

# VOWS CONCERNING MILITARY CAMPAIGNS OF HATTUŠILIŠ III AND TUTHALIAŠ IV

Johan de Roos, Leiden

The publication of the fragments of vows 2189/c and 220/e by H. Otten and C. Rüster in KBo 41, as numbers 59 and 60 respectively, gives me an excellent opportunity to honour the memory of our late friend and colleague Prof. Fiorella Imparati. Throughout her long career she made a great contribution to Hittitology, notably in the area of history and religion, and it is most appropriate that we should choose the above subject to commemorate her death in the spring of 2000.

Tablet 220/e was found on Büyükkale in the Mittlere Burghof in s/10 in "Schutt über Hethitischen Niveau".

Because Prof. Otten<sup>1</sup> says in the *Inhaltsübersicht*, p. IV, of KBo 41 that as regards the ductus and size of the writing, the fragment is similar to KBo 9.96, the latter text will be included in the discussion.

Although R. Lebrun published a transliteration and translation of 220/e<sup>2</sup> in 1976, it seemed a good idea to provide a transliteration with translation here, as the latter work deviates from in a number of respects.

## A. KBo 41.60 (= 220/e)

Obv. i?

1' [ ] x [ ]  
2' [ ] 'ú'-iz-zi<sup>3</sup> UTU-ŠI<sup>3</sup>  
3' [ ] x 'kán'-kán

4' [ ] kiš-an [ ] K-RU-UB ma-a-an-ua GAL ME-ŠE-DI  
5' [ ] -'ua-ra'-aš ma-a-an-'ua'-kán A-NA IZI<sup>4</sup> ku-it  
6' [ ] -a]t tu-uk A-NA<sup>3</sup> IŠTAR<sup>3</sup> Ša-mu-ḫa  
7' [ ] na-a-ūi<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Written communication from Prof. Otten, to whom I am most grateful for other information pertaining to unpublished vow fragments.

<sup>2</sup> Samuha. *Foyer religieux de l'Empire hittite*, 1976, 213.

<sup>3</sup> There could have been more signs after the dividing line.

<sup>4</sup> One sign in rasura.

8'	[	]:pár-zi-ša <sup>5</sup> IK-RU-UB na-a-ui <sub>5</sub>
9'	[	a-pád-d]a še-ir kiš-an IK-RU-UB
10'	[	U]L a-ki e-eš-zi-ua-ra-aš
11'	[	]aš-šu-'la'-aš EZEN <sub>4</sub> DÙ-mi 'na-a'[-ui <sub>5</sub>

Obv. i?

1'	[	
2'	[	] comes, His Majesty
3'	[	is ] hung
4'	[	made the following] vow: "If the chief-of- guards
5'	[	]and he . . . , if for the fire something
6'	[	]t for thee, Ištar of Šamuḫa.
7'	[	] Not yet (given)
8'	[	]...? ... he/she promised . Not yet (given).
9'	[	] made because of this [ ] the following vow:
10'	[	]he shall not die (and) he shall stay (alive)
11'	[	] I shall celebrate the festival of salvation. Not yet (celebrated).

Of these vows, one of which is known to have been addressed to Ištar of Šamuḫa for a GAL MEŠEDI related to fire, there are three cases where the vow has not yet been carried out or fulfilled. The assumption that this type of vow, in which we see *nawī*, 'not yet (fulfilled)', and *karu*, 'already (fulfilled)', was sent by the temple to the palace, in some cases after ascertaining whether what had been promised had been realized or received, has to some extent been undermined by one unpublished vow found in Temple I where we also find the terms *nawī* and *karu*. And yet

<sup>5</sup> Not in CHD. (?) *parzašša* comparable? Or better ]x-pár-zi-ša instead of gloss sign?

these expressions do indicate some form of verification, although it may also have been carried out by the palace itself.

Following an examination of all the vow texts, it is clear that there are no duplicates within this genre. And yet it should be noted that throughout the entire corpus there is almost no possibility of joining fragments.<sup>6</sup> The search for such a possibility is, however, somewhat hampered by the fact that the tablets often contain vows made by different people, in different places, to different gods, for different reasons. The almost total absence of any indication of where the vows were found which have thus far been published in the KUB series likewise impedes the search for fragments which can be joined.

But even if *karu* and *nawī* may indicate that these vows were written at a later date than most of the others, it is important from a historical point of view to collect vows which are all of a military nature, although providing an exact date is extremely problematic. My point of departure remains the view that the making of vows only occurs from Ḫattušiliš III on, under the reign of King Muwatalliš II, and that the verb *mald-* in earlier texts always means 'to solemnly proclaim' or 'to proclaim publicly'.

#### B. KBo 9.96

In view of the limited space, I refer the reader to my *Gelofte Teksten*, 1984, II 286 ff. and III 424 ff., for transliteration and translation.

While on page 204 of his new standard work *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, H. Klengel characterizes the text as 'Gelübde des Muwatalli II', I would prefer to see it as a vow of Ḫattušiliš III, although the DUTU-ŠI is indeed Muwatalliš II.<sup>7</sup>

Ḫattušiliš took upon himself the conquest of Amurru, as can be deduced from his Apology.

As regards content, the fragment which is preserved in Munich and which was recently published by A. Ünal is to some extent comparable to this text.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> I have only been able to combine 543/u and 1309/u (transliterations in R. Lebrun, *op.cit.* 214).

<sup>7</sup> One of the arguments supporting this standpoint is the fact that, in my view, it is far more likely that GIN-ri is a 3rd person *ijattari* than the rare 1st person *ijahhari*. In the text, in which 1st person and 3rd person alternate, the 1st person is used by Ḫattušiliš, while the 3rd person refers to Muwatalliš.

<sup>8</sup> ZA 86, 1996, 238 ff.

It should, however, be noted that his additions, notably in the translation, suggest more than can actually be concluded from this highly fragmentary text. Moreover, there is no question of a vow, and there is no direct indication in the text that Hattušiliš is anxious to take upon himself the conquest of Amurru.

### C. KBo 9.96 and KBo 8.63

A greater kinship with KBo 9.96 is to be found in KBo 8.63, a vow text which also dates from the time of Muwatalliš II, although the vow was probably also made by Ḫattušiliš III. If the texts could indeed have been joined, then this would almost certainly have already been pointed out. Nevertheless, there are several interesting facts which I would like to point out.

1. The two texts were found in almost exactly the same place: u-12 and x-13 on Büyükkale.

2. With respect to the break, the lower part of KBo 8.63 fits the upper part of KBo 9.96 (with a slight gap).

3. As regards content and the use of words, there is a strong resemblance between the two texts: the Obverses deal on the one hand with the struggle against Egypt and Amurru and the rewards which Ištar is to receive when the campaign has been brought to a successful conclusion, and on the other hand with two matters about which we know nothing, which make mention of the construction of temples (?) and the gift of civilian prisoners if Ištar of Lawazantija is successful. On the Reverses we find in KBo 9.96 references to a son, and to a *patili* priest and a torchman, both of whom play a part in rituals surrounding childbirth, while in KBo 8.63 mention is made of a birth stool.

4. In both texts we find the expression <sup>D</sup>UTU-ŠI *ku-in me-mi-an ... I-DI*, which is quite rare, as well as words like *aššanu-*, *uēd-*, and *NAM.RAMEŠ*.

Both texts are among the oldest vow texts, dating from the period when Ḫattušiliš, as king of Ḫakpiš, took up arms for his brother, the reigning monarch King Muwatalliš, against Egypt and Amurru, and on his way home from Lawanzantija took Puduhepa with him. In spite of these resemblances, they must be considered separate texts.

D. KBo 41.59 (= 2189/c)

2189/c also comes from Büyükkale (g/14) as 'Mauerkasten Füllung', close to building f.<sup>9</sup>

Obv. i?

1'	[	-i]aʔ-ua-za-kán
2'	[	<sup>D</sup> K]u-pa-pa-aš <sup>10</sup>
5"	[	]-a
8"	[	G]U <sub>4</sub> ʔ am-
	aš-šī <sup>11</sup>	

Lines 3', 4', 6', 7': no writing left. Numbering uncertain.

Obv. ii?

1' [ ]x<sup>D</sup>[  
2' [ ]<sup>D</sup>UTU-Šx[  
3' [ ]A-NA DINGIR-L[IM  
4' [ -u]n [ ]  
5' [ pī]-ih-bi [ ]

6' [ ]x<sup>12</sup> A-NA D LUGAL-[ma  
7' [kiš-an] IK-RU-UB ma-ʾaʾ[-an  
8' [ ]x ar-ḫa SIG<sub>5</sub>-[in ú-iz-zi  
9' [nu] ʾAʾ-NA DINGIR-LIM 1 UD x<sup>13</sup>  
10' 1 GE<sub>6</sub> KÙ.BABBAR 1 GE<sub>6</sub> GUŠKIN [  
11' DINGIR-LUM-ja-za ma-la-[a-ši  
12' nu-ud-du-za BAL<sup>14</sup>-an-za-[ki-mi]<sup>15</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See note 1.

<sup>10</sup> A supplementation to form the name of this goddess would seem grounded in view of her occurring in Hittite texts in this writing. (Cf. too V. Haas, RHA 36, 1978, 67ff.)

<sup>11</sup> It would seem more likely that the scribe forgot *-ba-* than that he wrote a deliberately shortened form: *am-ši* or *am* would then have sufficed. But HW<sup>2</sup>, 66b gives another example in KBo 8.57 Obv. 4, Rev. 10: *am-aš-ši-in*. Reading GU<sub>4</sub> uncertain because before *am-aš-ši* (in intercolumnium) there is one verticle wedge visible.

<sup>12</sup> A vertical stroke which cannot represent  $\Delta N$ , 1 or  $^m$ .

<sup>13</sup> No KÙ.BABBAR or GUŠKIN possible.

13' ma-a-an-na-mu <sup>D</sup>LUGAL-m[a  
 14' <sup>D</sup>UTU-Š/ki-e-iz [  
 15' nu ku-it ku-i[t  
 16' nu-za A-NA 'DINGIR'-[LIM  
 17' šap-pu-  
 18' nu-ud-[du-za  
 19' x[

Obv. i?

1' [  
 2' [ Ku]baba  
 5" [  
 8" [ ] an ox? *ambašši*

Obv. ii?

1' [  
 2' [ ] His Majesty [  
 3' [ ] to the godhea[d  
 4' [  
 5' [ ]shall I [give]  
 6' [ ]to Šarru[ma  
 7' [ ] made [the following] vow: "I[f  
 8' [ ] safely re[turns  
 9' [then I shall] for the god 1 day [  
 10' 1 silver night (and) 1 golden night [  
 11' and [thou], o god, [shall] appro[ve (them)  
 12' then for thee [I] shall mak[e] offers [  
 14 BAL is written with a relatively old sign.  
 15 Other forms are also possible.

13' And if thou, Šarruma, for me[  
 14' His Majesty from here [  
 15' and anything whatsoever [  
 16' then shall [I] to the g[od  
 17' no translation possible  
 18' and (for) y[ou  
 19'

These, too, are vows, one of which was directed to the god Šarruma for the safe return from a campaign (Obv. ii? 6'-12'). Lines 13' ff. are the continuation, with a second request directed to Šarruma on behalf of the king.

The promised gifts - 1 day [ ], 1 silver night and 1 gold night - may refer to taking an active part in the campaign. I find V. Haas' reading and interpretation of 11' "*ku-la-fmu-ur-ši-ja* = für den *kulamurši*- Ritus, welcher stets des Nachts stattfindet, ..... dargebracht"<sup>16</sup> highly unlikely.

To begin with, the first sign looks more like *ma* than *ku*,<sup>17</sup> while the preceding DINGIR-LUM-*ja-za* fits in better when combined with a following verbal form, which requires *-za*, than when read as "for the god".

For nowhere else in the vow texts do we find an explanation of why a god or goddess is given the gift. Moreover, while the nights fit in well with the rite, one or more days are also promised. Because we are dealing with a vow to Šarruma, a dating to Tuthaliaš IV is more likely than to Hattušiliš III.

The fact that vows were often made before a campaign is quite understandable: it would be impossible to defeat the enemy and return home safely without the support of one or more gods. And for that purpose the personal god as a guard is the most obvious candidate. But, as noted earlier in connection with KBo 33.216,<sup>18</sup> there are many different gods to whom a vow can be made before a military campaign. It is likely that there is often a relationship between the region on which the campaign is centred and the gods who are invoked. Thus Hurrian gods are likely to be of greater support when the campaign is directed towards a Hurrian area. At the same time, this may present a distorted

<sup>16</sup> Review of KBo 41 in OLZ 95, 2000, 42, ad no. 59.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *ma* in 7' and 13' and *ku* 2 x in 15'.

<sup>18</sup> In JAC 4, 1989, 39 ff.

picture, since in general the Hurrian gods were gaining in popularity at the time of Ḫattušiliš III and Tuthališ IV.

The following can now be added to the 'military' vows mentioned in JAC 4, 40 f.:

KUB 56.15 Obv. ii 15-24 and 25-29	:to prevent the escape of Pijamaraduš
KUB 56.25 Rev. iv 8'	:for an unknown campaign
KUB 56.27 3'-11'	:for a campaign to the land of Arzawa
KUB 56.28 Rev. 5'-12'	:for the handing over of the lands of the enemy to Tuthališ
KUB 56.28 Rev. 13'-15'	:idem
KUB 56.28 Rev. 16'-20'	:to capture the enemy in a net
KUB 56.30 Rev. 14'-19'	:for one of Tuthališ' campaigns
KUB 56.31 Obv. 3'-7'	:for a campaign.

It is interesting that in KUB 56.12 6' a silver shield is promised to the goddess Lelwani, not for protection during a campaign, but rather for protection from illness.

Although it is often difficult to establish the purpose for which a particular vow was made, because so many of them have been damaged, in general we can say that the vows focusing on the health or welfare of the king, the queen or the future king are much more numerous than those with a military aspect.

Moreover, within the group consisting of campaign vows, it is often difficult to ascertain the particular campaign concerned. Such clearly dated vows as KBo 33.216 are unfortunately quite rare.

## NOTE SULLE TRANSAZIONI DELLA FAMIGLIA DI Anu-uballiṭ f. Anu-aḫḫē-iddin d. Sîn-leqe-unnēni

Giuseppe Del Monte, Pisa

La scomparsa di Fiorella Imparati ha lasciato non solo un vuoto scientifico nell'ittitologia, alla quale ella ha dedicato tutta la sua vita, ma anche un grande rimpianto in chi l'ha personalmente conosciuta e ne ha apprezzato le doti umane e i multiformi interessi personali che andavano ben al di là del campo di sua specializzazione. Volentieri negli ultimi anni della sua vita discuteva con me di problemi della Babilonia di età tarda, ai quali nel frattempo mi ero dedicato, ed è per ricordare questo aspetto forse meno noto della sua personalità che mi piace ricordare Fiorella Imparati non con un contributo ittologico, ma con queste problematiche note su una famiglia di Uruk di epoca seleucide, il cui stesso albero genealogico è disseminato di incertezze.

Il clan dei Sîn-leqe-unnēni di Uruk è famoso, oltre che per il suo celebre capostipite "autore" dell'Epopèa di Gilgameš, per annoverare fra i suoi membri un gran numero di scribi, intellettuali e sacerdoti, soprattutto *kalû*, "lamentatori", già a partire dall'età neo-babilonese. Ridotta è invece la documentazione relativa ai loro interessi economici. In età seleucide questa si concentra soprattutto attorno ad una famiglia che dai due personaggi per primi indirettamente attestati chiamerò "famiglia di Anu-uballiṭ figlio di Anu-aḫḫē-iddin", dei quali il secondo deve essere vissuto durante il regno di Seleuco I, e il primo in età macedone; e probabilmente non a caso gli interessi rappresentati sono relativi soprattutto a prebende templari.

Il caso del ritrovamento ci ha lasciato due gruppi di contratti distribuiti nel tempo e connessi strettamente fra di loro al loro interno. Un primo gruppo, del quale ci siamo occupati ampiamente altrove,<sup>1</sup> ruota attorno ad una mancata vendita immobiliare: il 10.VII.33 ES Anu-aḫḫē-iddin figlio di Anu-uballiṭ discendente di Sîn-leqe-unnēni stende un compromesso (VS XV 23) per la vendita della sua parte, un terzo, di un edificio con annesse due aree non costruite, sito nel quartiere del Tempio

<sup>1</sup> G.F. del Monte, "Il quartiere del Tempio di Adad ad Uruk in età seleucide, Parte I - Il I secolo ES", in: H. Waetzoldt (ed.), *Fs. Giovanni Pettinato* (in stampa), §§ 1-2; ivi traslitterazione e traduzione dei due documenti qui brevemente citati.