

Yukarıda incelediğimiz üç metine geri dönecek olursak, bunların dinsel içeriklerine ilişkin şu gözlem ve yorumları yapabiliriz: Hattice kompozisyonlara geri giden anlatımlarda birbirlerine paralel olmak üzere dört Hatti kökenli ve önemli kült merkezi ile bunların rahipleri (^{LÜ}SANGA, *paraḫu*, *šaḫmulup*) anılmaktadır. Şehirlerin adları büyük bir olasılıkla üç metinde de aynı sıraya göre Arinna, Hattuṣ(a), Zip(pa)lanta, Narak/Nerikka şeklinde verilmiştir ve bunlardan Hattuṣ ile Narak formları söz konusu yerlerin orjinal Hattice isimlerine geri gitmektedir. İdentik sıralamaların aslında bu şehirlerin kültürel önemini ve buna bağlı olarak rahiplerinin birbirlerine olan hiyerarşilerini yansıttığını düşünebiliriz. İlk sıradaki Arinna, Hatti panteonunda Güneş Tanrıçası Urunṣemu'nun vatanıdır. Baş tanrı Taru'nun eşi olan Urunṣemu, Zippalanta ve Nerik şehri Fırtına Tanrıları'nın anneleridir ki, bu nedenle şehri Arinna'nın üçüncü ve dördüncü sıradaki Zippalanta ile Nerik'den önce anılması akla yatkındır. İkinci sıradaki Hattuṣ(a)'nın Hitit öncesi devirlere ait Hatti kültüründeki pozisyonu şimdilik belli değildir. Ancak, M.Ö. 13. Yüzyıl'dan, yani III. Hattuṣili devrinden kaynaklanan KUB 21.19'deki Hititçe kontekste Hattuṣa'nın tanrıların toplantı yeri sıfatı ile bu sefer Arinna'nın hemen önüne geçtiğini görüyoruz. Söz konusu ilginç durumun, Hititler'in başkenti olmasından sonra Hattuṣa'nın gerek politik gerek se dinsel bakımdan kazandığı büyük değerin bir göstergesi olduğu kabulü herhalde yanlış olmayacaktır.

More about *Res Gestae* in Hittite Historiography

Piotr Taracha (Warsaw)

In previous studies of Hittite historiographic texts many important conclusions have been reached regarding their origins, literary composition and techniques, and intended audience. Included in this was also a general "view" of history writing held by the Hittites. There is no need here to summarize the results of those previous studies¹. The Hittites themselves labelled the texts in question as *pešnatar* "(kingly) manliness, manly deeds, exploits", thus considering them a uniform group in which the portrayal of the king and the commemoration of his deeds, wisdom, and achievements are of paramount importance.

In his recent publication of Old Hittite historiographic texts S. de Martino proposed their two-fold division into annals, where the time sequence is indicated by stereotyped phrases, "in that very same year", "in the following year", "in the second year", "in the third year", etc., and *Res Gestae* that also describe events in order of time, as a "chronicle" does but use different phrases and literary techniques to indicate it². The division corresponds to the classification of later Assyrian inscriptions composed to commemorate the deeds of the king as Annalistic Texts and Display Texts (*Prunkinschriften*). The latter do not necessarily describe military events; but if military enterprises are included they are not normally arranged in chronological order but, most commonly, they are grouped according to geography³. This small contribution, which I dedicate to Silvin Koşak as a token of my esteem and friendship, aims at demonstrating that the Hittite *Res Gestae* evolved as the historical consciousness of the Hittites and an idea of Hittite terri-

1 See now S. de Martino, *Annali e Res Gestae antico ittiti* ([StMed 12] Pavia 2003), 9-13 with ref.; cf. also H. Roszkowska-Mutschler, in FS Popko, 289-300; A. Gilan, in Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, September 2-8, 2002, ed. A. Süel (Ankara 2005), 359-369.

2 S. de Martino, *Annali*, 11-13; see also idem, in Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology, 225-230. Among the *Res Gestae* S. de Martino distinguished between compositions describing manly deeds of the king and the narratives mentioning military achievements of the king and his father and/or predecessors. This subdivision, however, is irrelevant to the topic of this paper.

3 Cf. A.K. Grayson, Or NS 49 (1980), 150-155; idem, in Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: New horizons in literary, ideological, and historical analysis. Papers of a Symposium held in Cetona (Siena), June 26-28, 1980, ed. F.M. Fales (Roma 1981), 37-38.

torial state developed in the early New Kingdom period between Tuthaliya I and Šuppiluliuma I. As we shall see, the narratives of military campaigns of that time, like the Assyrian Display Texts, are probably mostly organized according to geographical proximity.

Significantly, no annals from this period are known. Concerning the *Res Gestae* of Tuthaliya I (KUB 23.16 = CTH 211.6)⁴ and Arnuwanda I (KUB 23.21 = CTH 143)⁵, both describing military endeavours of the king made together with his father, it is impossible to prove anything conclusive about their organization, since both of these compositions are only preserved in fragments. Hence, we shall use the Deeds of Tuthaliya II (CTH 142) as our starting point and then seek to render plausible a similar structure and technique for the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (CTH 40) composed by his son Muršili II.

S. de Martino has pointed out that the best preserved fragment of the Deeds of Tuthaliya II, KUB 23.11 (NS)⁶ contains narration of military campaigns organized not in chronological order but rather according to geography⁷. In fact, the enemies against whom Tuthaliya fights – Arzuwa and Lukka, Aššuwa, the Gašgaeans, Išuwa and the Hurrians – are arranged here clockwise in a circle, starting from southwestern Anatolia. In my opinion, the organization of this text is neither due to the “embryonic” style of the early annals⁸ nor unique. The composition of the Deeds of Tuthaliya II differs from the annalistic texts in its structure, style and literary

technique. Moreover, it has much in common with other early New Kingdom historiographic texts, including the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma⁹.

The latter document is one of the historical compositions of Muršili II in which the historiographic literary technique reached its acme¹⁰. It may be considered the end-product of a careful editorial process of selection and arrangement of narrative material from a larger corpus of earlier written records, although the composition itself contains large gaps and it is not certain how one should order the fragments. As stressed by H.A. Hoffner, “without a complete connected text, and especially without a preserved beginning and end, one cannot properly analyze a literary composition as to its structure”¹¹. None the less, if we assume that the historiography of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma follows the tradition of the early New Kingdom *Res Gestae* where military campaigns are arranged according to geographical proximity, it is possible to conclude about the organization of this composition.

The sequence of events in Fragments 2-4, 6, and 8 that H.G. Güterbock attributed to the First Tablet cannot be established with certainty¹². Fragment 2 suggests that the descriptions of military campaigns of the “grandfather” Tuthaliya (III) are introduced here with references to the earlier history of Hittite relations with the respective land. These references go back as early as the Old Kingdom (concerning the land of Hajaša; Frgm. 2 I 2'-19')¹³ or the lifetime of Tuthaliya I and his father Kantuzzili (in an obscure context; Frgm. 2 I 20' ff.)¹⁴. Fragment 3 might also be taken as referring to campaigns of Kantuzzili (and Tuthaliya I ?)¹⁵ against Arziya¹⁶. Unfortunately, this is a small fragment without any satisfactory context. On the whole, the First Tablet can be considered a prologue or something of the kind, referring to the early military campaigns of the “grandfather” in a broader historical context. The existing fragments mention his campaigns against Hajaša (Frgm. 2),

4 Transcription and German translation of KUB 23.16 apud O. Carruba, SMEA 18 (1977), 162-163. For identification of the text as a fragment of the “annals” of Tuthaliya I, see J. Freu, in Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia: Pavia, 28 giugno – 2 luglio 1993, ed. O. Carruba/M. Giorgieri/C. Mora (Pavia 1995), 138; idem, Hethitica 13 (1996), 33; and now idem, in FS Lebrun (Louvain-la-Neuve 2004), vol. I, 287-288, and O. Carruba, AoF 32 (2005), 255-256.

5 Transcription and German translation of KUB 23.21 apud O. Carruba, SMEA 18, 166-171. On similarities between both compositions, see, e.g., J. Freu, in FS Lebrun, vol. I, 288.

6 O. Carruba, SMEA 18, 158-163. As the Middle Hittite script of a duplicate KUB 23.12 is comparable to that of other texts of Tuthaliya II (see now M. Popko, RO 58/2 (2005), 12 with n. 13) there can be no possible doubt about the date of this composition. In view of this evidence I could no longer maintain my earlier contention in WO 28 (1997), 74-84, according to which the military events described in CTH 142 belonged to the reign of Tuthaliya III, father of Šuppiluliuma. Cf. P. Taracha, in FS Haas, 420 n. 12. Accordingly, in my 1997 study I have stressed similarities in contents and organization between the *Res Gestae* of Tuthaliya and the fragments of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma that describe the military actions of the “grandfather” but now a better explanation of these similarities is found (see infra).

7 S. de Martino, L'Anatolia occidentale nel medio regno ittita, Eothen 5 (Firenze 1996), 18-22; cf. also idem, Annali, 10.

8 G. del Monte, L'annalistica ittita (Brescia 1993), 49-50. Cf. also H.A. Hoffner, Or NS 49 (1980), 294-295.

9 H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956), 41-68, 75-98, 107-130.

10 See, e.g., H.A. Hoffner, Or NS 49, 311-312, who briefs the results of H. Cancik's detailed analysis of the historiography of the Muršili II annals: H. Cancik, Mythische und historische Wahrheit (Stuttgart 1970); idem, Grundzüge der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung (Wiesbaden 1976).

11 H.A. Hoffner, Or NS 49, 312.

12 H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 59-62.

13 Cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 59 n. a).

14 A restoration *Ū* in line 20' seems preferable to both Güterbock's DUMU(?) and an alternative *ŠEŠ* (see, e.g., O. Soysal, BiOr 60 (2003), 48 with n. 30; J. Freu, in FS Lebrun, vol. I, 294-295) because it gives a better historical context.

15 However, Kantuzzili mentioned here in lines 5' and 11' may just as well be identical with the “priest” of Kizzuqatna, brother of Tuthaliya III.

16 For the location of Arziya on the Halys in the Upper Land, see a recent discussion apud O.R. Gurney, in FS Hoffner, 124-126.

the town of Šallapa in the Lower Land (Frgms. 4 and 6), as well as towards the southeast (Mount Nanni in Frgm. 8). Concerning the fights on Mount Nanni, Šuppiluliuma appears for the first time as their participant.

With the “Second” and “Third” Tablets (Frgms. 10-15)¹⁷ we are in a better position, “since the existing fragments can be brought into a sequence which may be regarded as essentially safe”¹⁸. They deal with campaigns of Šuppiluliuma himself, who is either dispatched by his aging father Tuthaliya, or goes with him on the campaign. At the time, Tuthaliya had several spells of ill health and recovered at least from two of them. A sequence of the campaigns appears clear¹⁹. Hajaša and Gašga wars occur passim in Fragments 10-14. They lasted for years, and each time Šuppiluliuma is dispatched by his father residing in Šamuha to fight the enemies attacking the Upper Land and the land of Hatti. Three campaigns, at least, were led by Tuthaliya in the periods of his recovery but Šuppiluliuma took part in all these activities. First, Tuthaliya fights against the lands of Maša and Kammala in the west²⁰ but has to come back facing an invasion of the land of Hatti by the Gašgaeans. Another campaign under the joint leadership of Tuthaliya and Šuppiluliuma was to the land of Hajaša (Frgm. 13). After some time, upon another campaign of Šuppiluliuma against the Gašgaeans, Tuthaliya once more becomes well and descends from the Upper Land to fight the Gašga tribes at the town of Zithara (Frgm. 14). All these campaigns against the Hajašaeans and Gašgaean troops are probably described in chronological order though without annalistic narration. First of all, however, they are grouped according to geographical proximity. I see in it the most important feature regarding the organization of the whole composition.

Consequently, we do not know what was a chronological relation between the Gašga wars and the military campaign(s) of Šuppiluliuma against Arzuaean tribes attacking the Lower Land during the lifetime of Tuthaliya (Frgms. 14 and 15). Tuḫanuḫa, a place very far from the territory of Arzua, is mentioned as a scene. Significantly, like in the First Tablet, the description of the struggles for the Lower Land follows here the report on the wars in northern and northeastern Anatolia.

Beginning with Fragment 16, the reconstruction of the text is hypothetical, except for the fragments that belong to the “Seventh” Tablet²¹. However, we can tentatively ascribe the existing fragments to the tablets of the original copy of the

17 H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 62-68, 75-77.

18 Cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 119.

19 See now T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford 1998), 162-163; H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches* (Leiden 1999), 132-133.

20 A brief description of this campaign in Fragment 13E I 7'-15' can be taken as an interpolation that does not disturb a sequence of the Hajaša and Gašga wars grouped here according to geography.

21 Cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 119.

Deeds, on the assumption that each of the tablets had the same arrangement of the events, starting with fights against the Gašgaeans and then describing wars against Arzua (only the third tablet), Mitanni and Egypt. A principle of dividing the events into particular tablets was probably based on chronology.

Fragments 28C and 34 show that the original copy must have had many lines per column, at least eighty. A copy the second tablet of which ends in Fragment 15 is certainly not identical with this. The second tablet of the original most likely ended somewhere between Fragment 15 and 17. Besides, the third tablet and the following seem to have described military campaigns of Šuppiluliuma after his accession, since the “grandfather” is nevermore mentioned. They may be reconstructed as follows:

- Tablet 3: Fragments 17 (Gašga), 18-21(?) (Arzua), 23-24 (Išḫupitta?, Armatana), 25-26 (Išuḫa and Mitanni);
- Tablet 4:²² Fragments 22 (Gašga?), 28 (=“Seventh” Tablet), 27, 29-32 (Gašga, Mitanni, Egypt);
- Tablet 5: Fragments 33-37 (Gašga, Mitanni, Egypt).

The end of Muršili's work about the deeds of his father is lost and the rest of the fragments cannot be placed with certainty²³.

Final remarks. It can be assumed that the arrangement of the enemies according to geography, as we see it in the Deeds of Tuthaliya II, was typical also for the other *Res Gestae* of the early New Kingdom period between Tuthaliya I and Šuppiluliuma I. It reflects both the political situation of that time and the historical and geographical consciousness of the Hittites. Although the situation partially changed after the new political settlement of the West under Muršili II and the conquests of Hattušili III who recaptured the northern territories from the Gašgaeans, it left a memorable impression on later generations. Referring to the crisis years in the reign of Tuthaliya III, Hattušili arranged the enemies attacking the Hittite territory in geographical order in a similar way as Muršili II did regarding the wars of his father Šuppiluliuma described in the third tablet of the Deeds: the Gašgaeans, Arzua, Araunna, Azzi, Išuḫa, Armatana (KBo 6.28 obv. 6-15)²⁴.

22 Cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 47.

23 Cf. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 49.

24 A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, 21ff. The coincidence of the arrangement of the enemies in this text that O. Carruba called “concentric invasion” with the sequence of wars in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma has been often discussed in previous publications, cf. A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna*, 25; H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 119; O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18, 142-143; S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *THeth* 8, 1977, 44-45 with n. 37.

In conclusion I wish to stress that our understanding of Hittite ideas about the past as well as our appreciation of the organization and literary characteristics of Hittite historiographic texts is still at a primitive level. I hope that my remarks will provide some clues and possibly some guidelines for future scholars interested in this subject.

Heth. *šuhmili*- und lyk. *humeli*-

Johann Tischler (Dresden)

Jean Catsanicos hat in einem umfangreichen Aufsatz¹ viel Mühe darauf verwendet, die Bedeutung von heth. *šuhmili*- als „bien fixé; wohlgeordnet, festgefügt, passend“ zu erweisen und dann anschließend dessen etymologische Verbindung mit ved. *sū-māya*- ‚schön verfertigt‘ zu versuchen. Die Ausführlichkeit seiner Darstellung war u.a. auch deswegen notwendig, weil *šuhmili*- früher meist als Substantivum mit der Bedeutung ‚Schilfrohr, Pfeil‘ gedeutet worden war². Catsanicos hätte seine umfangreichen Ausführungen etwas kürzen können, wenn ihm die Existenz einer etymologischen Entsprechung von *šuhmili*- in einer anderen idg.-anatol. Sprache bekannt gewesen wäre. Eine solche ist mit dem lyk. Adjektivum *humeli*- gegeben, das eine ähnliche Bedeutung wie sein heth. Gegenstück hat, also sowohl lautlich als auch bedeutungsmäßig besser als das von Catsanicos recht gewaltsam herangezogene ved. *sū-māya*- dazupaßt.

1) Heth. *šuhmili*- ist bereits in altheth. Originalen belegt, vgl. *šu-uh-mi-li-iš dankuiš daganzip[aš taknašš=a* ^dUTU-uš] (14) *uṣatten* ^dIM-naš EZEN₄-ni nu=za ez[ten] (15) *ekutten nu šēr kat[a] nepišza* ^dIM-aš LUGAL-i [aššu] (16) *huišṣuatar mijatar tarḫuili* ^{GIŠ}turi piški[ddu] (17) *katta(-)šarama taknaz šu-uh-mi-li-iš taganzipaš* (18) *taknašš=a* ^dUTU-us ANA LUGAL aššu *huišṣuatar tarḫuili* (19) ^{GIŠ}turi piškiddu ‚feste dunkle Erde [und Sonnengottheit der Erde], kommt herbei zum Fest des Wettergottes und eßt (und) trinkt! Und von oben, vom Himmel herab, soll der Wettergott dem König Leben, Gedeihen (und) eine siegreiche Lanze geben; von unten, aus der Erde herauf soll die starke Erde und die Sonnengottheit der Erde dem König Heil, Leben (und) eine siegreiche Lanze geben!‘ KUB 43.23 Rs. 13. 17 (OS)³. Im gleichen Text findet sich der Dat.-Lok.Sg. *šuhmili*, II NINDA.GUR₄.RA GUL I GAL GEŠTIN (57) I ŠAḪ.TUR ANA KI *šu-uh-mi-li* (58) *taknaš* ^dUTU-i (59)

1 À propos des adjectifs hitt. *šu-hmili*- et véd. *sū-māya*-: quelques remarques sur le traitement du groupe °V-H_xC° à la jointure des composés, in: BSL 81 (1986), S. 121-180.

2 So zuerst Laroche, OLZ 1962, 30f. und Kronasser EHS, 1962, 213 (Entsprechung von GI ‚Rohr, Pfeil‘); dann auch Friedrich, HW Erg. 3, 1966, 29 (‚Rohr‘); Oettinger, Stammbildung, 1979, 155 (‚Pfeil‘); Puhvel, HED 1-2, 403 (‚Pfeil‘). – Daß es sich um ein Adjektivum handelt, hat dann zuerst Archi, FS Meriggi², 1979, 33 gesehen (‚fest (Erde)‘).

3 Haas, FS Otten², 1988, 134f.