harm to them, [as he] (is) sti[ll]  
12 living, as his soul (is) not placated, [then,] (it is) through his (fault) [(that) it was not established] to make the *mantalli* ritual.

14 Kiuta, a locality, for GAL<sup>DU</sup> [they will take (?)] away [and] will give it to the spirit, Katapaili [(...)]

16 (for it is) responsible, and that one the spirit :aršul[a. . .]

As it was established (with oracles) the (unfulfilled) oath of the father of the king regarding the question of Urhi[-Tešup], the mother of the god will resolve (!) the oath, and to the [sons(?)]

[of U]rhi-Tešup, in Neja <sup>80a</sup>, a locality [(...)]

0 they will [con]sign.

Here are brought together, side by side, the case of Urhi-Tešup and of Dattaš (although we do not know with certainty who this U<sup>DU</sup>GAL<sup>1</sup>, and line 1 also brings up the case of queen Danu-Ḫepa, which one could not have been considered resolved even at that time (an investigation on Danu-Ḫepa and Urhi-Tešup occurs also in another mantic KUB XVI 16 v 1, and 23, Cat. 214,6). It is clear, then, that at the of Hattušaš watch was kept with continual mantic observations to, by means of the correct ritual performances, that the descendants of political adversaries could have no unfavorable influence. And if in

line 28 DUMU<sup>MES</sup> should really be restored, then one must recognize that a solution was also sought by means of the gift of benefits. In KUB XXII 35 III 6ff., Cat. 222, is mentioned again the father of the king, that is, Hattušiliš, and this time in relation to Ḫalpazitiš, the son of Arma-Dattaš, and the question here too regards the *mantalli* ritual, which was reserved for the dead.

These fears are expressed still more clearly in a more detailed text, KBo II 6 (+), Cat. 221,2:

I EME <sup>1</sup>DUXXX<sup>DU</sup> ku-iš SIxSA-at nu kiš-an DÜ-an-zi

32 EME <sup>1</sup>DUXXX<sup>DU</sup> A-NA DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> LUGAL-UT-TI pi-an ar-ḫa a-ni-ja-an-zi

AŠ-RI<sup>BLA</sup> LUGAL-UT-TI <sup>GIS</sup>DAĞ<sup>BLA</sup>-ja pá-r-ku-nu-wa-an-zi

34 <sup>DU</sup>UTU<sup>SI</sup>-ja-az pá-r-ku-nu-uz-zi šar-ni-ik-zi-el-la

ŠA É<sup>TI</sup> ME-an-zi nu ku-it dam-me-li pi-di ti-an-zi

36 ku-it-ma A-NA GIDIM SUM-an-zi DUMU.DUMU-SU-ja ta-me-da-za ka-ni-iš-ša-an-zi ma-a-an-ma-za DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> QA-TAM-MA ma-la-a-an-ḫar-te-ni

38 INIM <sup>1</sup>DUXXX<sup>DU</sup>-kán ki-e-iz INIM-za DU<sup>S</sup>-ta-ri

That slander of Arma-Dattaš which was proved (with oracles), — can they then act thus?

32 Will they treat (by means of the cult) the slander of Arma-Dattaš before the gods of kingship, will they purify the places of kingship and the thrones (of the cult),

34 will His Majesty purify himself, will they make reparation for the house (patrimony?) — by putting this in an untouched place,

36 by giving that to the spirit —, will they honour his grandchildren with (something) else? If the god (is) thus kept pacified,

38 the question of Arma-Dattaš will be resolved with this question?

This text, according to the colophon, constitutes the fifth tablet of an investigation into the case of Arma-Dattaš and a woman, Šaušgattiš, not further identifiable for us. A divinity has been provoked by an « (evil) tongue », that is, by an act of magic, effected in connection with the dead Arma-Dattaš. The evil effects are directed against the king and his surroundings, and to neutralize them, the ritual practices must also repacify a spirit (GIDIM). Those responsible are certainly the sons of Arma-Dattaš, with whom, it seems, it is hoped a reconciliation may be reached: for initiatives of a magical character undertaken by these descendants see for example in



ndchildren of Arma-Dattaš do slander ... » *ma-a-an* GIDIM-*pāt*  
U.TUKU-*u-an-za* ... *ku-it* ... DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA <sup>1</sup> <sup>D</sup>XXX. <sup>D</sup>U-*ja*  
*-an-zi* <sup>82</sup>.

hich leads to such careful examination is the ease with which  
an come provoked, and in consequence the vulnerability of the  
d, which finds itself exposed to the vendettas of those who are  
keeping alive the ancient conflicts. The same problems existed  
ase of Urḫi-Tešup, KUB XVI 41 (+), (Cat. 222) <sup>83</sup>:

]Š-TU EME <sup>1</sup>Ūr-*ḫi*-<sup>D</sup>[U-up ...  
Š-RI <sup>BI.A</sup> LUGAL-UT-TI <sup>GIS</sup>DAG <sup>BI</sup>. [<sup>A</sup>-*ja pār-ku-nu-wa-an-zi*]  
JTU <sup>SI</sup>-*ja-za pār-ku-nu-zi* [ ...

*a-a-an-ma-an-na-aš* ŠA <sup>1</sup>Ūr-*ḫi*-<sup>D</sup>U-up HUL[-*lu a-pi-iz*]  
NIM-*za DU<sub>8</sub>-ri HUL-lu-na-aš-kán Ē-ir-za p[a-ra-a]*  
*-ru-up-ta-ri* . . .

ecause of the slander of Urḫi-Tešup . . .  
will they purify] the royal places [and] the (cult) thrones  
ill His Majesty purify himself [ . . .

f for us the evil of Urḫi-Tešup through [that]  
ning shall be resolved, will evil for us be excluded  
om (our) house? . . . <sup>84</sup>.

r Šaušgattiš in II 55: "will her sons make slander and disturb the spirit?" *nu*  
*J-ma* EME *e-eš-ša-an-zi nu* GIDIM *ni-ni-in-kiš-kán-zi*.

14 is completed with 7/v, which is here joined to KUB XVI 41 according to  
T 5, p. 171, who reproduces the phrase.

cases of homonymy have led to maintaining that certain judiciary procedures  
have mention were set into motion to destroy politically hostile persons.  
arly observed corrently that an Ura-Dattaš (GAL.<sup>D</sup>U), who appears in a mantic  
ove (KUB XVI 32) in which are treated also Urḫi-Tešup and Arma-Dattaš,  
licated in the struggle for the domination of Ḫattušaš; but only with hesitation  
k that it is the same person as that GAL.<sup>D</sup>U, son of Ukkuraš, who underwent  
e withdrawal of fabrics or some work animals (KUB XIII 35 (+), studied  
er, *StBoT* 4, p. 3ff., cf. p. 79f.); H. Otten, *Tot.*, p. 136, was the first to place  
connection with KUB XVI 32 II 24, though with much prudence. With now  
n one must proceed in such cases appears from the fact that almost in the  
in which such a trial is attested, there was another Ura-Dattaš (son of Kan-  
from the beginning on the side of Ḫattušiliš (cf. *supra*, p. 202f.), who remained  
im through the whole period of his reign, if it is he whom we must posit as  
he edict of Šaḫurunuwaš: KUB XXVI 43 v 31.

gain, note the Aliḫešniš of the trial KUB XXI 76 (+), and on the other hand  
iš. son of Mittannamuwaš, who is perhaps the same one cited in Šaḫurunuwaš

v 22. It is nevertheless singular to find in a trial a Ḫešniš and a Ḫalpazitiš (KUB XIII  
33 II 5, 13 and IV 1, see R. Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 34), and again a Ḫalpazitiš with a Alalimiš  
(KUB XIII 34 (+) IV 3, 6, *ibid.*, p. 40), all names which recur, one next to the other, in  
the narration of the conspiracy against Tuthališa IV (?) organized by a certain Ḫešniš  
(KUB XXXI 68, treated by R. Stefanini, *Athenaeum* XL, 1962, pp. 22-36; for the persons  
above cited cf. also O. Carruba, *OrAn* IX, 1970, p. 84). Now, if on the one side the  
Ḫešniš of the conspiracy will probably be the same one who appears as witness, with the  
title of prince, in the treaty of Dattašša (KBo IV 10 v 30), and for whom one can only  
hypothesize an identification with the Ḫešniš of the trial who is described as <sup>LU</sup>ŠA.TAM  
"treasurer", then, on the other side, Alalimiš in the trial is a cup-bearer, <sup>LU</sup>ŠU.SILA.DU<sub>8</sub>.A,  
and therefore probably the same person as the head of the cup-bearers, GAL <sup>LU</sup>ŠU.SILA.  
DU<sub>8</sub>.A, who appears beside the prince Ḫešniš in KBo IV 10 v 32 (cf. KUB XXI 38 r 32).  
Since this last is with excellent reason identified with the Alalimiš of the conspiracy (also  
a Ḫalpazitiš appears beside them with the title of "head of the hoplites", GAL  
<sup>LU.MES</sup>UKU.UŠ, KBo IV 10 v 29), it will then be necessary to deduce that the trial of  
which KUB XIII 34 (+) informs us, which is surely anterior to the conspiracy, did not  
impede the career of Alalimiš.

