

DUMU.MUNUS GAL RECONSIDERED

*J. de Roos**

When, in 1987, the discussion about DUMU.MUNUS GAL had been enlivened¹, various scholars began to give their opinion on the description or title. Since no *communis opinio* has been achieved, it seems like a good idea to me to put all the different viewpoints together and to represent the considerations, as far as relevant. As a matter of fact, a congress like this might also be a good discussion platform, in order to have articles with a clear viewpoint and published within the last three years, defended by their authors. Articles that are in themselves interesting are too often stored for eternity in large libraries, without having orally or in writing been discussed or commented upon.

First of all I will give a short introduction for those who are not acquainted with the problem. In three Hittite cuneiform texts, in my opinion all dating from around mid 13th century, Ḫattušiliš III–Tuthaliyaš IV, the still unexplained title or description DUMU.MUNUS GAL occurs, to be distinguished from the more distinct title DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL².

On two bullae from Korucutepe³ DUMU.MUNUS GAL or GAL DUMU.MUNUS also occurs in connection with the name Kilušhepa, who is also mentioned hieroglyphically together with that of Ari-Šarruma. Unfortunately the cuneiform script has been lost almost completely. Korucutepe is situated in the region, usually identified with Išuwa, where Kilušhepa lived at the side of the regional king Ali- and/or Ari-Šarruma.⁴

Since we know that Kilušhepa was Puduhepa's daughter,⁵ it seems simple to assume that Puduhepa is referred to as GAL, so DUMU.MUNUS GAL = 'daughter of the great', but it is not as simple as that. First of all one would rather expect ŠA GAL in that case, but moreover it should be common use and therefore common knowledge that simply GAL was meant to be Puduhepa. This point will be elaborated on later.

Below we shall deal with a number of problems without being able to say whether a final solution can be given to all points. For: each text in which DUMU.MUNUS GAL

* Lecture held at the Congress of Hittitologists, Çorum, September 2002.

¹ J. de Roos, JEOL 29 1985-'86 (published in 1987), 74-83.

² Erroneously read by G. Torri, Lelwani 1999, pp. 41 and 42 in KBo 4.6.

³ Bullae 2.2.A and 2.2.B have been published by H.G. Güterbock in: M.N. van Loon (ed.), Korucutepe 3 1980, 127 ff, following on an earlier preliminary publication in JNES 32 1973, 135 ff.

⁴ See a.o. Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate 'The Hittite Dynastic Marriages of the Period between ca. 1258 and 1244 BC' in AoF 23 1996, 40-75: 52 with note 25.

⁵ Thus J. de Roos o.c. 81 f. Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate just leaves open the possibility that she is Puduhepa's sister, o.c. 48: "... Kilusheba(t) of Išuwa about whom it is fairly likely that she was in fact a daughter of Puduhepa(t)" and on p. 52: "Concerning Kilusheba(t) of Išuwa my treatment implies that I consider her to have been the daughter, rather than the sister of Puduheba(t)..."

is found, in all three as already said, has its own peculiarities and uncertainties. The scholars who have published in detail on the title are successively: I. Singer, Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate and indirectly O. Carruba as well, in 1991⁶, in 1996⁷ and 2001⁸ respectively.

Singer has a preference for a meaning such as ‘Great Princess’ (= daughter of a Great King) for DUMU.MUNUS GAL, on the basis of a comparison with titles such as LUGAL GAL ‘Great King’ and MUNUS.LUGAL GAL ‘Great Queen’.

Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate⁹ rejects this idea, “since DUMU.MUNUS GAL lacks the clear connection with ‘Great Kingship’ of the other two expressions”, and “because there exists no male replica DUMU.NITA GAL meaning Prince of a Royal Family with Great Kingship Status”. Instead the author prefers to represent GAL in this expression by: ‘of first rank’ (*hantezzi*)¹⁰. In connection with this the author states that the description concerns the daughters of the married couple Ḫattušiliš III and Puduḫepa, Gaššuliyawiya and Kiluḫepa. But based on KBo 18.1 the Babylonian spouse of Tuḫaliyaš IV as well, so that both native and foreign ‘daughters’ might be meant by these words. The same foreign female might appear as DUMU.MUNUS GAL in KUB 22.70 and have played a part that has caused problems within the palace.

According to Houwink ten Cate she is the same daughter-in-law of Puduḫepa who is referred to in KBo 18.1 as DUMU.MUNUS GAL, when Tuḫaliyaš had already ascended the throne.¹¹ Tuḫaliyaš’ wife is said to have been totally excluded from the official correspondence by Puduḫepa, as appears from the historical texts available and Puduḫepa is even said to have seen to it that there would not be any seal-impressions. Her name is not mentioned anywhere and she is said to be referred to by the description ‘the daughter (or the girl) of Babylonia’ in the oracle text KUB 6.5 27’, 29’ and 33’ and in the letter KUB 57.123 Obv. 12 f. If this is true, this would definitely exclude the explanation of GAL pointing at Puduḫepa, because daughter of Puduḫepa now also should refer to the daughter-in-law.

In order not to get off the track I will just give you the viewpoints of Singer and Houwink ten Cate.¹² In Singer’s view the Hittites gave the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL to ‘daughters of Great Kings of Ḫatti or of other great powers’. Hittite Great Princesses were married to the kings of Egypt and Babylonia, Išuwa, Amurru and Šeḫa River Land’. By adding the latter country, Singer also has the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL applying to a sister of Ḫattušiliš III, Matanazi. Houwink ten Cate interprets GAL by Hittite *hantezzi* ‘daughter born from the principal wife’.

⁶ The title ‘Great Princess’ in the Hittite Empire, UF 23 1991, 327-337.

⁷ ‘The Hittite Dynastic Marriages of the Period between ca. 1258 and 1244 BC’, AoF 23 1996, 40-75.

⁸ ‘Tawananna II. De magnae filiae regis cognominis significatione atque usu’ in: Studi Sul Vicino Oriente Antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni. Vol. I 2000 [2001], 71-83.

⁹ O.c. 48.

¹⁰ O.c. 51 f.

¹¹ O.c. 65.

¹² I. Singer, o.c. 335.

Because even after these considerations many questions still remain unanswered, I want to go back once more to the Hittite cuneiform texts in which DUMU.MUNUS GAL occurs. As already said, there are three of them.¹³

1) KBo. 4.6

By now this has become one of the most cited Hittite texts, subject of a discussion on dating since 1925.¹⁴ By many it has now been accepted that it concerns a prayer (or prayers) of Puduḫepa on behalf of her daughter Gaššuliyawiya or of her daughters Gaššuliyawiya and Kilušḫepa¹⁵. Although not fully decisive for ascribing the circumlocution DUMU.MUNUS GAL to Kilušḫepa, because she occurs as such on the aforementioned bullae from Korucutepe, I should like to return once more to the idea of separating the texts into two different prayers, as published in the aforementioned JEOL article. The fact is, for the cuneiform texts this would be one of the few passages in which Kilušḫepa is referred to as such with some certainty. Fortunately O. Carruba¹⁶ has recently fully supported the suggestion to separate the prayers, although this causes him to draw another conclusion: for him the two prayers on a *Sammeltafel* are for two Gaššuliyawiya's; one on behalf of the wife of Muṣiliš II and the other one for one of the daughters of Ḫattušiliš III and Puduḫepa, although it does not have to be from Puduḫepa at all, but it is not impossible. The arguments against separation, if described at all, have not changed my mind for that matter and certainly Carruba's suggestion implies the problem that there should be at least a period of half a century between the two prayers. Although the two prayers concern two different persons, they would be on one tablet because of the similarity of the names and the subject of illness.

I. Singer¹⁷ states that in KBo 4.6 the name Gaššuliyawiya and the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL are used interchangeably and rejects a separation. "The formal differences between the two parts of the prayer do not support the separation and they can be explained differently." The difference between *uppešta* and *uppahḫun* is about the person who directs the two substitutes – in the first case Gaššuliyawiya and in the second case the author of the prayer – Puduḫepa.¹⁸ According to Singer it is about two offences committed by Gaššuliyawiya which must be redeemed. The first one is said to have been recorded in the missing beginning of the Obverse.

Houwink ten Cate agrees with Singer that the two daughters of Ḫattušiliš and Puduḫepa, Kilušḫepa and Gaššuliyawiya had the title of DUMU.MUNUS GAL. He

¹³ KBo. 4.6, KBo 18.1 and KUB 22.70.

¹⁴ J. Friedrich, AO 25, 1925, 19-20.

¹⁵ Thus J. de Roos, JEOL 29 1985-86 [1987], 77 ff.

¹⁶ In the article mentioned in note 8. p. 76 f.

¹⁷ O.c. 329.

¹⁸ Subject of this *uppešta* might be MUNUS Tawanna from fragment 335/e, as published in IF 89 1984, 298-301 by H. Otten. Will there still be a special reason why this name or circumlocution has been combined with DUMU.MUNUS GAL?

implicitly rejects the idea of prayers for two different persons, because Kilušhepa is already referred to as such on the basis of the bullae.

G. Torri¹⁹ does recognize that the prayer consists of two parts: one directed to an unknown deity on behalf of a princess, without a name being mentioned and the other one directed to Lelwani on behalf of Gaššuliyawiya. Torri does think it possible that it ultimately concerns prayers which are directed to different deities, but on behalf of the same person. To me it seems indeed a small step to assume it concerns two prayers on behalf of two different persons.

I think it most unlikely that in case of two prayers directed to different deities (?) on behalf of two different offences committed by one and the same person, her name should be mentioned in one case, and in the other case a title which might as well apply to many other persons. Why would Puduhepa have done so? This could only be the case if the same person was first DUMU.MUNUS GAL and thereafter no longer – or the other way around – similar to modern ‘fiancée of...’, which is bound to change to ‘wife of...’.

2) KBo 18.1

As far as interpretation is concerned this letter remains a problem, because assuming that Tuthaliyaš as reigning monarch sent this letter to his mother Puduhepa, Lupakki announces in the second part that all is well with the King and with the DUMU.MUNUS GAL, whereas we do not have any idea who is meant by this. The text has been found on Büyükkale, so in view of this location it is likely that Puduhepa was at Hattuša and that Lupakki together with Tuthaliyaš was visiting DUMU.MUNUS GAL or that the latter woman accompanied Lupakki and Tuthaliyaš on a trip. The date of the letter is unknown, but it is certainly after Tuthaliyaš’ accession to the throne. The identification of DUMU.MUNUS GAL with the Babylonian spouse of Tuthaliyaš, as Singer suggests²⁰, is only based on the fact that “by her descent, the Babylonian princess was no doubt entitled to the title DUMU.MUNUS GAL, Great Princess, i.e. the daughter of a Great King”. That is the reason why she would have been referred to as such in KBo 18.1 as well as in KUB 22.70. But why could KBo 18.1 not have been sent from e.g. Išuwa, where Tuthaliyaš was visiting his sister DUMU.MUNUS GAL (= Kilušhepa?), perhaps before his marriage?²¹ And why is Tuthaliyaš’ spouse referred to as ‘the daughter of the country of Babylonia’ or as ‘the girl of Babylonia’ in other Hittite texts?²²

¹⁹ Lelwani 1999, 42.

²⁰ UF 23 1991, 332.

²¹ According to Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate Kilušhepa married between 1258 and 1244, and closer to 1258 than to 1244 (o.c. 52 f.). Tuthaliyaš is said to have married a Babylonian princess before 1245 (o.c. 58).

²² KUB 6.5 and KUB 57.123 a.o. See Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate (o.c. 64): “After Tuthaliya’s spouse has arrived in Hattuša she might still be referred to by a circumlocution based on her country of origin” etc.

3) KUB 22.70

So much has already been written about this interesting oracle text, that I can add little new information. Because DUMU.MUNUS GAL does things in this text which are aimed against queen Puduḥepa, at least have an adverse effect on the palace, A. Unal, Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate and others think that this DUMU.MUNUS GAL refers to the Babylonian spouse of Tuthaliyaš IV. Houwink ten Cate even thinks that this text is “the main source for Tuthaliyaš’ spouse”.²³ As already said she is referred to in a different way in the few other texts where she might be alluded to. With the exception of KBo 18.1, where she also might be referred to like this, there are no further data about how and why of this difference. Yet I also think it rather unlikely that DUMU.MUNUS GAL refers to one of the daughters of Ḫattušiliš and Puduḥepa, in view of her behaviour; but neither is it absolutely impossible.

As far as the indication DUMU.MUNUS GAL is concerned, the following questions remain unanswered:

1. If DUMU.MUNUS GAL is applicable to many various persons, how does it happen that the expression only occurs in three Hittite texts? And how do we know to whom it refers?
2. Why is one and the same person sometimes referred to as DUMU.MUNUS GAL and why sometimes referred to by means of the proper name? This also applies to Kiluḥhepa who, for instance in KUB 40.80 ‘dies under her proper name’ without any further reference?
3. Why would the circumlocution be used in the first part and the proper name in the second part of one and the same text (according to many) KBo 4.6? Does this ever occur in case of other descriptions or titles?

Some new information was brought forward by J.D. Hawkins at the congress where the present contribution was held. In the Niṣantepe archive there is a bulla mentioning Ali-Šarruma as king of Išuwa, but without another name like Kiluḥhepa. Nevertheless, this clarifies KUB 40.80 where, as said, Kiluḥhepa dies as wife of Ali-Šarruma.

Three kings of Išuwa are now attested: Ari-Šarruma, Ali-Šarruma and Ehli-Šarruma. Ari-Šarruma is mentioned on the Korucutepe bulla together with Kiluḥhepa; after his death Kiluḥhepa married Ali-Šarruma and died during his reign. Ali-Šarruma could have been the younger brother of Ari-Šarruma and therefore it is not surprising that Kiluḥhepa became his wife.

Regrettably the above does not add to our understanding of DUMU.MUNUS GAL. Did Kiluḥhepa perhaps lose this title with the death of Ari-Šarruma? I can only conclude that a good explanation for the circumlocution DUMU.MUNUS GAL has not yet been found. Hopefully this will change when new text material will appear.

²³ O.c. 65 – but we do not even know whether it concerns Tuthaliyaš’ wife.