

# Observations on Hittite International Treaties

Stefano de Martino - Trieste

Fiorella Imparati † - Firenze

Some considerations drawn from an examination of Hittite international treaties are presented here. We continue our analysis of formal aspects identifiable in Hittite texts belonging to different literary genres, an analysis which began with an examination of correspondence that was discussed at the second Hittitological Congress.

In this context we shall not make a detailed examination of the structure of the treaties and their content, which have been the object of important and fundamental works that may be referred to in the ample bibliography compiled by G. Beckman in his volume on "Hittite Diplomatic Texts"<sup>1</sup>.

## I. STYLISTIC FEATURES

Although the purpose of the compilation of the treaties was purely political, we can observe in them a frequent use of stylistic features, such as: 1) metaphors, 2) hyperbole, 3) hendiadys, 4) idioms, 5) emphatic expressions and 6) similes.

### 1) *Metaphors*

In the treaty stipulated by Šuppiluliuma I with Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša, in the clauses concerning the king's duty to show loyalty to the Hittite royal family, we find the phrase: (KBo V 3 + i 14-15) *namma=ma=za damain BĒLAM kuiēšaš kuiš* [UN-aš<sup>2</sup>] *ANA* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>š</sup> *EGIR-an arḫa lē kuinki šākti* "but furthermore you shall not recognize any other noble man, whoever he (might be), behind the back of My Sun"<sup>3</sup>. The expression *ANA x appan ar-ḫa eš-*, "to be behind the back of someone", is here used metaphorically to indicate a conspiracy against someone.

The following passage from the treaty between Muršili II and Targaš-nalli of Ḫapalla may be interpreted in a similar way: (KBo V 4 rev. 13) *nu=aš=kán 1-aš 1-edani kunanna EGIR-an šarā lē kuiški dāi*, which can be translated freely as "none shall undertake to kill the other behind his

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (WAW 7), Atlanta 1996.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 2. Teil (MVAeG 34/1), Leipzig 1930, 106 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 23-24.

back (*1-edani .... appan*)<sup>4</sup>"; it is in fact difficult to render in a modern language the pleonasm formed by the presence of more than one pronoun used as the subject, that is, with the enclytic particle *-aš*, with *1-aš* and with *kuiški*. The same expression also appears in the treaty between Muršili II and Kupanta-Kurunta, the successor of Mašḫuiluwa on the throne of Mira and Kuwaliya, KUB VI 44 + iv [27']-28', where, however, the indefinite pronoun *kuiški* after *lē* is missing.

Another metaphor well-known also from documents of various kind such as mythological texts and letters, etc., is the expression *dankui tekan* "dark earth" used to indicate the Underworld. This recurs in various treaties in the curse formulas against those who have not honoured their oaths and must therefore be completely annihilated – in some texts with their family and all their goods – "on the/from<sup>5</sup> the dark earth", in the sense that they will find no peace, not even in the Underworld. We may mention, for example, the treaty with Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša (KBo V 3 + iv 50'-59'); the treaty between Muršili II and Manapa-Tarḫunta of the land of the river Šeḫa (KUB XIV 49 + iv 35'-39'); the treaty between Muwattalli II and Alakšandu of Wiluša (KUB XXI 1 + iv 33-37); and the treaty with Ulmi-Teššup of Tarḫuntašša<sup>6</sup> (KBo IV 1 + rev. 12-14, 18-20).

Various expressions are used to indicate the death of a sovereign<sup>7</sup>, like the well known DINGIR<sup>lim</sup> *kiš-* "to become a god" (see, for example, the treaty between Tutḫaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru: KUB XXIII 1 i 41, ii 20). We should also mention the expression ḪUR.SAG *EMĒDU*, "to reach the mountain", which in this context means to die<sup>8</sup> (treaty between Ḫattušili III and Bentešina of Amurru: KBo I 8 obv. 7); and the expression EGIR-*KI*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 91; 4, 209; Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 67.

<sup>5</sup> In the treaties with Ḫuqqana and with Ulmi-Teššup the postposition *šēr* is used; in the other two examples cited here the simple ablative.

<sup>6</sup> On the controversial question whether the Hittite king who stipulated this treaty was Ḫattušili III or Tutḫaliya IV, see most recently H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches* (HdO), Leiden 1999, 239, 258, 290f.

<sup>7</sup> See V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (HdO), Leiden 1994, 216; Th. van den Hout, *Hidden Futures*, Amsterdam 1994, 41-44; P. Taracha, "Funus in effigie: Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Totenritualen", in: *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 1-2 (= Fs. Nowicka, 1998) 189 n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> On this expression see E.F. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien* (BoSt 9), Leipzig 1923, 125 n. 12; CAD E 140; Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 216; S.Y. Şenyurt, "Ein Überblick über die hethitischen Jenseitsvorstellungen", in: S. Alp / A. Süel (eds.), *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*, Ankara 1998, 581.

ŠIMTI-ŠU ALĀKU, "to go to one's own destiny"<sup>9</sup> (treaty between Ḫattušili III and Bentešina, obv. 16). Moreover, in the treaty with Alakšandu of Wiluša, where there is mention of the succession to the throne after the latter's death, the expression ŠA AMA=KA UD-aš ari is used (KUB XXI 1 + i 63'-64'), "the day of your mother<sup>10</sup> (= your day of death) arrives".

Whereas euphemistic expressions are used to indicate someone's physical death, the term "to die" (MĀTU) is used explicitly to indicate the end of a person's political career. In fact, with regard to the removal of Bentešina from the throne of Amurru by Muwattalli II and to his later political rehabilitation by Ḫattušili III, in the treaty stipulated by the latter with Bentešina the following expressions are used: "(obv. 11-12) Bentešina was (politically) dead in the [land] of Amurru"; "(obv. 22-23) You (= Ḫattušili) are giving life to me (= Bentešina), a dead man"<sup>11</sup>.

There are expressions which use images drawn from the animal world. For example, in the treaty between Tuḫaliya I/II and Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna<sup>12</sup>, with regard to the semi-nomadic people of Išuwa who had gone from being subjects of Ḫatti to being subjects of Mittani, the following metaphor is used: "(KBo I 5 i 17-18) Now, finally, the cattle (= the people of Išuwa) have chosen their stable (= the land of Mittani)"<sup>13</sup>. The same metaphor is used to indicate the passage of Kizzuwatna to the sphere of Hittite power: "(i 30-31) Now the people of the land of Kizzuwatna are Hittite cattle and have chosen their stable"<sup>14</sup>.

## 2) Hyperbole

The phrase "not even a blade of straw or a splinter of wood", which recurs in both Hittite and Akkadian in texts of various kinds<sup>15</sup>, to indicate something insignificant, very small, or of a little value, is found in the treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza of Mittani, in the version of the Hittite part (KBo I 1 obv. 51: ḪĀMU U ḪUŠĀBU).

A similar image, used to indicate a fault of the smallest kind, is found

<sup>9</sup> See CAD A.1, 300 ff.

<sup>10</sup> See Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 56; Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 216; van den Hout, *Hidden Futures*, 42; Şenyurt, "Ein Überblick über die hethitischen Jenseitsvorstellungen", 580.

<sup>11</sup> Similarly in the same text obv. 24.

<sup>12</sup> For the identity of the Hittite king who stipulated this treaty see Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 13 f. with previous literature; differently see now Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, "An alternative Date for the Sunassuras Treaty", *AoF* 25 (1998) 34 ff.

<sup>13</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 15.

<sup>14</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 15.

<sup>15</sup> On this expression see E. von Schuler, "Eine Kleinigkeit", *OrNS* 52 (1983) 161-163.

in the treaty attributed to Arnuwanda I and stipulated with Ḫuḫazalma, presumably the king of Arzawa: "(KBo XVI 47 obv. 8'-9') if (the cities of Ura and Mutamutašša) sin as much as a thread of wool (<sup>sig</sup>*maišta*-<sup>16</sup>), [then] I My Sun (= Arnuwanda I) shall fight them from here (= from Ḫatti), you (= Ḫuḫazalma) fight them from there (= from Arzawa)"<sup>17</sup>. In this context we should also recall the expression that appears in the treaty with Šattiwaza, in the version of the Hittite part, in which Tušratta states that he is ready to invade the territories beyond the Euphrates, even if only a lamb or kid-goat of his country should come to any harm (KBo I 1 obv. 9)<sup>18</sup>.

In the treaty between Šattiwaza and Šuppiluliuma, with regard to the fact that the king of Mittani, Šuttarna, had impoverished the goods of his country, the following expression is used: "(KBo I 3(+) obv. 11) He (= Šuttarna) exhausted the house of the king of the land of Mittani, together with its treasures and its riches. He filled it with dirt (*ITTI EPIRI UBTELLIL*)"<sup>19</sup>.

### 3) *Hendiadys*

We may consider as hendiadys the expression that recurs several times in the treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta: *warriš/NĀRĀRU GĒŠPU-aš(=a) šardiyas eš-* "(KBo V 13 ii 9', 10', 12', and 15'-16', where the expression appears in the negative form), to be *supporter* and *helper* of the forearm(?)", to indicate the strong support which Kupanta-Kurunta and his descendants must ensure to the Hittite sovereign Muršili II and to his heirs; the same expression is used also in the treaty with Alakšandu, KBo XXI 1+ iii 39, 43.

Another example of hendiadys appears in the Middle Hittite treaty with the Kaškeans: "(KBo VIII 35 ii 15') let you (= the Kaškeans) *thrive* (and) *prosper* (*maišten šišten*) in the hand of the King". Note that the combined use of the two verbs *mai-* and *šišt-* also crops in other texts of various kind<sup>20</sup>.

### 4) *Idioms*

An expression that could be taken from everyday language is found in the historical introduction of the treaty between Muršili II and Kupanta-Ku-

<sup>16</sup> See CHD L-N 119.

<sup>17</sup> See S. de Martino, *L'Anatolia accidentale nel medio regno ittita* (Eothen 5), Firenze 1996, 69-71, and 63 ff. for the attribution of this document to Arnuwanda I and for the identification of Ḫuḫazalma as king of Arzawa.

<sup>18</sup> For this phrase see Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, 4-5, with n. 3.

<sup>19</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 45; see also CAD E 186: "he mixed it with dust".

<sup>20</sup> See CHD L-N 115.



runta. The Hittite king, with regard to the succession of Kupanta-Kurunta after Mašḫuiluwa on the throne of Mira and Kuwaliya, quotes the words of the latter: "(KUB VI 41 + i 24-25) I (= Mašḫuiluwa) have no son. The people (*antuḫšatar*) are grumbling (?) against us: <Tomorrow (will it be) *this way or that way* [(*kiššan*)]<sup>21</sup> *našma=wa kiššan*?> "<sup>22</sup>.

A similar expression to the one quoted above, which also seems to be characteristic of the spoken language, appears in the treaty with Alakšandu: "(KUB XXI 1 + iii 17-18) ... if someone comes and whispers before you (= Alakšandu): <My Sun is undertaking *such and such* [(*kiš(a)*)]*n kišan* [(=a)]<sup>23</sup> to your disadvantage....>".

### 5) *Emphatic Expressions*

Emphasis in a phrase may be expressed by resorting to various stylistic devices, such as the use of words with a figurative meaning. In the treaty with Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna the renounce of the king of Mittani to have diplomatic relations with this country is expressed with the phrase "(KBo I 5 iii 59) I (= the king of Mittani) *will indeed have no illicit relations* (?) [with] the land of Kizzuwatna". We may observe here the use of the Akkadian verb *NĀKU*, which means specifically "to have sexual relations"<sup>24</sup>.

In the treaty in Akkadian with Šattiwaza, Šuppiluliuma I emphasises how Hittite military intervention in favour of the Hurrian prince had revitalized (*BALĀTU*)<sup>25</sup> Mittani. All this was done by virtue of the family ties which linked this Hittite king to his son-in-law Šattiwaza: "(KBo I 1 obv. 57-58) I, Great King, King of Ḫatti, *have given life* to the land of Mittani, for the sake/on the wishes of my(!) daughter". Further on in the text we read: "(rev. 22) And I, Great King, King of Ḫatti, *will revive* the dead land of Mittani". The treaty ends with the following auspicious formula: "(rev. 75) [*Prolong the life*] of the throne of [your father]; *prolong the life* of the land of Mittani!"<sup>26</sup>. Moreover, in the treaty between Šattiwaza and Šuppiluliuma I, the former uses the words: "(KBo I 3 + obv. 28) If you, my lord, *will give me life*"<sup>27</sup>, alluding to the support that may be given to him by the king of Ḫatti. See also the treaty in Akkadian between Šuppiluli-

<sup>21</sup> Restorations follow KBo IV 7 + i 25.

<sup>22</sup> See CHD L-N 77; Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 70.

<sup>23</sup> Restorations according to KUB XXI 5 iii 33.

<sup>24</sup> See Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, 105 n. 8; CAD N.1, 197-198.

<sup>25</sup> See CAD B 60.

<sup>26</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 40, 44.

<sup>27</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 45.

uma I and Tette of Nuḥašše, KBo I 4+ iii 57-]58.

It should be noted that the image of the Great King who gives life to the subordinate countries belongs, as it is known, more to the Egyptian tradition than to the Anatolian one. This tradition may have been transmitted through Hurrian-Syrian mediation; in fact it is no coincidence that it appears in a treaty with the king of Mittani.

Particular emphasis can be observed in some curse formulas directed at countries subordinate to Ḫatti, in the event that they fail to honor commitments taken under oath. Note the great efficacy of a passage from the Middle Hittite treaty with the Kaškeans, KBo VIII 35: "(ii 19-25) if you come to attack the land of Ḫatti, may Zababa turn back your weapons<sup>28</sup> and may they eat your own flesh; may (he) [t]urn back your arrows and may they pierce your own hearts<sup>29</sup>. And if you break the oaths, your oxen, your sheep and men shall not procr[eat]e, and let the oath deities devour your children within you (lit. in your heart)"<sup>30</sup>.

With such crude images the Hittite sovereigns aimed to terrorize their partners and thus prevent possible violations of sworn pacts, especially when the contracting countries seemed less trustworthy to them, also because they were not organized in centralized forms of government, as were the Kaškeans.

A form of emphasis can also be detected in the lapidary reply of the king of Mittani in a passage from the treaty with Šunaššura, with regard to the request of the Hittite sovereign that the people of Išuwa who had previously passed into Hurrian territory are returned to him: "(KBo I 5 i 12-13) But the ruler of Ḫurri sent back to My Sun thus: <No!><sup>31</sup>". Such concise replies, nonetheless effective, also appear in other texts, among which, by way of example, we may mention a passage from the letter sent by Ḫattušili III to the king of Ahhiyawa concerning the affair of Piyamaradu (KUB XIV 3 i 71), in which the latter brusquely responds "No!" to the proposal of the Hittite sovereign<sup>32</sup>.

#### 6) *Similes*

In the treaty in Akkadian between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza, within

<sup>28</sup> See CHD P 145.

<sup>29</sup> See CHD P 220.

<sup>30</sup> See CHD L-N 68; on this kind of curse formulas see N. Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter* (StBoT 22), Wiesbaden 1976, 77 ff.

<sup>31</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 15.

<sup>32</sup> See F. Sommer, *Die Ahhiyavā-Urkunden* (ABAW NF 6), München 1932, 6-7.

the curse formulas, we find a series of similes which express with particularly strong images the terrible fate reserved for the king of Mittani should he fail to honor the oaths he has undertaken: "(version of the Hittite part, KBo I 1 rev. 61-68)<sup>33</sup> The gods, lords of the oath ... will draw you (=Šattiwaza and the Hurrians) out like malt from its husk. As one does not get a plant from the midst of *PUPUWAḪ*<sup>34</sup>, so, you, together with your wives, your sons, and your land shall have no progeny. ... And, you, Šattiwaza — these oath gods shall snap you off like a reed, together with your land. ... The ground shall be ice, so that you will slip. The ground of your land shall be a marsh of *SAḪḪU*<sup>35</sup>, so that you will certainly sink and be unable to cross".

Analogous curse formulas are found in the treaty between Šattiwaza and Šuppiluliuma (KBo I 3+ obv. 44-52)<sup>36</sup>. Although effective expressions do appear in the curse formulas of some Hittite treaties, as already mentioned, we should point out that such vivid images do not appear frequently in this type of document. We might therefore advance the hypothesis that in the composition of this treaty, particularly in the version drawn up by Šattiwaza, that is, the version of the Hurrian part, a repertoire of images characteristic of the Assyrian tradition were adopted, a tradition we do not know about from treaties of the Middle Assyrian age, but one that is well documented for the Neo-Assyrian Age<sup>37</sup>.

## II. SPECIAL EXPRESSIONS

There are in the treaties frequent expressions in which parts of the body are used, for example: 1) the hand, 2) the eyes, 3) the heart. There are also expressions containing 4) terms linked to the sphere of the family.

1) We will not deal here with expressions containing the word "hand", because they are the object of a recently published work<sup>38</sup>.

2) Let us now proceed to an examination of those expressions using

<sup>33</sup> The same images also appear in the version of the Hurrian part, KBo I 3+ rev. 27-33; for these passages see Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 44, 48.

<sup>34</sup> See Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*, 33 n. 8; *AHW* II 879.

<sup>35</sup> See *CAD* S 56.

<sup>36</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 49.

<sup>37</sup> See for example S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (SAA 2), Helsinki 1988, *passim*.

<sup>38</sup> S. de Martino / F. Imparati, "La «mano» nelle più significative espressioni idiomatiche ittite", in: *do-ra-qe pe-re. Studi in memoria di A. Quattordio Moreschini*, Pisa 1998, 175-186.

another part of the body, that is, the term "eyes", again in relation to international treaties.

In the treaty with Šunaššura, with regard to the pledge requested of this sovereign by the Hittite king of not supporting any possible defections of countries, cities and people subject to Ḫatti, we find the following phrase: "(Hittite text, KUB VIII 81 + ii 8'-10') You, Šunaššura, must not make it (= a land or a group of people) turn away from following (me = the King of Ḫatti); he shall keep (his) eyes (turned) to him/her/it".

The interpretation of the final phrase poses problems (l. 10'): :š<sup>a</sup>-a-ku-wa-aš-še-eš-ša-an ḫar-du. In the first place we note the inexplicable presence of the gloss mark in front of the first word. Another difficulty is the identification of the suffixes following the term *šakuwa* "eyes"; we can interpret here the expression either *šakuwa*=š<sup>i</sup>=š<sup>an</sup>, "the eyes to him/her/it"<sup>39</sup>, or *šakuwa*=šeš=š<sup>an</sup>, "his/her eyes"; in the latter case the neutral gender of the noun does not agree with the common gender of the possessive, even though sometimes this non-agreement may be found especially in relation to parts of the body<sup>40</sup>. The second problem is the identification of the subject of the verb *ḫardu* in the 3rd person singular; the third problem is knowing to whom the enclitic pronominal form -š<sup>i</sup> may refer.

It would seem plausible to consider Šunaššura the subject of the phrase, even though in this case we would have the 2nd person singular of ll. 8'-9' passing to the 3rd person singular; changes of subject however, as we know, are not infrequent in the treaties.

As regards to the third problem, G. Beckman believes that the pronoun -š<sup>i</sup> refers to the Hittite king and translates the passage thus: "He (=Šunaššura) shall keep his eyes turned to His Majesty (-š<sup>i</sup>)"<sup>41</sup>. In our view, however, it is strange that the expression *ANA* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>š<sup>i</sup></sup> is not used here in reference to the Hittite sovereign, as it is in other parts of the text (ii 1', 4', 6', 13').

In our opinion, the most likely explanation is that the pronominal form under examination refers to the country, to the cities and to people mentioned in l. 6', using here a form in the singular with a collective value. Thus the Hittite sovereign requests Šunaššura to turn his eyes to countries, cities and people who have passed to Hittite side, with the purpose of controlling their movements and avoiding possible defections.

<sup>39</sup> See A. Goetze, "Das hethitische Fragment des Šunaššura-Vertrages", ZA 36 (1925) 16.

<sup>40</sup> See J. Friedrich, HE I, 66.

<sup>41</sup> Friedrich, HE I, 21.

Returning again to examine certain expressions containing the word "eyes", we remember a passage from the treaty with Tuppi-Teššup in which the Hittite sovereign intimates to this king not to pass to the side of another sovereign with the words: "(Hittite version, KBo V 9 i 32') You shall not turn your eyes to another (*damedani* IGI<sup>bi.a</sup> = *wa lē neiyattati*)"<sup>42</sup>.

In the treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza, to express the friendship that should link the countries of Ḫatti and Mittani, even in the future, it is said that these two countries should not look at each other "with an evil eye (*INA İNI LEMUTT[I]*)"<sup>43</sup> (KBo I 1 obv. 68).

It is interesting to mention the ban addressed by a Hittite sovereign to a subordinate ruler on "directing towards the mountain the eyes" of fugitives or seminomadic peoples who had left Hittite territories and entered the country of the king subordinate to Ḫatti. The purpose of this ban was to prohibit the subordinate ruler from sending such groups of people to places that were difficult to control for Hittite troops; this ruler should rather direct them on the road to Ḫatti; see, for example, the treaty in Akkadian between Šuppiluliuma I and Tette of Nuḫḫašše (KBo I 4 + iii [41-47] ); and the treaty in Akkadian between Muršili II and Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru (KBo V 9 iii 20). In the treaty in Akkadian between Muršili II and Niqmepa (RS 17.338 + 61-65) it is added also that the sovereign of Ugarit should provide for sustenance of these semi-nomadic peoples, even supplying them with "beer and provisions".

3) As regards those expressions in which the word "heart" appears<sup>44</sup>, we should mention two passages from the treaty in Hittite stipulated by Muršili II with Kupanta-Kurunta; here the Hittite sovereign reaffirms that the latter should not listen to evil rumours aimed at breaking the peaceful relations established between them and orders the subordinate king to keep the relevant clauses of the treaty deeply impressed in his heart: "(KUB VI 41 + iv 24'-25') this word is to be left in your heart (*ŠÀ-ta*) and leave it in your heart....". Equally, further on in the text, we read: "(KUB VI 44 + iv 23'-24') [This wo]rd is to be sealed in [y]our heart (*ŠÀ-ta*), like a bond and leave in your soul (*ZI-ni*) this [word]"<sup>45</sup>.

4) Various expressions use terms linked to the sphere of the family. It is well known that some of these terms are sometimes used in a metaphori-

<sup>42</sup> For *šakuwa* with the verb *nai-* see CHD L-N 350f.

<sup>43</sup> See CAD I-J 156.

<sup>44</sup> See A. Kammenhuber, "Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person", ZA 56 (1964) 150-212; ZA 57 (1965) 177-222.

<sup>45</sup> See J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, Teil I* (MVAeG 31/1), Leipzig 1926, 138.

cal sense, like "father" and "son", to indicate an unequal relationship between a person of superior rank and another of inferior rank, and "brother" to indicate a relationship of parity.

In the treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Aziru, the Hittite sovereign, addressing himself to the latter, says that the nobles of Hatti, who are in the land of Amurru, "shall walk like brothers [before you] (= Aziru) (Hittite version, KBo X 12(+) iii 10')". This expression also appears in an analogous context in the treaty in Akkadian between Šuppiluliuma I and Tette of Nuḫḫašše (KBo I 4+ iii 13-14) and in the one, again in Akkadian, between Muṣili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit (RS 17.338+ 42). It may have had the aim of emphasizing the unity and harmony that should exist between the subordinate king and the Hittite high dignitaries, but also of emphasizing that the position of the subordinate king corresponded to that of the nobles of Ḫatti<sup>46</sup> and therefore, in some way, of playing down the rank of this king.

### III. STYLISTIC-NARRATIVE ELEMENTS

In this section the elements we wish to draw attention to concern the inclusion in the text of: 1) admonitory anecdotes, 2) themes recurring in other kinds of text, 3) passages reported in direct speech.

1) Certain clauses of the treaties are exemplified by means of anecdotes, which have the purpose of furnishing warning and codes of conduct. We shall briefly mention two well-known examples. One concerns the episode of Mariya that appears in a passage from the treaty in Hittite stipulated by Šuppiluliuma I with Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša, in which (KBo V 3+ iii 40'-47') it is said that Mariya had dared to look at a palace woman and because of this had been put to death. This episode had taken place at the time of the father of the Hittite king, Tuḫaliya III.

It has recently suggested by P. Dardano<sup>47</sup> that this was a fictitious episode set in the past to lend greater credibility to the narration. However, since a person named Mariya is also mentioned twice in col. iv (ll. 42', 51') of the same text, where part of an earlier treaty is reported<sup>48</sup>, we

<sup>46</sup> For this second hypothesis see G.F. del Monte, *Il trattato fra Muṣili II di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa di Ugarit* (OAC 18), Roma 1986, 84.

<sup>47</sup> P. Dardano, *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hititica La cosiddetta 'Cronaca di Palazzo'*, Roma 1997, 8-9.

<sup>48</sup> See O. Carruba, "Die Hajasa-Verträge Hattis", in: E. Neu / Ch. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Fs. für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1988, 59 ff.

may assume that this event had actually taken place at the time of Tuḫaliya III.

The other example comes from the treaty between Tuḫaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru, in which (KUB XXIII 1 + ii 20-38) the Hittite sovereign warns the king of Amurru not to behave in the same way as Mašduri, king of the land of the river Šeḫa, towards Urḫi-Teššup. We underline in the whole passage the instrumental emphasis in the narration of the episode by Tuḫaliya and in particular the use of the direct speech and rhetorical questions in the quotation of the words attributed to Mašduri concerning Urḫi-Teššup: "(KUB XXIII 1 + ii 29) Will I protect even a bastard? Why should I act on behalf of the son of a bastard?"<sup>49</sup>.

As noted elsewhere, what emerges from this passage is the political ability of Tuḫaliya, who stigmatizes Mašduri's conduct and at the same time emphasizes, through the latter's own words, the non-legitimacy of Urḫi-Teššup, thus conferring validity to the coup d'état carried out by his father; in fact, thanks to this coup d'état Tuḫaliya himself had become king<sup>50</sup>.

2) About the themes recurring also in other texts, we note some of these themes in so-called "historical" texts. We may recall, by the way of example, various passages in which it is intended to demonstrate the dishonesty and cowardice of the enemy.

In the Akkadian version of the treaty stipulated by Tuḫaliya I/II with Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna<sup>51</sup>, the Hittite sovereign underlines the cowardice of the king of Mittani in battle with the phrase "(KBo I 5 i 21-22) They (= the Hurrians) plundered the land of Išuwa behind the back of My Sun (*INA ARKI dUTU<sup>52</sup>*)". By specifying that the king of Mittani had attacked Išuwa behind the back of the king of Ḫatti, the latter wants to show that the norms of correct conduct to which one should adhere even in the course of military operations were not followed<sup>53</sup>. Moreover, with this military expedition the Hurrian king broke an agreement of non-belligerence previously under-

<sup>49</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 100.

<sup>50</sup> See F. Imparati, "Apology of Hattušili III or Designation of his Successor?", in: Th.P.J. van den Hout / J. de Roos (eds.), *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Ph. H.J. Houwink ten Cate*, Istanbul 1995, 148 with n. 29.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. n. 12.

<sup>52</sup> See Weidner, *Politische Dokumente*, 91; Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 15.

<sup>53</sup> On the rules of war in the ancient Near East see M. Liverani, *Guerra e diplomazia nell'antico Oriente*, Bari 1994, 140 ff.



taken with the Hittite sovereign, as we read a few lines further on in the text: "(i 25) The [ruler of] Ḫurri transgressed the oath".

In this context it is interesting to make a comparison with a passage from the "Detailed Annals" of Muṣili II (KBo XIV 19 iii 2'-3')<sup>54</sup>, in which it is said that the inhabitants of the locality of Tiḫuliya<sup>55</sup>, taking advantage of the absence of Šuppiluliuma I, who was in Hurrian territory, attacked Muṣili behind his back.

In a passage from the treaty between Šattiwaza and Šuppiluliuma I it is said that the Assyrian armies repeatedly refused to go to battle against Piyaššili and Šattiwaza: it was intended thus to emphasize the cowardice of the enemy<sup>56</sup> (text in Hittite, KUB XXIII 50+ 21'-29').

We may recall, by way of comparison, a passage from the "Detailed Annals" of Muṣili II, in which this sovereign narrates that at the beginning of his reign he had stationed a military contingent at Karkamiš against a possible Assyrian attack: when the Assyrians came to know of the presence of this contingent, they attacked no more (KUB XIV 16 i 12'-19')<sup>57</sup>.

Again in the "Detailed Annals" of Muṣili, in reference to an attack against the Hittites which the Kaškeans had wanted to organize on Mount Kulitha<sup>58</sup>, it is said that the Kaškeans, on the arrival of Muṣili, fled from the encounter with the Hittite troops (KBo XVI 8+ II 28'-38')<sup>59</sup>.

3) Lastly we can note that the use of direct speech in the various parts of the treaties, both in the historical introduction and in the clauses, often assumes a particular significance.

In the historical introduction it serves mainly to lend veracity to the description of past events, used instrumentally.

In the introduction of the treaty with Šattiwaza direct speech is used instead to report a line of reasoning attributed to the enemy, even though it is not expressed verbally: it was thus intended perhaps to demonstrate the arrogance of a group of *mariyannu* who had dared to challenge Šuppiluliuma I: "(KBo I 1 obv. 34-35) ... and they (= the *mariyannu*) began war, thinking: <Let us fight with the Great King, king of Ḫatti!>"<sup>60</sup>.

Particularly interesting is a passage from the treaty between Ḫattušili III and Bentešina, in which we find, in the form of direct speech, an entire

<sup>54</sup> See G.F. del Monte, *L'annalistica ittita* (TVOA 4, 2), Brescia 1993, 119.

<sup>55</sup> See G. del Monte, RGTC 6, 419; RGTC 6/2, 168.

<sup>56</sup> See Liverani, *Guerra e diplomazia*, 145.

<sup>57</sup> See del Monte, *L'annalistica ittita*, 75.

<sup>58</sup> See del Monte, RGTC 6, 218; 6/2, 83.

<sup>59</sup> See del Monte, *L'annalistica ittita*, 110.

<sup>60</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 39.



phrase extrapolated from a letter, in all probability sent by the king of Amurru to the Hittite sovereign before the drawing up of the treaty. This passage is introduced by an *incipit* typical of letter-writing formulae: "(KBo I 8+ obv. 22) Thus (say) to my lord!". This is evidence that for drafting of treaties, as for that matter of other texts, documents in the archives were consulted.

#### IV. SPECIAL EPITHETS ATTRIBUTED TO RULERS SUBJECT TO ḪATTI

It is interesting to see how the Hittite sovereign addressed himself to the partner with whom he stipulated the contract. The epithets with which the king of Ḫatti called or described the other contracting party depended on the political structure of the latter's country, that is, whether it was organized according to a monarchical structure or according to a different structure.

Obviously in the first case the ruler of the country subordinate to the Hittites was called or described with the title of "king": we should mention, for example, the sovereigns of Tarḫuntašša, Kizzuwatna, Aleppo, Karkemiš, Ugarit, Amurru and Mittani.

In some cases the Great King emphasized, albeit instrumentally, that he had conferred kingship on his partner, elevating him from the position previously held. For example, in the treaty with Šunaššura the Hittite sovereign – to underline the difference in the treatment reserved for Šunaššura by Ḫatti compared to the treatment Mittani had previously imposed on him – expresses himself thus: "(KBo I 5 i 38-39) The Hurrians call Šunaššura a servant, but My Sun has now made him a true king"<sup>61</sup>.

As far as the second case is concerned, that is, when the other contracting country was not governed according to a monarchical structure, the Hittite sovereign simply called his partner by his name, without any title, as in the case of Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša. Šuppiluliuma I also addresses himself to the latter with a clearly derogatory epithet, whose interpretation, however, is controversial. In fact in KBo V 3 + I 2-3, where Šuppiluliuma says he has elevated (šara dā-) Ḫuqqana from a humble condition, this condition is expressed with a term that scholars have interpreted in different ways due to the tablet's poor state of preservation at this point: J. Friedrich, followed by other scholars<sup>62</sup>, reads here *apizzin* UR.ŠAG<sup>1</sup>-an "ein ein-

<sup>61</sup> See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 15.

<sup>62</sup> Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches*, 2. Teil, 107 n. 1, 137-138; see also HW<sup>2</sup> 187: "Held von geringem Rang"; Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 9: "a down-at-the-heels paladin".

facher(?), (aber) tüchtiger (Mann)", while J. Klinger<sup>63</sup>, E. Eichner<sup>64</sup> and G. Beckman<sup>65</sup> read *apizzin* UR.<sup>1</sup>GI<sub>7</sub>-an "a lowly dog". We incline towards the latter interpretation<sup>66</sup>, since in the first case the adjective *appizzi-* would contrast strikingly with the term UR.SAG, "hero", to which it refers, unless of course we attribute to the expression a highly ironic tone.

One singular example is an expression that recurs in a passage appearing in two treaties stipulated by Muršili II with the rulers of countries in western Anatolia, that is Targašnalli of Ḫapalla (KBo V 4 rev. 2-15) and Kupanta-Kurunta of Mira and Kuwaliya (KBo IV 3 + iv 20'-37').

Indeed, in the passage under examination of the two above-mentioned treaties Muršili establishes that the three "free man" (LÚ<sup>mes</sup> *ELLŪTIM*), Targašnalli, Mašḫuiluwa before<sup>67</sup> and then Kupanta-Kurunta<sup>68</sup>, and Manapa-Tarḫunta should be linked by a single oath, maintain peaceful relations among themselves and not conspire against each other.

The presence of this passage in the treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta suggests that an analogous passage also appeared in the previous treaty — which has not survived — stipulated by Muršili II with the predecessor of Kupanta-Kurunta, that is, with Mašḫuiluwa.

Further, again in the treaties with Targašnalli and with Kupanta-Kurunta, Muršili defines the relations which these rulers should have with other "free men" (again using the same expression here), who in all probability governed neighbouring countries<sup>69</sup>. These relations, whether amicable or hostile, were to be inspired by a unitary policy on the part of Targašnalli, Mašḫuiluwa before and then Kupanta-Kurunta, and Manapa-Tarḫunta: a

<sup>63</sup> J. Klinger, "Fremde und Außenseiter in Ḫatti", in: V. Haas (ed.), *Außenseiter und Randgruppen* (Xenia 32), Konstanz 1992, 192, 208 n. 42.

<sup>64</sup> "Huqqana von Haiasa: Held oder Hund?", lecture held at the "II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia", Pavia 1993.

<sup>65</sup> Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 23.

<sup>66</sup> The term "dog" used in a derogatory way is also documented in the letter KUB III 61 rev. 3, on which see A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil* (THeth 16), Heidelberg 1989) 455-456; S. de Martino / F. Imparati, "Aspects of Hittite Correspondence: Problems of Form and Content", in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia* (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995, 105-106.

<sup>67</sup> Mentioned in the treaty with Targašnalli.

<sup>68</sup> In the treaty stipulated with him by Muršili II.

<sup>69</sup> See the treaty with Targašnalli KBo V 4 rev. 10 and the treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta KBo IV 3 + iv 24; for the interpretation of the expression *arahzanda weḫ-* see Friedrich, *Staatverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches, 1. Teil*, 63 n. 2, 88; E. Neu, *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (StBoT 5), Wiesbaden 1968, 198; HW<sup>2</sup> I, 241; J. Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 132.

unitary policy that was also reflected in the request to the three of them by the Hittite king for a single oath.

This policy adopted by the Hittite sovereign, although being presented as an invitation to maintain the peace in that particular geographical area, may in reality have had the aim of obtaining a sort of reciprocal control of each of the three rulers over the others, thus preventing one of them from acquiring a position of supremacy that may have been dangerous for the stability of Hittite power in western Anatolia.

What is surprising, on the other hand, is the diversity of the formulary appearing in the treaty with Manapa-Tarḫunta, where only the relationship which this ruler should have with Mašḫuiluwa is established (KUB XIX 50+ iii 20-27; KUB XIX 49+ iii 19'-47'). S. Heinhold-Krahmer<sup>70</sup> has suggested that the reason for this lies in the fact that the land of the river Šeḫa was more adjacent to Mira and Kuwaliya than to Ḫapalla, and also in the fact that Muršili II was more preoccupied about the unreliability of Manapa-Tarḫunta and about a possible aggressive policy of the latter towards Mašḫuiluwa. These considerations however, in spite of their validity, do not explain the fact that in the treaty with Ḫapalla we find both the land of the river Šeḫa and Mira-Kuwaliya mentioned in a similar context.

One might suppose that the treaty with Manapa-Tarḫunta had been stipulated before the treaty with Targašnalli; it must be pointed out, however, that in the treaty with Manapa-Tarḫunta (KUB XIX 50+ iii 15-19) Muršili mentions, together with Manapa-Tarḫunta, also Mašḫuiluwa and Targašnalli, which means that at the time this act was drawn up the Hittite king had already proceeded with the tripartite division of the territory belonging to the former kingdom of Arzawa.

Returning now to the epithet given by Muršili to these three persons, that of "free men", it has been pointed out that he never calls them "kings", a term which is used for the first time by Muwattalli in the treaty with Alakšandu<sup>71</sup> in reference, in addition to the latter, to the present rulers of western anatolian countries, Manapa-Kurunta<sup>72</sup>, Kupanta-Kurunta

<sup>70</sup> S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa* (THeth 8), Heidelberg 1977, 134f.

<sup>71</sup> See E. Forrer, *Forschungen I*, Berlin 1926, 89f.; Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 127-129.

<sup>72</sup> About the interpretation of this name and the identity of the person who bore it, see Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 154-157; Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, "Sidelights on the Ahhiyawa question from Hittite Vassal and Royal Correspondence", *JEOL* 28 (1983-84) 62; Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 118 n. 20; D. Hawkins, "Tarkasnawa King of Mira", *AnSt* 48 (1998) 16 n. 68.

and Ura-Ḫattuša<sup>73</sup>.

It may be recalled, in this regard, that Manapa-Tarḫunta and Mašḫuiluwa belonged to families that had for some time held local power and who gravitated politically in the sphere of Arzawa<sup>74</sup>. On the basis of the documentation in our possession, it cannot be established whether these families already held the kingship in these countries subordinate to Arzawa or whether they held power in another form. However, since Muršili — as S. Heinhold-Krahmer has pointed out<sup>75</sup> — does not call "king" even Uḫḫa-ziti, who instead had in all probability been the king of Arzawa, in our view it is not surprising that the Hittite sovereign chooses not to recognize the kingship of Manapa-Tarḫunta and Mašḫuiluwa either. Obviously, it is a device for belittling the power of these two figures in a official act, thus emphasizing the superiority of the king of Ḫatti over the recently conquered countries of western Anatolia.

It must also be pointed out that when Muršili uses the term "free men"<sup>76</sup> to refer also to the chiefs of localities neighbouring the countries ruled by Manapa-Tarḫunta, Mašḫuiluwa and then Kupanta-Kurunta, and Targašnalli — neighbouring chiefs and localities whose name the Hittite sovereign feels it is unnecessary to mention — it seems that his intention is to put any anonymus local chief on the same footing as the rulers of politically well-defined countries like the land of the river Šeḫa, Mira-Kuwaliya and Ḫapalla. This, in substance, is perfectly in line with the political approach adopted by the Hittite sovereigns in most of the treaties of subordination, in which manifestations of favour towards the subject rulers alternate with emphatic expressions of their inferiority compared to Ḫatti.

It is difficult to establish the identity of the above-mentioned chiefs of the localities neighbouring the three western Anatolian countries, defined as "free man", and also the identity of the localities governed by them. It is significant, however, that Muršili had not stipulated any treaty with them. This is bound up with the question of how Muršili had divided up and organized the territory of Arzawa as a whole. The problem, which has

---

<sup>73</sup> In all probability the successor of Targašnalli: see Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 153 and n. 176.

<sup>74</sup> For Manapa-Tarḫunta see Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 102; "Manapa-<sup>d</sup>U", in: *RIA* 7 (1987-1990) 332; for Mašḫuiluwa see G. del Monte, "Mašḫuiluwa, König von Mira", *Or* 43 (1974) 356-357; Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 100-101; "Mašḫuiluwa", in: *RIA* 7 (1987-1990), 446-447.

<sup>75</sup> Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 102-103.

<sup>76</sup> Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 134 f.

been tackled by S. Heinhold-Krahmer<sup>77</sup>, is one that is difficult to resolve due the nature of the documentation in our possession. In fact, although we know about Muršili's creation of states like Mira and Kuwaliya, the land of river Šeḫa and Ḫapalla, we don not know whether or not these countries covered the entire territorial area of Arzawa.

Given that the country of Mira and the land of the river Šeḫa already existed as local powers at the time of the kingdom of Arzawa, it is improbable that they constituted the core of the country of Arzawa. As we know, at the time of Muršili's conquest they were enlarged with the addition of the territory of Kuwaliya<sup>78</sup> and Appawiya<sup>79</sup> respectively; the state of Ḫapalla was then created<sup>80</sup>. It is possible, however, that other regions — above all those which constituted Arzawa's core — were neither annexed to new states<sup>81</sup> nor incorporated into Ḫatti. They may in fact have remained partly empty following the massive deportation of the peoples of Arzawa worked by Muršili<sup>82</sup> probably to impoverish these regions and thus render them inoffensive. They may also in part have been left to peoples who were not incorporated into some politically organized structure and have been ruled by these local chiefs, to whom reference may have been made in the treaties precisely with the expression "free men": local chiefes who surrounded the countries of Mira and Kuwaliya, the river Šeḫa and Ḫapalla.

In this way, in fact, there would have been no danger that, by leaving alive the central nucleus of the kingdom of Arzawa, this could revive and again represent a threat to the stability of Hittite power in western Anatolia.

---

<sup>77</sup> Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 136-147.

<sup>78</sup> See del Monte, RGTC 6, 232; 6/2, 89.

<sup>79</sup> See del Monte, RGTC 6, 27; 6/2, 8.

<sup>80</sup> Even though the name of this country is already documented in the Annals of Tuḫaliya I/II, KUB XXIII 11 ii 6'.

<sup>81</sup> For another opinion see Hawkins, *AnSt* 48 (1998) 23.

<sup>82</sup> See E. Forrer, "Kilikien zur Zeit des Hatti-Reiches", *Klio* 30 (1937) 25; Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 143-145.