

---

The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered

Author(s): Hans G. Guterbock

Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Apr., 1967), pp. 73-81

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/543703>

Accessed: 07/05/2010 07:03

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Journal of Near Eastern Studies.*

JOURNAL OF  
Near Eastern Studies

APRIL 1967 • VOLUME 26 • NUMBER 2

EIGHTY-FOURTH YEAR

THE HITTITE CONQUEST OF CYPRUS RECONSIDERED

---

HANS G. GÜTERBOCK, *University of Chicago*

THE tablet containing the Hittite text of an inscription of Suppiluliuma II dealing with Alašiya, though known for several years and frequently discussed, still poses some problems; a fresh look at the text therefore seems indicated.

The tablet was found at Boğazköy in 1961 in the area of the so-called House on the Slope. It was published in cuneiform by H. Otten as No. 38 in *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Heft XII (1963) (abbr. *KBo* XII 38). A partial transliteration and translation was offered by the same author in *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, XCIV (1963), 13–23 (abbr. *MDOG* 94). G. Steiner published his own translation and interpretation in *Kadmos*, I (1962), 130–38. References to the text, mainly on the basis of *MDOG* 94, are found in most recent discussions of the fall of Ugarit and of the Hittite Empire under the attacks of the so-called Peoples of the Sea.<sup>1</sup>

Preserved is a large portion out of the middle of a two-column tablet. Top and bottom are lost. The left edge is damaged but partly preserved, so that the space available at the beginning of lines in Columns I and IV can be determined; the right edge is preserved. In other words, portions of all four columns are available, with loss of text at the beginning and between the columns; in Column IV the end of the text is reached. Of these four disconnected portions of the text, Col. I deals with a conquest of Alašiya and the tribute imposed on that country by a Hittite king. In Col. II, Suppiluliuma (II) speaks of an image of his father, Tudhaliya (IV), which he, Suppiluliuma, made and set up in a building called “Everlasting Peak.” After a double ruled line there follows the full title and genealogy of Suppiluliuma. Since he used the same already a few lines earlier, this repetition calls for comment; we shall discuss it presently. Col. III deals with a victory over the ships of Alašiya, and Col. IV returns to the “Everlasting Peak” and speaks of privileges granted that establishment.

This strange moving back and forth between two topics: Alašiya–building–Alašiya–building, has found different explanations. G. Steiner thought that the tablet contained

<sup>1</sup> To mention only a few: J. Nougayrol, “Nouveaux textes accadiens de Ras-Shamra,” *Comptes Rendus, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, année 1960 (1961), pp. 163–71 (abbr. *CRAI*); the same,

“Guerre et paix à Ugarit,” *Iraq*, XXV (1963), 110–23; M. Astour, “New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit,” *American Journal of Archaeology*, LXIX (1965), 253–58; cf. note 2 below.

the same story twice, in such a way that the self-presentation of Col. II 22 ff. could be restored also at the beginning of Col. I and that Col. III would supplement the lost part of Col. I (*Kadmos*, I, 131 with fn. 11). The present writer tried to write the text in the manner thus suggested by Steiner but found that this was not feasible with the text portions at hand and in view of the size of the gaps.—H. Otten, on the other hand, took the text as one coherent story of Suppiluliuma's deeds, which led him to ascribe to this king two campaigns against Alašiya: one (Col. I) against its king, the other (Col. III) against an unspecified enemy.—The present writer thinks that this distinction between two wars is correct, but that the former belongs not to Suppiluliuma but rather to his father, Tudhaliya IV. He will try to demonstrate this in the following pages.<sup>2</sup>

My starting point is the second column with its double rule and its strange repetition of the full self-presentation of the king. A double rule on a tablet normally indicates the beginning of a new text.<sup>3</sup> The passage here following the double rule, "I am My Sun, the Tabarna Suppiluliuma," etc., is indeed a beginning. It has been correctly observed that this is not the normal introduction of a (cuneiform) Hittite royal inscription, which begins with Akkadian *umma*, "thus (speaks)," but rather corresponds to the well-known pattern of Semitic inscriptions.<sup>4</sup> But it is also the normal introduction of inscriptions in Hittite hieroglyphs, where in fact the picture for "I (am)" was one of the first signs understood. We shall return to this similarity between the wording of Col. II 22 and the hieroglyphic inscriptions.

If a new text begins in line 22, the preceding part of Col. II must be the end of another text. The wording of this part is indeed suited for a concluding statement. According to my understanding, the form *Tudhaliyaš* of line 5 cannot be a genitive depending on ALAM, "image," of line 4 but can only be nominative; with the following (damaged but certain) *UL* this leads necessarily to the restoration "[My father] Tudhaliya did not [make] this image." Otten, although considering this interpretation, rejected it (*MDOG* 94, 17) because a negative statement about the king's father seemed incompatible with the general tone of pious devotion manifest throughout the text. However, apart from the grammatical fact just stated, no lack of reverence is involved here; for the son goes on to say that he completed the work of his father by inscribing his father's deeds on the image.<sup>5</sup> This is a work of filial devotion indeed; and the use of the full title here is justified, first of all in order to introduce the agent of these pious acts, secondly to legitimate him as son and heir, and finally to vouch for the accuracy of the rendition of the father's deeds.

Why should a text conclude with such a statement? Where are the deeds of Tudhaliya which his son dutifully inscribed for him? The obvious answer is that the statement is a

<sup>2</sup> I have held this view for a long time but postponed publication in the hope that the long-expected full publication of the pertinent texts from Ras Shamra would contribute to the clarification of the historical problems involved. Recently I noticed that A. Goetze must have independently reached the same conclusion, as shown by his brief statement in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, rev. ed. of Vols. I and II, Chapter XXIV, pp. 51 f. of the preliminary edition (1965) with n. 1 on p. 52 (where "§IV, 16, 13" is a misprint for §IV, 10, 13, referring to Otten, *MDOG* 94, 13).

H. Otten now also favors this interpretation. In his contribution to the *Fischer Weltgeschichte*, III

(1966), 173 he writes: "Vermutlich war es Tuthaliya IV., der die Insel erobern konnte," etc.

<sup>3</sup> References are hardly necessary; to give just two examples: *KUB* IX 31 (rituals) and *BoTU* 30 (copy of several royal inscriptions).

<sup>4</sup> Steiner, *Kadmos*, I, 130, n. 8. On the Semitic pattern cf. A. Poebel, *Das appositionell bestimmte Pronomen der 1. Pers. Sing. in den westsemitischen Inschriften und im Alten Testament*, ("Assyriological Studies," III [Chicago, 1932]). My translation "I am" in our text is based on the presence of the particle *-za*.

<sup>5</sup> I do not see what else *andan* (line 14; damaged but certain) could refer to!

postscript to the text of the deeds, which is to say that the text of the deeds preceded this postscript; in other words, Col. I is part of the inscription of Tudhaliya which his son set up for him. This is why I think that Col. I refers to a victory of Tudhaliya IV and would restore *his* name and title at the head of Col. I. According to this interpretation, then, the tablet *KBo* XII 38 contains two closely related inscriptions: first, a statue inscription of Tudhaliya IV commemorating his victory over Alašiya, which his son completed and provided with a postscript in which he records how he set the statue up in a special building; and second, an inscription of Suppiluliuma II describing his own victory over Alašiya and granting privileges to the same establishment, mentioned in the postscript to the first, which he had dedicated to the memory of his father.

Before discussing the historical consequences of this interpretation we first offer a new transliteration and translation of the text with the restorations based on the above considerations, and a brief commentary.

## TRANSLITERATION

## Col. I (top broken)

x + 1	[	]x x x x-pa-an-kán
2	[	]x x-un
3	[	]x TA DAM.MEŠ-ŠÚ DUMU.MEŠ-ŠÚ
4	[	e]-ep-pu-un SIG <sub>5</sub> -u-wa da-pi-da
5	[	IŠ-TU KUBABBAR G]UŠKIN pa-an-qa-u-e-eš-ša NAM.RA.MEŠ
6	[	x x hu-it]-ti-i-ya-nu-un na-aš-za uruPA-ši ar-ḥa
7	[	ú-da-aḥ-ḥ]u-un KUR A-la-ši-ya-an-ma-za-kán pé-de-eš-ši
8	[	ĪR-aḥ-ḥu-u]n ar-kam-ma-na-aḥ-ḥu-un ar-kam-ma-an-ma-ši-kán
9	[	ku-u-u]n(?) iš-ḥi-ya-nu-un
10	[	x]x A-NA LUGAL KUR A-la-ši-ya Ū A-NA <sup>1d</sup> PÍ-ID-DU?-RI
11	[	IT-T]I(?) <sup>d</sup> UTU uruTÚL-na Ū Ta-bar-na LUGAL.GAL
12	[	Š]A(?) <sup>d</sup> UTU uruTÚL-na <sup>1d</sup> SANGA ka-a-aš ar-kam-ma-aš e-eš-du
13	[	x x]x GUŠKIN 1 GUN URUDU 3 BÁN GA-YA-TUM
14	[	A-NA <sup>d</sup> UTU uruTÚL-na
15	[	x x x GUŠ]KIN 1 GUN URUDU 3 BÁN GA-YA-TUM
16	[	A-NA <sup>d</sup> U uruZi-pal-da
17	[	x x x GUŠKIN 1 GU]N URUDU 3 [BÁN] GA-YA-TUM
18	[	[A-NA <sup>d</sup> U ur]u [H]a-at-ti
19	[	x x x GUŠKIN 1 GU]N URUDU 3 BÁN GA-YA-TUM
20	[	[A-NA <sup>d</sup> U ur]uNe-ri-iq-qa
21	[	]x-ḤAR Ū-NU-TUM
22	[	]x x
23	[	uruḤa-at-t]u-ši pé-e ḥar-kán-zi
24	[	] da-pi-ya
25	[	]ta-an-zi
(broken)		

## Col. II (top broken)

x + 1 (trace)

2 *iš-pár-za-a-i* x[. . .3 *[n]a(?) -aḥ-ḥa-an-za* [. . .4 *ki-i-ma-za* ALAM [*A-BU-YA*(?)]5 *<sup>m</sup>Tu-ud-ḥa-li-ya-aš* U[*L DÛ-at*(?)]6 *ú-uq-qa-at* <sup>m</sup>KÛ.GA.TÚ[*L-aš* LUGAL.GAL]7 LUGAL KUR *Ḥat-ti* DUMU *<sup>m</sup>Tu-ud-ḥa[-li-ya]*8 LUGAL.GAL DUMU.DUMU-ŠÚ ŠA *<sup>m</sup>Ha-at-t[u-ši-li]*9 LUGAL.GAL Û DUMU.DUMU.DUMU-ŠÚ ŠA *<sup>m</sup>Mur-ši-ILI<sup>LI(M)</sup>*  
LUGAL.GAL10 *i-ya-nu-un*11 *nu A-BU-YA* *<sup>m</sup>Tu-ud-ḥa-li-ya-aš*12 LUGAL.GAL GIM[*-a*]*n a-ša-an-za* LUGAL-*uš*13 *e-eš-ta nu-kán QA-TAM-MA a-ša-an-da*14 LÚ-na-tar<sup>HI.A</sup> *ṛan-da<sup>1</sup>-an gul-šu-un*15 *wa-ak-ši-ya-nu-nu-un ku-it UL*16 EGIR-an-ma-kán UL *tar-na-aḥ-ḥu-un*17 <sup>na</sup>*ḥé-gur* SAG.UŠ *ú-e-da-aḥ-ḥu-un*18 ALAM DÛ-nu-un *na-an-kán [I]-NA* <sup>na</sup>*ḥé-gur* SAG.UŠ19 *an-da pé-e-da-aḥ-ḥu-un*20 *na-an da-ni-nu-nu-un*21 *wa-ar-ši-ya-nu-nu-un*22 *ú-uk-za* <sup>a</sup>UTU-ŠI *Ta-bar-na-aš*23 <sup>m</sup>KÛ.GA.[TÚ]L-*aš* LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR <sup>uru</sup>[*Ḥa*]*t-ti*24 UR.SAG DUMU *<sup>m</sup>Tu-ud-ḥa-li-ya*25 LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR *Ḥat-ti* UR.SAG26 [DUMU.D]UMU-ŠÚ ŠA *<sup>m</sup>PA-ši-ILI<sup>LI(M)</sup>* LUGAL.GAL U[R.SAG]27 [*A-BU-YA*] *<sup>m</sup>Tu-ud-ḥa-li-ya[-aš*

28 (traces, then broken)

## Col. III (top broken)

x + 1 *nu A-BU-Y[A. . .*2 *ú-uk :ti-eš-ša-iš[-ki-nu-un]*3 *nu a-ru-na-an ḥu-da-ak* [?]4 *ú-uk* <sup>m</sup>KÛ.GA.TÚL-*aš* LUGAL.GAL [*zi-i*]*ḥ[-ḥu-un*(?)]5 *nu-mu-kán* <sup>is</sup>MÁ.ḤI.A ŠA KUR *A-la-ši-ya*6 ŠÀ A.AB.BA 3-ŠÚ *za-aḥ-ḥi-ya ti-i-ya-at*7 *na-aš-kán ḥa-aš-pu-un* <sup>is</sup>MÁ.ḤI.A-*ma*8 *e-ep-pu-un na-aš-kán* ŠÀ A.AB.BA9 *lu-uk-ku-un*10 [G]IM-an-ma-kán *ḥa-da-an-te-ya*

- 11 *ar-ḥa ar-ḥu-un*  
 12 *nu-mu* <sup>1a</sup>KÚR.ḪI.A ŠA KUR *A-la-ši-ya*  
 13 *pa-an-qa-ri[-it za-aḥ-ḥ]i-ya ú-it*  
 14 *[n]a-an-kán za[-. . . . .]x x x*  
 15 *[n]u-mu x x [ . . .*  
 16 *[u](?)i-ya[-. . .*

- 
- 17 [ ]x EREM.MEŠ [xxx]x.MEŠ  
 18 [ ]x *nu-za x[. . . . .-l]i*  
 19 [ ] <sup>uru</sup>*Ḫat[-. . .*  
 20 [ ]x-za [x ]x x [ . . .
- 

21 f. (traces, then broken)

## Col. IV (top broken)

- x + 1 [ . . . . . ]DÛ-at  
 2 [ ]x-x-me-el *U[L k]u-it-ki*  
 3 [x x x(?)x *nu-uš-ši ku-u-un* <sup>na</sup>*ḥé-kur* SAG.UŠ  
 4 *[ú-uk] mK]Û.GA.TÚL-aš LUGAL.GAL ú-e-da-ḥu-un*  


---

 5 [AL]AM-Š[Û(?) . . . . .]x *da-ni-nu-nu-un*  
 6 *[wa]-ar-š[i-ya-nu-nu-u]n ú-uk*  
 7 x-x-x x-x SUM-un  
 8 URU.AŠ.AŠ.ḪI.A 70 *tar-ra-u-wa-zi*  


---

 9 *nu-uš-ši-kán ku-iš ar-ḥa* ME-i  
 10 *na-aš-ma-at ša-aḥ-ḥa-ni*  
 11 *ti-it-ta-nu-zi nu-uš-ma-aš [ . . .*  
 12 *ku-i-e-eš mTu-ud-ḥa-li-ya[-an(?)]*  
 13 [LUGAL].GAL *še-ek-k[ir] nu-u[š- . . .*  
 14 *[a]-pu-u-uš š[al?]li-x[ . . .*
- 

(end of column blank)

## TRANSLATION

Col. I (top broken) (1-2) . . . . .

(3) [PN (or: The king of Alašiya)] with his wives, his children, [and his . . . .] I seized; all the goods, [with silver, g]old, and all the captured people I [re]moved and [brought] them home to Hattusa. The country of Alašiya, however, I [enslaved] and made tributary on the spot; and [thi]s(?) tribute I imposed on it:

(10) [. . ?] for the king of Alašiya and for the *pidduri*, this shall be the tribute (owed) to the Sun-goddess of Arinna and to the Tabarna, the Great King, priest of the Sun-goddess of Arinna:

(13) [(A quantity)] of gold, 1 talent of copper, 3 seah of *gayatum* for the Sun-goddess of Arinna;

(15) [(a quantity)] of gold, 1 talent of copper, 3 seah of *gayatum* for the Storm-god of Zippalanda;

(17) [(a quantity) of gold, 1 ta]lent of copper, 3 seah of *gayatum* for the Storm-god of Hatti;

(19) [(a quantity) of gold, 1 tale]nt of copper, 3 seah of *gayatum* for the Storm-god of Nerik.

(21) [.....]... utensils [.....] in Hattusa they shall present.

(24) [.....] all [.....] they shall [... (broken; gap)]

Col. II (1) ..... (2) emerges [.....] fearing [.....]

(4) This image, [my father] Tudhaliya did not [make (it)]; I, Suppiluliuma, [the Great King], king of Hatti, son of Tudhaliya, the Great King, grandson of Hattusili, the Great King, and great-grandson of Mursili, the Great King, made it.

(11) And just as my father, the Great King Tudhaliya, was a true king, in the same way I inscribed (his) true manly deeds thereon. As I did not neglect (anything), I did not suppress (anything).

(17) I built an Everlasting Peak. I made the image and carried it into the (building called) Everlasting Peak; I installed and ...-ed it.

(22) I am My Sun, the Tabarna Suppiluliuma, the Great King, king of Hatti, the hero, son of Tudhaliya, the Great King, king of Hatti, the hero, grandson of Hattusili, the Great King, the hero.

(27) [My father] Tudhaliya [...]

(broken; gap)

Col. III (1) My father [.....] I mobilized and I, Suppiluliuma, the Great King, immediately [crossed/reached(?)] the sea.

(5) The ships of Alašiya met me in the sea three times for battle, and I smote them; and I seized the ships and set fire to them in the sea.

(10) But when I arrived on dry land(?), the enemies from Alašiya came in multitude against me for battle. I f[ought] them, and [.....] me [.....]....

(17) [.....] troops [.....] And [.....] Hat[ti]....

(broken, gap)

Col. IV (1) [.....] did/became [.....] nothing. And [I], Suppiluliuma, the Great King, built this Everlasting Peak for him.

(5) Hi[s im]age I [.....] installed and ....-ed (and) gave..... (As for) villages, they will designate seventy.

(9) Whoever will take (it) away from him or subject it to feudal duty, those [gods(?)] who kne[w] Tudhaliya, the Great King, shall [.....] them.

(End of text)

## COMMENTARY

Col. I 3: Instead of TA (Sumerogram for “with”) the Hittite sentence connective *ta* seems less likely, especially in a text of this date and nature. In front of TA DAM.MEŠ-ŠÚ *etc.* one expects the person to whom the possessives refer; in all likelihood this is the ruler of Alašiya, whether by name or by his title; [LUGAL KUR A-la-ši-ya-ká]*n* would be a possible restoration.

Lines 7 f.: *arḥa u-da-* is the usual verb in this context, as is *pedi-ši* IR-*aḥḥ-* in the next clause. The space seems to favor the shorter spelling, without additional *-na-*.

Line 10: For <sup>1a</sup>*pidduri* I cannot offer more than Otten, *MDOG* 94, 15 with notes 54 f.

For <sup>1a</sup>*pidduri* see now the tentative translation “Erbprinze (?)” quoted after E. von Schuler by J. Friedrich, *Heth. Wörterbuch*, 3. Ergänzungsheft (Heidelberg, 1966), p. 51. The proposal is based on our text; the other passages cited by Friedrich do not fit the proposed meaning.

Lines 13, 15, 17, 19: In front of GUŠKIN, “gold,” one expects either a measure (weight) or the word GAL, “a cup,” as in the Ras Shamra tribute lists.<sup>6</sup> The traces in line 13 rule out GAL, so that some weight (x GÍN) remains the most probable restoration.

For *gayatum* see W. von Soden’s remark *apud* Otten, *MDOG* 94, 15, n. 51. The measure for *gayatum* is, however, not *qa* but BÂN = *sûtu*, “seah.” The horizontal wedge clearly crosses the vertical on the tablet; besides, BÂN is a common measure in Boğazköy while *qa* is not.

Col. II 4–5: For the restorations see the introductory remarks above, p. 74.

Lines 12 f.: The meaning “true” of *ašant-* is well known (cf. J. Friedrich, *Heth. Wörterbuch*, with lit.). Yet, since the form is participle of the verb “to be,” the meaning might be literally “being how . . . being thus,” “qualis . . . talis”: “I wrote his deeds just as he was.” Since this is not far from “true” I prefer the accepted meaning.

Lines 15 f.: Otten’s rendering of the two verbs *wakšiyanu-* and *appan tarna-* as “fehlen lassen” and “auslassen,” respectively, comes close to the mark. From the usage in other texts it can be deduced that *wakšiya(nu)-* refers to omission by mistake, neglect, or oversight, whereas *appan tarna-* literally “leave behind,” refers (among other usages) to intentional omission or suppression.<sup>7</sup> Our translations “neglect” and “suppress” are an attempt to render these shadings. Instead of saying, as one might expect, that he “neither added nor omitted,” the king stresses that he omitted nothing either by oversight or by intent.

Line 17: For <sup>na</sup>*ḫegur* Otten (*MDOG* 94, 18–20) has collected the evidence. The only passage that contains concrete information is the one quoted from *KBo* XIV 20 (Otten, p. 19; cf. now Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *JNES*, XXV [1966], 173 f., 181 f.), according to which it is a mountain peak or summit; the determinative “stone” would characterize it as rocky. While the combination É <sup>na</sup>*ḫegur*, “house of the peak,” is more frequent, our text omits É but still says that the king “built” the *ḫegur* and that he transported the image “into it.” Some kind of structure must therefore be meant; if not a regular building then at least a walled, terraced or otherwise built-up summit.

SAG.UŠ is Hittite *ukturi-*, “eternal, everlasting.”

Line 21: I leave *waršiyanu-* untranslated since I am not sure of its meaning even after recent discussions. To accept “besänftigen” with “image” as object is no less difficult than to assume that the pronoun *-an*, which in line 18 clearly refers to the ALAM (*šena-*, common gender), should, in lines 20 f., refer to the deceased king himself. The discussion of the root *warš-* etc. by Laroche, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*, LVIII (1963), 59–62, does not help for our text.

Line 27: My restoration [*A-BU-YA*], “my father,” is based on the consideration that here, at the very beginning of the text proper, after the self-presentation, the mention of Tudhaliya’s name should be preceded by this apposition, just as in line 11 (and

<sup>6</sup> For these see the latest treatment by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz in *Die Welt des Orients*, III/3 (1966), 206–45.

<sup>7</sup> *appan tarnumaš* in colophons, “(a tablet) of leaving out,” seems to designate abridged versions or excerpts.



restored, for the same reason, in lines 4–5). The three signs, moreover, fit exactly into the available space. (For a parallel from a hieroglyphic text see below.)

Col. III 10: *ḥadanteya* is otherwise unknown. One expects something like “dry land” at this point, and the connection with the verb *ḥat-*, “to dry up,” offers a possibility for arriving at this meaning, although the word formation (derivative from the participle?) is not clear.

Col. IV 1: *DÜ-at* is either *iyat*, “did, made,” or *kišat*, “became.” Is this a reference to his father’s death: “became [god]”?

Line 8: *tarrauwazi*, for *tarrauwanzi*, cannot be infinitive (thus Otten: “[mit dem Auftrag] zur Versorgung”) since the *-u-* belongs to the stem. Therefore it must be 3rd. pers. plur. pres. The meaning will be discussed by C. W. Carter in connection with his edition of cult inventories.<sup>8</sup>

### CONCLUSIONS

Historically it seems to me that the new interpretation of the document fits well into the picture. If Tudhaliya IV conquered Alašiya and made it tributary, one understands the passage in the Madduwatta text better, according to which Tudhaliya’s son and first successor, Arnuwanda, claimed that country as Hittite possession.<sup>9</sup> We know that he did not have much success, since both Attariššiya, the man from Aḥḥiya, and Madduwatta raided it. But whatever the outcome or the real power constellation, Arnuwanda’s claim as such now appears to have been founded.

How the sea victory of Suppiluliuma II will fit into the history of his time is a question which may better be left open until the Ras Shamra documents are published in full. From the information available so far (see note 1 above) there seems to be a difference in the constellation of the various parties as reflected in the different sources: whereas the texts from Ras Shamra depict Alašiya as ally of Ugarit—and, by implication, of the Hittites—Suppiluliuma in our document fights “the enemies from Alašiya.”<sup>10</sup> Whether this means that the whole country had joined the enemies, or whether it was only partly occupied by an enemy, and whether this enemy has anything to do with the enemy to whom Ugaritian sailors are said to have handed their ships<sup>11</sup> remains to be seen.

Concerning the fragment of a treaty with Alašiya, *KBo XII 39* (Otten, *MDOG* 94, 10–13; Steiner, *Kadmos*, I, 134–36), I am not so sure that the endless form <sup>m</sup>*Tu-ud-ḥa-li-ya* in line 16 of the “obv.” really precludes attribution of the text to Tudḥaliya.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> On this work see the preliminary notes in *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (*Historia*, Einzelschriften, Heft 7, 1964), pp. 71 f. with n. 84.

<sup>9</sup> A. Götze, *Madduwattāš* (“MVAeG” 32, 1, 1928), rev. 84–90 of the text; re-edited by F. Sommer, *Die Aḥḥijawā-Urkunden* (München, 1932), pp. 337 f.

<sup>10</sup> This is what <sup>16</sup>KÜR.ḪI.A ŠA KUR Alašiya can only mean. It is true that ordinarily this is expressed by the simple genitive construction without *ša*, <sup>16</sup>KÜR <sup>uru</sup>X, “the enemy from X.” As an example for the use of *ša* I noted *KBo X 2 i 24*, <sup>16</sup>KÜR ŠA <sup>uru</sup>Hurri, which can only mean “the Hurrian enemy.” To construe the *ša* as something different, “enemies of A.” in the sense of “hostile to A.,” would be over-

taxing the difference between two writings of what in Hittite is simple genitive.

<sup>11</sup> Text RS 20.18, cited by Nougayrol in *CRAI* 1960, p. 166, and *Iraq*, XXV, 120; to be *Ugaritica* V, No. 22.

<sup>12</sup> Tentatively I think of the possibility of combining <sup>uru</sup>Hatti-<sup>m</sup>Tudḥaliya as a double name, comparable to the hieroglyphic name written with the ligature of the signs for Hattusa and Tudhaliya in Karakuyu (I. J. Gelb, *Hitt. Hierogl. Monuments* [“O.I.P.” XLV (1939)], No. 34; cf. E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*, I [1960], under Nos. 196 and 207, with a different interpretation). Could this “Hatti of Tudhaliya” be the southern extension or Upper City at Boğazköy, and was it built by him?

But whether the treaty belongs to this king or to one of his two sons really is not of great importance.<sup>13</sup>

For the structure called "Eternal Peak" Otten thinks of Yazılıkaya. But it seems to me that the three built-up peaks at Boğazköy, known respectively as Nişantepe, Sarı Kale, and Yenice Kale, are at least as likely candidates for the various *hegur*-houses mentioned in the sources;<sup>14</sup> outside the capital, Gāvurkale may be another.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, there are reasons which make me think specifically of Nişantepe as candidate for the "Eternal Peak" of our text.

We saw that Suppiluliuma's text beginning in Col. II 22 has the opening formula "I am" familiar from hieroglyphic inscriptions. From all we know about Hittite monumental inscriptions it is most likely that the deeds of Tudhaliya which his son put on his "image," that is, almost certainly a statue,<sup>16</sup> were carved in hieroglyphs. It seems to me, therefore, that *KBo* XII 38 is a Hittite version of two hieroglyphic (Luwian) inscriptions. Now it is well known that Nişantepe bears on its slope a hieroglyphic inscription of Suppiluliuma (the second, as will be seen presently). Is it mere coincidence that this inscription, known as Nişantaş, begins, after a damaged group which *may* be "I am," with the titles and the same genealogy of Suppiluliuma, son of Tudhaliya, grandson of Hattusili? Contrary to our assumption of 1935<sup>17</sup> that the next Tudhaliya sign (No. 21 in the drawing) was part of the genealogy, F. Steinherr and E. Laroche have convinced me (in conversation) that this is rather the beginning of the actual text, where the sign groups 18–21 read "My father Tudhaliya."<sup>18</sup> During a common visit to the Nişantaş inscription in September 1966, E. Laroche actually identified the signs for "I am" there: Group 1 of the drawing (see n. 17) is composed of the three signs No. 1, 439, and 391, followed (Group 2) by No. 450 (of Laroche's sign list); together they read *AMU-wa-mi-à*.

Obviously one cannot claim that the inscription beginning with "[My father] Tudhaliya" in *KBo* XII 38 ii 22 is actually a translation of the Nişantaş inscription. What can be stated is that our tablet contains Hittite versions of, first, a statue inscription of Tudhaliya and, second, a hieroglyphic inscription of Suppiluliuma II *comparable* to Nişantaş and dealing with a building on a mountain peak *comparable* to Nişantepe. I confess that I personally prefer this comparison to that with Yazılıkaya; but, of course, neither of these proposals for the identification of the *hegur* of our text—nor any other—is capable of proof.

<sup>13</sup> Incidentally: in "obv." 9 read DINGIR.MEŠ *MA-MIT*, "the gods of the oath," since *-pat* after *-ma* is impossible. The same spelling occurs in *KUB* XXVI 25 ii 10 (and *MA-MIT*<sup>1</sup>.<sup>a</sup> *ibid.*, ll. 5 and 7), in a text of the same period.

<sup>14</sup> Some are named after deities: É <sup>na</sup><sub>4</sub>*hegur* <sup>d</sup>*Pirwa*, É <sup>na</sup><sub>4</sub>*hegur* <sup>d</sup>*LAMA*; material collected by Otten, *MDOG* 94, 18. Is this "Peak-house of Pirwa" or "house of the Pirwa-Peak"?

<sup>15</sup> The idea that "to build a peak" should be taken literally as referring to the construction of something like a pyramid or a tumulus must be ruled out because pyramids do not occur in the Hittite world and tumuli appear there only later. Or is the erection of a tumulus as innovation at the threshold to the Iron Age conceivable after all?

<sup>16</sup> That statues existed is now proved by Dr. Hâmit Koşay's discovery of a colossal Hittite stone statue at Alacahüyük; see the preliminary note by M. Mellink, *American Journal of Archaeology*, LXIX (1965), 136 with Fig. 4 on Pl. 36.

<sup>17</sup> K. Bittel and H. G. Güterbock, *Boğazköy* ("Abhandl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss." 1935, 1), pp. 63 f.; drawing of the first line, *ibid.*, Taf. 25. Photograph of whole inscription: K. Bittel and R. Naumann, *Boğazköy-Hattuşa*, I ("WVDOG" LXIII, 1952), Pl. 50, a. Cf. H. Th. Bossert, "Nischan-Tepe und Nischan-Tasch," *Afo*, IX (1934), 172–86.

<sup>18</sup> The reduced genealogy (without the previously assumed great-grandfather Tudhaliya) could apply to either Suppiluliuma I or II. General considerations of the development of full-fledged inscriptions, however, are strongly in favor of deciding for the second.