

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ULMI-TEŠUB TREATY

Oliver Gurney†, Abingdon

The authorship of the Ulmi-Tešub Treaty, CTH 106 (henceforward UT) is still, according to Th. van den Hout, the editor of the text,¹ and both the recently published Hittite histories,² a matter of controversy. In other words it is still in doubt whether Ulmi-Tešub was the successor of Kurunta as king of Tarḫuntašša, or was the same person, who then adopted a new name on assuming the throne. In the present note I should like to correct an error in my own contribution to this discussion and to add some further considerations in favour of the attribution of the treaty to Ḫattušili.

In AnSt 43, 14 I cited the just quoted sentence of the Bronze Tablet (BT) I 35-38 and BT § 11 as disproving van den Hout's contention that the UT (KBo. IV 10+) obv. 16'-37' had been produced by copying out Ḫattušili's second treaty without changing anything. This of course was an error. I was thinking of this proposal as a general principle in the renewal of treaties; but it was not intended to apply at all to the production of the Bronze Tablet, only to the production of a treaty with Kurunta's hypothetical successor. It would have been better to quote UT obv. 27, where the text would be tacitly ignoring the change made by Tudhaliya in the boundary as if the BT did not exist. Such a procedure might perhaps be credible if the BT had been annulled and deliberately consigned to oblivion, as maintained from the first by the excavator, P. Neve in AA 1987, 408;³ but only if this had occurred immediately after its production. Once the new treaty had been effectively sworn and promulgated it could not have been ignored in this way.

Apart from this error, I believe that the other arguments in my article are sound, and a reconsideration of the prosopography supports them. Most of them have been independently advanced by Sürenhagen

¹ Theo van der Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*. (Studien zu dem Boğazköy-Texten, Heft 38 (1995).)

² T.R. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford, 1998, and Horst Klengel, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Band XXIV, 1999).

³ See also M. Astour in M.W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar*. Leiden Bethesda, 1996, 51, and H. Klengel, op. cit., 290, n. 618. However, J. Börker-Klähn, *AoF* 21 (1994), 154-5, maintains that a treaty inscribed on metal could not be annulled at all by removing the seals and burial or by any method short of melting down.

in OLZ 87 (1992), 351-2 in his review of Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy* (1988). There is no need to concede that the UT could, as a first draft, have been altered later. It is only a draft in the sense that it was the text due to be engraved on an "iron tablet". When the necessary insertions had been made, especially § 6, it was ready for inscribing on metal. If it was not, as it stands, suitable for promulgation as a new treaty with Kurunta's successor, the only alternative is that Ulmi-Tešub and Kurunta are one and the same person. This possibility was not considered seriously by Professor Imparati in her otherwise meticulous treatment of the question in *Eothen* 4 (1991), 23-68 (unknown to me at the time of writing).

Van den Hout in his excellent edition of the text⁴ has enlarged on his reasons for believing this to be a treaty with Kurunta's successor, and though he has in a postscript taken note of our views, he has expressed the opinion that the evidence is at present insufficient to decide the issue. He has not, however, refuted our criticisms in detail. His emphasis is on the prosopography, a matter on which Sørenhagen has little to say and my own documentation was defective. A few remarks on this subject will perhaps therefore not be amiss, especially in a volume in honour of Fiorella Imparati, who has taken a special interest in this aspect of the matter in the past, and whose acquaintance I was happy to make in early days at Oxford.

The first point raised by van den Hout on pp. 13-15 is the very same one discussed by me (p. 25) and due to the prompting of R.H. Beal, namely the relative position of the military officers, but reaching the opposite conclusion. This is because he has assumed that at the beginning of KUB XXXI 32 rev.⁶ the same missing title of Tattamaru [GAL ^{LUMES}UKU.UŠ GÜB] had stood as in the BT. Since in the UT this title was held by LUGAL-^dLAMMA, Tattamaru must then have retired from this command, the UT must be later than the BT and he adopts the sequence shown in my second table on p. 25. I have claimed that this table is ruled out by the consequent necessity to ascribe KUB XLVIII 119 to Tudhaliya and have therefore assumed a different title for Tattamaru in the lacuna of KUB XXXI 32. This point is crucial and could lead to a final decision if a duplicate of XXXI 32 were ever to be found supplying this missing title. Meanwhile however we have to be content with a proper assessment of XLVIII 119. Van den Hout pp. 13-14 assigns this fragment to Tudhaliya on the ground that it records the

division of the army into left and right. He then quotes it as his (only) instance of a vow by the queen on behalf of Tudhaliya (p. 90 n. 109). I would rather ascribe it without question to Hattušili on the ground that the plea for the cure of His Majesty's illness of the right eye and the vow in obv. 14 are made by the queen to the Storm-god of Nerik. Cf. Klengel in KUB LVI, foreword on no. 13. In the absence of any other texts recording such a prayer by Puduhepa for the health of her son - even if she lived to the age of 90, as now maintained - the improbability of this attribution of XLVIII 119 is obvious.

If, as it seems from the wording, the army had not been so divided before, then we must accept my third table in which Šahurunuwa has relinquished one of his offices. Here also the Ulmi-Tešub Treaty precedes the BT.

The second argument advanced by van den Hout is based on the apparent omission of a reference to the kingship of Tarhuntaša in UT obv. 11 (here in the form EN-UT-TA occurring at the end of the passage in I 14, where the corresponding passage III 12 in the BT has LUGAL-UT-TA, cf. his pp. 52-53). This certainly looks like a copying error, but though the UT is a copy, its original was not the BT but either Hattušili's first treaty or (if van den Hout is right) his second treaty, both of which (*mutatis mutandis*) would be lost. The BT was in any case a new composition and its position in the series is not affected.

The further argument based on Ulmi-Tešub's marital status (pp. 16-17) has, I think been fully answered by my parallel with the Duppi-Tešub Treaty.

The prosopography is now augmented by van den Hout's much fuller documentation. Where I had preferred not to assume that wherever a witness is merely entitled DUMU.LUGAL he held no office, van den Hout is more ready to make this assumption. Accordingly, the fact that Huzziya, who is GAL MEŠEDI in the BT but merely DUMU.LUGAL in the UT gains significance. Van den Hout assumes without question that he had relinquished the post and explains this by the suggestion that he had been replaced on the birth of a natural heir, Arnuwanda. This is pure hypothesis. The GAL MEŠEDI was an active military officer: the title would hardly be given to an infant. It seems to me more likely that KBo IV 10 was the earlier document and Huzziya had been promoted.

The oracle texts KUB V 20 and LII 41 and the vow XLVIII 123 refer to anxiety for the royal family caused by bad dreams experienced by the royal children. The texts name Huzziya, Kurakura, Tašmi-Šarruma,

⁴ Van den Hout, op. cit., 11-19

Hešni and Gaššuliyawiya in this connection.⁵ Other sons of Hattušili appear to be Hannutti, Hešmi-Šarruma, and LUGAL-^dLAMMA, and his daughter Kilushepa was married to Ari-Šarruma the king of Isuwa. All these belong to the generation of Tudhaliya (StBoT 38, 80) and would be in place as witnesses to the BT and CTH 225 or a later document. As children they would not have been available till near the end of Hattušili's reign, but it is possible that Huzziya, Hesni, Hannutti, LUGAL-^dLAMMA and Tasmi-Šarruma, all of whom appear in the UT, might have been old enough to be included at that time. We can never be sure.

More helpful are the cases where we know of filiations. The first known king of Isuwa was Ari-Šarruma, who was succeeded by his son Iḫli-Šarruma (StBoT 38, 125 f.). The father is witness in the UT, the son, still as a prince, in the BT. It is possible that he had still not succeeded to his throne twenty years later (ibid., 19), but this is somewhat unlikely.

The scribe of the BT, Halwaziti, son of Lupakki, is to be distinguished from Halpaziti, son of Zuwanni, who was apparently a contemporary (ibid., 106 ff.). The latter was the father of GUR-Šarruma (KUB XII 15, X 96 and LI 12), but the former seems to have been this young scribe's tutor (LVII 110 - if that is the meaning of KAB.ZU.ZU. The father of Halwaziti, Lupakki, also a scribe, was not a witness, but his grandfather, Kammaliya, who was a scribe and chief cook, is attested in all three of our documents. This suggests that at the time of these documents Kammaliya had retired as scribe and was a man of some seniority, and this is likely to have occurred well before the beginning of Tudhaliya's reign, when the grandson, Halwaziti, was already an accomplished scribe. It happens that no text actually inscribed by Kammaliya is known.

The scribe Alihešni was married to the daughter of the landowner Šahurunuwa. This suggests that he was of the same generation as the Šahurunuwa family. He was the son of Šaušgaziti and was involved with him and Gilušhepa, the daughter of Hattušili, and with Naninzi, Ali-Šarruma and Lupakki (probably not the same as the father of Halwaziti) in the strange texts LIV 1 (Archi and Klengel, AOF 12) and XL 80 (StBoT 38, 182 ff.). Thus all these people are approximate contemporaries, but they do not help to establish the date of Ulmi-Tešub.

It is somewhat better with Naninzi. A man of this name was one of the sons of the venerable Mitannamuwa, who was honoured by Muršili II, appointed governor of Hattuša by Muwatalli, and became adviser, healer and chief scribe to Hattušili III.⁶ This Mitannamuwa, if we adopt the approximate dates given by T.R. Bryce in his recent book,⁷ must have been about 40 years old when he was honoured by King Muršili c. 1300 B.C. Since he lived to give advice to Hattušili in his dispute with Urḫi-Tešub (KBo IV 12 obv. 25), he cannot have died before c. 1268 B.C. He would then have been 72 years of age, and his sons would have been born between 1320 and 1315. Walwaziti, his second son according to KBo IV 12, became chief scribe in turn and lived to witness both the UT and the BT, the latter c. 1237 or 1236. If he was born c. 1318 he would by then have been 81 or 82. We can hardly stretch these figures another 20 years. Naninzi, who is given as Mitannamuwa's fourth son, might have been born a few years after 1315, but by the accession of Tudhaliya he would then have been about 72. It is difficult to credit a man of this age with the multifarious activities during Tudhaliya's reign outlined for him in StBoT 38, 180. This must surely have been another man. Similarly the Alihešni mentioned above can hardly have been the (eldest?) son of Mitannamuwa, who is said to have been a priest.

The Mahḫuzzi who was GAL *MUBARRI* in the Ulmi-Tešub Treaty, was chief scribe both in the Šahurunuwa document and in the colophon of the damaged Middle Hittite text XIII 7, the recopying of which he supervised. This, like the case of Huzziya, looks like a promotion and would thus support the sequence which I have advocated. In the BT he is replaced by Naninzi and had evidently retired.

None of these arguments is conclusive, but they have a certain cumulative effect.

The strongest argument, however, rests, as before, on the adverb *kinun*. I have argued that when the author of the UT declares that "now" the king and the queen have made Kurunta king in Tarḫuntašša, this can only mean that the treaty has been made by Hattušili and Puduḫepa shortly after the appointment of Kurunta in Tarḫuntašša. This sentence is part of §7 which represents the incorporation on this tablet, in smaller script, of the "military treaty" ABoT 57 (*ŠA KARAŠ išhiulaš DUPPU*), with the added editorial note §6. It marks the altered circumstances since

⁵ Van den Hout, op. cit., 106, 109, 197.

⁶ See especially A. Unal, *Hattusili III*, Teil I (Texte der Hethiter 3) Heidelberg 1974, 60 f.

⁷ Bryce, op. cit., xiii.

the time of Muwatalli and the reason for the present change in the stipulations, which date from that time. That is why it is introduced by *kinun* "now" which properly belongs to the following sentence: he could not afford the levy and so the king and the queen have made this new treaty. By translating "then" and taking the verbs *iyat* and *hantiyait* into the *kuwapi* clause, van den Hout is saying that just when Muwatalli and the whole of Hattuša were caring for the gods of Tarhuntašša, their Majesties appointed Kurunta. This cannot be right: the two periods are cited in sharp contrast. He asserts baldly (p. 64) that this usage of *kinun* is common ("wie öfters") and he gives two alleged examples, both of which were among the five chosen by me to illustrate the opposite. In both instances I maintain that he is wrong. Both describe two distinct moments: in Madd. rev. 62, *hantezzi paši* "on the first occasion", followed by *nušši pait kinun Mulliyaraš* "and now Mulliyara has gone": in KBo IV ii 9, first when Niqmaddu murdered his father and offered subjection and again (*kinunakan*, the time of this narrative) when Šuppiluliuma sent in his general Kurunta to ravage his land. The two moments are carefully distinguished and the second is introduced by *kinun*. The best examples are in the Laws. Where there has been a change, the old law is introduced by *karū* and the new by *kinun*; but in two instances (§§9 and 25) an additional sentence has been inserted to the effect that His Majesty has changed the penalty. This sentence is added after the *kinun*, showing that it is not mere narrative but serves to explain the change. It is the same with the UT, but the essential condition for this form of expression is that the circumstances have not changed again. Van den Hout cannot relinquish his preconception that Ulmi-Tešub was the successor to Kurunta. It is on his hypothesis that the name Kurunta should not have been left standing and the failure to change it in copying the old treaty is an error,⁸ as alleged by him on p. 12. If the UT was Hattušili's second treaty, no names were changed in copying. They were simply written at different times, between which the man had changed his name.

⁸ "An unaccountable lapse" (AnSt 33 [1983], 98 n. 10, quoted by Sörenhagen, OLZ 87 [1992], 354).

NOCH EINMAL ZUR DOPPELKONSONANZ IM LYKISCHEN

Roberto Gusmani, Udine

Eine der auffallendsten Eigentümlichkeiten der lykischen Graphemik ist die Verdoppelung von Konsonanten sowohl hinter einem anderen Konsonanten als auch (jedoch seltener) im Anlaut: vgl. Schreibungen wie *pddē*, *Arttuñpara*, *xxxāte*, *erbbe*, *tlidi*, *zzimaza*, *ppuwēti* usw. Im Vorwort zu seiner vorläufig noch unentbehrlichen Edition der bis zum Ende des 19. Jh.s bekannten lykischen Inschriften hatte E. Kalinka auf diese sonderbaren Schreibweisen aufmerksam gemacht, ohne sich allerdings auf eine mögliche Erklärung einzulassen.¹ Während P. Meriggi, H. Pedersen und E. Laroche dieser Erscheinung keine besondere Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt haben,² sind in letzter Zeit mehrere eingehende Behandlungen zu verzeichnen: Gemeint sind die Ausführungen von H. C. Melchert in seinem Werk *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA 1994), S. 295 f., mein Kurzvortrag *Graphemisch-phonematische Bemerkungen zum Lykischen* im Rahmen des Pedersen-Kolloquiums vom Jahre 1993,³ der Beitrag *Lycian Consonantal Orthography and some of its Consequences for Lycian Phonology* von Th. P. J. van den Hout für die Festschrift *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. by Th. P. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos (Istanbul 1995), S. 105 ff., sowie das

¹ Vgl. E. Kalinka, *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti* (Wien 1901), S. 4 f. Mit der lykischen Erscheinung wären nach P. Kretschmer («Glotta» 4, 1912, S. 315 f.) die eigenartigen Schreibungen *δκττῶ*, *ἐκ ττοῦτο* usw. in einer griechischen Inschrift aus Ephesos (die anscheinend die Verteilung der beiden Konsonanten auf verschiedene Silben unterstreichen sollten) in Verbindung zu bringen: Über die Feststellung des äußeren Parallelismus hinaus ist er aber nicht gegangen.

² Nur eine flüchtige Bemerkung findet man bei G. Neumann im Sammelband *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abt., 2. Band, Lief. 2, Leiden - Köln 1969), S. 372, während A. Heubeck (KZ 98, 1985, S. 36 ss.) nur auf die Doppelkonsonanz im Anlaut eingeht. Wegen des im Vordergrund stehenden Themas beschränkt sich I. Hajnal in seiner Studie *Der lykische Vokalismus* (Graz 1995) verständlicherweise auf einzelne Beobachtungen (s. vor allem S. 15 f.).

³ Vgl. in den betreffenden Akten (*In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, hgg. von J. E. Rasmussen [Wiesbaden 1994]), S. 125 ff.