dees (second half of the thirteenth century B.C.). But if the discontent has already spread too far, or if there is reason to believe that arrests will not put an end to it, one can counter the enemy propaganda with royal propaganda. Recently the noted East German author Stefan Heym in his book *Der König David Bericht* (Munich: Kindler Verlag, 1972) has drawn a modern parable from the supposed experience of a ninth-century Jewish official, Ethan ben Hoshaya, who was commissioned by King Solomon to draw up an elaborate explanation of the events surrounding the demise of the Saulids and the rise to the throne of David. That such a piece of royal propaganda may have had independent existence before portions of it were incorporated into the present canonical Book of Samuel has been long suspected by Old Testament scholars. I had occasion several years ago to call attention to the striking points of similarity between this "Apology of David" and the late thirteenth century Apology of Ḫattušili III. But what needs to be stressed here is that, although it may be impossible at present to prove any formal link between the Apology of Ḫattušili and the royal propaganda of David and Solomon, it is not impossible to speak of a tradition of royal apologies in the Hittite kingdom or even of a certain loose literary form, which several of them seem to assume. More than this one should not expect, since one would after all not expect usurpations to occur often enough in a stable society to justify the development of an elaborate traditional format.

Apologies in the above sense–defenses of usurpations–must be carefully distinguished from other defenses made by Hittite kings. A good example of another kind of defense can be found in the so-called "Ten-year (or "Decenniel") Annals of Muršili."[9] In paragraphs 3-4 of that text (KBo III 4 i 10-15), certain defamatory remarks against the young Muršili attributed to surrounding enemy lands are described: "His father," they said, "who was king of Ḫatti, was a valiant king and held the enemy lands in subjection. But he has died. The (older) son [Arnuwanda], who sat on the throne of his father, was also a mature man [Sum. LÚ.GURUŠ]. But he fell ill and died. [§4] He who now sits on the throne of his father is small and unable to defend the land of Ḫatti and its borders."[10] Although the words are attributed to the surrounding enemy lands, they surely reached the king's ears through his own subjects. And the king's concern must surely have been aroused by the possible effect which these words of enemy propaganda might have on the morale, indeed the loyalty, of his own subjects. This lengthy taunt or charge of incompetence was certainly cited for a purpose. Muršili does not answer the taunt immediately. Paragraphs 5-6 deal with the reasons for Muršili's delay in responding to this challenge by the surrounding enemies, namely, the pressing need to celebrate the long-neglected festivals of the sun goddess of Arinna. Midway through paragraph 6, however, the king returns to the subject of the taunts: "To the sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, I raised (my) hand and spoke: 'Oh sun goddess of Arinna, my lady! As regards the surrounding enemy lands, who keep calling me a child and keep belittling me and who keep trying to take (from me) your territories, oh sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, come here to me . . . and smite before me those surrounding enemy lands!' The sun goddess of Arinna heard my plea and came to my aid. Then after I had sat down on the throne of my father, I subjected these surrounding enemy lands in the course of ten years and slew them" (KBo III 4 i 22-29).[11] In other words on the occasion of the celebration of the festivals of the sun goddess the young Hittite king made a vow soliciting the aid of the sun goddess in the overthrow of those enemies who were presently taunting him. That the goddess achieved this vengeance for Muršili within the first ten years of his reign seems to be the clear import of these lines. And if so, then it was the celebration of this achievement which occasioned the drafting of this smaller,



annals text at the end of the first ten years of the king's reign. In concluding this remarkable document the Hittite king says: "Since I sat on the throne of my father, I have already been king ten years. These enemy lands I conquered with my own hand in (those) ten years. The enemy lands which the king's sons and the lords conquered are not included (here). Whatever else the sun goddess of Arinna my lady gives to me (to do), that too I will execute and carry out" (KBo III 4 iv 44-48).[12] Note in particular the king's concern here with only those military operations in which he was personally in command as well as his concern to carry out the commission of the goddess. The pattern is as follows: (1) The young king is the object of vicious propaganda, not touching his lineage but his age and fitness to rule in the place of his father and older brother. (2) The king cannot defend himself against this propaganda by words, so he chooses to do so by deeds. The deeds by which he must prove his manhood[13] must be performed in person. No operations led by subordinates will do.[14] (3) Before beginning his ten-year quest to prove himself a man he seeks the aid of the sun goddess of Arinna and makes to her a vow. How Muršili paid the vow is never stated, although it is possible that the composition of the smaller ten-year annals text itself was at least partial payment. In that text in contrast to the longer, detailed annals the pride of place among the deities who aid Muršili in battle always goes to the sun goddess.

Now the ten-year annals of Muršili may well be a defense of the young king's manhood. But as noted above it must be kept distinct from the true apologies, which concern the king's right to the throne.

The two clearest examples of apologies among the official texts in the Hittite archives are the Telepinu Proclamation[15] and the Apology of Ḫattušili III. Although differing in detail, these two texts share a general pattern, which once discerned demonstrates the more or less traditional way in which Hittite usurpers defended their usurpation. The following outline reveals the essential structure of the two works:

1. Introduction: T §1, H §§1-2.
2. Historical survey: noble antecedents. T §§1-9, H §§3-10.
3. Historical survey: the unworthy predecessor. T §§10-22a, H §§10-12.
4. The coup d'état: T §22b, H §§12-13.
5. The merciful victor: T §§23 & 26, H §§12-13.
6. The edict: T §§27-50, H §§13-15.

Ḫattušili III begins his apology with a genealogy, for as a full blood brother of Muwattalli he can lay claim to direct descent from the royal line of Šuppiluliuma and Muršili. Furthermore, to bolster his claims to kingship he points to his remote namesake, the dynasty founder Ḫattušili I, king of the city of Kuššara (Ḫatt. I 1-4, §1).[16] In this way, although he was not the direct heir either of Muršili or Muwattalli, Ḫattušili could marshal a genealogical claim to kingship. In later years his descendents mindful of this ploy would condemn its use by others (Ḫatt. XXVI 1 i 6-16, §2).[17]

KUB

Unlike Ḫattušili III, Telepinu could not lay claim to royal descent.[18] The nearest he approached to a family connection with the preceding kings was in his marriage to Ištapariya, the eldest sister of his predecessor, Ḫuzziya (BoTU II 23A ii 9-10, §22).[19] But since this was hardly a legitimate claim to kingship, he does not adduce that fact in his own support but only in passing as a kind of explanation for Ḫuzziya's alleged attempt upon his life. Therefore, Telepinu's introduction is quite terse: "Thus (speaks) the Tabarna, Telepinu, the Great King." It is clear that the defense of both usurpers had to rest upon grounds other than descent.

# UNITY AND DIVERSITY

## Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East

*Edited by*
*Hans Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
Baltimore and London
1975

# PROPAGANDA AND POLITICAL JUSTIFICATION IN HITTITE HISTORIOGRAPHY

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

The term "apology" as a designation of a formal composition has most frequently been applied to texts from early Christian and pre-Christian times to denote a detailed defense against false attacks and accusations.[1] The most familiar examples of such apologies are that of Plato and those of the early Christian apologists. The late professor Edgar H. Sturtevant of Yale University, however, employed this term[2] to describe a lengthy text[3] composed in the first person for the Hittite emperor Ḫattušili III, a contemporary of the Egyptian pharaoh Ramesses II and the Assyrian kings Adad-nirari I and Shalmaneser I, who reigned about 1290-1265 B.C. Since Sturtevant's publications on this text the term "apology" has occasionally been employed by other Hittitologists[4] to describe Ḫattušili's remarkable composition, but the prevailing custom has been to call it either an "accession report" (German: *Thronbesteigungsbericht*),[5] an "aretalogy" or an "autobiography."[6] We will use the term "apology" in the ensuing discussion in the specialized sense of a document composed for a king who had usurped the throne, composed in order to defend or justify his assumption of the kingship by force. Since there is presently known no Hittite term or phrase with this meaning, by which scribes might have identified such texts in their colophons, we must identify surviving Hittite examples by formal criteria alone.

The Hittite kings exhibited in their official documents a remarkable sensitivity to rumors and accusations directed against the throne. Among the evils against which the kings must be protected were "evil words" (Hittite: *idalamuš memiyanuš*), which we should understand as "slander, defamation, malicious gossip." Hittite officials were instructed to denounce promptly anyone who directed defamatory remarks against the king, even if the offender were an intimate friend: "Or if a man hears an evil (plot) against His Majesty from a close friend, yet does not denounce (the friend before His Majesty),–let this (neglect of duty) be (forsworn) under oath!"[7] And again: "If you have a very close friend, and I, His Majesty, say to you: 'Have nothing more to do with him!' yet you do not break off with him,–let this (disobedience) be (forsworn) under oath!"[8] The thought and the wording of these instructions reminds one of the similar Deuteronomic command to denounce those who suggest the worship of gods other than Yahweh, even if the offender is a member of one's immediate family (Deut. 13:6-9). Hittite kings were always eager to root out any sign of potential treason against the crown, but the sense of insecurity and distrust of the lower echelons of civil servants shows itself in the official documents most intensely during the final half-century of the empire (c. 1250-1200 B.C.).

One can deal with incipient unrest in various ways. If the disaffection has not spread widely, one can arrest the discontents and either execute or intern them. This approach is certainly suggested by the above passages from King Tudḫaliya's protocol for the gran-

dees (second half of the thirteenth century B.C.). But if the discontent has already spread too far, or if there is reason to believe that arrests will not put an end to it, one can counter the enemy propaganda with royal propaganda. Recently the noted East German author Stefan Heym in his book *Der König David Bericht* (Munich: Kindler Verlag, 1972) has drawn a modern parable from the supposed experience of a ninth-century Jewish official, Ethan ben Hoshaya, who was commissioned by King Solomon to draw up an elaborate explanation of the events surrounding the demise of the Saulids and the rise to the throne of David. That such a piece of royal propaganda may have had independent existence before portions of it were incorporated into the present canonical Book of Samuel has been long suspected by Old Testament scholars. I had occasion several years ago to call attention to the striking points of similarity between this "Apology of David" and the late thirteenth century Apology of Ḫattušili III. But what needs to be stressed here is that, although it may be impossible at present to prove any formal link between the Apology of Ḫattušili and the royal propaganda of David and Solomon, it is not impossible to speak of a tradition of royal apologies in the Hittite kingdom or even of a certain loose literary form, which several of them seem to assume. More than this one should not expect, since one would after all not expect usurpations to occur often enough in a stable society to justify the development of an elaborate traditional format.

Apologies in the above sense–defenses of usurpations–must be carefully distinguished from other defenses made by Hittite kings. A good example of another kind of defense can be found in the so-called "Ten-year (or "Decenniel") Annals of Muršili."[9] In paragraphs 3-4 of that text (KBo III 4 i 10-15), certain defamatory remarks against the young Muršili attributed to surrounding enemy lands are described: "His father," they said, "who was king of Ḫatti, was a valiant king and held the enemy lands in subjection. But he has died. The (older) son [Arnuwanda], who sat on the throne of his father, was also a mature man [Sum. LÚ.GURUŠ]. But he fell ill and died. [§4] He who now sits on the throne of his father is small and unable to defend the land of Ḫatti and its borders."[10] Although the words are attributed to the surrounding enemy lands, they surely reached the king's ears through his own subjects. And the king's concern must surely have been aroused by the possible effect which these words of enemy propaganda might have on the morale, indeed the loyalty, of his own subjects. This lengthy taunt or charge of incompetence was certainly cited for a purpose. Muršili does not answer the taunt immediately. Paragraphs 5-6 deal with the reasons for Muršili's delay in responding to this challenge by the surrounding enemies, namely, the pressing need to celebrate the long-neglected festivals of the sun goddess of Arinna. Midway through paragraph 6, however, the king returns to the subject of the taunts: "To the sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, I raised (my) hand and spoke: 'Oh sun goddess of Arinna, my lady! As regards the surrounding enemy lands, who keep calling me a child and keep belittling me and who keep trying to take (from me) your territories, oh sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, come here to me . . . and smite before me those surrounding enemy lands!' The sun goddess of Arinna heard my plea and came to my aid. Then after I had sat down on the throne of my father, I subjected these surrounding enemy lands in the course of ten years and slew them" (KBo III 4 i 22-29).[11] In other words on the occasion of the celebration of the festivals of the sun goddess the young Hittite king made a vow soliciting the aid of the sun goddess in the overthrow of those enemies who were presently taunting him. That the goddess achieved this vengeance for Muršili within the first ten years of his reign seems to be the clear import of these lines. And if so, then it was the celebration of this achievement which occasioned the drafting of this smaller,



annals text at the end of the first ten years of the king's reign. In concluding this remarkable document the Hittite king says: "Since I sat on the throne of my father, I have already been king ten years. These enemy lands I conquered with my own hand in (those) ten years. The enemy lands which the king's sons and the lords conquered are not included (here). Whatever else the sun goddess of Arinna my lady gives to me (to do), that too I will execute and carry out" (KBo III 4 iv 44-48).[12] Note in particular the king's concern here with only those military operations in which he was personally in command as well as his concern to carry out the commission of the goddess. The pattern is as follows: (1) The young king is the object of vicious propaganda, not touching his lineage but his age and fitness to rule in the place of his father and older brother. (2) The king cannot defend himself against this propaganda by words, so he chooses to do so by deeds. The deeds by which he must prove his manhood[13] must be performed in person. No operations led by subordinates will do.[14] (3) Before beginning his ten-year quest to prove himself a man he seeks the aid of the sun goddess of Arinna and makes to her a vow. How Muršili paid the vow is never stated, although it is possible that the composition of the smaller ten-year annals text itself was at least partial payment. In that text in contrast to the longer, detailed annals the pride of place among the deities who aid Muršili in battle always goes to the sun goddess.

Now the ten-year annals of Muršili may well be a defense of the young king's manhood. But as noted above it must be kept distinct from the true apologies, which concern the king's right to the throne.

The two clearest examples of apologies among the official texts in the Hittite archives are the Telepinu Proclamation[15] and the Apology of Ḫattušili III. Although differing in detail, these two texts share a general pattern, which once discerned demonstrates the more or less traditional way in which Hittite usurpers defended their usurpation. The following outline reveals the essential structure of the two works:

1. Introduction: T §1, H §§1-2.
2. Historical survey: noble antecedents. T §§1-9, H §§3-10.
3. Historical survey: the unworthy predecessor. T §§10-22a, H §§10-12.
4. The coup d'état: T §22b, H §§12-13.
5. The merciful victor: T §§23 & 26, H §§12-13.
6. The edict: T §§27-50, H §§13-15.

Ḫattušili III begins his apology with a genealogy, for as a full blood brother of Muwattalli he can lay claim to direct descent from the royal line of Šuppiluliuma and Muršili. Furthermore, to bolster his claims to kingship he points to his remote namesake, the dynasty founder Ḫattušili I, king of the city of Kuššara (Ḫatt. I 1-4, §1).[16] In this way, although he was not the direct heir either of Muršili or Muwattalli, Ḫattušili could marshal a genealogical claim to kingship. In later years his descendents mindful of this ploy would condemn its use by others (Ḫatt. XXVI 1 i 6-16, §2).[17]

KUB

Unlike Ḫattušili III, Telepinu could not lay claim to royal descent.[18] The nearest he approached to a family connection with the preceding kings was in his marriage to Ištapariya, the eldest sister of his predecessor, Ḫuzziya (BoTU II 23A ii 9-10, §22).[19] But since this was hardly a legitimate claim to kingship, he does not adduce that fact in his own support but only in passing as a kind of explanation for Ḫuzziya's alleged attempt upon his life. Therefore, Telepinu's introduction is quite terse: "Thus (speaks) the Tabarna, Telepinu, the Great King." It is clear that the defense of both usurpers had to rest upon grounds other than descent.

Paragraphs 1-9 of the Telepinu Proclamation have often been discussed, but chiefly from the standpoint of what information they afford about the history of the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I. Yet far more important for our problem is the function which they seem to serve within the scheme of the document itself. As the historical prefaces in the treaty documents of the fourteenth century serve to justify the legal measures contained in the treaty proper, so the historical introduction in this text is intended as a basis for Telepinu's claims to kingship. The historical introduction to the narration of the coup d'état itself is intended to contrast the rightness of the first three kings (Labarna, Ḫattušili, and Muršili) with the wrongness of the following four (Ḫanteli, Zidanta, Ammuna, and Ḫuzziya). The rightness of the first three kings is underscored by the use of the same stereotyped phrases to describe their successes: "He became king. His sons, his brothers, and his relatives by marriage, the members of his family, and his soldiers were united . . . . And by his strength he kept the hostile country in subjection" (of Labarna in §§1-2, of Ḫattušili in §5, of Muršili in §8).[20] The common theme is unity and strength. These three monarchs could easily be called the "orthodox caliphs" of the Hittite Old Kingdom. Theirs was the golden age of harmony within and unmarred victory abroad. The only discordant note struck in this opening section (§§1-9) is in paragraph 7, where note is taken of the treacherous behavior of certain "subjects of the princes," who began to seize property holdings and conspired to kill their masters. Following as it does hard upon the description of paragraph 6, it would appear that this disorder occurred in the provinces and the large provincial cities assigned to the king's sons rather than in the Hittite heartland. Thus it does not constitute a contradiction of Telepinu's conception of the inner unity and tranquility of the capital. Even so, one should seek the positive contribution of this brief paragraph to the plan of the first nine sections. It is quite unlike the author to include extraneous information in his narrative just for the sake of historical completeness. Quite possibly he wishes to give here a brief allusion to the rebellion which even now seethes beneath the surface and later (§§11-12) boils up in regicide.

The crowning achievement of the Old Kingdom rulers in Telepinu's eyes was the sack of Aleppo and Babylon by Muršili (§9). Accordingly he diverges from his usual stereotyped phrases to describe that achievement. Aleppo had been the only Syrian thorn in the flesh for Muršili's predecessor Ḫattušili, who otherwise met with little effective resistance in North Syria. Another early Hittite text describes Muršili's conquest of Aleppo as avenging his father's blood upon that kingdom.[21] These twin military achievements and the rich harvest of booty which they yielded form the climax of that golden age.

Against the background of the glorious reigns of Labarna, Ḫattušili, and Muršili, the disgrace and ignominy of the reigns of Ḫanteli, Zidanta, Ammuna, and Ḫuzziya could not be more evident. It appears also that by the device of singling out the detail of the usurper married to his predecessor's sister the author wishes to bracket this period from Ḫanteli through Ḫuzziya. It is as though he would say, "Just as the brother-in-law Ḫanteli put an end to the golden age through his foul murder of Muršili, so the brother-in-law Telepinu put an end to the dark age of disgrace through the just and bloodless deposing of Ḫuzziya." Muršili did no harm to Ḫanteli, yet the latter killed him. Ḫuzziya tried to kill Telepinu, yet the latter spared his life (§22).[22] Through ruthlessness the age of disgrace began; through mercy the age of disgrace was ended and the golden age restored. The words which characterize the narrative of paragraphs 10-22 are "blood, killed, avenged." As the age of the first three kings was characterized by unity and success, so that of the following four kings was characterized by intrigue, murder, and defeat. Disaster at home is typified by the crop fail-



ures mentioned in the reign of Ammuna (§20). Disaster abroad is illustrated by the defeats of the Hittite armies also in the reign of Ammuna (§21).

Telepinu attempts neither by an opening genealogy nor by any statement in connection with the description of his accession to link himself to the kings which preceded him.[23] It would not have served his purpose to mention it, even if, as Gurney believes, Telepinu was a son of Ammuna.[24] For the picture which he draws of that king is anything but complimentary, and it is clear that he regards himself as the spiritual heir of the first three monarchs. To him the reigns of the following four kings were a disastrous interlude, which it is his good fortune to end. Even the throne name Telepinu, as I have maintained elsewhere,[25] suggests that he conceived of himself at the very outset of his reign as the bringer of renewed prosperity and success. For the god Telepinu was the Ḫattian god whose disappearance signaled the failure of all that was good and whose reappearance signaled the restoration of the benevolent forces of nature.[26] That the new king did not choose for himself the name Ḫattušili or Muršili shows also that he had no pretension to an actual descent by blood from the first three kings.

The ground of Telepinu's removal of Ḫuzziya was of course not just the latter's unworthiness as king, but more specifically the king's attempt on Telepinu's own life (§11). Even a king might not murder with impunity, as Telepinu's own edict (§§30-31) later makes clear:

> Whoever hereafter becomes king and plans injury of brother or sister--you are his senate (*pankuš*)--speak to him frankly: "Read from the tablet(s) this tale of blood(shed)! Formerly in Ḫattuša blood(shed) became common. And at that time the gods exacted of the royal family the penalty for it."
>
> Whatever (king) does harm among (his) brothers and sisters risks (*šuwai-*) his royal head. Call the assembly (*tuliyan halzišten*)! If at that time he carries out his plan, let him make compensation with his head![27]

Similarly Ḫattušili III only takes action against Urḫitešub when the latter makes an attempt upon his life.

The coup itself is tersely described: "Ḫuzziya would have killed them (Telepinu and Ištapariya), but his plan became known,[28] and Telepinu drove them away" (*BoTU* II 23A ii 11-12, §22).[29] The reason for the plural object "them" is that the plot against Telepinu's life was shared by Ḫuzziya and his five brothers, all of whom with the ex-king were interned in houses built for them by the new king (§23).[30] There is no divine working on behalf of Telepinu as one sees in the Apology of Ḫattušili. He is not protected by a deity, or promised the kingship by one. The only direct references to the gods in this comparatively unreligious document are (1) in their avenging the murders of the kings (§§19, 20, 30) and (2) in the words of reproof spoken through the "men of the gods" (*siunan antuḫšeš*; *BoTU* II 23A ii 32, §27). It is interesting to note what form the gods' revenge assumed. In paragraph 19 the gods avenged the blood of Kaššeni, whom Zidanta had murdered, by prompting Zidanta's own son Ammuna to murder his father. In paragraph 20 the gods then avenge Zidanta's blood upon the young king Ammuna by withholding from the land increase of crops and cattle. Telepinu himself summarizes the matter in paragraph 30 as follows: "Formerly in Ḫattuša blood(shed) became common, and at that time the gods exacted of the royal family the penalty for it." Therefore, the chief role of the gods in this document is punishing the royal family for internecine strife. Telepinu makes no claim that they had designated him to rule. He even refrains from such an oblique claim to divine appointment as the phrase in Ḫattušili I's political testament: "In the place of a lion

the gods will only put another lion" (*HAB* II 39, §7).[31]

In the Ḫattušili Apology, on the other hand, the coup is described in terms borrowed from the courtroom. Archi has shown how throughout the text Ḫattušili the pious is contrasted with his evil foes. But at the moment of truth it is the confrontation between Urḫitešub and Ḫattušili which alone has importance.

As in the Telepinu Proclamation the question is raised as to which of the two is more fit to rule. And indeed Urḫitešub has been portrayed throughout the document as not only incompetent but also as an evil man who has recourse to witchcraft (*alwanzatar*) and other means which displease the gods. Ḫattušili has not neglected either to call attention to the young incumbent's mother's somewhat less than glorious state: he was "the son of an *esirtu*-woman" (*Ḫatt.* III 41).[32] But these factors were insufficient justification for the deposing of Urḫitešub. Telepinu based his swift, decisive coup on the alleged plot of Ḫuzziya to kill him and his wife. Ḫattušili, too, could and did accuse Urḫitešub of attempting to kill him, "But he at the command (lit. "word") of a god and the suggestion (lit. "word") of a man tried to destroy me" (*Ḫatt.* III 63-64). Yet it is not on the murder attempt of Urḫitešub that Ḫattušili bases his claim to kingship. It is true that he takes arms in self-defense (*Ḫatt.* III 65-66). His claim to kingship, however, rests upon the will of the gods, who have chosen him.[33] In the Apology it is the goddess whose name is written with the Ishtar sign and whose cult center was the town of Šamuḫa.[34] In other texts the deity who conferred kingship upon him was the sun goddess of Arinna.[35] In his final challenge to Urḫitešub, Ḫattušili in fact appeals to the Ishtar of Šamuḫa and the storm god of Nerik to decide the issue between the two of them by the ordeal of battle (*Ḫatt.* III 71-73, §11). The argument from the outcome of the ordeal of battle was unanswerable: "In truth would (the gods) have subjected a great king to a small king? Now because he started hostilities with me, they subjected him to me in the trial" (*Ḫatt.* III 78-79, §11). Ḫattušili's vindication as the king divinely chosen to depose Urḫitešub comes through the providence[36] of the goddess Ishtar, who reassures him in dreams (*Ḫatt.* IV 7-17, §12) and appears to others in dreams to enlist their support of Ḫattušili, saying, "On your own ye are weak,[37] but I, Ishtar, have turned all the Hittite lands to the side of Ḫattušili!" (*Ḫatt.* IV 21-23, §12). At the showdown the miraculous power of Ishtar supported Ḫattušili: (1) for the first time ever she refused to support Urḫitešub (*Ḫatt.* IV 24ff.) and (2) the Kaškeans who formerly had been Ḫattušili's enemies now appeared as his allies (*Ḫatt.* IV 26ff.). As ever more allies flocked to the side of Ḫattušili, Urḫitešub found himself trapped in the town of Šamuḫa "like a pig in a sty" (*Ḫatt.* IV 25-26) or "like a fish in a net" (*KBo* VI 29 ii 34).[38] Ḫattušili's victory and divine vindication was clear and complete.

A victor can afford to be generous, yet not all victors choose to be. Only when there is something to be gained from magnanimity do they make the effort.[39] Both Telepinu and Ḫattušili make the effort, because the situation was still delicate and the stakes for survival too high. Thus both documents are at pains to portray the new kings as men of mercy. Telepinu "built them houses (and said), 'Let them go (and) dwell (there). Let them eat (and) drink, and do not do them any harm. And I declare: "They did me harm, yet I will not do them harm"'" (*BoTU* II 23A ii 13-15, §23). And when the henchmen who were to carry out the murders were brought before him for judgment, he expressed his leniency as follows: "Why should they die? Let them rather hide their faces.[40] So I, the king, made them real[41] farmers. I took their weapons from their shoulder(s), and I gave them . . ." (*BoTU* II 23A ii 29-30, §26). Ḫattušili also dispensed favors upon his accession (§§12-13). He did not attempt to execute Urḫitešub, but publicly humiliated him,[42] bringing him from

Šamuḫa "like a captive" (*Ḫatt.* IV 31, §12), and interned him in the land of Nuḫašše in one of the fortified cities. Even the unsuccessful attempt of Urḫitešub to escape to Babylonia, where he could organize support for a return to power (*Ḫatt.* IV 33f., §12), did not lead Ḫattušili to the extreme measure of executing a son of Muwatalli. But additional precautions were taken in the selection of a new place of internment, which seems to have been a coastal area (A.AB.BA *tapuša*, *Ḫatt.* IV 36). It is clear from the constant repetition of the phrase "out of respect for my brother (Muwattalli)"(three times in the main text: *Ḫatt.* III 62, IV 29, 61; twice in *KBo* VI 29: i 36, ii 38) that Muwattalli's line had many supporters still, and that Ḫattušili was resolved to win them over. As a gesture of good will to them he installed as a local king in the city of Tarḫuntašša,[43] where Muwatalli's capital had been situated,[44] the latter's son $^{m}$KAL (to be read *Inara*?).[45] Still another party with which Ḫattušili dealt cautiously was Šippaziti, the son of his long-standing rival and opponent, Armadatta (*Ḫatt.* III 22; IV 3, 5, 6).[46] Once before (§10), when his father Armadatta had been convicted of unprovoked attacks on Ḫattušili, Šippaziti and his father had been spared harsh treatment and had only been sent to Alashiya for internment (verb: *uppa-*), while the crown awarded half of his estate to Ḫattušili for damages. The grounds for his lenient treatment then doubtless still called for lenient treatment after the defeat of Urḫitešup, despite the fact that this was a "second offense" by the family against Ḫattušili. *Ḫatt.* III 25 seems to read: *nu-mu* $^{I}$*Ar-ma-*$^{D}$*U-aš [ku-it...-w]a-aš an-tu-uḫ-ša-aš e-eš-ta* "and [because] Armadatta was a man [ . . . ] to me, . . . I let him off!" This seems to suggest that Ḫattušili and Armadatta were at least distantly related, a situation which is possible to explain, if we assume that Armadatta's father, Zida, was the same man as the Zida who was the brother of Šuppiluliuma, Ḫattušili's grandfather. If that Zida belonged to the same generation as Šuppiluliuma, Armadatta would have been roughly contemporary with Muršili, which fits with his being called "an old man and ill" by Ḫattušili shortly after his father, Muršili, had died (§10). Šippaziti would belong to Ḫattušili's own generation. As a great-grandson of the king who was Šuppiluliuma's father, Šippaziti was entitled to gentle treatment.

Both the Telepinu Proclamation and the Apology of Ḫattušili conclude with quasi-legal sections. This material fills quite a large amount of space in the Telepinu text, while in Ḫattušili it is brief. In Telepinu the regulations concern the conduct of justice as it affects the royal family. In Ḫattušili the regulations concern only the disposition of royal property to the cult of the goddess Ishtar of Šamuḫa. In both cases the narrative portions provide background for the legal portions, but since the Ḫattušili sections are few in number (§§13-15), one gains the impression that he perhaps only follows the documentary form in Telepinu's precedent and that his primary concern was the narrative itself and the justification of his usurpation.

The pattern of introducing legal reforms by historical narrative introductions is first attested in the Telepinu text. Thereafter one finds it in the probably "Middle Hittite" text describing the reforms of a king named Tudḫaliya (*KUB* XIII 9 and *KUB* XL 62; *CTH* 258 = Cat. 172, with unpublished dupl. 99/p).[47]

The reforms themselves focus on the restoration of the former unity and prosperity of the earliest monarchs. Thus Telepinu writes: "Whoever after me through all time shall become king, in those days let his brothers, his sons, his relatives-in-law, the members of his family, and his subjects (lit. "soldiers") be united! And you shall come (and) with (your) strength hold the hostile country in subjection" (*BoTU* II 23A ii 40ff., §29), harking back to his descriptions of the reigns of Labarna, Ḫattušili, and Muršili in paragraphs 1-2, 5, and

8. At the basis of this restored unity and strength should lie a clear and universally recognized order of royal succession, which Telepinu gives in paragraph 28: (1) son of the king's primary wife, (2) son of the king's secondary wife, and (3) husband of the daughter of the king's primary wife.[48] The aim was the elimination of ambiguity and unpredictable, unaccountable high-handed behavior of the sovereign. Therefore, in the future the king must not offer pardon and later rescind it (§29). He must neither himself instigate or tolerate among others plots to kill members of the royal family (§§30-31). With these words Telepinu renounces the dictum that "might makes right" and that "a king may do as he pleases."[49] The Hittite king, too, is accountable, in the first instance (as indeed previous to these reforms) to the gods who avenge bloodshed, but now also to the judicial body called the *pankuš*. The punishment meted out by the gods embraced not only the offender himself but his family as well.[50] The punishment decreed by the *pankuš*, on the contrary, must not extend beyond the person of the offending king or prince (§§31-32): "but let them not contrive harm for his house, his wife (and) his children!" This "limited liability" would seem also to emend the provisions of the Hittite laws,[51] whose main version dates to the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I (c. 1675-1600), which allowed in some cases that the deceased's heir appropriate the property of the convicted murderer, and in one other case actually prescribed that the murderer's son be handed over to the deceased's heir (law §44a).[52] Telepinu's reasoning was that, since the expropriation of the convicted man's property was often the principal motivation for falsely accusing him and engineering his death (§§31-32),[53] if one revised the law so as to eliminate the expropriation clause, it ought to reduce, if not eliminate, the plots to incriminate and have executed the Hittite princes.[54] Although superficially it might appear that the somewhat disorganized group of rulings at the end of Telepinu's text have no common theme, one can in fact relate all the rulings to the central concern of internecine strife and killings among the royal family! Thus even paragraph 50, which concerns persons in the royal family who practice sorcery, deals with the threat that the sorcerer poses to the lives of his relatives.

We mentioned at the outset that it was possible to speak of a tradition of Hittite apologies. Telepinu is the earliest usurper of whom we have certain evidence for a written defense. While it needs to be affirmed that no earlier such document can be proven, it should also be pointed out that a possible example of a still earlier written defense by a usurper exists in a lamentably fragmentary state. I refer to *KBo* III 45 (= *BoTU* II 16; *CTH* 10), whose recently discovered duplicate *KBo* XXII 7 adds almost no words not already contained in *KBo* III 45. A transliteration of this remarkable fragment follows:[55]

[ ]x *tá-aḫ-ḫu-uš*[ -
*w*[*a*-]*a*'[56]-*tar-na-aḫ-ḫa-an ḫar-zi šu-uš-ká*[*n*
L[Ú].MEŠ URU*Ḫa-at-ti* KI ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*NI* x[

---

[*n*]*e-pi-ši* DINGIR.MEŠ *iš-tar-ni-in-ku-en* [*(ta)*
[UR]U*KÁ*.DINGIR.RA-*aš ku-e-az*[57]-*mi-it da-a*[-
[(GU)]D.ḪI.A-*NI*[58] UDU.ḪI.A-*NI*[58] *a-ap-pa-an ša-an*[-59...*(na)*]
[*(ku)*]-*en-ta ta e-eš-ḫar-še-et šu-up-pa*[-60
[ ]-*a-i-á-en ta pa-a-i-á-en ta á*? [-61
[*ša*-] ˹*a*˺?-*li-ku-wa-aš-ta-ti ta-at-ra-an-t*[*a*(-)[53] . .*ŠA*? URU*KÁ*.DINGIR.RA)][62
[*(u)t-n*]*e-e-az-ma tar-nu-mi-en* TÚG.SIG U[RU KÁ.DINGIR.RA??
[*nu ma*]-*a-an ša-la-i-iš at-ta-aš ut-tar p*[*e-eš-ši*-[63]

---

[ x x x *me*]-*ma-a-i a-ni-ši-wa-at* m*Mur-ši-i*[-*li*-

[ x x x x x] x *ŠUM-an-še-et le-e ku-iš*[*-ki te-ez-zi*[64]
[ *ḫa-an*]*-te-ez-zi-i-aš-mi le-e*[
[ *n*]*a*?*-an a-aš-ki-iš-ši k*[*án-kán-du*[65]

[ ]x *ku-iš*[

Because of the fragmentary state of this text, certainty in its interpretation is in no way possible. Yet a few suggestions may be made here. In line 4′ the speaker includes himself or his readers among those who have "made the gods sick" by an evil deed. Line 5′ may explain what the deed was: "[We] took(?)[66] of Babylon their possessions."[67] In line 6′ cattle and sheep are mentioned, perhaps part of the booty taken from Babylon. The next verb is singular: "He killed/smote [ . . . ], and its blood. . .[he. . .-ed]." Line 8′ mentions "we went and their/your field [ . . . ]." The verb *šalikwaštati* means "we penetrated."[68] Lines 9′-10′ seem to refer to removing from the land of Babylon certain items of value, perhaps including "fine garments." Line 11′, the final line of the section which describes the evil deeds against Babylon which made the gods sick, seems to say: "[And w]hen he became rebellious(?),[69] the father's word [he(??)] c[ast off(?)]." That the final verb is third singular would seem to follow from the third singular verb "he became rebellious" in the protasis. The identity of the final verb ("cast off") is reasonably certain from the very similar passage in *KBo* III 27 obv 28ff., as well as from the interesting and relevant lines in paragraph 19 of the Political Testament of Ḫattušili (*KUB* I 16) addressed to Muršili. *If* this restoration is correct, who is the unidentified person who "became rebellious" and "c[ast off] his father's word"? Since the deed described in lines 1′-11′ is against the city of Babylon and is connected with penetrating its territory and taking its goods, it would seem highly probable that the person who cast off his father's word was Muršili himself, who led the Hittite armies against Babylon. As a consequence of Muršili's sin described in lines 1′-11′, the narrator proceeds in lines 12′ and following to draw consequences. The key word *anišiwat* in line 12′ is of uncertain meaning, since it is a hapax legomenon. Friedrich (*HWb*, 22, quoting Hrozný) translates it "today," but, although *šiwat* can be an endingless locative "on the day," *ani* can hardly be "this." If *ani* is the same as *anni-*, it would denote the more remote object "that." Thus one would translate *anišiwat* as "on that day." Because the end of Muršili's name is missing in the lacuna, one cannot determine its case, and therefore it is impossible to say if it is the subject or object of the sentence. Since the author of this text would hardly criticize Muršili in this fashion during the king's lifetime, it is possible that he says here: "On that day Muršu[li died]." Yet since the narrator describes the Babylonian expedition as "we," either he or his readers must have taken part. Therefore, a date not long after the death of Muršili but within the next generation is probable. This would place the composition of this text during the reign of Ḫanteli or his immediate successor, a date which is not opposed by the archaic language of the text. Line 13′ adds: "His name let no on[e speak]!" I would assume that lines 15′-16′, although related to the preceding lines, do not refer to Muršili himself by the words "[Let them] h[ang] him in his gate!" although we have so little knowledge of the details of the death of that king that it is impossible to say.

In order to distinguish between what is fairly certain in this fragment and what is highly conjectural, let me review its contents and my interpretation. Lines 4′-11′ describe actions carried out against Babylon early in the Hittite Old Kingdom, therefore certainly by Muršili and his men. Some actions are attributed to the entire group, with which the narrator identifies either himself or his listeners by the use of "we" forms. Other actions he attributes to one man. In the final line, apparently summarizing, he attributes to the one man rebellion and the casting off of "(his) father's word." If the Babylonian raid itself displeased the gods, then the one man who could be singled out for censure would be the king who led that raid. I suggest then that this text was composed during the reign of Ḫanteli, and that he, through criticizing the final act of Muršili as displeasing to the gods, sought to remove all stigma from himself as Muršili's usurper. If this is so, the fragment forms a part of what was possibly the earliest bit of political propaganda used by a Hittite usurper and is a document which served as a precedent for Telepinu.

## NOTES

[1] *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1963 ed.), II, 124ff.; *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon,* 9. Aufl. (Mannheim, 1971), II, 404; *Der Kleine Pauly,* I, 455. For aretalogies see M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich, 1950), II, 216ff.

[2] E. H. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (1935) 42-99 (hereafter cited as *Chrest.*) (*CTH* 81).

[3] Original edition by A. Goetze in *MVAeG* XXIX/3 (1924) (hereafter cited as *Ḫatt.*). Additional joins and duplicates since Goetze's edition conveniently assembled in *CTH* 81, 15. A new edition by H. Otten will appear in a future volume of the series *StBoT* published by Otto Harrassowitz of Wiesbaden.

[4] A. Goetze, *CAH* II², fasc. 37, 45. See H. M. Wolf, *The Apology of Ḫattušiliš Compared* . . .(Ann Arbor, 1967) 12ff. for a review of evidence for the form of the document. See also O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (Baltimore, 1964) 175f.

[5] *MVAeG* XXIX/3 (1924).

[6] A. Goetze, *CAH* II², fasc. 37, 45.

[7] *KUB* XXVI 1 iv 7-10, §29; E. von Schuler, *Dienstanw.,* 8ff.

[8] *KUB* XXVI 8 ("B") i 33'-37', §5; *CTH* 255.

[9] H. M. Wolf, *Apology of Ḫattušiliš Compared,* 16, lists similarities between the Annals of Muršili and the Apology of Ḫattušili.

[10] Translation in Goetze, *AM,* 16-21; and Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *Muršili . . . Karakter* [Dutch] (Leiden, 1966) n. 2.

[11] Translations in Goetze, *AM,* 21-23, and Gurney, *The Hittites,* 173-74; discussion in E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer,* 45, n. 282.

[12] Translations in Goetze, *AM,* 137, and Gurney, *The Hittites,* 174. See also Sommer, *AU,* 247; Friedrich, *Staatsv.,* I, 44; and Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *Numen* 16 (1969) 83, n. 12.

[13] Thus in the colophons (*KUB* XIX 30 iv 15; *KBo* V 8 iv 24) this text is called "the manly deeds of Muršili," on which concept see H. Hoffner, *JBL* 85 (1966) 327 with n. 4.

[14] See *Ḫatt.* II 37ff, §7, and H. Hoffner, *CBQ* 30 (1968) 220ff.; *KBo* III 4 iv 44-48, §42.

[15] *CTH* 19 (p. 5); Forrer, *BoTU* II 23; Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrest.,* 175ff.; O. R. Gurney, *CAH* II², fasc. 44, 3-10; Eiserle's Munich dissertation, which was a new edition of this text, has still not been published, as had been anticipated, in the series *Texte der Hethiter* (Carl Winter Verlag, Heidelberg).

[16] See H. Otten, *ZA* 61 (1971) 234.

[17] Von Schuler, *Dienstanw.,* 8-9, 17-18.

[18] See Gurney, *CAH* II², fasc. 44, 7 with n. 4, rebutting E. Menabde.

[19] Ibid., 7-8.



[20] On the grammar of §§2-3a (*BoTU* II 23A i 5-8) see H. Hoffner, in *Peoples of the Old Testament,* ed. D. J. Wiseman (Oxford, 1973) 207.

[21] *KBo* III 57 (*BoTU* II 20) obv. ii 10'-11'; Gurney, *CAH* II², fasc. 11, 24.

[22] See A. Archi, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 14 (1971) 186ff., for examples of this same use of contrasts in the propaganda of Ḫattušili III.

[23] Thus I cannot accept Gurney's second explanation of the events in §§21-22 (*CAH* II², fasc. 44, 7-8).

[24] That Telepinu did not, however, utterly disassociate his line from his immediate predecessors is shown by the name of his son Ammuna (*BoTU* II 23A ii 32, §27).

[25] Hoffner in *Peoples of the Old Testament,* ed. Wiseman, 208ff.

[26] See von Schuler in Röllig (ed.), *Wörterbuch der Mythologie* (Stuttgart, 1965), vol. 1, 201f.; and H. G. Güterbock in *Festschrift Joh. Friedrich* (1959) 207ff.

[27] *BoTU* II 23A ii 46-52, §§30-31; Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrest.,* 190-91; A. Goetze, *Kleinasien²,* 87; H. G. Güterbock, *JAOS* supp. 17 (1954) 19; E. Laroche, *RHA,* fasc. 76 (1965) 35.

[28] The subjects of the verb (*arḫa*) *išduwa-* (J. Friedrich, *ZA* nF 3, 198 with n. 2; E. Neu, *StBoT* 5, 78f.) are usually evil thoughts or rebellious plans which the evil doer seeks to conceal (*šanna-*). Only once (*KUB* XXX 10 rev 19 and dupls.) is the subject something good (translation by A. Goetze, in *ANET²,* 401).

[29] For the verbal construction *arḫa parḫ-* "to banish" (*HWb,* 159; A. Goetze, *JCS* 17, 99) the documentation is as follows: *KUB* XIII 7 i 12-13, "they will banish him, and he shall pay the judgement with his house"; *KUB* VIII 1 ii 7-8, "if on the 20th day the moon 'dies,' the prince, who has been banished, will return and occupy his father's throne"; *KUB* XIV 1 i 1, "Attarissiya of Aḫḫiya(wa) banished you [Madduwatta] from your land"; *KUB* XIII 2 iii 11ff., "As it has been from olden days, in the lands a regulation governing *hurkel* (incest) has been observed; in a town in which they have been accustomed to impose the death penalty, they shall continue to do so; but in a town where they have been accustomed to impose exile (or "banish") they shall continue that (custom)."

[30] Compare the internment of his disinherited son by Ḫattušili I in *KUB* I 16 (*HAB*), §6.

[31] *HAB,* 68. The prominent emphasis in the Old Hittite texts on the need for a king to be worthy or fit suggests that the apologies which justify deposing an unworthy king first arose in that atmosphere and fitted less well in the social and political climate of the empire period several centuries later. Perhaps this is why Ḫattušili III had to reinforce the argument of Urḫitešub's unfitness with claims of his own to divine revelations and divine designation.

[32] On Akkadian *esertu/esirtu* in Hittite texts, see A. Goetze, *ArOr* 2, 153ff. On this passage see Goetze, *CAH* II², fasc. 37, 44, n. 1.

[33] See Archi, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 14 (1971) 188ff.

[34] *Ibid.*

35 *Ibid.*

36 This translation seeks to express that combination of divine justice and effective power which seems to inhere in the Hittite term *parā ḫandantatar*. See *Ḫatt.*, 52ff.; Sommer and Ehelolf, *Pap.*, 30-31; Goetze, *Kleinasien*², 146; Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrest.*, 86 and 229; Wolf, *Apology of Ḫattušiliš Compared*, 28ff., 185; Hoffner, in *Peoples of the Old Testament*, ed. Wiseman; and A. Archi, *SMEA* 14 (1971) 188.

37 See H. Hoffner, *JNES* 28 (1969) 228. Earlier translations by Goetze, *Ḫatt.*, 33; Sturtevant and Bechtel, *Chrest.*, 79; and H. G. Güterbock in Oppenheim, *TAPS* 46 (1956) 254.

38 See Wolf, *Apology of Ḫattušiliš Compared*, 15.

39 See Muršili's description of his father Šuppiluliuma's sparing of the acropolis and shrines of Carchemish in *KBo* V 6 iii 31ff.

40 That is, not show their faces in the capital, but remain in seclusion. See *KUB* I 16 (*BoTU* II 8) ii 30-36, §6.

41 *Karšaniš* "real" as opposed to absentee landowners, whose serfs tilled the soil.

42 For other instances of this practice see *KBo* III 22: 73-79 (Anitta text, §18), *KBo* X 2 iii 40-42 (Ḫattušili I annals, §20).

43 URUDU-*taššа* formerly read Dattašša.

44 *Ḫatt.* II 52-53, §8.

45 *Ḫatt.* IV 65, §13; also *ABoT* 57 (*CTH* 97) and 544/f (*CTH* 96).

46 Šippaziti (*šippa-* LÚ), the son of Armadatta, is known aside from the passages cited in E. Laroche, *Les noms hittites* (Paris, 1966) 163; perhaps also from *KBo* XVI 83 iii 3; *KBo* XVI 60 rev. 6; *KBo* XVI 22 obv. 4. Possibly a third [$^{m}$*Ši-ip-*]*pa-*LÚ, the son of Pulli, is known from *KBo* XVIII 89 obv. 4. Perhaps the grandfather (Zida) of the Šippaziti of the Ḫattušili text is the brother of Šuppiluliuma who held the office of GAL *MEŠEDI* and not a second Zida, as Laroche assumes (*Les noms hittites*, 211). *Ḫatt.* III 25 suggests Armadatta was related to Ḫattušili and was therefore a member of the royal family. If so, Šippaziti's royal descent (great-grandson of the king who was Šuppiluliuma's and Zida's father) would have influenced Ḫattušili's lenient treatment of him (*Ḫatt.* IV 36-40, §12).

47 Aside from the literature cited in *CTH* 258, cf. E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer*, 60, n. 422; J. Friedrich, *JAOS* 88 (1968) 37; O. Carruba, *Die Sprache* 12 (1966) 84f.; and H. Otten in H. Schmökel, *Kulturgeschichte* (1961), 370.

48 Goetze, *Kleinasien*², 87; Gurney, *CAH* II², fasc. 44 (1966) 10; E. Menabde, *Vestnik . . . Istorii* 4 (1969) 67-82; H. Hoffner, *JNES* 28 (1969) 228.

49 For this *idaluš memiyaš*, compare: "Oh, the king [does] in secret what he pleases!" (*KUB* I 16 ii 53-54, §10; *RHA*, fasc. 67 [1960] 144), and for further examples see *BoTU* II 23A ii 5, 52; *BoTU* II 23C ii 1; *KBo* XIII 1 + *KBo* I 44, rev. 37-38.

50 See Goetze, *Kleinasien*², 147 with text citations.

51 Hittite laws §§6, 43-44a; see also *BoTU* II 23B iv 19-21, §49; and *KUB* XIII 9, ii 3-7.



52 See also *KBo* XVI 25 (*CTH* 251) iii 10'ff.; and *KUB* XIII 7 (*CTH* 258, 2) i 17ff.

53 I translate *BoTU* II 23A ii 56-58 as follows: "For what cause are princes destroyed? Is it not for the sake of (obtaining) their houses . . .?" See also ii 63-65.

54 A good example of the abuse of such expropriation laws is seen in the story of Naboth and King Ahab of Israel (1 Kings 21).

55 I should like to thank here Professors H. Otten and E. Laroche for their friendly suggestions regarding the transliteration and interpretation of this fragment. They are in no way to be held accountable, however, for my own interpretation of the lines.

56 Reading suggested by Laroche.

57 *KBo* XXII 7: 2' *ku-it-šum-*[*mi-it*].

58 Or perhaps *-ni*?

59 Amount of space undetermined.

60 Is this a form of the adjective *šuppi-* "holy" or the noun *šuppa* "flesh, meat"?

61 Copy in *KBo* shows three vertical wedges, making LÍL possible. Forrer in *BoTU* read *a*[-....] (assuming he saw four verticals?), but fails to draw the sign. *KBo* XXII 7: 5' has *ku-e-ra-šum-m*[*a?-an?*], perhaps favoring LÍL, although the usual Hittite word corresponding to LÍL is *gimra-*. *kuera-* usually occurs in pairings with A.ŠÀ, so that the latter is certainly not its Sumerogram.

62 *KBo* XXII 7 breaks off here.

63 Restored following *KBo* III 27 obv 28ff. See Sommer, *HAB*, 154, n. 1 (reference courtesy of Laroche).

64 Restored following *KBo* III 27 obv 7ff.

65 Restored following *KBo* III 27 obv 9ff., 12, 22.

66 Restoring *da-a*[*-a-en*].

67 Literally "their what" (*ku-e-az-mi-it, ku-it-šum-*[*mi-it*]). The booty from Babylon is mentioned prominently also in *BoTU* II 23A i 29, §9, on which see above.

68 Or "we reached, touched, arrived at"; see *HWb*, 179, and Neu, *StBoT* 5, 147ff.

69 The verb form is 3 sg. pret. *ḫi*-conjugation on the stem *šala(i)-*. Despite the single writing of the *l* one should consider it to be the same verb as is found in *KBo* I 45 ii 5 (*šallawar*), which translates the Akkadian word *za-ra-ru-u* (=*sarāru* "to rebel, rise up against"); see *Ḫatt.*, 87; *HWb*, 87; *MSL* III, 49-87; and Laroche, *RHA*, fasc. 79, 161. Alternatively, if the verb belongs with those medio-passive forms of the stem *šallai-/šalliya-* (Neu, *StBoT* 5, 146-47; Laroche, *RHA*, fasc. 79, 161: "etirer, tirailler"), then one would have to translate here "[wh]en he grew up/became great, his father's word [he] c[ast off]," and compare *KUB* I 16 iii 26-32, §19.

- 6 -

# HITTITE MYTHOLOGICAL TEXTS: A SURVEY

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

What the nonspecialist may call "Hittite myths" and what is listed under that term in the English translations in Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* actually consists, as has often been noted,[1] of tales which the Hittites learned from several ethno-linguistic groups: the non-Indo-European Ḫattians, the non-Indo-European Ḫurrians, and other groups (Luwians, Palaeans). In fact, strange as it may seem, it is difficult to identify a single mythological tale in the corpus of myths from Boğazköy which one may attribute to the Indo-European Hittites themselves with any certainty.[2]

The group of tales about the exploits of the gods which came into Hittite hands first after their arrival in Anatolia was doubtless the Ḫattian group. Only tales from this group have so far been found in Old Hittite versions. Unlike myths derived from the Ḫurrians, these Ḫattian myths were committed to writing only in connection with rituals.[3] They are therefore probably not to be thought of as real literary compositions. Yet this should not blind the reader to genuine literary values in these sometimes deceptively simple stories. For elsewhere in the ancient Near East we know of truly great literary works, which were recited in connection with festivals. The fact that their plots were suited to the festival occasion or to the ritual being performed detracts in no way from their value as literary creations. We have no way of knowing the oral prehistory of these Ḫattian stories. Nor can we say that they were only employed in connection with those rituals in which they are transmitted in writing. It is quite clear that they lack the elaborate formulae and the stereotyped metaphors, similes, and kennings of the Ḫurrian tales.[4] It is also clear that several are etiologic. The fact that several are well adapted to more than one use speaks for multipurpose employment of the stories. In fact, it is noteworthy that already in the earliest known periods of the Hittite kingdom a collection of tales about the deeds of historical persons was codified as a repository of admonitory examples.[5] Other stories which must have been transmitted orally, were occasionally used to reinforce the commands of the king in the protocols, state treaties, and other official documents.[6] Did the Hittites derive this custom from the Ḫattians preceding them? Did the Ḫattians also use tales about the activities of the gods for admonitory purposes?

Many of the myths of Ḫattian origin share a similar plot structure. The myths of the Telepinu type and the Illuyanka myth in particular tell of a crisis which results from the disappearance or defeat and incapacitation of a deity important to the welfare of the land. The crisis leads to a general meeting of the gods to find means of remedying the situation. The deity chosen to restore the former order has to seek the aid of either a mortal[7] or some other lower creature (in Telepinu, the bee). Success is eventually achieved, but the Illuyanka story (in both versions) includes a casualty in the person of the mortal who assists the god.



In several of the Ḫattian myths prominent use is made in the plot of marriage customs.[8] In particular in the Illuyanka myth and in the story of Telepinu and the Daughter of the Sea God (*CTH* 322) the role played by the husbands corresponds to that of the person who in Hittite laws is called the *antiyanza*.[9] This kind of husband enters the home of his bride's parents and, in lieu of title to his wife's dowry during her lifetime or after her decease, receives a payment at the time of the marriage. This payment is described by the word which denotes the bride-price,[10] which the husband pays to the bride's parents in the more usual patrilocal marriage. In the Illuyanka myth and the tale of Telepinu and the Daughter of the Sea God this institution is presupposed and indeed its procedures are utilized to achieve the principal goals in the action of the plot. Thus in Illuyanka version two[11] the goal of the storm god is to recover his eyes and heart, which the dragon Illuyanka has taken from him. In order to avoid direct confrontation with his former conqueror before he has retrieved them, he must devise a plan to obtain them indirectly in a manner which will not arouse suspicion. So the storm god begets a mortal child and orders the boy to offer himself to the dragon as a son-in-law. That the boy is to be an *antiyanza* is clear, although the specific term is not used. For he "goes to the house of his wife" to take up residence there, and when entering his wife's house is entitled to ask for a gift or payment (in this case the storm god's heart and eyes), and when at the end the storm god is about to destroy the dragon and his family, the young man is bound by the mores of his society to say, "Include me with (them)! Spare me not!" and to die together with his new family. The ties with his own father and mother were severed, and the new relationship superseded the former. The new relationship was what the Hittites called *andayantatar*,[12] the status of the *antiyanza*.

In the myth of Telepinu and the Daughter of the Sea God[13] the same type of marriage must be understood as underlying the plot. The story is set in primeval days, when the various spheres of influence (sky, earth, nether world, mankind) were allotted to the various deities.[14] At that time the sea god, perhaps unhappy with his lot, became angry and carried off the sun god from the sky and hid him. Conditions deteriorated on earth because of the sun's absence. Yet, no god could stand against the sea god. So the storm god summoned his son Telepinu and contrived a plan. Telepinu went to the sea god, who became afraid and gave him his daughter in marriage. He also gave him the sun god. This could be understood in the same way as the second version of Illuyanka: the god Telepinu married into the sea god's family and received the sun god as his marriage price, just as the mortal son of the storm god received the eyes and heart of his father. But Telepinu did not stay with the sea god. He took his wife and the sun god and returned to the residence of the storm god. This gave the sea god reasons for complaint. As long as Telepinu remained with him, Telepinu needed to make no payment; on the contrary he could request a payment for himself. After he had departed, he was no longer entitled to keep the daughter or the sun god, unless he made good the bride-price. Thus the sea god sent a message to the storm god: "Your son Telepinu [has taken] my daughter as his wife. He has taken her away (to his home)." (This second statement is an unnecessary addition unless the marriage was first conceived as of the *antiyanza* type.) "Now [what] will you give me?"[15] The storm god asked the advice of the goddess DINGIR.MAḪ, who advised him to pay. Thereupon the items to be paid are listed[16] until the text breaks off.

At this point an explanation is necessary as to why the term *antiyanza* is not used in either text. In the second text one could point to the fragmentary nature of the text. Perhaps, one could argue, the word did occur in one of the long breaks. But surely no such excuse can be offered for version two of Illuyanka, which is in good textual order. It seems

to me that the answer is obvious. One needs a special term only for a kind of marriage which is uncommon. The Hittites, to whom this type of marriage was a novelty, coined the term *antiyanza*, which is a Hittite–not a Ḫattian–word to describe it. If the arrangement was new to the Hittites, it must have been a survival of a practice among the autochthonous peoples, the Ḫattians. And if this type of marriage was common among the Ḫattians, perhaps even the prevailing type, then it needed no special name. Indeed, the very fact that in the Illuyanka myth the institution seems so clearly to underlie and explain the plot, yet no special mention is made of any unusual type of marriage, would be *prima facie* evidence that this was the normal type of marriage among the Ḫattians.

In the first version of Illuyanka there are also certain parts of the plot which seem extraneous to the central theme of the vanquished storm god aided by a goddess and a mortal finally overcoming his erstwhile conqueror. The role of the goddess and the mortal fits into the common framework for the plots of these Ḫattian myths, as I have already discussed above. What seems extraneous is the final episode in which the mortal man Ḫupašiya, who although he is already married, has become the goddess Inara's captive husband, and longs for home like Odysseus' on Circe's island. Although he is warned he must never look out of Inara's window in her absence, he does so, catches sight of his wife, and longs to leave. When Inara discovers what he has done, she kills him. Since the lovers' retreat was a house on a cliff in the region of Tarukka, it is possible that the episode grew up to explain the presence of the ruins of that house, which, according to the text, eventually came into the hands of the king.

Both versions of the Illuyanka myth are said to form the cult-legend of the Purulli Festival, which was performed in the spring to celebrate the renewal of plant life.[17] According to the ritual at the end of the second version the festival witnessed a gathering of all the gods (that is, their statues) and a competition. We know of other examples of competitions or games held at festivals by the Hittites, including pugilism.[18] However, if, as is possible, the Hittite expression *pul tiyanzi* (which Goetze translated "they compete") really means "they cast lots," then this festival is the determining of primacy among the gods of the Nerik circle by lot-throwing. About this first celebration of Purulli the text records that the god Zašḫapuna of the city of Kaštama was the greatest.

Among the myths which reached the Hittites through Ḫurrian intermediacy was the so-called Kumarbi cycle, which includes the Kingship in Heaven myth, the myth of the Kingship of the God KAL, and the Ullikummi myth.[19] Of these, the first and third have already received detailed treatment by a number of Hittitologists, and both are available to English-speaking scholars in good translations by Albrecht Goetze[20] and Hans Güterbock.[21] Exceedingly interesting similarities between the Kumarbi cycle and the early Greek myths about Ouranos, Kronos, and Zeus have been pointed out first by Emil Forrer and then in much greater detail and precision by Güterbock.[22] The similarity concerns primarily the generations of gods who held divine kingship, that is, ruled the other gods, and the events attending the passing of the throne from one generation to the next. Meriggi[23] has added the important observation that in one of the poorly preserved lines of column II of Kingship in Heaven the birth of a god identified by the Sumerian word $KIRI_4$.ZAL (or KA.ZAL) meaning literally "shining nose, shining face"[24] is described in a manner which strikingly parallels the birth of "bright-eyed" (*glaukōpis*) Athena. One god splits open the skull of Kumarbi and the deity KA.ZAL emerges from the skull. Of some importance to the proper understanding of Kingship in Heaven is the relationship between the deities who succeed to the kingship. That they are not father and son has been stressed by others. It is my



opinion that the kingship is passed back and forth between two competing lines of gods. Those lines can be seen most clearly in the following table:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alalu | Anu |
| Kumarbi | Storm god (Teshub) |
| Ullikummi | |

The filiation between Alalu and Kumarbi is made most explicitly in col. I, line 19, where Kumarbi is called Alalu's NUMUN "seed."[25] The filiation between Kumarbi and Ullikummi is also explicit in the Song of Ullikummi, where Kumarbi copulates with a gigantic rock and begets thereby the stone monster Ullikummi. As for the other line, the text tells us that Anu's genitals were swallowed by Kumarbi and impregnated him with three gods, one of whom was the storm god Teshub. Thus it is indisputable that we have two rival dynasties here with the kingship alternating between them in their struggles. Each deposed father is avenged by his son, who then becomes the new ruler. Of course, this alternation from generation to generation proceeds no further, for from the preserved portions of the end of the Song of Ullikummi it is clear that the storm god Teshub himself, not his son, will defeat Ullikummi in their second encounter, now that the latter's firm hold on the shoulder of Upelluri has been severed.

The characters in the Kumarbi cycle can easily be compared with figures in other mythologies. It has long been noted that Anu, whose name harks back to the Sumerian sky god's name, compares in his role in Kingship in Heaven with the god Ouranos ("heaven") in Greek myths. Anu is deposed and at the same time emasculated by Kumarbi, just as Ouranos is emasculated by his son Kronos. The correspondence between the Greek Kronos and the Ḫurrian Kumarbi has recently become even more striking with the discovery by E. Laroche that the god depicted holding the stalk of grain on the Yazilikaya relief is none other than Kumarbi, who at Ras Shamra/Ugarit was identified with the West Semitic god Dagan.[26] Thus both the Greek Kronos and the Ḫurrian Kumarbi were grain gods, which, of course, makes it quite appropriate that Kronos "reaped" his father's genitals with a sickle! Ullikummi has been compared with the monster Typhon of the Greek legends. Ubelluri, who holds heaven and earth, is an obvious Atlas figure and matches his Greek counterpart in stupidity as well. For as Atlas was dim-witted enough to be outwitted even by the muscle-bound Hercules in the episode of the golden apples of the Hesperides, so Ubelluri is not even aware of the attaching to his shoulder of the stone monster Ullikummi, who grows so big that he reaches from the nether world all the way to heaven.[27]

The myths of the Kumarbi cycle are much better known to the general public than the so-called "minor" Ḫurrian myths. Yet among these are some with not only highly interesting plots–they remain very fragmentary–but also points comparable with other myths and legends in the ancient Near East. Most of these minor Ḫurrian myths and legends were first edited by H. G. Güterbock or Johannes Friedrich in the 1940s and 1950s.[28] Two–the myths of Appu and Ḫedammu–have recently been reedited with additional fragments by Jana Siegelová.[29]

A unique feature of the Appu myth is that it seems to illustrate or substantiate a moral, which, although in a fragmentary state of preservation, can just be made out in the first preserved lines of the text. I understand it to say: "He (a deity, perhaps the sun god) is the one who always vindicates just men, but evil men he repeatedly bends like a GIŠ.RU (or GIŠ-*ru* "tree"?),[30] evil men he repeatedly strikes on their skulls (like) *šakšakiluš* until he brings them to ruin." The story which immediately follows was obviously intended to bear

out the truth of this statement. Its interpretation should therefore proceed from these lines. The man, whose name identifies this myth, Appu, is important only as the father of two boys, whom he names respectively "bad" (*idaluš*, once in variant *ḫuwappaš*) and "good, just" (*ḫandanza*). The names may also make reference to some circumstances attending their births, but it is also clear from what follows that the names accurately reflect their characters.[31] Idalu is greedy and dishonest, while Ḫandanza (like Abraham in the story of his dividing the promised land with Lot)[32] is quiet and willing to allow himself to be swindled, as well as impeccably honest. As in the Abraham-Lot story, the god allows Idalu apparently to get away with his dishonesty. Idalu takes the best share of his father's inheritance and gives to Ḫandanza the worst. Yet the sun god causes Ḫandanza's inferior cow to outstrip Idalu's healthier and more valuable plow ox. The old, worn-out cow the sun god caused to bear calves. At this point the text becomes almost entirely illegible. Siegelová's newly found fragments provide only tantalizing disconnected bits of what may have been the intervening narrative. One fragment seems to repeat the words of the proem with specific reference to brother Idalu:[33]

] dUTU-*uš IŠ-ME nu-k*[*án*
-]*ya-at nu* LÚ.ḪUL[-
GI]ŠḪAŠḪUR-*lu-ma-wa-za-kán* [GIM-*an li-la-ak-ki*
-*d*]*a*?-*an* SAG.DU-*an* [*ša-ak-ša-ki-lu-uš wa-al-ḫa-an-na-i*

"[ . . . ] the sun god heard and [ . . . ] and Idalu [ . . . ] '[like] an apple tree [he repeatedly bends . . . . ] the head [(like) *šakšakiluš* he repeatedly strikes].'"

Eventually the two brothers begin a series of appearances before various deities to consider their case. It would seem that brother Idalu, angered at the prosperity of Ḫandanza despite all his own tricks, wishes to charge Ḫandanza before the gods. It is here where the appropriateness of the iterative forms of the verbs in the proem appears.[34] At each successive trial the verdict goes in favor of Ḫandanza. Thus the just man is vindicated "repeatedly" and the unjust man is bent "repeatedly" like an (apple?) tree and struck on the head until he is brought to ruin. The sun god (Shamash) at Sippar is the first to hear the suit and awards the verdict to Ḫandanza, using the same verb (*šarlai-*) as was employed in the proem. Whereupon Idalu begins to curse, and when the sun god hears the cursing, he refuses to make the final decision, and urges them instead to go to Nineveh, where Ishtar will hear their case. They go to Nineveh, but here the text breaks off again, so that we can only suppose on the basis of the proem that Ishtar too vindicates Ḫandanza. Since earlier in the tale brother Idalu had enumerated six prominent Mesopotamian deities: Shamash, Sin, Adad, Ishtar of Nineveh, Nanaya of Kissina, and Marduk of Babylon,[35] one wonders if the case was eventually appealed at all of these six Mesopotamian courts. At any rate, there is nothing in the proem which would lead one to expect any other major turn of events in the tale such as that assumed by the theory of Güterbock that the tale of the Sun God and the Cow was a continuation of the Appu story.[36]

The Ḫedammu myth in its preserved portions (even with Siegelová's additions) yields little in the way of an intelligent plot. The goddess Ishtar is confronted with a sea monster named Ḫedammu, who is described as having a voracious appetite. Wishing to destroy him, the goddess first attempts to lure him through her feminine charms and then to do him in through violence. In this activity she not only resembles the Mesopotamian Ishtar known from Sumerian and Akkadian texts, but also the goddess Inara as portrayed in the first version of the Illuyanka myth.[37]



In the myth called the Sun God and the Cow (*CTH* 363; *KUB* XXIV 7 ii 45ff.),[38] the story opens with the sun god contracting a great sexual desire for a cow, which grazes in his meadow. He apparently tries first to threaten her to leave his meadow and then takes her sexually.[39] The offspring of this union is anthropomorphic, a fact which intensely angers the cow. She tries to kill her two-legged child, but the sun god rescues him and leaves him on a mountainside under the protection of the wild animals. There he is found by a childless fisherman, who thanks the sun god for leading him to this foundling.[40] The child is brought home by the fisherman, who presents it to his wife and asks her to feign birth pangs, so as to make it appear to the neighbors that the child is their own newly born infant. This the woman does, and the ruse apparently succeeds. At this point the text breaks off. Güterbock has suggested that the cow at the beginning of this story is the same cow which appeared in the Appu myth and that this is therefore a continuation of the Appu myth. As stated above, I cannot concur with this interpretation of either story.

Another Ḫurrian tale concerns a hunter named Kessi,[41] who takes a lovely young wife. The girl so entrances him that he neglects his hunting and even his widowed mother who has been depending on him to this point. The mother cajoles him into going hunting again. But in the mountains he finds no game. His preoccupation with his new wife also causes him to neglect the gods' cult, and for this reason they hide all the game from him. After a long and fruitless hunt, Kessi falls ill. Most of the rest of the story has not survived, but in a final fragment we read of dreams which Kessi has and which his mother seeks to interpret for him. These contain interesting symbolism, mostly concerning feminine attire.[42] The mother offers an interpretation for each dream, but the broken condition of the text does not allow us to reconstruct her interpretations with any certainty. Other Kessi stories, or alternatively other parts of this story, are found among the El Amarna tablets and in Ḫurrian texts from Boğazköy.

A myth of Canaanite origin in Hittite translation concerns the god Elkunirša (probably West Semitic *'ēl qônē' 'ereṣ* "El, creator of the earth") and his wife Asherah, here written Ašertu.[43] The goddess Asherah propositions the young god Ba'al (name written dU "storm god") through her maidens, whom she sends to him. "Come, sleep with me!" she urges him. When, however, Baal refuses her, she becomes enraged and threatens him: "Get behind me, and I will get behind you! With my word I will press you down! With my . . . I will . . . you!" The leaders indicate words of unclear reading or interpretation. The verb[44] in other contexts is to be translated "to send, write." Here it must fit into the context of a threat. Thus H. Otten translated it "pierce" or "prick." If he is right, then the uncertain noun must be a sharp implement. Otten read the signs which represent the implement as [GIŠBA]L?.TUR-*az* "with the spindle." Since the spindle is the feminine implement par excellence, as I have tried to show elsewhere,[45] I accepted this reading in my 1965 interpretation of this passage. Recently, however, Professor H. G. Güterbock suggested to E. Laroche that the half-broken sign read [BA]L? by Otten was [GI]R "knife."[46] I have checked the traces on the tablet and found that Otten's KUB XXXVI copy is correct, and that these traces cannot be reconciled with the sign [GI]R, although they are possible for [BA]L, as well as for several other signs. Therefore I would tentatively retain Otten's reading because it fits the traces as well as the womanly context better. It is likely that some misunderstanding of the underlying West Semitic original of this passage has obscured the meaning for us. When Baal has left Asherah, he goes to her husband Elkunirša and reports the incident. Elkunirša instructs him to go, sleep(?) with her, and humble her. We are not told that Baal slept with Asherah, so that it is feasable that the *hapax*

*legomenon* *šaššumai* does not mean that. Perhaps it is a synonym of "humble" on the order of "threaten, reprimand(??)." If so, then Baal did precisely as he was told. He reported to her that he had slain her children. Whereupon the goddess is stunned and begins mourning for her children. At this point is a lacuna of undetermined length. When the story resumes, Asherah is persuading her husband Elkunirša to allow her to punish Baal. She coaxes him by holding out the prospect of sleeping with her again. I restore the broken context as follows:[47]

[*ma-a-an-wa* $^{D}$]*u-an* [*am-mi-ta-az me-mi-ya-na-az* . . ]
[*kat-ta t*]*a-ma-aš-mi a*[*m-mi-ta-az-ma-wa-ra-an* $^{GIŠ}$ X.TUR-*az ḫa-at-ta-ra-a-mi*]
[*nu*]*-wa-du-za kat-ta še-eš-m*[*i* . . . . . ] . . . .

"[If] I may [p]ress [down] the storm god [with my 'word' and may pierce? him with] m[y . . . ], I will sleep with you." The text then says: "Elkunirša hearkened (i.e., agreed to her conditions) and said to his wife: 'The storm god [I hand over to you.] Treat him as you like!'"[48] Then the couple goes to bed.

But while they are talking, the goddess Anat is listening in in the form of a bird. And when they retire to the bed, she flies off across the steppes to find Baal and warn him. She finds him in the steppes and warns him: "Oh Baal! [The food] of Ashertu [do not eat!] The wine do not dri[nk! . . . ] . . . [ . . . ] she is seeking [to harm you.]"[49] Now follows another large lacuna. From two larger fragments which belong to the same text, it appears that Asherah succeeds in injuring Baal, for he must be purified from the evils which she inflicted upon him. Instrumental in the purification are Anat (written Ishtar) and the "sons of the Anunnakki."[50]

From the foregoing survey it is evident that the Hittites collected tales from various sources. Very few were purely literary works. It has been noted that the Ḫattian myths were transmitted only in connection with rituals. Even the Ḫurrian myth of the Sun God, the Cow and the Fisherman (*KUB* XXIV 7 ii 45ff.) follows a ritual and hymn to Ishtar on the same tablet, and the Appu tale, which begins with the hymn-like dedication to the sun god, may have followed a lengthy hymn to the sun god. We have just seen how the tale of Elkunirša, Asherah, and Baal leads into a rather lengthy ritual description, whose application must surely have gone beyond the mere needs of the narrative. Considering how few of the smaller Ḫurrian myths we possess in complete texts, it is perhaps difficult to claim the status of real literary works for more than the great narratives of the Kumarbi cycle, and for Gilgamesh translations. Aside from these it seems that the Hittites regarded their myths as of a piece with the genres of prayer and ritual. In other words, they employed their myths in acts of worship and magical treatment.



## NOTES

[1] H. G. Güterbock, in *MAW*, 141-43; O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (Baltimore, 1964), 177ff.

[2] I do not consider the *Siege of Uršum* (*KBo* I 11; *CTH* 7) a myth, although as in many other quasi-historical texts legendary elements are found therein (see H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 [1938] 114ff.). Thus it is no example of a purely Hittite mythological tale (con. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 178).

[3] Güterbock, in *MAW*, 143.

[4] See on this subject the Brandeis University dissertation of my former student Bert DeVries, "The Style of Hittite Epic and Mythology" (1967).

[5] *KBo* III 34 and duplicates (*BoTU* II 12, and so forth). *CTH* 8. See Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 100ff.; Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 139.

[6] *KBo* V 3+12 iii 53, 65; iv 42, 51, 59; Friedrich, *Staatsv.*, II, 128, 134ff.

[7] In the Illuyanka myth it is Ḫupašiya in version one and the mortal son of the storm god in version two.

[8] For a sketch of these customs, see A. Goetze, *Kleinasien*$^{2}$ (Munich, 1957) 111-13; Gurney, *The Hittites*, 99ff.; and for the principal sources, see Hittite laws §§27-37 (English translation by Goetze in *ANET*$^{2}$, 190).

[9] Hittite law §36. K. Balkan, *Dergi* 6, 147ff. first explained the meaning of this term in the Hittite law. Güterbock first suggested the relevance to Illuyanka (*MAW*, 152), but did not develop the idea to the details of the story.

[10] Hittite *kušāta*.

[11] See English translation by Goetze in *ANET*$^{2}$, 126.

[12] *Hwb*, 23; see Balkan, *Dergi* 6, 147ff.

[13] *CTH* 322, composed of *KUB* XII 60 and its duplicate *KUB* XXXIII 81. Transliteration: Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites* (*RHA* 77:79) 19f. At present no translation is available, although a French one is being prepared by E. Laroche to appear in a volume of the series Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient (Éditions du Cerf, Paris), and an English translation has been prepared by the writer to appear within the next two years in a volume of Hittite texts in English translation.

[14] *KUB* XII 60 i 1-4. See Gulšeš myth (Otten, *AfO* 23 [1970] 32f., lines 8-19).

[15] *KUB* XII 60 i 16-19.

[16] Here the items which constitute a *kušāta* are listed. In *KUB* XLI 11 rev. 13ff. one finds the items which constituted an *iwaru* "dowry." For the latter passage, see now H. Hoffner, Jr., *AOAT* 22 (1973).

[17] Güterbock in G. Walser (ed.), *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (Historia, Einzelschriften, Heft 7, 1964) 61, 69; Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1973).

[18] Güterbock, in Walser (ed.), *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, 72.

[19] See *CTH* 343-45 and E. Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites*, *RHA* 82, 145ff. with citation of previous literature.

[20] *ANET*², 120ff.

[21] *JCS* 5 (1951) 135ff.; 6 (1952) 8ff.

[22] E. Forrer in *Mélanges Franz Cumont*, Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales, IV (1936) 687-783; H. G. Güterbock, *Kumarbi Efsanesi* (Istanbul, 1945); idem, *AJA* 52 (1948) 123ff.

[23] *Athenaeum* 31 (1953) 104, n. 11; see E. Laroche, *RHA* fasc. 79, 162. The passage is *KUB* XXXIII 120 ii 37-38.

[24] For the Sumerian, see B. Landsberger, *JCS* 8 (1954) 132; A. Sjöberg, *ZA* 55, 1ff.; *AS* 16, 69; the Akkadian translation of the god's name would seem to have been *muttellu* "princely" (*AHw*, 690).

[25] The reading NUMUN had not yet been established for this line in time for Goetze to employ it in his translation in *ANET*², 120.

[26] E. Laroche, *RHA* fasc. 84/85 (1969) 70; *Ugaritica V*, 523ff.; *JAOS* 88 (1968) 149ff.

[27] *ANET*², 125 (left-hand column).

[28] Güterbock, *Kumarbi Efsanesi*, 116ff.; J. Friedrich, *ArOr* 17/1 (1949) 232ff.

[29] "Appu-Märchen und Ḫedammu-Mythus," *StBoT* 14 (1971). See also H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Tyndale Bulletin* 20 (1969) 52-55, an article unfortunately unknown by Siegelová.

[30] See below, where, if my understanding and restoration of *KBo* XIX 105: 4'-7' (*StBoT* 14, 14) is correct, the more specific GIŠ ḪAŠḪUR-*lu* "apple tree" would make the reading GIŠ-*ru* "tree" here certain.

[31] H. A. Hoffner, Jr., "Birth and Name-giving in Hittite Texts," *JNES* 27 (1968) 198ff.; see also Siegelová, *StBoT* 14 (1971) 28ff.

[32] Gen. 13:8ff.

[33] *KBo* XIX 105: 4'-7' (*StBoT* 14, 14), on which see n. 30 above.

[34] *šarliškizzi, lilakki, walḫannai.*

[35] *KUB* XXIV 8 + *KUB* XXXVI 60, iv 13-20 (*StBoT* 14, 12-13).

[36] Advanced first in *Kumarbi Efsanesi* (1945) 119-22, still apparently held in *MAW*, 154-55.

[37] *ANET*², 125 (bottom of right-hand column).

[38] J. Friedrich, *ZA* 49 (1950) 224ff., prepared a transliteration, German translation, and commentary.

[39] Comparable is the tale of the Syrian god Baal mating with a heifer (*ANET*², 142, left-hand column). On the broader question of bestiality in Near Eastern mythological and legal texts see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *AOAT* 22 (1973).

[40] The child sired by a god, abandoned, found, and adopted by a humble couple is a theme which can be found frequently in ancient Near Eastern legend. Compare the Sargon Legend (*ANET*², 119).



[41] Friedrich, *ZA* 49 (1950) 234ff., prepared transliteration, German translation, and commentary.

[42] Such motifs in a man's dreams must have been ominous, see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *JBL* 85 (1966) 326ff., and Delbert Hillers in *AOAT* 22 (1973).

[43] *CTH* 342; H. Otten, *MIO* 1 (1953) 125ff.; H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *RHA* fasc. 76 (1965) 51ff.; Goetze, *ANET*³, 519. Goetze's translation is far too cautious and obscures many of the gains in interpreting the myth since 1953.

[44] *ḫad ta)rai-*, on which see *HWb*, 66.

[45] *JBL* 85 (1966) 326ff.; see Delbert Hillers in *AOAT* 22 (1973) 71-80.

[46] Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites*, 140, n. 1.

[47] *KUB* XII 61 ii! 1'-3' (Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites*, 141).

[48] For the situation of El surrendering Baal to one who would harm him, compare *ANET*² 130 (right-hand column) in the Baal-Anat cycle from Ugarit.

[49] *KUB* XXXVI 37 + *KUB* XXXI 118 ii 13-14, as I would restore them.

[50] Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites*, 142-43.