

*Reprinted from*

# ANATOLIAN STUDIES

Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara

---

---

VOL. XLIII

1993

---

---

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT ANKARA  
c/o The British Academy, 20-21 Cornwall Terrace, London NW1 4QP

KURUNTA OF TARḪUNTAŠŠA AND THE IMPERIAL HITTITE  
MAUSOLEUM

A New Interpretation of §10 of the Bronze Tablet<sup>1</sup>

By RICHARD H. BEAL

Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

In 1986 the world of Hittitology was excited on hearing of the discovery of a well preserved bronze tablet. Inscribed on this tablet was a treaty between Hittite Great-King Tudḫaliya IV and his cousin Kurunta, appanage king of Tarḫuntašša, son of Tudḫaliya's father Ḫattušili III's elder brother Muwattalli II. An *editio princeps* of this treaty was published promptly, thoroughly, and, as always, extremely competently by H. Otten.<sup>2</sup>

The tenth paragraph of this treaty reads:

ANA AWAT <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ=ya=kan ABUYA <sup>m</sup>Maraššantaš KA×U-za  
karpta  
<sup>m.d</sup>LAMMA-aš=wa ANA <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ lē manninkuwan  
nu ABUYA ANA <sup>m</sup>Maraššanta TUPPU iyat  
n=at <sup>m</sup>Maraššantaš ḫarzi  
eni=ma ABUYA UL šakta  
AWAT <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ=kan mahḫan ŠA <sup>d</sup>10 kuntarra andan gulšanza  
<sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ=kan mahḫan zilatiya ANA <sup>m.d</sup>LAMMA parkiyauwanzi  
UL kišari  
uit=ma mahḫan ABUYA memian IŠME nu memiyan ABUYA=pat ḫullaš  
mahḫann=a ūk <sup>m</sup>Tuthaliyaš LUGAL.GAL LUGAL-izziahḫat  
nu antuḫšan uiyanun  
nu=kan AWAT <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ mahḫan ŠA <sup>d</sup>10 kuntarra andan gulšanza  
n=an aušta  
nu=kan <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ zilatiya ANA <sup>m.d</sup>LAMMA parkiyauwanzi UL  
kišari  
<sup>m</sup>Maraššantaš=ma kuit TUPPU ḫarzi n=at uizzi mān udai n=at lē dattari

The *editio princeps* translates<sup>3</sup>: "In bezug auf die Angelegenheit der beständigen Felsanlage hatte mein Vater durch den Mund des Maraššanta entschieden: 'Kurunta soll der beständigen Felsanlage nicht nahe (treten)!' So hatte mein Vater für Maraššanta eine Tafel ausgestellt, und die hält Maraššanta (in Händen). Jenes wußte aber mein Vater nicht, wie (nämlich) die Angelegenheit der beständigen Felsanlage (am) Wohnsitz des Wettergottes aufgezeichnet (ist), und wie (es) für alle Zeit dem Kurunta nicht zusteht, (zur) beständigen Felsanlage hinaufzusteigen. Wie es aber geschah, (daß) mein Vater den Wortlaut erfuhr, da stieß mein Vater selbst (seine) Entscheidung um. Und

<sup>1</sup>I would like to thank H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner, Th. van den Hout, J. A. Scurlock and B. J. Collins for their comments on various drafts of this paper. Those thanked should not be assumed to necessarily agree or disagree with the ideas herein presented. I wish to thank O. R. Gurney, D. Sürenhagen and Ph. Houwink ten Cate for allowing me pre-publication access to their articles. For abbreviations other than those listed for this journal see *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*.

<sup>2</sup>Bo 86/299 i 91-ii 3, copy and ed. H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 1)*, Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1988.

<sup>3</sup>*StBoT* Beih. 1 pp. 14 f.

als ich Tuthalija, der Großkönig, König wurde, da sandte ich einen Menschen, und den Wortlaut (bezüglich) der beständigen Felsanlage, wie er (am) Wohnsitz des Wettergottes aufgezeichnet war, den sah er: (Zur) beständigen Felsanlage hinaufzusteigen, steht für alle Zeit dem Kurunta nicht zu. Die Tafel, die aber Maraššanta (in Händen) hält, wenn es geschieht, daß er sie herbringt, so soll sie (ihm) nicht weggenommen werden!"

There are several things in the *editio princeps*'s understanding of this paragraph of the treaty which seem odd. What is the part played by Maraššanta? It appears that he was a spokesman for the king. If he was the king's spokesman, why then did the king make a tablet for Maraššanta? If Maraššanta was a messenger, why did he keep the tablet rather than delivering it? Why in the end did he get to keep it?

Secondly, Hattušili and Tudhaliya's actions do not seem to make any sense. Hattušili caused the phrase "Kurunta shall not go near to the mausoleum" to be written on Maraššanta's tablet, without knowing about the inscription on the Stormgod's *kuntarra*. When he found out about the inscription on the Stormgod's *kuntarra* which already said, "(it) does not behoove Kurunta to climb up (to) the mausoleum", he reversed his decision. Yet by the *editio princeps*'s translation, both the tablet's and the *kuntarra*'s inscription seem to be saying virtually the same thing. Why then did Hattušili change his decision? Are we to believe that he saw that the inscription on the god's *kuntarra* agreed with his previous decision on Maraššanta's tablet forbidding Kurunta's ascent and so decided to permit Kurunta's ascent? Tudhaliya, on his coming to the throne decided that the inscription on the *kuntarra* must be checked before he wrote his treaty with Kurunta. He was told that the inscription denied the mausoleum to Kurunta. This essentially ended discussion of the subject matter. However, from later in the treaty, we find out in passing that Tudhaliya has returned the mausoleum to Kurunta.<sup>4</sup> Why write a full paragraph explaining why on three occasions it has been forbidden to Kurunta and later in an unrelated paragraph say that all this has been reversed? It appears that contrariness runs in Hattušili's family: all reason points one way, so we do the exact opposite without having to give any reason whatsoever. Even so, why does Tudhaliya not end the discussion with some mention of his decision to ignore the *kuntarra*'s inscription?

Thirdly, according to the *editio princeps*'s translation, the decision of Hattušili that was written on Maraššanta's tablet was now invalid; yet when Maraššanta brought this tablet to officialdom, he was allowed then to keep it. If it was of so little importance that he could keep it as a souvenir (and assuming that "souvenir" is a concept a Hittite would have understood), why was it mentioned in a state treaty? If it was invalid and important enough to be mentioned in a state treaty, why was it not to be destroyed?

F. Imparati and F. Pecchioli Daddi also saw problems with this paragraph.<sup>5</sup> They argue<sup>6</sup> that Hattušili reversed his decision when he found out that the <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ was assigned to the Stormgod as his residence (*kuntarra*) and so it would not be possible for Kurunta to use it in the future for his own benefit (*parkiyauwanzi*). This reconstruction of events has its own problems, however. They must argue that although some <sup>NA4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ-s were used as mausolea, what Hattušili found out from the hieroglyphic inscription was that

<sup>4</sup>Bo 86/299 ii 64–6.

<sup>5</sup>"Le relazioni politiche fra Hatti e Tarhuntassa all'epoca di Hattusili III e Tuthaliya IV," *Quattro Studi Ittiti*, ed. F. Imparati, (Eothen 4, 1991, arrived Jan. 1993) 27–9.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid. 27.

this one was not Muwattalli's mausoleum, and so possession of it could not be used by Kurunta to gain legitimacy should he wish to seize the imperial throne. Hattušili made his first decision based on a misunderstanding; what he thought was his brother's mausoleum was in reality a cult place of the Stormgod. But it seems beyond belief that Hattušili would not have known where his brother was buried.

Ph. Houwink ten Cate in his review of the *editio princeps*<sup>8</sup> attempts to solve these problems with a modified understanding of the paragraph: Hattušili "distanced himself" (*karpta*) from Maraššanta's opinion that "Kurunta shall not approach the mausoleum". He then gave Maraššanta a tablet containing his decision. When he heard about the *kuntarra*'s inscription denying Kurunta access to the mausoleum, he reversed himself, and thus Maraššanta's tablet "would not be put into practice".<sup>9</sup>

This too has its problems. Firstly, if Maraššanta wanted Hattušili to deny Kurunta access, and Hattušili ruled against him, why did Hattušili then give Maraššanta the tablet containing the ruling? Wouldn't that be putting the fox in charge of the henhouse? Documents giving someone a right are generally given to the person whose rights are thus guaranteed, not to the person who wants to take them away. Secondly, it is odd that according to this reconstruction, the treaty quotes Maraššanta's opinion but doesn't say what was on the tablet Maraššanta received and yet later the treaty quotes the inscription on the *kuntarra*. Thirdly, Hattušili's reason for ruling against Maraššanta is not given, although elsewhere the treaty is not shy about referring to imperial favour toward Kurunta. Finally, by Houwink ten Cate's reconstruction, one is still left with an explanatory paragraph ending with Kurunta banned from the mausoleum and a later paragraph reversing this without comment. This last problem is papered over by Houwink ten Cate with the suggestion that perhaps Kurunta received possession of the mausoleum in §16 but was denied access to his possession by §10.<sup>10</sup> While this reconstruction is definitely a step in the right direction,

<sup>7</sup>Ibid. 29.

<sup>8</sup>ZA 82 (1992)—233–70 esp. 244–49.

<sup>9</sup>For this last translation see further our §3 below.

<sup>10</sup>Houwink ten Cate's solution, begins with completely different assumptions than mine. He believes that the bronze tablet (Bo 86/299) and KBo 4.10 are both treaties of Tudhaliya IV, the first with Kurunta and the latter with his successor Ulmi-Tešub (for this view see most recently Th. van den Hout, JCS 41 [1989]: 100–14). Before the appearance of the bronze tablet, I too argued for the idea that Kurunta and Ulmi-Tešub were different people (Beal, Diss. 1986 pp. 391–4 n. 1237). But after having read the arguments by H. Klengel, AOF 18 (1991): 231 f., O. R. Gurney (above), and Sørenhagen, OLZ 87 (1992): 341–71 in favour of equating the two royal names and making KBo 4.10 a treaty of Hattušili III, I am now inclined to this latter opinion. Houwink ten Cate also believes that Kurunta was made *tuhkanti* "heir presumptive" (or better with Gurney, CAH 2/1 p. 672, "heir designate") by Hattušili, only to be subsequently removed and replaced by Tudhaliya. As evidence he cites KUB 14.3 (ed. F. Sommer, AU pp. 2–19), the so called Tawagalawa letter, which speaks on several occasions of the mission of the *tuhkanti*/TARTENNU (for which title see Gurney, AnSt 33 [1983]: 97–101) and once mentions that "but [previously(?) Kurunta was there" (i 73) and §§13–14 of the bronze tablet which speak of the appointment of Tudhaliya's elder brother as *tuhkanti* and his later removal in Tudhaliya's favour. However, since KUB 14.3 refers to the *tuhkanti*/TARTENNU by title (i 7, 9, 11 (2x), 67, ii 4), why should it suddenly refer to the same person by name? It seems more likely that at least two different missions were sent, one led by the *tuhkanti* and one by Kurunta. §§13–14 of the bronze tablet say that, before Tudhaliya became king, the gods made Tudhaliya and Kurunta friends and they swore to protect one another. When Hattušili appointed Tudhaliya's elder brother as *tuhkanti*, Kurunta remained loyal to Tudhaliya. He even



many inconsistencies remain.

As we shall see, if three difficult words in paragraph 10 are translated differently from the *editio princeps*, our problems will be solved and the paragraph will make considerably more sense.

### 1. =kan . . . karp- and the part played by Marraššanta

The verb in the first sentence is =kan . . . karp-. The verb *karp-* is a verb common in its literal meaning "to lift". Additionally =kan (or =ašta) *karp-* is well known, if not well understood, in legal contexts. Since the Bronze Tablet is a legal document, it is well worth looking at the possible meanings for this usage.

(1) [mān=ašta ant]uwahḥaš LUGAL-un IŠTU DINI karp[zi . . .] . . . (7 fragmentary lines) . . . mān=an=za kuwapi=ma apezzian LUGAL-uš EGIR-an kappūēzzi n=aš ANA UTU-ŠI āra ēšdu mān(!)=aš appezziann=a naššu MEŠEDI našma DUMU.É.GAL našma LUGULA LİM LÚ.DUGUD n=ašta LUGAL-un karpzi n=an arḥa parḥanzi DINAM IŠTU É-ŠU šarnikzi & mān=at išanāš=a uttar antuwahḥaš naššu BĒL DINIŠU našma=šši kattawanalliš apāš=a=kan LUGAL-un karpzi n=an=kan ANA LUGAL išši=šši anda pāi n=ašta apūn antuḥšan kunanzi . . . appezziann=a wemiazzi nu niwallan antuḥšan kunanna paš<sup>11</sup> "If someone 'lifts' the king with a legal-suit . . . If sometime later the king reconsiders him (reopens the case). Let him be proper for His Majesty (to reconsider). And if later he 'lifts' the king, whether (= even if) he is a royal-bodyguard or a palace-servant or an overseer of clansmen<sup>12</sup> (or) a non-commissioned(?) officer, they will chase him away. He will compensate (for) the legal-case with his house. § If it is a matter of blood and either the injured party or his avenger 'lifts' the king, and he gives him (the accused) into the king's mouth (i.e. gets the king to order the accused's execution) and they kill that person (the accused) . . . and later (the king) finds out he gave an innocent person to be killed."

(2) nu zik LÚ HAZ[AN]NU ŠA URU HATTI išhiul kišan paḥši nu=tta=kkauddanaz lē kuiški karpzi "You, city-governor of Hattuša, keep this instruction. Let no-one 'lift' you in these matters."<sup>13</sup>

In discussing the meaning of *karp-* in legal contexts, E. von Schuler<sup>14</sup>

swore "If your father doesn't install you for kingship, wherever he does install you, I'll be loyal to you, I will be your servant/slave (nu=wa=za tuel IR-iš). Again, why jump from using a person's name to using his title then back to using his name. Since Tudḥaliya is not hiding the fact that he was once passed over for kingship, why should he hide the supposed fact that it was Kurunta who was placed ahead of him? Most compellingly, it is impossible to believe that someone just named heir to the empire would swear to be his passed-over cousin's servant/slave. Thus, §§13–14, in my opinion, clearly show that Kurunta was not the elder brother and *tuhkanti*. A combination of the kingship of an appanage kingdom, which Kurunta seems to have received shortly after Hattušili seized the throne (Bo 86/299 i 14–15), with the imperial *tuhkanti*-ship seems unlikely anyway. Finally, if we accept Klengel, Gurney and Sørenhagen's argument for KBo 4.10 being a Hattušili text, which I have argued on other grounds should be accepted (*The Organization of the Hittite Military*, THeth 20 [1992] p. 387 n. 1466), we will see that Klengel, AOF 18: 228, was correct to suggest that the elder brother and *tuhkanti* was Neriqqaili, who is listed in KBo 4.10 rev. 28 as the *tuhkanti*. That he is also found with this title in KUB 26.43 rev. 28, a Tudḥaliya IV text (and in first place in Bo 86/299 though entitled only "royal-prince"), only means that he was reappointed as heir designate after his brother became king.

<sup>11</sup>KUB 13.7 i 1, 9–20 (Tudḥ. II), ed. HW<sup>2</sup> 1: 220 s.v. ara- 2 (i 9–13).

<sup>12</sup>For this translation see Beal, THeth 20 (1992): 473–81.

<sup>13</sup>KUB 26.9 + Bo 69/1256 iv 9–11 (MH/NS), ed. H. Otten, OrNS 52 (1983):136 f.

<sup>14</sup>FsFriedrich, pp. 471 f. n. 88.

thought that to *karp-* the king was a bad thing, either "divert the king from carrying out a proper legal-act"<sup>15</sup> or "to prevent the king from the exercise of his proper juridical authority"<sup>16</sup> or "to keep the king away from the results of a legal examination".<sup>17</sup> Otten<sup>18</sup> preferred the second possibility when translating example no. 2 "No one shall hinder you in this matter."<sup>19</sup> However the verb *karp-* is also used in a slightly different phrase: n=ašta namma l DINAM parā karpanzi.<sup>20</sup> This has been recently translated by Güterbock and van den Hout: "They pick out the next case."<sup>21</sup> That is, there is no negative connotation in the phrase =ašta DINAM *karp-*. Is there a negative connotation in the above two texts? In the second text it is *karp-*ing the city-governor in this matter (the instructions) that is forbidden. This would seem to imply that *karp-*ing the governor in other matters was not forbidden. In the first text's first example, the tablet is too broken to know what the consequences of *karp-*ing the king might have been. It is, however, the initial action. In the second example, the text is clearly saying that after the king has made a judgement, he himself may reopen the case, but it is forbidden for one of the parties to later *karp-* the king about it. The problem here is not *karp-*ing the king, but *karp-*ing the king after the king has already decided a case. In other words, the king may re-examine a case that he has already decided, but the litigants may not try to reopen it. In the third example, the *karp-*ing of the king is not the problem. Rather it is what follows, namely convincing the king of the guilt of a man who is really innocent that will get you punished. Thus, in all examples, *karp-*ing the king seems to mean nothing more than "to appeal to", "to call-upon",<sup>22</sup> that is, it is an entirely neutral term.

The *editio princeps* had assumed that the subject of the sentence, ANA AWAT NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ=ya=kan ABUYA mMarraššantaš KA×U=za karpta, is the Akkadogram ABUYA "my father". This is indeed an Akkadian nominative form and the *editio princeps*'s translation is grammatically possible in Hittite. Also possible according to the Hittite grammar would be for Marraššantaš to be nominative, rather than genitive and ABUYA to be accusative. The Akkadian accusative ABAYA is only rarely used in Hittite, ABUYA being the most commonly used Akkadogram for both nominative and accusative forms.<sup>23</sup> This would allow the king to be the object of the verb *karp-*, as would be expected from the other examples of its usage in legal contexts cited above. The object preceding the subject is, of course, less common than the subject preceding the object, but the former is not uncommon.<sup>24</sup> The object-subject order could perhaps be explainable if the KA×U=az needed to be emphasized.<sup>25</sup> It will be seen

<sup>15</sup>"den König von (der Durchführung eines ordentlichen) Prozeßverfahrens abbringen".

<sup>16</sup>"den König von der (Ausübung der ihm zustehenden) Gerichtsbarkeit abhalten".

<sup>17</sup>"den König von (den Ergebnissen) prozessualer Untersuchung fernhalten".

<sup>18</sup>OrNS 52 (1983):136 f.

<sup>19</sup>"Niemand soll dich von dieser Sache abhalten."

<sup>20</sup>IBOT 1.36 iii 11 (instr. for MEŠEDI, MH/MS).

<sup>21</sup>The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard, OIAS 24, (1991) pp. 24 f.

<sup>22</sup>A similar translation, "to apply to", was employed by F. Josephson, *Part. (1972)* pp. 75, 126–8.

<sup>23</sup>HW<sup>2</sup> 1:567b s.v. atta- IV. In Akkadian *abu* takes possessive suffixes as follows nom. *abūšu*, acc. *abāšu*, dat. *abīšu*, and by analogy MB and NB in the first person use the suffix -(y)a attached to a fully declinable stem. (W. von Soden, *GAG* p. 86 605 h i and p. 6\*).

<sup>24</sup>For other examples of Obj.-Subj.-Verb sentences in the bronze tablet Bo 86/299 see i 15, 87, 98, ii 8–13, 32, 87, 88.

<sup>25</sup>Suggestion courtesy of H. G. Güterbock.

below that the KA×U-az was indeed an important part of the sentence, and well deserving of emphasis. If our suggested neutral translation of =kan karp- is utilized the first sentence of the paragraph would then translate: "Maraššanta orally called upon/appealed to my father concerning the matter of the mausoleum."<sup>26</sup>

Given this translation, it would follow that Maraššanta was not merely the king's spokesman or messenger anomalously mentioned in a state treaty, but rather a person concerned about Kurunta's use of the mausoleum, perhaps, as Sörenhagen thinks,<sup>27</sup> the official charged with administering the mausoleum. It would make perfect sense that, as the initiator of the suit and perhaps the person in a position to carry out the decision, Maraššanta would have been given a tablet to keep containing the royal edict.

## 2. parkiya- and Kurunta's right to the mausoleum

The second problem, as we have stated above, is that, according to the *editio princeps*'s translation, Hattušili III and later Tudhaliya IV discovered that what was written on the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod banned Kurunta from going up to the mausoleum. In Hattušili's case this agreed with the decision he had already made without knowing about that inscription. Yet having read the *kuntarra*'s inscription both kings reversed themselves, that is they permitted Kurunta to approach the mausoleum.

Hattušili's initial decision, written in Maraššanta's tablet, is clear: m.dLAMMA-aš=wa ANA NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ lē manninkuwan "Let Kurunta not be near to the mausoleum."<sup>28</sup> This is quite understandable since Hattušili had usurped the Great-Kingship from Kurunta's brother. Thus Kurunta had a better claim to the throne than either Hattušili or Tudhaliya. In granting Kurunta an appanage kingdom centred on Kurunta's father's capital city Tarhuntašša, Hattušili was taking a gamble that he could buy off Kurunta and simultaneously provide a king to worship the gods whose cults demanded a king's presence, since the city was founded as the imperial capital. What Maraššanta had no doubt argued to Hattušili was that by also allowing Kurunta access to the royal mausoleum he would have given Kurunta some claim to the succession.<sup>29</sup>

The final result, mentioned in passing in a later paragraph, is equally clear: NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ-ašši EGIR-pa piḥhun nu=kan zilatiya NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ ANA

NUMUN m.dLAMMA arḥa lē kuiški dāi.<sup>30</sup> "I (Tudhaliya IV) gave the mausoleum back to him. Let no one in the future take the mausoleum away from the descendants of Kurunta."

The critical sentence of our paragraph is the one which was written on the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod: nu=kan NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ zilatiya ANA m.dLAMMA parkiyauwanzi UL kišari.<sup>31</sup> The verb park-/parkiya- means transitively "to raise, elevate" or intransitively "to rise, ascend". The *editio princeps*'s understanding of this is that Kurunta had no right to climb up (to) the mausoleum. However, grammatically, while "Kurunta" is dative/locative, "mausoleum" is nominative or accusative; the *editio princeps* must supply the dative "(zur)" in its translation. However, when park(iya)- means to go up to it takes an allative not an accusative: nu G<sup>15</sup>IG kuiš ḥašzi nu(coll.) šuhḥa parkiyanzi n=an=kan šarā SUD-anzi "They go up to the roof and pull up the one who opens the door".<sup>32</sup> It is difficult to see why the infinitive construction should turn an allative into a nominative or accusative.

Ose lists several examples of the verb kiš- with an infinitive.<sup>33</sup> In these the logical subject of the infinitive is expressed with a dative/locative: mān tuk=ma [warr]išuwanzi UL kišari "If it is impossible for you to come to help";<sup>34</sup> nu=šši UL parā i[y]anniyauwa[nzi] «UL» kišari UL=ma=šši EGIR-pa ti[yauwanzi] kišari "If it is not possible for him to go forward and it is not possible for him to go backwards."<sup>35</sup> Ose does cite one example: nu=kan IŠTU [(ANŠE)].KUR.RA.MEŠ kuit šarā pennumanzi UL kišat nu dUTU-ŠI ANA KARAS.ḪI.A GİR-it piran ḥūiyanun "Because it was impossible to drive up by horse, I my majesty led the army on foot,"<sup>36</sup> where a potential logical object of the infinitive (since penna- otherwise takes the animal driven as direct object) is expressed by the instrumental. However, as Ose himself notes, the instrumental case could have been influenced by the instrumental case of the GİR-it "on foot" in the main clause. More relevant is that when penna- does take animals as object it denotes the herding of these animals, while when the instrumental is used the animals are pulling a vehicle or perhaps being ridden.<sup>37</sup> In Ose's passage (from the Annals of Muršili), it is clear that the horses in question are a means of locomotion. Thus, in none of these sentences is a logical object of the infinitive included. Importantly, unlike the new example from the bronze tablet, in none of the previously attested examples is there found a nominative or

<sup>30</sup>Bo 86/299 ii 64-6.

<sup>31</sup>Bo 86/299 ii 1-2, cf. NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ=kan mahḥan zilatiya ANA m.dLAMMA parkiyauwanzi UL kišari ibid, i 96-7.

<sup>32</sup>IBOT 3.148 iii 13-14 (evocation rit., NS) coll. and ed. Otten, *StBoT* Beih. 1:46 w. n. 82a. Park(iya)- used transitively is only attested with a meaning "to lift, raise, elevate" and a derived meaning "to grow (a flower)" (said of a plant) (see below n. 43). It might be imagined, that park(iya)- "to go up", like pai- "to go" would take an accusative of the road travelled. However this meaning is unattested and may never have existed due to the potential for confusion—\*G<sup>15</sup>KUN<sub>n</sub> parkiyazzi would mean "he raises the ladder" and "he climbs the ladder". Furthermore, even if such a meaning could be shown to exist, it seems unlikely that Kurunta was being denied/given permission to scale the mausoleum; rather he was being denied/given permission to go up to the mausoleum. Grammatically "mausoleum" should be equivalent to "roof" in the example from *IBOT* 3.148.

<sup>33</sup>F. Ose, *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen*, MVAcG 47/1, pp. 47-8.

<sup>34</sup>KBo 5.9 ii 19 (Duppl.), ed. J. Friedrich, *SV* 1:16 f.

<sup>35</sup>KUB 8.53 iv 18-20 (Gilgameš), ed. Friedrich, *ZA* 39 (1930):12 f.

<sup>36</sup>KUB 14.16 iii 11-2, w. dupl. KUB 14.15 iii 42-3, ed. *AM* 54 f.

<sup>37</sup>KUB 10.3 i 11, w. dupl. KBo 8.119 obv. 2 (ANTAHŠUM- fest.).

<sup>26</sup>G. Beckman's comment, *WO* 20/21 (1989-90) 294 that the placement of the enclitics at the end of the SAG.UŠ supports the contention that NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ represents a single Hittite word is incorrect. If each Sumerogram represented a separate word the enclitics would still be placed on the SAG.UŠ: ukturiyaš=ya=kan ḥekuraš memiyani ammel attan Maraššantaš iššaz karpta. This comment is not intended to deny that NA<sup>4</sup>hekur SAG.UŠ could stand for a single Hittite word.

<sup>27</sup>Sörenhagen, *OLZ* 87 (1992) 345 f. n. 14, has already noted that Maraššanta could not have been just a messenger, but must have had some title to do with the mausoleum.

<sup>28</sup>Bo 86/299 i 92.

<sup>29</sup>Note how although Macedonian king Alexander III's body was intended by Perdikkas (Alexander's successor as supreme commander) to be buried at Aegai, the old Macedonian capital and burial place of all her kings, it was waylaid and taken to Egypt by Ptolemy I and eventually associated with the Ptolemies' own family dynastic cult. Strabo 17.1.8, cf. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic world from Alexander to the Roman conquest* (Cambridge, 1981) p. 232 w. nn. 8-9; Diodoros XVIII 3.5; XVIII 26-8 (with some reading between the lines), cf. Loeb edition vol. 9 pp. 19 n. 4; 95 nn. 1-2; Pausanias 1.6.3, 1.7.1 and Arrian *FGrH* 156.9.25; 10.1. See F. E. Peters, *The Harvest of Hellenism* (New York, 1970) p. 73.

accusative. Thus, the grammatical construction in this passage of the bronze tablet is unique.

However, other passive verbs and the verb “to be” do take infinitives. Friedrich, *HE*<sup>2</sup> §275b–276a, teaches that the logical object of the infinitive in Hittite is the subject of the primary verb. Translating his examples literally one gets: *IŠT[U KUR] URUKÜ.BABBAR-TI LUMUNABTUM EGIR-pa piyanna UL āra* “A fugitive is not right to give back”.<sup>38</sup> *nu=šši GUDpūhugariš piyawanzi IZI-it warnumanzi(!) [MUŠEN.HI].A wahnummanzi SI×SA-at* “An ox was ascertained for him to give (and) to burn(!) (text: to wave) with fire (and) birds to wave”.<sup>39</sup> *mān URU-LUM kuiš . . . ANA mUlmi-d10-up . . . piyanna UL ZI-anza* “If some city is not the will <for My Majesty> to give to Ulmi-Tešub”.<sup>40</sup> Note, in the last the logical indirect object of the verb *pai-* “to give” remains in the dative case when the sentence is converted to an infinitive construction. This is to say, to get the *editio princeps*’s translation of the sentence in the bronze tablet, one would assume a non-infinitive construction: *\*nu m.dLAMMA-aš ANA NA4hekur SAG.UŠ zilatiya UL parkiyazzi* “Kurunta will not in the future ascend to the mausoleum”, which put into an infinitive construction would have said *\*nu=kan ANA NA4hekur SAG.UŠ zilatiya ANA m.dLAMMA parkiyauwanzi UL kišari* “It is impossible for Kurunta to ascend to the mausoleum”.<sup>41</sup> However, as was pointed out above, in the actual sentence on the tablet the word *hekur* “mausoleum” is not in the dative-locative but in the nominative or accusative. Thus, the question is not one of Kurunta ascending to the mausoleum. A literal translation of the sentence would read, “The mausoleum to rise up is impossible for Kurunta” i.e. “The rising up of the mausoleum will not occur for Kurunta” (or “from Kurunta” assuming a separative dative) or “The mausoleum is impossible for Kurunta to lift” i.e. “It is impossible for Kurunta to lift up the mausoleum” or “the lifting up of the mausoleum will not occur for/from Kurunta.” The varying translations depend on whether we translate *park(iya)-* transitively or intransitively.

What sense can be made of these literal translations? Since what we are translating as “mausoleum” is literally “ever-lasting rock-sanctuary”, we of course cannot employ any of these translations in a literal sense. The Hittite verb *parkiya-* reminds one of the usages of the Akkadian verb *elû* whose basic meaning in the G stem is (1) “to ascend (to)”, “go up (to)” and (2) “to rise up”, “to grow” while in the D stem it is “to raise, elevate”.<sup>42</sup> *Park(iya)-* has a similar semantic range.<sup>43</sup> Note however that *elû* in the G stem also means “to forfeit

<sup>38</sup>*KBo* 5.4 i 38 (Targ.), ed. J. Friedrich, *SV* 1:58 f.

<sup>39</sup>*KBo* 4.2 iii 50–1, w. dupl. *KUB* 43.50 obv. 11–2 + *KUB* 15.36 obv. 3–4, ed. Götze and Pedersen, *MSpr* 4 f.:11–2.

<sup>40</sup>*KBo* 4.10 rev. 18, ed. Th. van den Hout, Diss. 38 f. Van den Hout argues in a note at the bottom of p. 39 that an equally possible translation: “If some city is not the will for Ulmi-Tešub to give,” i.e. “if Ulmi-Tešub doesn’t want to give some city (to his Majesty),” can be ruled out by context.

<sup>41</sup>For an example of a sentence containing a word in the allative and another in the dative see *LUGAL-uš URUHattuša DINGIR.DIDLI-aš aruwanzi uet*, *KBo* 22.2 rev. 13, quoted in F. Starke, *StBoT* 23 (1977) 69 §100.

<sup>42</sup>*CAD* E 114–35.

<sup>43</sup>“To ascend (to)” see above n. 32. “To rise up” e.g. *KUB* 36.89 obv. 26, ed. *CHD* *nakki* A la; (mid.): *KUB* 8.16:3–4 + *KUB* 8.24 rev. 4–5 (OH/NS), ed. E. Neu, *StBoT* 5:138. “To grow”: *nu šankuš alil mahhan parkiyat tuell=a ŠA<sup>d</sup>10 dZI-KA alil parktaru* “Just as the š.-plant grows (lit. lifts up) a flower, so may the soul/will of you O Stormgod grow (like) a flower” *KUB* 33.68 ii 1–2 (OH/MS), tr. courtesy of H. A., Hoffner and H. G. Güterbock. “To raise” (act.): e.g. *KBo* 23.12 rev 10–1 (MS); (mid.): *KBo* 11.10 iii 10–1 (MH/NS), tr. courtesy of H. A. Hoffner and H. G. Güterbock, ed. Neu, *StBoT* 5:138 (differently).

(*ina* X *elû* “to forfeit X”), a usage very common in the Old-Babylonian period and still attested in Middle Assyrian and Nuzi texts.<sup>44</sup> In the D stem *elû* with direct object can mean in Neo-Assyrian dialect “to set aside, remove, take off”.<sup>45</sup> Although it is not otherwise attested, a similar semantic development may have taken place in the equivalent Hittite verb.<sup>46</sup> If so, the sentence in the bronze-tablet could be translated: “It shall not happen that the mausoleum shall be forfeited by (lit. rise up/be raised up for/from) Kurunta”. This would mean that the inscription on the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod said exactly the opposite of what the *editio princeps* translated it to say. It would also mean that it said exactly the opposite of what Hattušili had ordered to be written on Maraššanta’s tablet. Far from denying Kurunta’s rights by some variant wording of Hattušili’s order, what was already on the *kuntarra* established Kurunta’s rights and established them in a place that was under the protection of the Stormgod.

With this understanding of the *kuntarra*’s inscription, the actions of Hattušili and Tudhaliya now begin to make sense. Hattušili decided to buy off Kurunta with an appanage state centred on the old capital of Tarhuntašša. Maraššanta, perhaps the administrator of the imperial funerary cult, during the course of an audience (note: “orally”) with Hattušili convinced the king that there could be a danger if Kurunta took control of the imperial mausoleum. Thoroughly convinced (but without having time to research the subject as he would have if he had been approached by mail—the reason why “orally” needed to be emphasized) Hattušili issued Maraššanta a tablet stating that Kurunta could not approach the mausoleum. Later it came to light that there was an inscription on the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod which prohibited anyone from denying Kurunta access to the mausoleum. This was probably written by Muwattalli II to guarantee Kurunta’s access to the mausoleum after Kurunta’s brother Muršili III = Urhi-Tešub, with whom Kurunta may not have been on the best of terms,<sup>47</sup> became king. Since this inscription in favour of Kurunta was under the protection of the Stormgod it could not be cavalierly contradicted by an edict of Hattušili without serious concern that the Stormgod would vent his anger on Hattušili. This then explains why Hattušili reversed himself, declaring the edict given to Maraššanta void. It also explains why Tudhaliya needed only to look at the inscription on the *kuntarra* and repeat its inscription in the treaty for everyone to know that he had ruled in favour of Kurunta.

### 3. The middle voice of *da-* and Maraššanta’s tablet

Finally, if Maraššanta’s tablet was now invalid, why, if he should present his tablet, was no one to take it away from him? The suggestion of Imparati and Pecchioli Daddi,<sup>48</sup> that perhaps Tudhaliya wanted to be able to hold Maraššanta’s tablet over the head of Kurunta in the event that Kurunta caused him trouble, is clearly wrong since a subsequent treaty, particularly one that admits that Maraššanta’s tablet is invalid, would certainly have superseded Maraššanta’s document. One would expect from Akkadian parallels a statement to the effect that “if the tablet shows up it is to be broken”. The answer here too

<sup>44</sup>*CAD* E: 124 f. s.v. *elû* 3b2’.

<sup>45</sup>*CAD* E: 126 f. s.v. *elû* 6.

<sup>46</sup>Since the grammatical construction is somewhat different, we are not claiming that the Hittite is a calque on the Akkadian.

<sup>47</sup>Witness the fact that Kurunta seems to have abandoned his brother Muršili and supported his uncle Hattušili’s usurpation. (Bo 86/299 i 6 11.)

<sup>48</sup>*Eothen* 4:28. The authors themselves present another suggestion, which, without rejecting this one, they prefer (see below n. 54).

lies in a careful reading of the Hittite. *n=at lē dattari*. The *editio princeps*'s translation must supply a "from him" which the text does not have. Admittedly Hittites sometimes omitted indirect object pronouns. The *editio princeps* also must supply an "away" which the text also does not have. *Arḫa da-* "take away" is not a rare expression, after all. Nor is there a separative sentence particle (e.g. *=ašta=kan*). Furthermore, there is the curious use of the relatively rare middle form of *da-* rather than the usual way indefinites are handled in Hittite *n=at=ši=kan arḫa danzi* "they will take it away from him".

The middle form of *da-* occurs elsewhere in this treaty.<sup>49</sup> "Because the treaty tablet of my father was made as follows: 'Install the child of the woman whom the queen gives to you for wifeship for kingship in Tarḫuntašša.' When that treaty-tablet was made, Kurunta, in the time of my father, had not yet taken that woman. Now, if Kurunta takes that woman for himself or if he does not take her for himself," *apāš memiyaš UL dattari* "(lit.) That matter shall not be taken".<sup>50</sup> Like the passage in question, in this sentence there is no sentence particle or *arḫa*. In our case the subject of the verb is a tablet whose words are now invalid, while in this case the subject of the verb is the words written on a tablet which are now invalid. The *editio princeps* translates this later passage "jene Angelegenheit wird nicht (weiter) aufgegriffen", that is, entirely differently from the first.<sup>51</sup> A translation "that matter (i.e. the aforementioned section of the earlier treaty) is invalid," seems to best fit the sense of the passage. Another passage exists, in which "words" are the subject of a middle form of *da-*. "(Takuhili of Ariyanta) came back and reported to me: 'Bentešina had the tablet of the palace and gave it to Tattamaru, saying "present it to His Majesty". But the latter broke it against a stone wall.' If I did not believe this man (then), when none of the messengers, whom I had sent, returned, then I believed this story. I said (to myself):" *ŠA mZAG.ŠEŠ=wa kuwapi memiaš UL daddat nu=wa namma EGIR-and[a] tamain UN-an wiyami nu=wa apel memiaš dattari tuppiya[š] duwarnumaš memian kēzziya hānun* "When the word of Bentešina was not received/accepted, will I then send another person and his word will be received/accepted?" For this reason I believed the matter of the broken tablet."<sup>52</sup> All previous translators have translated the key word of this passage "received".<sup>53</sup> This admittedly makes sense in this passage and will fit tolerably well in our §10 of the bronze tablet, but is hardly appropriate in the second passage in the bronze tablet. The translation suggested for the second passage in the bronze tablet *UL dattari* "not valid" fits just as well in the passage concerning Bentešina: "If (at first) I did not believe this man (then), when none of the messengers, whom I had sent, returned, then I believed this story. I said (to myself): 'At a time when the word of Bentešina was not valid/was not accepted, will I then send another person and his word will be valid/be accepted?' For this reason I believed the matter of the broken tablet." When the translation of these passages is applied to our passage, problems evaporate. The last sentence of

<sup>49</sup>Bo 86/299 ii 89.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid. ii 84-9.

<sup>51</sup>This point was also made by Ph. Houwink ten Cate in his review of the *editio princeps*.

<sup>52</sup>KUB 26.92:9-16, w. dupl. KUB 8.79 rev. 25-6, ed. A. Hagenbuchner, *THeth* 16 (1989): 401-3, E. Laroche, *Syria* 31 (1954) 105, Th. van den Hout, Diss. 132 f., tr. I. Singer, *Tel Aviv* 10 (1983) 12.

<sup>53</sup>So Singer; Neu (*StBoT* 5:160) and van den Hout, "(auf) genommen werden"; Laroche, "a été recueillie"; Hagenbuchner, literally "genommen werden". See previous note.

paragraph 10 clearly should be translated: "When the tablet which Maraššanta holds appears (lit. comes), let it not be accepted (i.e. let it be invalid)."<sup>54</sup>

### Conclusion

In sum, paragraph 10 of the bronze-tablet treaty should be translated as follows: "Maraššanta orally appealed to/called upon my father concerning the matter of the mausoleum. 'Let Kurunta not approach the mausoleum.' My father made a tablet for Maraššanta and Maraššanta has it. But my father did not know how the matter of the mausoleum is written on the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod, and how it shall not happen in the future that the mausoleum be forfeited by (lit. rise up/be raised up for/from) Kurunta. It happened that when my father heard the words, my father himself overturned the matter. And when I Tudḫaliya, the Great King, became king, I sent a person and he saw how the cult-sanctuary of the Stormgod is inscribed and it shall not happen that the mausoleum be forfeited (lit. rise up/be raised up) for Kurunta. When the tablet which Maraššanta holds appears (lit. comes), let it not be accepted (i.e. let it be invalid)."

<sup>54</sup>Ph. Houwink ten Cate in his review of the *editio princeps* independently came to much the same conclusion: "let it not be put into practice (viz. let no (further) action be undertaken upon it)". Imparati and Pecchioli Daddi, *Eothen* 4:28, also suggested this solution, which they find most likely ("la tavoletta... non deve presa (in considerazione)").