

THE OFFICE OF GAL GEŠTIN IN THE HITTITE KINGDOM \*

Marco Marizza

***Previous studies and sources***

The recent publication<sup>1</sup> of the seal *corpus* of Nišantepe has considerably increased the availability of sources on the office of the GAL GEŠTIN;<sup>2</sup> a thorough review of the documents is now necessary in order to update the former studies of F. Pecchioli Daddi, S. Rosi and R. Beal. F. Pecchioli Daddi collected for the first time all the sources known until 1982,<sup>3</sup> and S. Rosi<sup>4</sup> established some of the main duties of the GAL GEŠTIN. The most recent analysis is that of R. Beal:<sup>5</sup> he studied the tasks of this official and his rank in the Hittite military hierarchy, and briefly sketched the activities of some of the most important dignitaries who held this office, like Himuili and Nuwanza.

The typology of the sources for the GAL GEŠTIN is rather differentiated. The largest part of the documents, however, refer to the military sphere, thus marking without any doubt the duties of this dignitary. The sources date from the Old Kingdom to the late Empire period; this allows a diachronic analysis of the duties of the GAL GEŠTIN, especially thanks to the fresh information provided by the Nišantepe seals.

The most important sources among the Old-Hittite texts are the so-called *Palace Chronicle*, the fragment KUB 26.71, the *Edict of Telipinu* and some land grants. The land grants

\* I wish to thank prof. Stefano de Martino for his precious advice.

1. See Herbordt 2005.

2. Most scholars agree in translating this title with “Chief of the Wine”; for example, see Rüster – Neu 1989, 214 no. 242 (“Weinoberer”). The Hittite word for the sumerogram GEŠTIN is *wiyana-*, but in the texts this office is written only in the Sumerian form.

3. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 535-537.

4. Rosi 1983, 48-53.

5. Beal 1992, 342-357.

are a very important source also for the Middle Kingdom,<sup>6</sup> together with texts of political and administrative content.<sup>7</sup> For the Empire period, the most important sources are the “*Deeds*” of Šuppiluliuma I and the *Annals* of Muršili II, especially the “*Comprehensive Annals*”. Further, the GAL GEŠTIN is listed among the witnesses of the treaties with Ulmi-Tešub and with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša. As regards the religious texts, it is difficult to place them in a clear chronological sequence; as is well known, the tablets reporting religious festivals and rituals were copied many times, and it is not always possible to establish the time of their original elaboration and/or detect additions and changes introduced in later times.

As stated above, the glyptic documentation may now be added to the cuneiform texts. In the past, the interpretation of the hieroglyphic writing of the title GAL GEŠTIN has been very difficult. The most significant obstacle was the problem of defining a clear difference between this title and that of GAL SAGI(A), especially in the hieroglyphic writing;<sup>8</sup> the question, however, now seems to have been settled. Many scholars compared the sign L.157 with L.160,<sup>9</sup> which is transcribed VITIS;<sup>10</sup> its syllabic reading should be *wi*.<sup>11</sup> On these premises, B. Dinçol suggested that the sign L.157.1, which appears in the Middle-Hittite seal SBo II 58 belonging to Ḫalpaziti,<sup>12</sup> represents a mixed form to be read as GAL GEŠTIN,<sup>13</sup> and further suggests an identification of the owner of this seal with the GAL GEŠTIN of Arnuwanda I.<sup>14</sup> S. Herbordt shed new light on this problem in a study of the

6. The traditional division of the Hittite history into three periods (Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, Empire period) is adopted here.
7. Cf. KUB 14.1 rev. 25, 26 (CTH 147); KBo 18.51 obv. 10' (CTH 188); KBo 8.20 obv. 13' (CTH 215); KUB 26.62 IV 25' (CTH 236.1); KUB 34.58 I 8' (CTH 275); KUB 34.45+KBo 16.63 obv. 13', 14' (CTH 295.5). To this group belongs also KBo 44.1 obv. I 5' (CTH 212), because the onomastic elements clearly suggest a dating of this fragment to the Middle Kingdom, although the writing is typical of the Empire period.
8. For an example of the uncertainty to distinguish these two titles in the past see Laroche 1960, 183 no. 345: the scholar believed that this was the sign for GAL GEŠTIN. H.G. Güterbock (in Boehmer – Güterbock 1987, 76) read the titles of DUMU.LUGAL and of scribe, and states not to be able to interpret the third office.
9. Thus Boehmer – Güterbock 1987, nos. 122 and 170; see also Dinçol 1998, 165-166.
10. See Herbordt 2005, 409; thus already Hawkins 1995, 29 fn. 34. Cf. Laroche 1960, 85 (“vigne, vin”). Marazzi 1990, 152-153 transcribed “VINUM”.
11. Cf. Laroche 1960, 85.
12. Dinçol 1998, 167 suggested a dating to the 14th century BC.
13. Dinçol 1998, 165.
14. In her analysis, Dinçol 1998, 165-166, considers also the seal SBo II 256, which is printed on a *pythos* found in the warehouse of Temple I. In this case, however, several problems arise from the reading of many signs, above all as regards the interpretation of the title; according to Dinçol, the title would be written with the two signs placed respectively above (G.203, without interpretation) and down to the right (G.68 = L.150, “tree of life”).

numerous documents of the Empire period discovered in Nişantepe.<sup>15</sup> In these seal imprints the title of Chief of Wine is always expressed through the sign sequence L.363 – L.370 – L.160, *i.e.* MAGNUS.BONUS<sub>2</sub>.VITIS. According to B. Dinçol,<sup>16</sup> here the sign BONUS<sub>2</sub> would have an auspicious meaning and would not belong to the wording of the title. On these premises, S. Herbordt<sup>17</sup> and B. Dinçol<sup>18</sup> were also able to distinguish the Luwian hieroglyphic writings of the titles GAL GEŠTIN and GAL SAGI(.A): the latter title would be rendered in writing mainly through the sign L.354.<sup>19</sup> If a dating of SBo II 58 to the 14th century BC is accepted, it can be noted that the Luwian hieroglyphic writing for the title of GAL GEŠTIN was subjected to little evolution from the Middle Kingdom to the Empire period, because the sign L.157.1 occurs only in the seal of Ḫalpaziti. As pointed out by S. Herbordt,<sup>20</sup> it may be added that the addition of the triangle (L.370) in order to designate a profession is a typical element of the Empire period seals.

Finally, it is worth to anticipate here two remarks suggested by the study of the Nişantepe glyptic which shall be treated more thoroughly below. The first is that in some instances (cf. DOMINUS-ziti, x-mi-Šarruma and Armanani) the GAL GEŠTIN is also a member of the royal family, even if it is not possible to establish at what level of blood relationship.<sup>21</sup> The second is the coexistence of the offices of Chief of Wine and of scribe in the seals of Armanani.

### *The Chiefs of Wine known so far*

If the documentation is examined as a whole, it may be noted that many names of GAL GEŠTIN are preserved, especially in the Land Grants and in the Annals; the number is so large that it is possible to sketch a rather exact, quite continuous sequence of the individuals who held this office, at least from the late phase of the Middle Kingdom to the last decades of the late Empire period.

### *The Chiefs of Wine in the Palace Chronicle*

KBo 3.35 l. 14', 16' (CTH 8.B) represents in absolute terms the most ancient source for the title of GAL GEŠTIN. According to P. Dardano,<sup>22</sup> this passage of the *Palace Chronicle*

15. Herbordt 2005; on the problem of the reading of the title GAL GEŠTIN see p. 96; see also Hawkins 2005, 311. Considering the seals from Nişantepe, S. Herbordt had already suggested the possibility to recognize the title of GAL GEŠTIN (cf. Herbordt 1998, 176).
16. Dinçol 1998, 164.
17. Herbordt 1998, 176.
18. Dinçol 1998, 163.
19. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 96 with fn. 747 and with previous bibliography; see also Hawkins 2005, 310.
20. Herbordt 2005, 45.
21. It should be noted that in the cuneiform texts the GEŠTIN Nuwanza is also attested; he lived during the reign of Muṣili II, and had the title of DUMU.LUGAL (cf. KBo 5.8 IV 15').
22. Dardano 1997, 92.

should narrate the misdeeds of a dignitary, a certain Ḫapruzi, against other officials, including a Chief of the Wine, whose name is broken.<sup>23</sup> This official is replaced by Nakkilit, and the narration is interrupted at this point. Some scholars date this document to Ḫattušili I and Muršili I.<sup>24</sup> Recently, however, M. Forlanini suggested that the facts narrated in the “Palace Chronicle” refer to a more ancient period.<sup>25</sup>

#### Pulli

This dignitary occupied the top position among the witnesses of IK 174-66 rev. 23 (CTH 222). For the dating of this tablet, found in İnandık, many different hypotheses have been suggested and many scholars proposed an attribution to the beginning of the Old Kingdom.<sup>26</sup> The recovery of many new land grants allowed a general reconsideration of these documents,<sup>27</sup> and in a recent study G. Wilhelm proposed that IK 174-66 could be dated to the reign of Ḫuzziya I or Ammuna.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, the GAL GEŠTIN Pulli is to be kept separate from the other Old-Hittite evidences known for this anthroponym, both for chronological reasons and for the rank held.

#### Zidanni

This official is mentioned among the witnesses of many land grants,<sup>29</sup> which bear the seal of the so-called “Tabarna anonymous”. Similarly to the case of the İnandık tablet, the scholars debated at length about the dating of these documents, which in former studies had been assigned to the beginning of the Old Kingdom.<sup>30</sup> In this connection, G. Wilhelm pointed out that these documents could be assigned to a later period, probably to the reign of Telipinu.<sup>31</sup>

23. According to Beal 1992, 343 fn. 1307, one should read <sup>m</sup>...]-x-*ki-ša-aš* on the basis of his interpretation of l. 15'; Pecchioli Daddi 1995, 331 shared this opinion. In this respect, the objections of Dardano 1997, 93, who reads this passage -]*x-ki-ša-aš* BA.ÚŠ, are correct. Thus already Soysal 1989, 21.
24. See for example Pecchioli Daddi 1995, 322, with bibliography; and Klengel 1999, 40.
25. Forlanini 2004, 256, 264 fn. 10. Contrary to the majority of the scholars (cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1995, 322), who believe that Ḫattušili I is “the father of the king” and Muršili I is “the king” of the “Palace Chronicle”, according to Forlanini “the father of the king” would rather be Labarna I and “the king” would be Ḫattušili I.
26. For a bibliography on this text see Wilhelm 2005, 273; see also Klinger 2003, 240 fn. 15.
27. The edition of all the Land Grants tablets is forthcoming in the volume StBoTB 4, edited by E. Neu – Ch. Rüster – G. Wilhelm.
28. Wilhelm 2005, 276.
29. 140/f rev. 10 (=LSU 11); 680/f rev. 11 (=LSU 12); KUB 48.102 rev. 4' (=LSU 26); Bo 90/729; Bo 90/750; Bo 91/1791; Bo 90/732. In this latter document the title is written in the unusual form of GAL LÚ.MEŠKAŠ.GEŠTIN (“Obermundschen”, cf. Otten 1991, 347).
30. Easton 1981, 41, attributed KUB 48.102, 140/f and 680/f to Muršili I. On this matter see also Carruba 1993, 71-85.
31. See Wilhelm 2005, 276; also Fuscagni 2003, 163.

## Ḫattušili

KUB 26.71 is a “Sammeltafel” which preserves the “Anitta Proclamation” (CTH 1.B), the “Ammuna Chronicle” (CTH 18.A), and a text which refers on events related to a king not mentioned (CTH 39.6). In this last part of the tablet, which occupies the fourth column, a GAL GEŠTIN named Ḫattušili is mentioned. Some scholars suggested that also this last part of the document should be assigned to Ammuna;<sup>32</sup> S. de Martino, however, taking into account prosopographical and geographical elements, showed that the anonymous king might be Telipinu.<sup>33</sup>

For the same reasons as those of Pulli, also this GAL GEŠTIN Ḫattušili cannot be identified in any other documents.

## Muššu

Like Pulli and Zidanni, also this official is known only thanks to some land grants dated to Ḫantili II.<sup>34</sup> I think that an identification with the sender of the letter Çorum 4 obv. 2 (CTH 186)<sup>35</sup> is impossible,<sup>36</sup> due to both the chronological distance between the two persons and the different spellings of their names, i.e. <sup>m</sup>Mu-u-uš-šu for our GAL GEŠTIN and <sup>m</sup>Mu-ú-šu in the other instance.<sup>37</sup>

## Tapzu[-

The only attestation for this name is at the same time the only source for a GAL GEŠTIN during the reign of Ḫuzziya II. Tapzu[- is mentioned in the land grant VAT 7436 rev. 12 (CTH 221.1; =LSU 2). The name is fragmentary, but the space in the gap shows that there is place for only one sign at most. It is not possible to suggest a restoration, however, because this name is a *bapax*.

32. For example, see von Schuler 1965, 26; Hoffner 1980, 306; Klengel 1999, 75.

33. de Martino 1999, 77-81. For an edition of the text and a further comment see de Martino 2003, 81-87. Klinger 1995, 90, brings forth a different opinion. He suggests that this Ḫattušili should be placed between Ḫimuili GAL GEŠTIN of Muwatalli I and Ḫalpaziti GAL GEŠTIN of Arnuwanda I.

34. Bo 90/728; Bo 90/568; KUB 48.103 rev. 9' (=LSU 27). We might add the land grant 389/f [rev. 7'] (=LSU 17), where the name of this official may be restored, without any doubt, on the basis of the other names appearing in the list of witnesses. For the attestations in Bo 90/728 and Bo 90/568 see Rüster 1993, 67. As regards KUB 48.103, Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 537, suggested the reading ]-ka for the name of the GAL GEŠTIN at rev. 9'; the comparison with the other Land Grants, however, does not allow any doubt concerning the restoration of the anthroponym [M]uššu.

35. For the edition see Ünal 1998, 40-43 and 101.

36. Some doubts concerning a possible identification were already expressed by Ünal 1998, 41.

37. It should be noted that a god named Mūšu is attested in the *pantheon* of Emar; cf. Beckman 2002, 46.

### Ḫimuili (I)<sup>38</sup>

Ḫimuili (I) is mentioned as bearing the title of GAL GEŠTIN in the land grant of Muwatalli I Bo 90/671 rev. 8 (CTH 222).<sup>39</sup> There are no doubts that this dignitary is the same GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL of KBo 32.185 rev. 13 (CTH 222), another land grant of this same king.<sup>40</sup> Although in this other document no GAL GEŠTIN appears, there are no reasons to suppose that Ḫimuili (I) bears both offices (“Chief of the palace servants” and “Chief of Wine”) simultaneously. This supposition would represent an *unicum*, which does not find any correspondence in the available sources. On the contrary, the documents show a clear difference between the duties of these two offices. Therefore, it is evident that Bo 90/671 and KBo 32.185 must be placed in this chronological sequence. On the one hand, comparing the various lists of witnesses of the Land Grants, the “Chief of the palace servants” is always of a higher rank than the “Chief of Wine”; on the other hand, in Bo 90/671 the GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL is still Arinnel (rev. 6), an official who had already been active under Ḫuzziya II. Therefore, Ḫimuili (I) surely received this important promotion by king Muwatalli I.

The same Ḫimuili appears in the so-called “Protocols of dynastic succession” (CTH 271),<sup>41</sup> dealing with the murder of Muwatalli I in a palace conspiracy by this high ranking official together with Kantuzili,<sup>42</sup> the UGULA<sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup> KUŠ<sub>7</sub>.GUŠKIN of KBo 32.185 rev. 14, who, on the basis of the seal Bo 99/69,<sup>43</sup> probably was the father of Tuthaliya I/II.<sup>44</sup>

### Ḫalpaziti

There are several sources about this official; moreover, it is possible to recognize this same Ḫalpaziti in many Middle-Hittite texts where an anonymous GAL GEŠTIN is mentioned. He is mentioned in the land grant of Arnuwanda I KBo 5.7 rev. 51 (CTH 223), and this is the most important attestation about this official. In the list of witnesses he occupies the second place, immediately after the GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL Duwa (rev. 51). The other documents in which Ḫalpaziti is mentioned with his own title are SBo II 58 and KBo 44.1

38. From now on, the indications Ḫimuili (I) and Ḫimuili (II) will be used in order to distinguish the two homonymous persons.

39. For a photo of the tablet see Neve 1993, 61 Abb. 166 a.b.

40. For the identity between these two dignitaries see, for example, Freu 2002, 72.

41. Cf. KUB 34.40 l. 9' and 17'; KUB 34.41 l. 9'; KUB 36.113 l. 4', 9', 11'; KUB 36.114 l. 4', 10, 12'; KUB 36.116 l. 5', 10'. For a comprehensive edition of these documents see Carruba 1977, 184-191.

42. On this episode and on the problems about these two persons see, for example, de Martino 1991, 5-21; Freu 1996, 17-38; Freu 2002, 72-74; Singer 2002a, 309; Taracha 2004, 636-637. For further bibliography see Singer 2002a, 308 fn. 43.

43. See Otten 2000, 376. *Contra*, Soysal 2003, 50.

44. See also the hypothesis put forward by Freu 1995, 137, who, on the basis of KUB 34.40 obv.<sup>2</sup> 8'-9' (CTH 271.1), suggested that both Ḫimuili and Kantuzili might be sons of the queen Šummiri, wife of Ḫuzziya II; there are no firm proofs of this hypothesis, however.



obv. I 5' (CTH 212). Th. van den Hout assigned the seal SBo II 58 to the Ḫalpaziti<sup>45</sup> who lived in the Empire period;<sup>46</sup> but, if the above mentioned suggestion of B. Dinçol<sup>47</sup> is accepted, this seal should belong to the GAL GEŠTIN of Arnuwanda I.<sup>48</sup> KBo 44.1 is a New-Hittite text. The identification with this dignitary, however, is evident also thanks to the presence of Duwa, who is surely the same person who is mentioned in KBo 5.7. Concerning the typology of the document, H. Otten and Ch. Rüster<sup>49</sup> suggested that this fragment should be part of a treaty, since the term *išhiul* (obv. I 3', 6') is present; in this case, the presence of names of officials and of verbal forms in the first singular person (obv. 10') might suggest a historical introduction. Otherwise, KBo 44.1 might be a portion of an annalistic text. Thus, it must be asked whether the tablet is a copy from a Middle-Hittite original or whether it is a New-Hittite script referring to events of the past.

The GAL GEŠTIN in question may be found in three more Middle-Hittite documents on the basis of their contents. The first two documents are in Hurrian language (KUB 27.43 obv. 15', CTH 791; KUB 32.19+ rev. III 35, CTH 777.8).<sup>50</sup> KUB 27.43 could be an edict or a protocol,<sup>51</sup> where also Tulpi-Tešub (obv. 12') is present; the latter could be the same man known from many other texts of the Middle Kingdom.<sup>52</sup> KUB 32.19+, according to G. Wilhelm,<sup>53</sup> could be a prayer of Taduḫepa (rev. III 63) to Tešub. The identification with Ḫalpaziti GAL GEŠTIN is possible here thanks to one further attestation together with Duwa (rev. III 35). An analysis of the contents of KUB 32.19+ may help in establishing its date; since it is not possible to interpret the text in full, however, it is necessary to retain some caution. In the text, military terms often appear,<sup>54</sup> and a sentence reads as follows: "May Tašmi-šarri take the lands!" (rev. III 34).<sup>55</sup> In this respect, G. Wilhelm suggested that the text refers to a wish for the military actions of the king;<sup>56</sup> and I. Singer identifies the

45. For the attestations of the anthroponym Ḫalpaziti in the Empire period see van den Hout 1995, 186-193.

46. van den Hout 1995, 187.

47. Dinçol 1998, 167.

48. In support of this second proposal are the differences with the other two seals of Ḫalpaziti (SBo II 56-57), which present a typology similar to that of the other seal imprints of the Empire period, and in which the sign for "scribe" occurs in the central field and not in the external ring as in SBo II 58.

49. Otten – Rüster 2003, IV. Otten 1992, 414 fn. 11, previously considered KBo 44.1 as a parallel text of KBo 5.7.

50. For a transcription see Haas, 1984, respectively 214 and 218-232.

51. See Haas 1984, 213. See also de Martino 1991, 15.

52. Cf. KUB 36.119 I. 2', 9' (CTH 275); KUB 34.58 II 3 (CTH 275); KUB 45.47 I 40, II 6, III 27 (CTH 494); KBo 16.97 I. c. 3a (CTH 571.2).

53. Wilhelm 1991, 46. Already Kammenhuber 1976, 173, qualified this text as a prayer. See also Haas 1984, 215 ("Anrufung").

54. Cf. the terms *šauri*, "weapon" (I 14); the class of *mariyanni* (I 17); *kargarni*, "chariot" (I 18); *ulmi*, "weapon" (I 61); *ḫurada*, "troops" (II 58). For these translations see Wilhelm 1991, 44; Wegner 2000, 213-256; Giorgieri 2000, 390-409.

55. For the translation of this passage see Wilhelm 1991, 43 fn. 25.

56. Wilhelm 1991, 44. Thus also Singer 2002b, 44.

latter with Tašmi-šarri,<sup>57</sup> the personal name of Tuḫaliya III.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, the scribe <sup>m</sup>NU.GIŠ.SAR occurs in the colophon (KUB 32.19+ IV 40); he could be identified with the homonymous augur who is mentioned in the letter KBo 15.28 obv. 2, rev. 5' (CTH 195), a tablet which has been dated to Tuḫaliya III.<sup>59</sup>

The third document is KBo 18.80+ obv.<sup>1</sup> 2, rev.<sup>1</sup> 6', 19' (CTH 214).<sup>60</sup> The text deals with some military actions of Ḫalpaziti in a region which should be the south-western Anatolia according to the mention of many toponyms, in particular Pitašša.<sup>61</sup> The presence of the colophon is relevant for the understanding of the typology of the document. Here, the note “first tablet, not finished” can be read (rev. 20'); and this suggests that it is a historiographic text. The *ductus*, the mention of Pitašša and the use of the verbal form *punuškeiteni* (obv. 2) suggested to H. Otten to link this document to the Madduwatta text;<sup>62</sup> and, indeed, KBo 18.80+ could offer some help in identifying the anonymous GAL GEŠTIN of KUB 14.1 rev. 25-28.<sup>63</sup> For this last passage, different interpretations have been brought forth. In particular, F. Pecchioli Daddi<sup>64</sup> and J. Klinger<sup>65</sup> suggested that the Antaḫitta of the Madduwatta text (rev. 27) was the “Chief of Wine”, this title being reconstructed in the break (G[AL GEŠTIN]). On the contrary, R. Beal<sup>66</sup> considers this identification unlikely, and suggests that Antaḫitta, together with Mazlauwa, could rather be the individual who disturbed the plans of Madduwatta making a report to the Hittite king. In my opinion, if Antaḫitta was really the GAL GEŠTIN (who in this passage plays a primary role), it would be reasonable to expect that he be mentioned already at the beginning of the paragraph; but this is not the case. Furthermore, a report by the GAL GEŠTIN in person against Madduwatta's plan would imply a self-accusation, since at the outset he had helped Madduwatta. In conclusion, it seems unlikely that Antaḫitta is the GAL GEŠTIN, even if the few elements available do not allow to refuse it. Nevertheless, I consider more probable that the “Chief of Wine” might be Ḫalpaziti in person, or, maybe, an anonymous predecessor of his.

One last question about KBo 18.80+ and KBo 44.1 concerns the possibility that these two tablets should be related, given the typology of both documents and the presence in

57. Singer 2002b, 44.

58. For a bibliography on the identification of Tašmi-šarri with Tuḫaliya III see Bryce 1998, 158 fn. 77, and Alp 1998, 59 fn. 17. See also Klengel 1999, 128 and 130; Freu 2002, 69. *Contra*, Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996; 1998, 44.

59. For this dating see de Martino 2005, 295 with bibliography. For a summary on the dates proposed for this document see van den Hout 2001, 427 fn. 22. Klinger 1995, 101, suggests a date to Arnuwanda I.

60. For a full edition see Otten 1992, 409-418.

61. According to Forlanini 1988, 150, Pitašša should be placed east of Konya; del Monte 1993, 105 fn. 117, places it west of Konya.

62. Otten 1992, 417.

63. For an edition see Götze 1927, 26-27, and Beckman 1999, 158.

64. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 537.

65. Klinger 1995, 90 fn. 63.

66. Beal 1992, 349 fn. 1326.



both of the GAL GEŠTIN Ḫalpaziti. Possibly, both fragments might be parts of a single historiographic narration; and KBo 44.1 might be a copy made during the Empire period.

It is not certain whether Ḫalpaziti, the sender of the letter KuT 50 upper e. 1 (CTH 190),<sup>67</sup> is the GAL GEŠTIN in question. This Ḫalpaziti might be an augur, unless it is supposed that he did not draw the response materially, but was simply present at the oracular query.

In some Middle-Hittite documents an anonymous GAL GEŠTIN is mentioned. KUB 34.58 obv. I 8' seems to be the text in which Ḫalpaziti can be recognized with most certainty. A. Kammenhuber, who dated this text to Arnuwanda I, suggested that the name of Ḫalpaziti was in the break;<sup>68</sup> but even if her suggestion were incorrect, there are no doubts that it is a reference to Ḫalpaziti, although implicit.<sup>69</sup>

KUB 26.62+ rev. IV 25' must be placed in the context of the treaties between Arnuwanda I and the Kaškean tribes;<sup>70</sup> and this dating strengthens the identification between this dignitary with the GAL GEŠTIN mentioned in this document. Here, his role might be that of receiving an oath of allegiance by the Kaška people.

In spite of the bad state of preservation of KBo 18.51 lower e. 10',<sup>71</sup> the mention of the name Wašuwatarla (obv. 2', rev. 12') offers an important chronological link with Ḫalpaziti, because this name is to be found in another letter only, KBo 18.69 obv.<sup>2</sup> 8', where also Ḫulla (rev.<sup>2</sup> 8') is mentioned, who is almost certainly the GAL KUŠ<sub>7</sub> known from KBo 5.7 rev. 52.

In conclusion, the documents presented here suggest that Ḫalpaziti might have been born during the late phase of the kingdom of Tuthaliya I/II, and that he might also have been some years younger than Arnuwanda I. He might have started his career in the early years of the reign of Arnuwanda I, and, if the proposed dating of KUB 32.19+ is accepted, Ḫalpaziti might have been serving for some years after the accession to the throne of Tuthaliya III.

#### Ḫimuili (II)

This dignitary is active during the reign of Šuppiluliuma I. We learn from the “Deeds” that he was involved in operations both in northern Anatolia against the Kaška people (cf. DŠ 17<sup>72</sup> and DŠ 28<sup>73</sup> and the fragment KBo 12.26<sup>74</sup> I 17' with dupl. KBo 12.25 l. 6', 10', 15'),

67. For an edition see Wilhelm 1998, 180-186. See also van den Hout 2001, 430-431, and de Martino 2005, 308.

68. Kammenhuber 1976, 174.

69. Thus already Freu 2002, 67.

70. On this matter see Neu 1983, 391-399.

71. For transcription and comment see Hagenbuchner 1989, 99-100. He cautiously dates this document to the 13th century BC. The writing, however, bears many Middle-Hittite elements; and a dating to the Middle Kingdom is suggested by Klinger 1995, 92; Košak, [www.hethiter.net](http://www.hethiter.net); de Martino 2005, 297.

72. KUB 19.18 rev. IV 6' (CTH 40.II.G).

73. KBo 5.6 I 11 (CTH 40.IV.A).

and in the west against Arzawa (cf. DŠ 18<sup>75</sup>), where he was defeated. If we suppose that the order of the fragments of the Deeds follows a correct chronological sequence, as reconstructed by H.G. Güterbock,<sup>76</sup> it is fair to conclude that the GAL GEŠTIN did not die in this latter circumstance, because we find him again in fragment 28. Furthermore, if we consider that the death of Tuthaliya III is referred to in DŠ 15 or at the beginning of the third tablet of the Deeds<sup>77</sup> — and in any case before DŠ 17 —, then all the activities of this GAL GEŠTIN would have taken place after the accession to the throne of Šuppiluliuma I. Indeed, the passages, in which Hīmuili (II) is mentioned, occur immediately after this latter event. As I will show at the end of this article, however, it is rather probable that Hīmuili had already started his career during the reign of Tuthaliya III.

#### Nuwanza

This military commander turns out to be in service since the second year of the *Comprehensive Annals* of Muršili II.<sup>78</sup> At that time, he is sent to Karkemiš with a contingent of troops to help Šarri-Kušuh defend the frontier on the Euphrates and to discourage an Assyrian attack. After his mission in Syria, Nuwanza is always in service on the northern frontier against the Kaška people: in the ninth year, together with the governor of Pala, Hūtupiyanza, he is involved in a campaign against the region of Wašulana, later on in the north-east against the lands of Azzi and Hayaša and, finally, again in the region of Pala, in the north-west.<sup>79</sup> In the fifteenth year, after a meeting with the king near the city of Marašantiya, Nuwanza defeats the lands of Kalašma, Lalha and Mituwa.<sup>80</sup> In the nineteenth year he is again in north-western Anatolia<sup>81</sup> (the Taḥara river, identified by G. del Monte with the Devrez çay,<sup>82</sup> is mentioned in this very fragmentary passage). It remains to be added that Nuwanza was a member of the royal family, because in the fifteenth year of the *Annals* (KBo 5.8 IV 15') the title “Chief of Wine” is followed by that of DUMU.LUGAL.

The GAL GEŠTIN to whom the letter KUB 57.1 obv. 1 (CTH 209) was addressed is almost certainly to be identified with our Nuwanza, whereas the sender Hūtupiyanza (obv. 2)

74. For an edition see Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 282-283. For the possibility of placing this fragment within the *Deeds*, see Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 59.

75. KBo 14.4 I 23, 24, 28 (CTH 40.III.18.A).

76. Güterbock 1956.

77. On this problem see de Martino 1996, 86-87 with bibliography.

78. KUB 14.16 I 13', 15' (CTH 61.II.2.A).

79. KBo 3.4 IV 17', 19', 20' (CTH 61.I.A); KUB 14.29 I 14' (CTH 61.II.5.A); KBo 4.4 II 18, 20, 50, 52, 58, 68, 72, 74, 77, III 20' (CTH 61.II.5.B). The mention of Nuwanza in the tenth year of the *Comprehensive Annals* (KBo 4.4 III 61'; CTH 61.II.5.B) concerns only a reference to the military actions of the previous year, without adding any further information.

80. KBo 16.11 I. 6' (CTH 61.II.8); KBo 5.8 IV 15'-16' (CTH 61.II.7.A).

81. KBo 2.5a III 12 (CTH 61.II.10).

82. del Monte 1993, 110 fn. 137.

might be a cousin of Muršili II and the above mentioned governor of Pala.<sup>83</sup> The mention of Pittipara (obv. 13, 15) might be connected to the events of the fifteenth year, when the Hittite king confronted and defeated Pitagatalli and Pittipara.<sup>84</sup> Judging from the text, Pittipara is still alive, and seems to prepare for the clash, since he is gathering soldiers against Ḫatti (obv. 14-15). Due to the fact that this tablet stems from the archive of Ḫattuša, it may be concluded that Nuwanza was still in the Hittite capital, whereas it is known that at the end of that same year the GAL GEŠTIN was sent to reconquer the lands of Kalašma, Lalḫa and Mituwa. Therefore, we may conclude that Ḫutupiyanza sent this letter shortly before the defeat of the Kaška people led by Pitagatalli and Pittipara, and some time after the arrival of the GAL GEŠTIN to north-western Anatolia.<sup>85</sup> Finally, we may note that Nuwanza — if we accept this identification — is mentioned at the beginning of the letter before Ḫutupiyanza. This implies that his rank was higher than Ḫutupiyanza's. Since it is known that the governor of Pala was a cousin of the Hittite king, it might be suggested that a blood tie existed between Muršili II and Nuwanza, who, as said above, bears also the title of DUMU.LUGAL.

The same person almost certainly should be recognized in two other instances: as the sender of the letter KBo 18.11 obv. 2 (CTH 188), which can be dated at the beginning of the Empire period on the basis of its palaeography,<sup>86</sup> and as the person mentioned in KBo 40.342 l. 2' (CTH 832). For its small dimensions, the latter fragment is difficult to interpret; since the Euphrates river is cited (l. 3', 7'), however, the text may be linked with the second year of the *Comprehensive Annals*, even though there are no solid basis for such an attribution.

#### Malaziti

This person is known as a GAL GEŠTIN only thanks to the seal Bo 84/413,<sup>87</sup> which B. Dinçol dates to the 13th century BC.<sup>88</sup> Although a Malaziti "Chief of Wine" is not known from the cuneiform documentation, it is possible to suggest an identification with the person mentioned in the third year of the *Comprehensive Annals* of Muršili II (KUB 14.15 I 25; CTH 61.II.2.B). This Malaziti is a Hittite military commander, who was sent together with a certain Gulla (*bapax*) against the land of Millawanda, in western Anatolia, which had been occupied by the king of Aḫḫiawa with the help of Uḫḫaziti, king of Arzawa. This campaign ended in a Hittite victory.<sup>89</sup>

83. For this identification see also Košak 1988, 309; Hagenbuchner 1989, 159; Beal 1992, 352-353; Klengel 1999, 175.

84. Thus Košak 1988, 309 fn. 3, and Beal 1992, 352-353.

85. Even if both Kaškean chiefs managed to escape and their fate is not known, it seems to me that Pittipara may be possibly mentioned also after the fifteenth year, in a period in which he might have been re-organizing the Kaškeans to attack the Hittites again.

86. For an identification with the GAL GEŠTIN of Muršili II see also Klengel 1999, 175.

87. For a picture of this seal see Dinçol 1998, 164. The sequence of signs used for rendering the title is L.363 – L.370 – L.160.1.

88. Dinçol 1998, 167.

89. For an edition of this passage see del Monte 1993, 77 with fn. 13.

It is possible, instead, to exclude the attestations of the Middle-Hittite sources,<sup>90</sup> both because of the role played by the homonymous persons mentioned, and because, as said before, B. Dinçol dates the seal Bo 84/413 to the Empire period.<sup>91</sup> I consider very unlikely an identification with the Malaziti mentioned in KUB 8.77 I 2' (CTH 239.4) and in KUB 40.93 l. 4' (CTH 297.13), both texts of the late Empire period. In particular, a certain Tarḫuziti (<sup>m</sup>DU.LÚ), a man of the town of Kaḫlawa, is cited in KUB 8.77 I 4': he might be the same scribe of KUB 2.13 VI 35 (CTH 591.5.A) and KBo 42.1 rev. IV 9 (CTH 555), who worked under the supervision of Anuwanza, an important scribe who lived during the reigns of Ḫattušili III and Tuḫaliya IV.<sup>92</sup> If we add this element to the existence of some seal imprints from Nišantepe in which a scribe named Malaziti is attested,<sup>93</sup> we may suppose that the scribes Malaziti and Tarḫuziti may be identified with the homonymous persons quoted in KUB 8.77.<sup>94</sup> As regards the attestation in KUB 40.93 l. 4', the palaeography allows to date it to the late Empire period, but it is not possible to establish whether this case concerns the same scribe Malaziti too or not, given the bad conditions of the tablet.

As for the date of the “Chief of Wine” Malaziti, it is possible that at the time of the attack against Millawanda he was rather young, and that he was appointed to the office of GAL GEŠTIN after the death of Nuwanza, in a late phase of the reign of Muršili II<sup>95</sup> or at the time of Muwatalli II. If Malaziti was active under the latter, we can also explain the absence of any further document about him: as is well known, the sources of the reign of Muwatalli II discovered in Ḫattuša are very scarce.

Finally, for the Malaziti REX.FILIUS of the seals SBo II 10-11 it is not possible to establish with certainty any identification, even if the second appellative fits better the propogographical profile of the GAL GEŠTIN than that of the scribe Malaziti, since in many cases this military rank is borne by members of the royal family.

#### Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA and ḪAR-šaniya<sup>96</sup>

These two dignitaries appear in the Bronze Tablet (Bo 86/299 IV 37 and IV 38; CTH 106), and must be dated to the reign of Tuḫaliya IV. The analysis of the sources and of the per-

90. Cf. KUB 23.11 obv. II 37', rev. III 1 and KBo 16.97 obv. 10.

91. Dinçol 1998, 167 *cit.* Note, for example, the presence of the triangle in the writing of the title, an element which Herbordt 2005, 45, links to the Empire period.

92. This identity could have been supported by the fact that the mentioned estate appears very small, especially if it is compared with the estates recorded in the cadastral list KUB 8.75; therefore, it seems that it might have belonged to a less prestigious personage, such as a simple scribe.

93. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 154-155 and Tafel 18, respectively Abb. 228a/b, 229a/b and, perhaps, 230a/b (thus Hawkins 2005, 263).

94. On the contrary, Houwink ten Cate 1973, 255, believes that Malaziti of KUB 8.77 I 2' is the same commander of the *Annals* of Muršili II.

95. As stated about Nuwanza, he still occurs in the 19th year of the *Comprehensive Annals*.

96. As noted by Beal 1992, 354 fn. 1342, and by van den Hout 1995, 165, besides “Ḫaršaniya”, the reading of this anthroponym may also be “Ḫuršaniya” or “Muršaniya”; all attestations known so far do not present a different analytic writing.

sons discussed so far shows, in a rather unequivocal manner, that the office of “Chief of Wine” was entrusted to only one person at a time; as already stated, however, in the Bronze Tablet there are two dignitaries who bear the title of GAL GEŠTIN at the same time; this is an *unicum* among the documents, and represents a problem which may yield different interpretations.

The sources about both persons are few.<sup>97</sup> Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA appears as GAL GEŠTIN also among the witnesses of the Ulmi-Tešub treaty (KBo 4.10 rev. 31; CTH 106), whereas ḪAR-šaniya is not mentioned there. The most significant attestation for ḪAR-šaniya is, instead, the oracular fragment KUB 49.103 rev. 15' (CTH 570). In this text we find Šaḫurunuwa (rev. 8', 15'): since the oracle clearly deals with war, he can be identified with the Šaḫurunuwa mentioned in KUB 26.43 (CTH 225), the decree of Tuthaliya IV in favour of the descendants of Šaḫurunuwa. Besides GAL DUB.SAR.GIŠ, in this decree Šaḫurunuwa is also designated as GAL UKU.UŠ and as GAL NA.GAD (obv. 49). In KUB 49.103 rev. 14'-15',<sup>98</sup> the king and the *tuhkanti* are mentioned in connection with Šaḫurunuwa and ḪAR-šaniya, and the field of operations is northern Anatolia.<sup>99</sup> Since Tuthaliya IV before his accession to the throne was busy in the north against the Kaškeans,<sup>100</sup> we may conclude that KUB 49.103 is to be dated to Ḫattušili III.<sup>101</sup> If this date is correct, also ḪAR-šaniya might have been in service already under Ḫattušili III; we must consider, however, that it is not known what title he had, and this must be taken into account for the explanation given further on.

Th. van den Hout,<sup>102</sup> who does not deal with the problem of the simultaneous presence of two GAL GEŠTIN in the same document, states that the age of ḪAR-šaniya cannot be inferred from the sources. But at the same time, in support of his hypothesis that the Bronze Tablet preceded KBo 4.10,<sup>103</sup> he suggests that ḪAR-šaniya was older than Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA, because he does not appear either in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty or in the donation to Šaḫurunuwa. Dealing with the problem of the eldest among these two officials, R. Beal suggests that ḪAR-šaniya would have served during the reign of Ḫattušili III, as attested in KUB 49.103; when he was too old, he would have retired, and Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA would have taken the place of ḪAR-šaniya,<sup>104</sup> and for this reason he appears in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty. Further, ḪAR-šaniya would be listed among the witnesses in the treaty with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša because he would have been honoured through the acknowledgement of the role he had held in the past. According to Beal, this explanation might be a solution to

97. For the attestations of these two anthroponyms see van den Hout 1995, 154 and 165 respectively.

98. For a transcription of these lines see Beal 1992, 320 fn. 1224.

99. Thus Archi 1979, V. Cf. the mention of mount Ašḫarpaya at rev. 9'.

100. Cf. Bryce 1998, 327.

101. Thus also Beal 1992, 355.

102. van den Hout 1995, 166.

103. See van den Hout 1995, 17.

104. Beal 1992, 355.

the presence of two GAL GEŠTIN in the Bronze Tablet. It must be observed, however, that Beal does not take a clear side on the problem of the dating of KBo 4.10;<sup>105</sup> when he accepts the attribution to Hattušili III, he does not explain the reason why HAR-šaniya occurs in the Bronze Tablet, but not in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty, which would precede the former. Furthermore, if Beal's proposal is accepted, it is not possible to explain why such an important and old person would be inserted where officials of inferior rank are usually listed. Leaving aside the discussion about the dating of KBo 4.10,<sup>106</sup> a dating of this treaty in the reign Hattušili III is, in my opinion, the simplest solution. If we suppose that HAR-šaniya was younger than Hattuša-DLAMMA, we would have a good explanation for the absence of HAR-šaniya in KBo 4.10; and this does not contrast sharply with his mention in KUB 49.103, which was written when he might not have been yet promoted to the office of GAL GEŠTIN. Furthermore, if we consider that the lists of witnesses are usually appended only to official texts such as land grants and treaties, it is clear that the outline followed for the compilation of these lists is designed so as to reproduce a rather rigorous hierarchical order. Thus, the reasons why Hattuša-DLAMMA occurs before HAR-šaniya are either a higher rank of the former — possibly due to a tie with the royal family<sup>107</sup> — or, more simply, an older age than HAR-šaniya's.

R. Beal also suggests an alternative solution for the problem of the two GAL GEŠTIN being mentioned in the very same document.<sup>108</sup> During the late Empire period, the Hittite army would have developed to the point that two GAL GEŠTIN were necessary. But even this hypothesis is not totally convincing: in the Bronze Tablet there is not a distinction between a GAL GEŠTIN “of the Right” and a GAL GEŠTIN “of the Left”, as in the case of other military offices like the GAL KUŠ<sub>7</sub> or the GAL UKU.UŠ. Further, it is inappropriate to suppose that HAR-šaniya assisted Hattuša-DLAMMA because of the latter's old age, before definitively taking the office of “Chief of the Wine”.

At this point, it must be admitted that, with the documents at our disposal, plausible explanations of the problem cannot be found. The simultaneous presence of the two GAL GEŠTIN in the Bronze Tablet, which in any case is an extraordinary fact, shows without doubt that this rank had lost some prestige. It is not clear whether such duplication was a single event depending on specific circumstances, or it was the result of a true and lasting reform. It is certain, however, that in the late Empire period the prestige of this military rank suffered a remarkable decline — if it maintained its original connotation at all.

105. In many passages of his work the scholar dates the text to Hattušili III (cf. pages 338 n. 1289, 384, 387 n. 1466), whereas in some others to Tuthaliya IV (cf. pp. 14, 358 n. 1355, 362 n. 1373, 408 n. 1538, 411 n. 1547).

106. For a bibliography on the problem about the dating of KBo 4.10 see van den Hout 1995, 326 and Klengel 1999, 239 with n. 446 and 274 with n. 561. See also Alp 1998, 54-60.

107. Indeed, in KBo 4.10 Hattuša-DLAMMA is mentioned before the DUMU.LUGAL mDU.SUM / Tarhüntapiya and he could belong, therefore, to a collateral line of the royal family.

108. Beal 1992, 355.



A HAR-šaniya is mentioned as the father of a certain Nuwanza in KBo 14.142 IV 11 (CTH 698.1.A), a text dated to Ḫattušili III or Tuḫaliya IV.<sup>109</sup> Linking the office of GAL GEŠTIN with the use, well known in the Hittite world, to hand down the same names within a family, it might be supposed that HAR-šaniya and this Nuwanza were the descendants of the “Chief of Wine” who lived in the time of Muṣili II. Of course, these elements cannot be considered as a definitive proof; it must be must admitted, however, that it is a very interesting coincidence.

#### Armanani

This dignitary is known from two seals. In the first,<sup>110</sup> he bears the titles of GAL GEŠTIN, DUMU.LUGAL, “scribe”, and MAGNUS.ḪATTI.[DOMINUS] (“Great Lord of Ḫatti”, written L.363 – L.196 – L.390).<sup>111</sup> The second seal<sup>112</sup> differs from the previous for the presence of the double-headed eagle (L.127) as an ornamental element and for the lack of the appellative DUMU.LUGAL. It is thus evident that both the seal imprints belong to the same person. As already noted by S. Herbordt,<sup>113</sup> the seals of Armanani show an unusual combination of titles. The first question, however, regards the identification and the date of this dignitary.

All documents bearing the anthroponym Armanani are datable to the late Empire period, but, contrary to the case of Malaziti, there are no other sources linking this person to the military context. This name occurs almost only in the glyptic,<sup>114</sup> whereas the only cuneiform source is KUB 18.12+KUB 22.15 obv. 14, 22, 44, 50, rev. 4 (CTH 564),<sup>115</sup> in which the writing of the name is <sup>mD</sup>SIN-ŠEŠ.

109. Cf. Trémouille 1997, 94, and Hutter 2002, 188. van den Hout 1995, 206 and 212, suggests an attribution to Ḫattušili III.

110. Cf. the seal imprints Bo 90/693, Bo 91/281, Bo 91/541, Bo 91/1091, Bo 91/1123, Bo 91/2341. For a picture of these five seal imprints see Herbordt 2005, Tafel 4, Abb. 47a/b. Also the imprint reproduced in Boehmer – Güterbock 1987, Tafel 30, No. 246, should belong to the same seal. *Contra*, Dinçol 1998, 165, who, however, incorrectly interprets the sign L.160.1 as L.337.

111. This restoration is suggested by Herbordt 2005, 122, on the basis of the seal imprints Bo 90/594, Bo 91/326, Bo 91/432, quoted in fn. 112, below. This appellative does not appear in the cuneiform documents: there are only the appellative EN/BELU <sup>URU</sup>Ḫatti (cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 453), without GAL, and the appellative BELU/EN GAL (cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 495-496), without the toponym Ḫatti; the cuneiform rendering of the title MAGNUS.ḪATTI.DOMINUS would thus be EN/BELU GAL <sup>URU</sup>Ḫatti.

112. Cf. the imprints Bo 90/594, Bo 91/326, Bo 91/432. For the picture of these imprints, see Herbordt 2005, Tafel 4, Abb. 48a/b.

113. Herbordt 1998, 177.

114. Cf. Laroche 1966; Laroche 1981, No. 134.

115. For an edition of obv. 1-7, obv. 14-18, and obv. 22, see Archi 1975, 122-124.

I endorse the hypothesis of J.D. Hawkins,<sup>116</sup> according to whom all the seals of Armanani DUMU.LUGAL might belong to a single individual, who, during his career, was promoted to the rank of GAL GEŠTIN. Since some seal imprints of Armanani bear only the titles DUMU.LUGAL and “scribe”, I would conclude that these seals are earlier than those bearing a longer list of titles of this individual. The glyptic documentation, however, does not offer any element to establish when this dignitary was in service. A more accurate chronological indication might be offered by KUB 18.12+, since its *ductus* is that of the late Empire period. This tablet preserves an oracle query, and the augurs are Piḫa-Tarḫunta and Armanani. The name Piḫa-Tarḫunta often occurs in both cuneiform and glyptic documents belonging to the late Empire period; on many occasions, this man plays the role of an augur.<sup>117</sup> This name occurs in two dreams of the queen, KUB 48.118 obv. 22 (CTH 584.7) and KUB 48.123 I 10', II 17' (CTH 590), dated to Ḫattušili III by J. de Roos.<sup>118</sup> This tie with the Hittite royal family and with the most important officials at court is further proved by the fact that, in the seal imprint from Niṣantepe Bo 90/652a,<sup>119</sup> he is designated REX.FILIUS; in the documents from Ugarit and Emar, he is the son of Uppar(a)muwa, the “DUMU.LUGAL of the land of Ḫatti”.<sup>120</sup> Therefore, Piḫa-Tarḫunta might be an augur, but also a member of the royal family.

If this hypothesis is correct, we may deduce that Armanani lived at least during the reign of Ḫattušili III. If, as it should be expected, he was promoted to GAL GEŠTIN late in his career, Armanani in KUB 18.12+ would have been young, and might have been promoted to this rank at the time of Tuthaliya IV.

The second problem is that in some seals Armanani bears both the title of “Chief of Wine” and of “scribe”. As far as is known from the sources, these two offices should belong to two different careers, apparently incompatible: a military career, and an administrative career. S. Herbordt tried to solve the problem considering that, at least at the basic level, all the “GAL” of the Hittite kingdom were connected with the scribal *milieu*; in this specific instance, therefore, she believes that the word “scribe” should be taken as meaning “learned”, and consequently, that Armanani had a basic training at a scribal school.<sup>121</sup> This hypothesis, however, does not explain why in some seals Armanani is only given the appellatives of DUMU.LUGAL and “scribe”.<sup>122</sup> If this solution were applied to any other dig-

116. Hawkins 2005, 250.

117. Cf. e.g. KUB 6.40 I. 3' (CTH 582), KUB 16.60 III 13' (CTH 579), and the seal Bo 90/644 (cf. Herbordt 2005, 168 and Tafel 24, Abb. 306a/b), in which he bears the title AVIS<sub>3</sub>.MAGNUS together with the appellatives EUNUCHUS<sub>2</sub> and DOMINUS. For this identification see Hawkins 2005, 267-268.

118. de Roos 1984, 63-64.

119. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 168 and Tafel 24, Abb. 307a/b.

120. Cf. Laroche 1981, No. 971.2-3. For a prosopography of Uppar(a)muwa see van den Hout 1995, 115-116. Note further that also Armanani is present in a document from Emar (Msk. 73.266). Imparati 1987, 195, suggested to identify Piḫa-Tarḫunta and Armanani, who are mentioned in the texts found in northern Syria, with the augurs of KUB 18.12+.

121. Herbordt 2005, 98.

122. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 121 No. 42-46.

nitary bearing only the title of “scribe”, it would not be possible to distinguish when the word “scribe” is used to indicate the degree of education or the profession proper. In my opinion, it is highly probable that this person really performed such office, which required a scribal training, in his early years, perhaps at the end of the reign of Ḫattušili III, as proven by his role of augur in KUB 18.12+. <sup>123</sup> In a later phase of his career, perhaps in the time of Tuthaliya IV, this member of the royal family would have been promoted to the rank of GAL GEŠTIN, and would also have obtained the honour of being nominated “Great lord of Ḫatti”. The case of Armanani would not be unique in this sense. A similar case is known from the documents from Nišantepe. A certain Mizrimuwa is designated “scribe” only in some seals, <sup>124</sup> whereas in other seals he is designated both “scribe” and MAGNUS. PASTOR, a military office <sup>125</sup> that should correspond <sup>126</sup> to the cuneiform GAL NA.GAD. <sup>127</sup> He is to be identified without any doubt with the Mizramuwa <sup>128</sup> GAL NA.GAD of KUB 26.43 rev. 31 (CTH 225.A). Therefore, it may be suggested that also Mizramuwa, at the beginning of his career, received a scribal training, and, later on, obtained a military command. It is not possible, however, to establish whether Armanani and Mizramuwa represent isolated instances, or during the last period of the Hittite Kingdom some other military commanders received some degree of scribal training at the beginning of their careers. Unfortunately, the Nišantepe archive does not offer any further example.

An alternative solution is that the contemporaneous mentions of the offices of GAL GEŠTIN and “scribe” might depend on a development of the administrative duties of the “Chief of Wine”, possibly implying a loss of prestige. If this were true, also the simultaneous presence of the two GAL GEŠTIN Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA and ḪAR-šaniya in the Bronze Tablet (see above) might be explained: as a consequence of a diminution of his rank, this office might have been attributed to two dignitaries at the same time. Nonetheless, I consider this hypothesis less probable, since ḪAR-šaniya at least is mentioned in a military context, as attested in the above mentioned oracle KUB 49.103.

In conclusion, the wealth of elements examined so far suggests to maintain the view that Armanani lived in the final part of the reign of Ḫattušili III and during the reign of Tuthaliya IV.

#### DOMINUS-*ziti* and *x-mi-Šarruma*

Both persons are known only through the glyptic documentation. DOMINUS-*ziti* is mentioned in Bo 90/714a; <sup>129</sup> the phonetic rendering of this name is still unknown. In addition to the title of GAL GEŠTIN, this dignitary has also that of REX.FILIUS (L.46), i.e. DUMU.

123. For a scribe performing the tasks of an augur see Imparati 1985, 255-269.

124. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 156-157 No. 243-246, and, perhaps, No. 249.

125. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 540-541; Beal 1992, 391-396.

126. Thus Hawkins 2005, 305.

127. Cf. Herbordt 2005, 157 No. 247-248.

128. Hawkins 2005, 265, believes that Mizrimuwa and Mizramuwa are the same person.

129. For a picture of this seal see Herbordt 2005, Tafel 48, Abb. 607a/b.

LUGAL. J.D. Hawkins suggested that the sign for DOMINUS might correspond to cuneiform EN, and the name might thus be rendered as <sup>m</sup>EN.LÚ.<sup>130</sup> This name occurs in KUB 57.5 rev. 3' (CTH 209), a very fragmentary letter, which A. Hagenbuchner dated to Ḫattušili III;<sup>131</sup> the *ductus* of the tablet suggests an attribution to a later age. The same *bullā* as Bo 90/714a also bears the seal of Armapīḫami (Bo 90/714b) and that of a person whose name is written VITA+RA/I (Bo 90/714c). Unfortunately, these names do not have a correspondence in the cuneiform texts, therefore they do not help in establishing the context of DOMINUS-*ḫiti*.

The name x-mi-Šarruma occurs in Bo 90/1227, a badly preserved seal imprint.<sup>132</sup> S. Herbordt suggested the reading of the anthroponym as Piyami(?))-Šarruma (L.66 – L.391 – L.80),<sup>133</sup> whereas J.D. Hawkins<sup>134</sup> suggests x-*mi-SARMA*. In this seal the sign for VITIS (L.160.1) is heavily damaged, therefore the reading of the title of GAL GEŠTIN may be accepted with caution, even though it seems rather probable. As in the previous case, also x-mi-Šarruma bears the title of REX.FILIUS.

There are no texts dealing with both dignitaries: this might support a dating between the end of the reign of Tuḫaliya IV and that of Šuppiluliuma II, since there is a very small number of documents dated to the successors of Tuḫaliya IV.

### *The Chiefs of Wine of Ḫatti: a chronology*

At this point, we may attempt to sum up the data inferred from the texts examined so far. As already anticipated, it is difficult to arrange the officials who held the title of Chief of Wine during the Old Kingdom in a reliable chronological order. We can take for granted that Nakkilit and his unknown predecessor must be placed at the head of the list and in direct succession between them. Pulli, Ḫattušili, and Zidanni, however, should be dated to the final period of the Old Kingdom. Pulli should be placed first, but it is not possible to establish the time interval which separates him from the other two GAL GEŠTIN, and consequently it is not certain whether one further person in this office should be inserted between them. A problem which cannot be solved at the moment is the chronological relationship between Ḫattušili and Zidanni, i.e. to establish who took office first.

The proposal of R. Beal as regards the person designated only “son of Karaḫnuili” (cf. KBo 7.14 obv. II 12; CTH 15.A) is worth mentioning here.<sup>135</sup> He suggests that this person, mentioned on the occasion of the campaign of Ḫattušili I against the city of Ḫaššu,<sup>136</sup> might

130. Hawkins 2005, 283.

131. Hagenbuchner 1989, 233.

132. For a picture of this seal see Herbordt 2005, Tafel 25, Abb. 320a/b.

133. Herbordt 2005, 170-171.

134. Hawkins 2005, 268.

135. Beal 1992, 328, 345 and 456.

136. For this dating see de Martino 2003, 91 fn. 256; for an edition of this passage see esp. 110-111.

have held the office of GAL GEŠTIN. However, there are no concrete elements to support this hypothesis.

As regards the Middle Kingdom, for kings Taḫurwaili and Alluwamna there is no evidence at all, whereas in the time of Ḫantili II we have Muššu. There are no texts for Zidanta II as well; in the time of his successor Ḫuzziya II, instead, Tapzu[-x] is mentioned. Since the length of the reigns of these kings cannot be established with any precision, it cannot be established whether Muššu and Tapzu[-x] served under one of the three kings for whom there is no documentary evidence; i.e., it cannot be established whether Muššu was already in office under Alluwamna or remained in office until the time of Zidanta II. The same applies to Tapzu[-x], who might have been appointed GAL GEŠTIN already by Zidanta II, and might have been in service still under Ḫuzziya II.

As regards Ḫimuili (I), he might have been Chief of Wine already during the last years of the reign of Ḫuzziya II, even though there is no document to support this hypothesis. As an alternative, Ḫimuili (I) might have been promoted to that rank by the usurper Muwatalli I. This king would have sought the support of the dignitaries connected to the family of the previous ruler,<sup>137</sup> aiming at being legitimized as a king by the ruling class. Later, Ḫimuili (I) was also promoted GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL by Muwatalli I (cf. KBo 32.185 rev. 13). Therefore, two alternatives are possible: either he bore the title already in the time of Ḫuzziya II and maintained it under Muwatalli I, or he was promoted in the Hittite hierarchy only thanks to the latter. As regards KBo 32.185, it should be noted that it does not contain information about the person who might have held the rank of GAL GEŠTIN after Ḫimuili (I). In any case, it seems unequivocal that at least another person active during the reign of Tuḫaliya I/II, should be placed between him and Ḫalpaziti.<sup>138</sup>

As concerns Ḫalpaziti, we have seen that, according to KBo 18.80+ and KUB 32.19+, this official might have been in service from the early years of Arnuwanda I to the early years of the reign of Tuḫaliya III. A direct succession Ḫimuili (I) – Ḫalpaziti thus seems untenable, since Ḫalpaziti would have already been in office under Tuḫaliya I/II, if not already under Muwatalli I. We have already discussed the possibility that Antaḫitta might be identified or not with the GAL GEŠTIN mentioned in the Madduwatta text (CTH 147). If the positive solution is accepted, Antaḫitta might have been the Chief of Wine appointed by Tuḫaliya I/II, and would have retained such rank until the episode quote above; later, Arnuwanda I might have replaced him with Ḫalpaziti.<sup>139</sup>

137. Freu 1995, 137, has suggested that Ḫimuili (I) and Kantuzili were the sons of queen Šummiri, the wife of Ḫuzziya II.

138. As an alternative, the Chiefs of Wine between Ḫimuili (I) and Ḫalpaziti might have been two persons, if it is admitted that Muwatalli I appointed another Chiefs of Wine after Ḫimuili (I), and that Tuḫaliya I/II, after ascending the throne, replaced the latter with a man loyal to him.

139. This alternative does not contrast the chronological reconstruction put forward for Ḫalpaziti: the dismissal of Antaḫitta and the appointment of his successor might have been concomitant circumstances. Consequently, the hypothesis that the first steps of Ḫalpaziti's career took place at the beginning of the reign of Arnuwanda I would be valid in any case.



The first GAL GEŠTIN known from the sources of the Empire period is Ḫimuili (II), known from the *Deeds* of Šuppiluliuma I; as stated, all his enterprises would have occurred after the death of Tuthaliya III. In my opinion, however, he obtained the title of Chief of Wine already under the latter king. We are aware, actually, that Nuwanza bore the title of GAL GEŠTIN as early as the second year of Muršili II, and held that office for a long time, at least until the nineteenth year of the *Comprehensive Annals*; therefore, it is difficult to believe that Nuwanza might have been active also during the reign of Muwatalli II. On the contrary, considering that Muršili II states to have ascended to the throne when he was young, it is fair to assume that Nuwanza was appointed GAL GEŠTIN already during the last years of Šuppiluliuma I, replacing Ḫimuili (II). A less likely alternative is that the succession of Ḫimuili (II) to Nuwanza might have taken place during the short reign of Arnuwanda III. According to these observations, also the transfer of office from Ḫalpaziti to Ḫimuili (II) might have taken place at the time of Tuthaliya III, the existence of one further GAL GEŠTIN being thus not required. Thus, both Ḫimuili (II) and Nuwanza might have been many years older than the kings they served.

For the reigns of Muwatalli II, Urḫi-Tešub/Muršili III and Ḫattušili III there is no reliable evidence about the men who were in the office of Chief of Wine. If the reconstruction proposed for Malaziti is correct, it should be concluded that he took the position of Nuwanza. It is not clear, however, if he was still in office under Muršili III, a king under whom no GAL GEŠTIN is known. If the proposal about Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA and ḪAR-šaniya is accepted, we might conclude that the former was active from an undetermined period of the reign of Ḫattušili III to an early period of that of Tuthaliya IV, as attested in the Bronze Tablet. Even if the problem of the presence of both GAL GEŠTIN in the Bronze Tablet remains open, it is possible that Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA began his office rather early in the reign of Ḫattušili III, whereas in the time of the treaty with Kurunta he would have been rather old.

The elements for dating Armanani are, as seen, rather scarce. The analysis of the sources seems to suggest that he was very young during the reign of Ḫattušili III, when he might have received his scribal training, whereas he might have been promoted Chief of Wine under/by Tuthaliya IV. If it is taken into account that in KUB 49.103 ḪAR-šaniya seems to have been in office already under Ḫattušili III — even if probably not yet as GAL GEŠTIN —, it might be concluded that ḪAR-šaniya was already rather old when he took the position of Ḫattuša-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA; thus, the time in which ḪAR-šaniya was in office might have been very short.<sup>140</sup> ḪAR-šaniya's short permanence in the office of GAL GEŠTIN may suggest placing Armanani in a late period of Tuthaliya IV's reign, and therefore that he might have been rather old.

For DOMINUS-ziti and x-mi-Šarruma, I have suggested a date after Armanani, because in the cuneiform documents there is no evidence for these two officials. They might have served under kings Arnuwanda III and Šuppiluliuma II, to whom very few sources can be

140. As an alternative, perhaps less probable, ḪAR-šaniya might have died in battle.



unquestionably assigned; as an alternative, one of them might also have been the GAL GEŠTIN of Muršili III.

<i>Old Kingdom</i>	
1. <sup>m</sup> X-]x	
2. Nakkilit	
many unknown GAL GEŠTIN <sup>141</sup>	
3'. Pulli	Ammuna or Huzziya I
(one unknown GAL GEŠTIN?)	
4'. Hattušili	Telipinu
5'. Zidanni	Telipinu
6'. at least one unknown GAL GEŠTIN	Taḫurwaili or Alluwamna
<i>Middle Kingdom</i>	
7'. Muššu	Hantili II
8'. Tapzu[-	Huzziya II
9'. Himuili (I), later promoted	Muwatalli I
GAL DUMUMEŠ É.GAL	
10'. one unknown GAL GEŠTIN <sup>142</sup>	Tuthaliya I/II
11'. Halpaziti	Arnuwanda I – beginnings of Tuthaliya III
<i>Empire period</i>	
12'. Himuili (II)	end of Tuthaliya III – Šuppiluliuma I
13'. Nuwanza, DUMU.LUGAL	Muršili II
14'. Malaziti, REX.FILIUS (?)	Muwatalli II – Muršili III/Urḫi-Tešub (?)
15'. Hattuša- <sup>D</sup> LAMMA	Hattušili III – beginnings of Tuthaliya IV
16'. HAR-šaniya	Tuthaliya IV
17'. Armanani, REX.FILIUS, scribe,	late reign of Tuthaliya IV (?)
MAGNUS.HATTI.DOMINUS	
18'. DOMINUS-ziti, REX.FILIUS	Arnuwanda III – Šuppiluliuma II (?)
19'. x-mi-Šarruma, REX.FILIUS	Arnuwanda III – Šuppiluliuma II (?)

### Conclusions

The evidence linked to the military sphere in the texts mentioned above proves that the duties of the GAL GEŠTIN belonged almost exclusively to the military environment since the Old-Hittite period, as attested in the *Palace Chronicle* and in KUB 26.71. R. Beal<sup>143</sup> illus-

141. If the suggestion of Beal 1992, 328, is accepted, the person mentioned as “son of Karaønuili” might be insert here.

142. This person might be Antaḫitta, although, considering what has been stated above, this hypothesis seems unlikely.

143. Beal 1992, 356. On the office of GAL GEŠTIN and especially on his duties see also Rosi 1983, 48-53.

trated the remarkable importance of the Chief of Wine in the Hittite army,<sup>144</sup> and noted that many enterprises of this official were performed under the king's command, but some other were conducted directly by him. In Beal's reconstruction, however, the position of the GAL GEŠTIN in the Hittite establishment does not emerge in full, especially in relation with non-military offices. Comparing the lists of witnesses quoted above, it may be noted that the GAL GEŠTIN was a very prestigious office, and that on many occasions it was bestowed upon members of the royal family. Specifically, the *Land Grants* show that the Chief of Wine is of lower importance than the GAL MEŠEDI, the GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL and the <sup>LÚ</sup>uriyanni only.<sup>145</sup> This, however, can hold true only from the end of the Old Kingdom to the end of Middle Kingdom;<sup>146</sup> for the Empire period, there are only two sources, both belonging to a late phase: in the treaties KBo 4.10 and Bo 86/299 (see above), the very low position of the GAL GEŠTIN in the list of witnesses might depend both on the presence of several members of the royal family and of kings subjected to Ḫatti, and also on a loss of prestige of this office.

The presence of the GAL GEŠTIN in the official texts, including KUB 34.58, also shows that this official played a “political” role since he was in tight connection with the court, and, consequently, was not strictly bound to the military sphere. Finally, KUB 34.45+ obv. 13', 14' (CTH 295.5) might possibly represent the only attestation of administrative duties, since in this text the GAL GEŠTIN is mentioned in the context of a trial, where he must engage in the affair of a certain Tapanuna which does not seem to concern military matters.

Further, the GAL GEŠTIN carries out a religious role. This official, actually, participates in several ceremonies,<sup>147</sup> even though no special link can be envisaged with the possible original duties of the office of “cupbearer” giving the name to the title. In many cases the Chief of Wine simply attends the ceremony, in other he plays an active role, such as in the celebration for the LAMMA deities (KUB 11.21 V 11', 16', 18'; CTH 682.1.F),<sup>148</sup> in which the GAL GEŠTIN offers a silver cup to the king. This gesture may go back to the original duties of this official, but actually in other texts this gesture is performed also by other officials, like the GAL DUMU<sup>MEŠ</sup> É.GAL.<sup>149</sup> From KBo 12.140 obv. 8 (CTH

144. Cf. Beal 1992, 527.

145. Also in the *Edict of Telipinu* (KBo 3.1 II 62, 71, [III 1] and duplicates; CTH 19.II.A) the GAL GEŠTIN occurs among the most important officials who might damage a prince in order to lay hands upon his properties.

146. The small variations concerning the positions held by the various officials may be justified mainly by contingent reasons, such as the career seniority, and the political interest to favour a specific dignitary. A perfect match can be observed comparing the land grants of Muwatalli I Bo 90/671 and KBo 32.185.

147. Cf. KBo 25.176 l. e. 1 (CTH 627.3.b.A; duplicate KUB 10.13 IV 25', CTH 627.3.b.B); IBoT 3.1 rev. 82' (CTH 609.1); KUB 11.21 V 11', 16', 18' (CTH 682.1.F); IBoT 2.91 III 1', 4', 10' (CTH 670); KUB 44.22 l. 5', 7' (CTH 670); KUB 10.11 rev. IV 29 (CTH 660.1.A; duplicate KBo 39.89 rev. IV 13'); KBo 20.81 V 12' (CTH 650).

148. For this classification see Košak, [www.hethiter.net](http://www.hethiter.net). The text was previously classified by Laroche 1971 as CTH 669.10. For an edition, see McMahon 1991, 90-93.

149. Cf. KUB 10.89 V 19 (CTH 591.1.A).

521.7),<sup>150</sup> which according to F. Imparati<sup>151</sup> should pertain to the religious administration and should be assigned to the reign of Tuthaliya IV, the GAL GEŠTIN is responsible for the cults in the town of Tawiniya.<sup>152</sup> In VBoT 67 I<sup>2</sup> 6' (CTH 500), a rather fragmentary ritual from Kizzuwatna performed for summoning the deities of an enemy town, an interesting link can be observed between the presence of the Chief of Wine and the war character of the ritual.

We may also take into account the offices which should be linked to that of the Chief of Wine, at least according to their designation. The UGULA LÚ.MEŠ GEŠTIN<sup>153</sup> seems to be attested only in KBo 25.176 l.e. 4, but the reading of the sign for UGULA is very uncertain,<sup>154</sup> and, more likely, seems a mistake for GAL.<sup>155</sup> The sources about the LÚ GEŠTIN<sup>156</sup> are only three,<sup>157</sup> all very fragmentary. All these texts are of religious character; the absence of a military context suggests that there is no direct link between these men and the Chief of Wine.

Finally, the relationship between the GAL GEŠTIN and the GAL SAGI deserves to be commented shortly.<sup>158</sup> At the beginning of this article, I have stressed that it is difficult to distinguish these offices in the glyptic documentation. As a matter of fact, judging from the basic meaning of both titles, it should be concluded that both officials had to perform the very same duties. As demonstrated throughout this essay, however, a very different picture is outlined in the documents; and a clear distinction is traced between the Chief of Wine and the Chief of the Cupbearers. Nonetheless, the title “Chief of Wine” clearly denotes an origin linked to the tasks of the cupbearer; this contrast requires a final, short comment.

As stated above, in a passage of the *Palace Chronicle* Nakkilit is appointed GAL GEŠTIN in place of his predecessor. Most probably, he is the same Nakkilit who occurs further on in the text (cf. KBo 3.34 II 30; CTH 8.A); in this instance, however, he bears the title of GAL LÚ.MEŠ SAGI (II 31), even though the passage in question clearly denotes a military context. R. Beal offers various solutions to this problem: homonymy; a mistake of the scribe when writing the episode; Nakkilit might have been in charge of both offices. In my

150. For a transcription see Imparati 1977, 50 fn. 113.

151. Imparati 1977, 50.

152. Imparati 1977, 50 transcribes obv. 7 as URU<sup>2</sup>Ta-a-lu-i-ir-ya-kán, which would be a *hapax*. For a correct reading, cf. del Monte – Tischler 1978, 416, s.v. *Taw(i)nija*.

153. Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 64.

154. Singer 1984, 95, does not read the sign UGULA; also Beal 1992, 357 fn. 1352, expressed some doubts on this count. On the contrary, Rosi 1983, 52-53, accepts the reading of this sign as UGULA, and states that this official would have led the “men of the wine”, whereas the GAL GEŠTIN would not have had any relation with the LÚ.MEŠ GEŠTIN, as would happen also for the UGULA NA.GAD and the GAL NA.GAD.

155. See also Beal 1992, 357 fn. 1352.

156. Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 63.

157. Cf. KBo 21.82 IV 15' (CTH 734.9); KBo 23.91 I 1' (CTH 627.1.e.1); HT 67 obv. 3' (CTH 821.2).

158. For a study about the office of the cupbearer see de Martino 1982, 305-318. See also Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 543-544.

opinion, the analogies between the two attestations clearly exclude the first hypothesis;<sup>159</sup> and a mistake of the scribe is unlikely, since in another fragment (KBo 3.33 II 6'-7'; CTH 9.4)<sup>160</sup> the description seems very similar, so that it is highly probable that the name Nakki-lit, followed by the title GAL <sup>LÜ</sup>.MEŠ SAGI.A (II 7'), should be restored after the break (II 6').<sup>161</sup> Among Beal's suggestions, the most probable one seems that this person held both offices; there is another solution, however. In ancient times, when the texts were written, there was no clear distinction between the two offices, and consequently between their respective duties, whether military or palatine and religious. We cannot establish neither the time nor the ways in which the competences of the two officials were transformed in the shape we know from the later texts: the GAL GEŠTIN was assigned only military tasks, while the domain of the GAL SAGI remained linked to the sphere of the court, holding this role in many religious celebrations. Perhaps this development took place in a time not too far from the events narrated in the *Palace Chronicle*. Actually, a passage of the KILAM Festival — which, according to I. Singer,<sup>162</sup> would have been given its original redaction in the Old Kingdom — might offer a *terminus ante quem*: as noted by R. Beal, in this text (KUB 10.13 IV 16') the very same GAL SAGI plays the role of cupbearer, and offers drinks to many officials, among whom the Chief of Wine (IV 25').<sup>163</sup>

In conclusion, for a long time in the Hittite history the GAL GEŠTIN represented one of the most relevant military offices; his rank was lower only than the king's, the *tubkanti's* and the GAL MEŠEDP's. Due to the absence of detailed sources about the end of the Empire period, it is not possible to establish with certainty whether the military competence of the Chief of Wine remained unchanged, or was abolished, as seems suggested by the case of Armanani; or even whether this title was given to more dignitaries simultaneously, as the mention of two GAL GEŠTIN in the Bronze Tablet seems to suggest. There is no doubt, however, that during the reign of the last kings of Ḫatti this official lost much of the high prestige he had enjoyed in the past.

159. Beal 1992, 358-359.

160. For an edition of this text see Soysal 1989, 37-38 and 93-94; he states that column II of the autography is to be numbered III, as is assumed here.

161. Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 544; Soysal 1989, 94; Pecchioli Daddi 1995, 330.

162. Singer 1983, 144 with fn. 5.

163. Beal 1992, 356.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alp S. 1998, "Zur Datierung des Ulmitešup-Vertrags", *AoF* 25, 54-60.
- Archi A. 1975, "L'ornitomanzia ittita", *SMEA* 16, 119-180.
- Archi A. 1979, *KUB XLIX*, Berlin.
- Balkan K. 1973, *Eine Schenkungsurkunde aus der althethitischen Zeit, gefunden in Inandık 1966*, Ankara.
- Beal R. 1992, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military* (THeth 20), Heidelberg.
- Beckman G. 1999, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta.
- Beckman G. 1998, "The Pantheon of Emar", in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to M. Popko on the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Warsaw, 39-54.
- Boehmer R.M. – Güterbock H.G. 1987, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy*, Berlin.
- Bryce T. 1998, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford.
- Carruba O. 1977, "Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte II.", *SMEA* 18, 175-195.
- 1993, "Zur Datierung der ältesten Schenkungsurkunden und der anonymen Tabarna-Siegel", in *Festschrift für Peter Neve. Zum 65. Geburtstag am 3. April 1994 von Freunden und Kollegen*, *IM* 43 [1994], Tübingen, 71-85.
- Dardano P. 1997, *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-ittita: la cosiddetta "Cronaca di palazžo"*, Roma.
- de Martino S. 1982, "La posizione del coppiere presso la corte ittita", *Studi Classici e Orientali* 32, 305-318.
- 1991, "Himuili, Kantuzili e la presa del potere da parte di Tuthaliya", in F. Imparati (a cura di), *Quattro studi ittiti* (*Eothen* 4), Firenze, 5-21.
- 1996, *L'Anatolia occidentale nel Medio Regno ittita* (*Eothen* 5), Firenze.
- 1999, *La cosiddetta "cronaca di Ammuna"*, in S. de Martino – F. Imparati (a cura di), *Studi e testi II* (*Eothen* 10), Firenze, 69-82.
- 2003, *Annali e Res Gestae antico ittiti* (*Studia Mediterranea* 12), Pavia.
- 2005, "Hittite Letters from the Time of Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III", *AoF* 32, 291-321.
- del Monte G. 1993, *L'annalistica ittita*, Brescia.
- del Monte G. – Tischler J. 1978, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes*, Vol. 6: *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* (Beihfte zum TAVO Reihe B Nr. 7/6), Wiesbaden.
- de Roos J. 1984, *Hettitische geloften. Een teksteditie van Hettitische geloften met inleiding, vertaling en kritische noten, Deel I-III*, Dissertation Univ. Amsterdam.
- Dinçol B. 1998, "Der Titel GAL GEŠTIN auf den hethitischen Hieroglyphensiegeln", *AoF* 25, 163-167.
- Easton D.F. 1981, "Hittite Land Donations and Tabarna Seals", *JCS* 33, 3-43.
- Forlanini M. 1988, "La regione del Tauro nei testi hittiti", *VO* 7, 129-169.
- 2004, "Considerazioni sullo spostamento del centro del potere nel periodo della formazione dello stato hittita", in M. Mazoyer – O. Casabonne (eds.), *Antiquus Oriens. Mélanges offerts au professeur René Lebrun I*, Paris, 249-269.

- Freu J. 1995, "De l'ancien royaume au nouvel empire: les temps obscurs de la monarchie hittite", in O. Carruba – M. Giorgieri – C. Mora (a cura di), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia, 133-148.
- 1996, "La 'révolution dynastique' du grand roi de Hatti Tuthaliya I", *Hethitica* 13, 17-38.
- 2002, "Deux princes-prêtres de Kizzuwatna, Kantuzzili et Telepinu", *Hethitica* 15, 65-80.
- Fuscagni F. 2003, *La fase iniziale del Medio Regno ittita: fonti e problemi*, Tesi di Dottorato di Ricerca, Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli.
- Giorgieri M. 2000, "Indice Linguistico", *PdP* 55, 390-420.
- Götze A. 1927, *Maddunwattas*, Leipzig.
- Güterbock H. G. 1956, "The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by his Son, Mursili II", *JCS* 10, 41-68; 75-98; 107-130.
- Hagenbuchner A. 1989, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter II* (THeth 16), Heidelberg.
- Hawkins J.D. 1995, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa* (SÜDBURG) (StBoTB 3), Wiesbaden.
- 2005, in S. Herbordt, 2005
- Heinhold-Krahmer S. 1977, *Arzawa* (THeth 8), Heidelberg.
- Herbordt S. 1998, "Sigilli di funzionari e dignitari hittiti. Le cretule dell'archivio di Nişantepe a Boğazköy/Hattuša", in M. Marazzi (a cura di), *Il geroglifico anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca a venti anni dalla sua "ridecifrazione". Atti del Colloquio e della tavola rotonda Napoli-Procida, 5-9 giugno 1995*, Napoli, 173-193.
- 2005, *Die Prinzen- und Beamtsiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullien aus dem Nişantepe-archiv in Hattusa*, Mainz.
- Haas V. 1984, *Die Serien itkahi und itkalzi des AZU-Priesters, Rituale für Tašmišarri und Tatuḫēpa sowie weitere Texte mit Bezug auf Tašmišarri* (ChS I/1), Roma.
- Hoffmann I. 1984, *Der Erlaß Telipinus* (THeth 11), Heidelberg.
- Hoffner H. 1980, "Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites", in *OrNS* 49, 283-332.
- Houwink ten Cate Ph.J. 1973, rev. to E. Laroche, *Les Noms des Hittites*, Paris 1966, in *BiOr* 30, 252-257.
- 1995-1996, "The Genealogy of Mursilis II", *JEOL* 34, 51-72.
- 1998, "An Alternative Date for the Sunassuras Treaty (KBo 1.5)", *AoF* 25, 34-53.
- Hutter M. 2002, "Das *hijara*-Fest in Hattuša. Transformation und Funktion eines syrischen Festes", in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to M. Popko on the Occasion of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Warsaw, 187-196.
- Imparati F. 1977, "Le istituzioni culturali del *naaḫékur* e il potere centrale ittita", *SMEA* 18, 19-64.
- 1985, "Auguri e scribi nella società ittita", in S.F. Bondi – S. Pernigotti – F. Serra – A. Vivian (a cura di), *Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani*, Pisa, 255-269.
- 1987, "La politique extérieure des Hittites: tendances et problèmes", *Hethitica* 8, 187-207.
- Kammenhuber A. 1976, *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern* (THeth 7), Heidelberg.
- Klengel H. 1999, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, Leiden.
- Klinger J. 1995, "Das Corpus der Mašat Briefe und seine Beziehungen zu den Texten aus Hattuša", *ZA* 85, 74-108.



- 2003, “Zur Paläographie akkadischsprachiger Texte aus Ḫattuša”, in G. Beckman – R. Beal – G. McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake, 237-248.
- Košak S. 1988, rev. to A. Archi, KUB LVII, in ZA 78, 309-314.
- Košak S., www.hethiter.net.
- Laroche E. 1960, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*, Paris.
- 1966, *Les noms des Hittites*, Paris.
- 1971, *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris.
- 1981, “Les noms des Hittites: Supplément”, *Hethitica* IV, 3-58.
- Lebrun R. 1992, “Le fragment KUB VII 60 = CTH 423”, *Hethitica* 11, 103-115.
- Marazzi M. 1990, *Il geroglifico anatolico*, Roma.
- McMahon G. 1991, *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities* (AS 25), Chicago.
- Neu E. 1983, “Überlieferung und Datierung der Kašäer-Verträge”, in R.M. Boehmer – H. Hauptmann (Hrsg.), *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, Mainz, 391-399.
- Neve P. 1993, *Ḫattuša – Stadt der Götter und Tempel*, Mainz.
- Otten H. 1991, “Exkurs zu den Landschenkungsurkunden”, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1991, 345-348.
- 1992, “Eine Anklageschrift gegen Ḫalpaziti?”, in H. Otten – H. Ertem – E. Akurgal – A. Süel (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, 409-418.
- 2000, “Eine Siegelabdruck Duthalijas I. (?)”, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2000, 375-376.
- Otten H. – Rüster Ch. 2003, KBo XLIV, Berlin.
- Pecchioli Daddi F. 1982, *Mestieri, Professioni e Dignità nell'Anatolia ittita*, Roma.
- 1995, “Le così dette ‘cronache di palazzo’”, in O. Carruba – M. Giorgieri – C. Mora (a cura di), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia, 321-332.
- Rosi S. 1983, “La posizione di alcuni dignitari ittiti a corte e nell'esercito”, in *Studi e Ricerche* II, Firenze, 39-53.
- Rüster Ch. – Neu E. 1989, *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten* (StBoTB 2), Wiesbaden.
- Rüster Ch. 1993, “Eine Urkunde Ḫantilis II.”, in *Festschrift für Peter Neve. Zum 65. Geburtstag am 3. April 1994 von Freunden und Kollegen = Istanbul Mitteilungen* 43 [1994], 63-70.
- von Schuler E. 1965, *Die Kašäer*, Berlin.
- Singer I. 1983, *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part One* (StBoT 27), Wiesbaden.
- 1984, *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part Two* (StBoT 28), Wiesbaden.
- 2002a, “Kantuzili the Priest and the Birth of Hittite Personal Prayer”, in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to M. Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, 301-313.
- 2002b, *Hittite Prayers*, Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- Soysal O. 1989, *Mursili I. – Eine historische Studie*, Dissertation Univ. Würzburg.
- 2003, “Kantuzzili in Siegelinschriften”, *BiOr* 60, 41-55.
- Taracha P. 2004, “On the Dynasty of the Hittite Empire”, in D. Groddek – S. Rößle (Hrsgg.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (19.02.1894-10.01.1986)*, Dresden, 631-638.
- Trémouille M.-C. 1997, *Ḫebat. Une divinité syro-anatolienne (Eothen 7)*, Firenze.

- Ünal A. 1998, *Hittite and Hurrian Cuneiform Tablets from Ortaköy (Çorum), Central Turkey*, Istanbul.
- van den Hout Th.P.J. 1995, *Der Ulmītešub Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung* (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden.
- 2001, “Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten”, in Th. Richter – D. Prechel – J. Klinger (Hrsgg.), *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken, 423-440.
- Wegner I. 2000, *Hurritisch. Eine Einführung*, Wiesbaden.
- Wilhelm G. 1991, “Zur hurritischen Gebetsliteratur”, in D.R. Daniels – U. Glessmer – M. Rösel (Hrsgg.), *Ernten, was man sät. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 37-47.
- 1998, “Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı”, *MDOG* 130, 175-187.
- 2005, “Zur Datierung der älteren hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden”, *AoF* 32, 272-279.