

---

A New Fragment of the "Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II"

Author(s): Philo H. J. Houwink Ten Cate

Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan., 1966), pp. 27-31

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/543137>

Accessed: 04/02/2009 14:32

---

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 organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



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

# A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE “DEEDS OF SUPPILULIUMA AS TOLD BY HIS SON, MURSILI II”<sup>1</sup>

PHILO H. J. HOUWINK TEN CATE, *Oriental Institute*

IN *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* XIV (Berlin, 1963)—(*KBo* XIV), a volume of Hittite texts published by H. G. Güterbock in 1963—No. 42 is a new fragment of the “Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II,” recognized as such by the editor. Güterbock’s recognition is based on the fact that in ll. 8 and 12 the term *A-BU-IA*, “My Father,” is used in a manner that is characteristic for the text of the “Deeds.” A second argument adduced in the Introduction to this volume is the mention of Hannuttis, the Marshall, known from Fragment 28 A i:12 of the “Deeds,” about whom we know from the Extensive Annals of Mursilis that he died in the beginning of Mursilis’ reign, an event which made the critical situation of the young king even more difficult than it already was, Hannuttis is mentioned in the latter text as the traditional governor of the Lower Land (*KUB* XIX 29 IV:11–12 = Goetze, *AM*, pp. 18–19).

But one can go further: it is possible to use this text for the restoration of a more extensive fragment of the “Deeds,” when it is combined with *KUB* XIX 22 (= 2 *BoTU* 68). Although published long ago and commented upon by a number of authors this text was up to this moment not recognized as such and therefore not admitted to the edition of Güterbock in *JCS*, X (1956). *KUB* XIX 22, ll. 1–7 is a more complete duplicate of the lines 8–16 of the new text, this duplicate continuing over some additional lines.

The beginning of this new fragment is preserved only in *KBo* XIV 42; from the point where *KUB* XIX 22 becomes available also, the transliteration is based on that text; restorations taken from *KBo* XIV 42 (indicated thereafter as A) are placed between parentheses inside square brackets. Perhaps it is good to note beforehand that the text is spread in A over a greater number of lines.

## TRANSLITERATION

A 1 [ *ḫ*a-ap[ ]X X[ ]  
2 [ *an-d*]a *ḫa-at-ke-eš-š*[*a-nu-ut*] ]  
3 [ *Š*]A KUR <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-ak-pi-iš-š*[*a*] ]  
4 [ KUR <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-ak-pi-iš-ša wa-a* [*laḫ-zi*] ]  
5 [ ] *ta-ma-aš-zi nu-kán* <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-a*[*k-pi-iš*] ]  
6 [ <sup>URU</sup>X-X-] *pa-at-ḫa-aš* <sup>URU</sup>*Ták-ku-up-ta-aš* [-*ša*] ]  
7 *a-aš-šir*

B 1 [*nu-kán ú-i(t A-BU-I)*]A A-NA DINGIR. MEŠ <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫat-ti*<sup>a)</sup> Ū A-NA <sup>URU</sup>TÚL-na  
2 [(AN.TAḪ.ŠUM<sup>SAR</sup> *da-iš*) *nu ka*]-[*a*<sup>1</sup>-*aš-pát me-mi-aš na-ak-ki-iš nu*  
*ku-ru-ri*<sup>HI.Ab)</sup> *ku-e*

<sup>1</sup> I am much indebted to Professors Laroche and Güterbock, who have both very kindly read and commented on drafts of this paper.

<sup>a</sup> A 8 <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-a*[*t-ti*]  
<sup>b</sup> A 10 *ku-u-ru-ri*<sup>HI.A</sup>



10 [And] he burned down [the land of Ḫa]palla. And he removed (it) together  
 11 with the population, [the cattle and the sheep] and he brought them to  
 Ḫattušaš.  
 12 [And my father sent forth . . . . to the country of . . .] and [gave] him troops  
 13 [and charioteers . . . . .]  
 14 . . . . .  
 15 . . . . .  
 16 . . . . .

## COMMENTARY

A 3 References for *Hakpiš/Hakmiš* may be found in Goetze, *RHA* I (1930), 22 note 23 —Goetze proposes an identification with Amasya. See, too, Goetze, *RHA* XV, fasc. 61 (1957), 98.

5 *nu-kán* excludes direct discourse, since *-wa(r)* is absent; this in turn makes *ta-ma-aš-zi* more probable than [*iš-*]*ta-ma-aš-zi*; *ta-ma-aš-zi* could be an example of Praesens Historicum, also to be found in other fragments of the “Deeds”; therefore I have restored *wa-a* [*lah-zi*] instead of *wa-a* [*lah-ta*] (l. 4).

5-7 As *kán* is the rule with the verb *aš-* I interpret this passage as an enumeration of towns still in Hittite possession or not yet captured by the Hittites; this—and the endless form—leads to the restoration of KUR (the country of Hakiš) in l. 4.

6 For *Takkuptaš*/*Takkupšaš* see Goetze, *RHA* I (1930), 21 note 19; see furthermore Güterbock *JNES*, XX (1961), 88, note 16; H. Klengel, *MIO* VIII (1961), 19 with note 18; K. Riemschneider, *JCS* XVI (1962), 117, 119 (together with notes 81 and 82). The town was not far removed from Nerik, was still in Hittite possession during the reign of Muwatallis, and was reconquered and rebuilt under Hattusilis III after having been captured by the Gasga-tribes.

B 1 For the restoration of the beginning cf. Fragment 18 A i:17; 28 A iii:20.

<sup>2</sup> See for the AN.TAĤ.ŠUM-festival (a Spring-festival): Goetze, *Kleinasien*<sup>2</sup>, p. 165 together with note 5 and Güterbock, *JNES* XIX (1960), 80 ff. and especially p. 87 and *idem apud* G. Walser, *Neuere Hethiterforschung, Historia Einzelschriften Heft 7* (1964), p. 62 ff. The addition of [ka]-[a]-aš I owe to Laroche.

3 Syntax prescribes to view *ku-ru-ri*<sup>III.A</sup> *ku-e* as object; this makes it necessary to restore a subject for *mi-e-nu-u-e-er* in the gap at the beginning of this line. Forrer (2 *BoTU* 68) wanted to restore [... DINGIR.] MEŠ-*aš-pát*. Professor Güterbock warns me however that this restoration is precluded by the Hittite complement -*aš*, since *šiunaš* never occurs as nom. pl. I take *mienu-* to have developed from *miyanu-*, the causative formation of the stem *mai-/miya-*; *miyanu-* means to “to cause to grow, to make fresh,” cf. Güterbock, *Oriens* X (1957), 354. This form *mienu-* is also to be found in the Huwassanna Ritual *KUB* XVIII 12 II:14 in a difficult passage: (11) *na-aš-ta an-da ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-a-i ku-iš-wa* (12) *mi-e-nu-uš GÜB-za i-ja-ad-da-ri* (13) *nu-wa-aš-ši mi-e-nu e-eš-du nu-wa e-da-ni* (14) *an-tu-uh-ši e-ni GIG mi-e-nu-ud-du*. The key words of this passage are rendered in Sturtevant’s *Glossary*<sup>2</sup>, p. 101 as *mēnu* “a disease,” *mēnu-* “cause the symptoms of *mēnu*,” and *mēnus* “ill with *mēnu*.” It seems probable that there are at least two homonyms *minu/menu* (see, too, Friedrich, *HW*, p. 141 *menu-* c./n. “Durchfall[?]” and p. 143 *minu-* “allein[?]”). Maybe it is possible to assume a word play

and to translate: "And next she speaks thereby as follows: 'He, who is "sick with the *minu*-disease," shall go at the left side and he may have a "*minu*" (a product of vegetation?) and (it) may heal(?) for that man that sickness.'" However this may be, also in this passage the verb seems to have a favorable meaning.

6 The inhabitants of Lalanda seem to have been notorious trouble-makers in the Lower Land. In *KUB XIX 23*—a letter from a high official Tudhaliyas to a Hittite queen—they are mentioned again; there it is said that "in fact from of old they were wont to come down (upon Hittite territory)" (rev. 11). This letter was placed next to the newly recognized fragment of the "Deeds" by its editor Goetze, possibly in part on account of this mention of the name Lalanda, and in any case explicitly because of the fact that the same personal name Hannuttis occurs again in this letter (rev. 5, 6: cf. Goetze in his Introduction to the volume "Briefwechsel, nennt Hanuttiš"). After equating these two persons in the first edition of his *Recueil d'onomastique hittite* (1952), Laroche separated both in his *Additions et corrections* (*RHA XIII*, fasc. 57 (1955), 92–93), No. 140. At that later time he proposed to equate Tudhaliyas, the writer of this letter, with the later king Tudhaliyas, son of Hattusilis III. Laroche does not yet identify the supposedly late Hannuttis with any known figure from the time of Hattusilis III, but it would certainly be possible to do so, since a royal prince of this name appears in the list of witnesses to an important treaty of that epoch (*KBo IV 10* rev. 28). K. Riemschneider has elaborated on the probably important military role of the crown-prince Tudhaliyas (*JCS XVI* (1962), 110 ff. and especially pp. 119 ff.).

The localization of Lalanda is still in dispute—the context of both *KUB XIX 22* and *23* points to a position in a mountainous region bordering on the Lower Land and not far removed from Hapalla. Among the identifications proposed so far my preference is for Forrer's identification with the town Laranda of the Greek period, but it should immediately be added that this equation is far from secure (cf. Forrer *Forschungen I*, 71–72). See in the last instance Garstang and Gurney, *Geography*, pp. 84 and 99–100 and Cornelius, *Orientalia* 27 (1958), 384 and 389.

6–7 See for this passage as a whole "Deeds" fragment 28 A ii: 5–8, but note that it would also be possible to restore *iš-ta-maš-šir* in the beginning of line 7 as suggested in Gurney's translation of this passage (*Geography*, pp. 83 and 99).

8 This restoration is tentative and a further elaboration of Forrer's *KUR*<sup>URU</sup> *Ha-at-ti*, cf. *EGIR-pa ŠA KUR*<sup>URU</sup> *Ha-at-ti i-ja-* in a number of passages in the "Deeds," fragment 28 A i: 39 and 48; fragment 34 i: 52; fragment 51(?): 11. Güterbock suggests the same for fragment 17 G IV: 8–9.

11 With some hesitation I have adopted Forrer's reading *ša-ra-a*, although it is not favored by the traces in Goetze's copy. After *arḫa warnu-* and before *uda-* it is an almost inevitable restoration.

It is difficult to offer a suggestion for the possible position of this fragment in the totality of the "Deeds." Much depends on the question whether the group of towns in the North mentioned in lines 5–7 are the last outposts of Hittite resistance against the Gasga-invaders or—on the contrary—the last towns in possession of the enemy. The fact that these place names are not mentioned in the other fragments of the "Deeds" is puzzling indeed. This makes it impossible to connect this passage with another better-known phase of Suppiluliumas' wars in the North. The remainder of the fragment suggests a considerable improvement in the military situation in the South, which seems

to have been of a dangerous nature before this turn of events. Maybe it is worthwhile to recall that Forrer, who at first suggested that *KUB XIX 22* could be a portion of the missing historical introduction to Mursilis' treaty with Targasnallis of Hapalla and afterwards gave preference to the possibility that the text could belong to the first parts of Mursilis' Extensive Annals, rightly stressed the fact that Mursilis nowhere mentions the fact that he had had to conquer Hapalla (cf. Forrer, *Forschungen* I, 71-72 and *Bemerkungen*, p. 47\* to 2 *BoTU* 68). This led Forrer to conjecture that the conquest of Hapalla mentioned in this text took place during the reign of Arnuwandas. Since it now is certain that the text actually belongs to the "Deeds," it is quite possible to modify Forrer's position into the statement that Hittite rule was restored in that region already during the reign of Suppiluliumas himself. Therefore it would be possible to place this fragment at the end of the "Deeds" assuming that the war in the North refers to the attacks of the Gasga-tribes during the last years of Suppiluliumas' reign. An important point in favor of this thesis may be the fact that according to this text Hannuttis is already operating in the Lower Land, the territory of which he was the governor according to the Extensive Annals of Mursilis before his death in the war against the Gasga-tribes in the vicinity of Ishupitta (*KUB XIX 29 IV*: 11-12 = Goetze, *AM*, pp. 18-19). Since the AN.TAH.ŠUM-festival was held in the spring, the events around Lalanda could be dated to the beginning of one of the last years of Suppiluliumas' reign, if this conjecture should prove correct.

But it should be acknowledged that there is an alternative possibility. Another new fragment of the "Deeds"—*KBo XII 26 I* together with its duplicate *KBo XII 25 I*—also refers to a Gasgaean attack (*KBo XII 26 I*: 12 ff. = *KBo XII 25 I*: 2 ff.), while *KBo XII 26 IV* relates events that took place in the South and mentions Mount Tiwatassa (l. 8), Waliwanta (l. 15) and Sallapa (l. 17). The commander Himuilis is mentioned in *KBo XII 26 I*: 17 = *KBo XII 25 I*: 6 (see, too, ll. 10 and 15). All this is vaguely reminiscent of the fragments 18-22 of the "Deeds," where events that took place in the same general surroundings, Arzawa, are related in great detail, where Himuilis is mentioned (fragment 18 A i: 23, 24, 28), and where Hapalla itself also occurs (fragment 20 i: 10). The possibility should not be excluded that all the new fragments belong somewhere in this group.