

The Treaties between Karkamiš and Hatti

Itamar Singer - Tel Aviv

The earliest treaty with the Hittite *secundo-genitur* is the poorly preserved accord between Šuppiluliuma I and his son Šarre-Kušuh, KUB 19.27 (CTH 50). It contains a lengthy description of the western borders of Karkamiš, of which unfortunately only a few names are clearly preserved, including that of the Land of Mukiš (obv. 7'). The badly effaced left edge contains what is probably a curse formula, including the names of the main deities of Karkamiš (l. 4), to which we shall return. As mentioned at the end (l. 6), the original treaty was probably inscribed on a golden tablet.

The next document is the concise accord between Piyaššili and a son of Šuppiluliuma, probably Muršili II (KBo 1.28; CTH 57). The much-discussed text establishes the relative status of the king of Karkamiš *vis-à-vis* the crown prince (*tuhkanti*) of Hatti.¹

From the reigns of the next two kings of Karkamiš, Šahurunuwa and Ini-Tešub, no treaties with Hatti have come down to us. Documents relating to the political ties between the Great King of Hatti and the Viceroy of Karkamiš reappear only in the last period of the empire.

Until now, only two treaty fragments between Šuppiluliuma II and Talmi-Tešub have been identified (CTH 122). KBo 12.41 (434/t), which was found in the so-called House on the Slope (Square L/18), preserves only the preamble with the elaborate genealogy of the two partners on the obverse and part of the colophon on the reverse. The deplorably effaced KUB 40.37 (Bo 4839) could be a duplicate, but not necessarily. In addition to the genealogy it has remnants of seven more lines which probably contained the historical preamble, mentioning the "sons of Šuppiluliuma" (l. 5), Šarre-Ku[ššuh] (l. 6) and Muršili (ll. 8, 11).

To the corpus of late treaties between Hatti and Karkamiš I suggest to add two further texts, each augmented by indirect joins.

The first is KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25, which belongs to the middle column of a large three-column tablet. KBo 12.30 (433/s), which was found in the House on the Slope, is kept in the Ankara Museum. The provenance of KUB 26.25 (Bo 77), which is kept in the museum of Istanbul,

¹ Detailed treatment of the text can be found in Gurney 1983, with previous literature, to which add now Mora 1993; Beckman 1996: 154; Imparati in Klengel 1999: 375.

is not known. Dr. Silvin Košak, who kindly compared for me the two fragments from the photographs kept in the Boğazköy Archive, has confirmed that their handwriting and size match well and that "an indirect join is very much possible."

KBo 12.30 was translated and discussed by Laroche (1964: 563) and Otten (1969: 52 f.), both of whom dated it to Šuppiluliuma II on the basis of its style and language:²

(ii 2-11) [Prot]ect [My Majes]ty, Šuppiluliuma, with loyal intention. Also, protect with loyal intention the overlordship of my descendant whom I will put in my place. Concerning the protection of the overlordship of My Majesty let only death be your limit. You should not have a beloved friend except your lord. You should not have a tent. If some man of Hatti approaches you concerning a good matter, you should be benevolent toward them and let them also be benevolent toward you.

(ii 12-15) But if someone ap[proaches] you for the sake of a plot, either for an evil thought (or: suggestion) concerning Šuppiluliuma, an insult to the gods, or (lit.: and) a detriment to the Hatti land, [do not listen to him].

Following a very short gap KUB 26.25 follows with further stipulations of a loyalty oath to Šuppiluliuma II. These exceptionally figurative entries have been partially translated by Otten (1963: 4) and in the *CHD*, L-N: 66b:

(ii 2'-7') [Let] these oaths [...] to you. As the beer (and) water that you drink, let [these oaths] be kept inside your heart. [Just as] you anoint [yourself with oil, so also] let these oaths be smeared [on your body]. Just as you put a garment [on your body], so also put these oaths on yourself.

(ii 8'-14') When you commit an evil against Šuppiluliuma or an evil against the son of Šuppiluliuma under the Sun-god of heaven, at that time let the thousand gods of the oath destroy you (with) the blaze of the Sun-god. And if you commit it at night, under the Moon-god, let the Moon-god destroy you with his *crescent*, [togeth]er with your wife, your sons, your offspring, your land, [...].

Both fragments contain typical provisions of loyalty toward the Great King of Hatti. The identity of the addressee is probably disclosed by the first line of KBo 12.30, which contains the very end of a paragraph continuing from the lost first column: [^{URU}Kar-g]a-miš-ši še-er e-eš-ta le-e-an kar-aš-ti. Otten's restoration of the place-name, with a dative-locative ending, is practically certain. As for the adverb *šer*, an alternative rendering to Otten's "up" could be "over", in the meaning "responsible for" Karkamiš. A similar expression occurs in the *HAZANNU* instruction (*CTH* 257) with regard to the governors "who are *over* Hattuša", *kuiš Hattuši šer*

² Lines 2-4 are also translated in *CHD*, P: 5b; lines 10-11 in *CHD*, L-N: 281b; lines 12-15 in *CHD*, L-N: 128b.

(see Singer 1998: 170, with refs.). The primary sense of the verb *karš-* is "cut (off), separate", and the like, which is extended to the meanings "stop, withhold, fail to, neglect", usually expressed by the causative *karšanu*³. The resulting phrase could refer either to the neglect of something which was up in Karkamiš, or to the "cutting off," i.e., discharging of someone from his responsibility over Karkamiš. I would opt for the second possibility and render this line as following: "He (who) was responsible over Karkamiš, do not discharge him!" In any case, the obvious candidate for this loyalty oath to Šuppiluliuma II is the king of Karkamiš, probably Talmi-Tešub. I checked the possibility that this second column may indirectly join KBo 12.41, the above-mentioned introduction of Šuppiluliuma's treaty with Talmi-Tešub, but the handwriting of the latter is somewhat bigger and the column itself is wider. Still, Dr. Cem Karasu, who kindly compared for me the two fragments in the Ankara Museum, did not exclude the possibility of an indirect join between KBo 12.41 (434/t) and KBo 12.30 (433/s), both of which were found in the House on the Slope. At any rate, if, as it seems, these fragments belong to different tablets, there must have been several duplicates or versions of the treaty written by Šuppiluliuma II for Talmi-Tešub.

Yet a further text dated to Šuppiluliuma II may find its "Sitz im Leben" as a diplomatic document exchanged between Hatti and Karkamiš, due to a fortunate indirect join. KUB 26.33 (VAT 13012) is defined in Laroche's catalogue as "*Serment d'un personnage inconnu*" (CTH 125). It is the upper part of a two-column tablet with substantial parts of columns ii and iii and traces of columns i and iv. Obv. ii, which deals with the succession problems after the death of Arnuwanda III, was utilized by Laroche in his seminal article on the reign of Šuppiluliuma II (1953: 76), and was then translated by other scholars as well:

(ii 3'-9') [The people(?)] of Hatti [sinned(?)] against him, but I have not sinned. If he had had [any offspring, I] would not have rep[laced] him, but would have protected his offspring. He had no offspring. I asked about a pr[egnant] woman, but there was no pregn[ant] woman.

(ii 10-13) As [there was no seed] to Arnuwanda, could I have sinned? Could I have replaced [my lord's(?)] offspring? Could I have made [myself another(?)] lord?

The next two paragraphs are too damaged for a reasonable translation, but no doubt they continue with the circumstances of Šuppiluliuma's accession to the throne. I think that the compound DUMU-aš SAG.DU-aš in line 15 could mean "head of sons", i.e., "the first son." If so, the beginning of

³ Neu 1968: 84 n. 8; HEG, Lfg. 3: 517 ff.; HED Vol. 4: 100 ff.

this paragraph may perhaps be restored as follows: "To Tudhaliya, [Arnuwanda ...] was (his) first son." The last paragraph seems to mention the coronation of Šuppiluliuma and his genealogy, reaching back to his famous namesake.⁴

Reverse col. iii contains three poorly preserved paragraphs, followed by a safely restored last paragraph. The second paragraph (iii 4'-9') seems to deal with the eventuality that the author, out of fear/reverence (*kuwayata šer*), might evade his military duties when called to arms. The occurrence of the land of Egypt (l. 7') is most intriguing, but it is hardly identical with the enemy mentioned at the end of the paragraph (l. 9').

The third paragraph seems to deal with the extradition of those citizens of Hatti who have been deceitful (l. 10' *maršešir*) toward His Majesty. The author promises not to hide any of his master's opponents (l. 14'), even if the person in question is [dear(?)] to him (l. 16'). He trusts that the extradited person will not be harmed (l. 18'). The last paragraph concludes the oath with a solemn promise to protect Šuppiluliuma and his descendants.⁵

(iii 19-24) In this matter [there should be no] negli[gence]. [Let] the gods guarantee the agreements. I shall protect you Šuppiluliuma, Gr[eat King], son of Tudhaliya, in the lordship. I shall [also] protect [your/my lord's] offspring in the lordship. Whichever son you install [in your place/in kingship, I shall protect] him in the lordship.

The overall impression gained from these last paragraphs is actually of a treaty written in the first person by the ruler of a privileged land. Stipulations of extradition and military cooperation are hardly compatible with a private oath of a high-ranking official inside Hatti itself. This impression of a state treaty is further supported by the very fragmentary fourth column.

The two extant paragraphs, despite their deplorable state of preservation, belong demonstrably to a list of witness deities. ^dGAZ.BA.A.A (line 3'⁶) is the logographic writing for ̪uwaššana, the goddess of ̪upišna, who figures regularly in state treaties. In the next paragraph the first line ends with ̪x-̪u-u-̪i-iš, which was correctly restored by Meriggi (1962: 95) as ^dKa]r̪u-̪iš. At the time, he could only refer to Neo-Hittite attestations of this protective god of Karkamiš, although Laroche (1956: 121; see also Lebrun 1993: 16) had already suggested restoring this deity in the treaty between

⁴ Obv. ii 21 f.: NUMUN/ŠÀ.BAL.BAL(?)] Šuppilul[iuma šalliš (?). Cf. KUB 21.7 rev. 9ff.; ABoT 56 i 5 ff. For a different restoration see Giorgieri / Mora 1996: 63.

⁵ Translated by Otten 1963: 4; Giorgieri / Mora 1996: 63.

⁶ Collation from a photograph kindly supplied to me by Volkert Haas shows that ^dGAZ.BA.A.A was mistakenly copied twice in Güterbock's handcopy; l. 2' is empty.

Šuppiluliuma I and Šarre-Kušuḫ (KUB 19.27 left edge 4):

]x-x ^dKar-[ḫu-ḫa ^dK]u-pa-pa DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš-ša š[A KUR^{URU} Kar-ga-miš

Starting from the assumption that this paragraph may indeed open with the supreme gods of Karkamiš, I sought and soon found a candidate for a join: KBo 13.225 (630/u)⁷, found in the House on the Slope. The indirect join was confirmed from photographs by Silvín Košák, to whom I wish to express my sincere gratitude. Line 8' of the rejoined text, with a gap of some three signs between the joins, now reads:

DINGIR^{MEŠ} KUR^{URU} Kar-g]a-miš ^dKu-[pa-pa ^dK]ar-ḫu-u-ḫi-iš

Obviously, what can now be identified in the fourth column of this treaty tablet is a typical division between the deities of Hatti and the deities of the contracting party, in this case Karkamiš. In the first paragraph we encounter ^dZABABA, the Storm-gods of Zippalanda and Neriqqa, Taru[ppaša-ni], the Tutelary-god of the town [...], Ḫuwaššana [of Ḫuḫišna], Ḫebat, and several broken names.

The second paragraph is in worse condition. Besides the afore-mentioned gods of Karkamiš, I can only identify the Storm-god of the town [...], IŠTAR (^dLIŠ), and possibly a deity of the town [K]atapa. The local gods are followed by [Heaven and E]arth (ŠAMÊ ER)-ŠÊ-TUM), then by the concluding phrase *na-a]t ke-e-da-ni [lingai/linkiya k]u-u[t-ru-wa-ni-eš a-š]a-andu*, "Let th]em (i.e. the gods) be wi[tnesses to] this [oath]. "From the colophon, following a double separation line, only one full sign is preserved, probably belonging to I]Š-TUR, "he wrote" (iv 13').

Despite its fragmentary state of preservation, this list of divine witnesses is of considerable interest for Hittite theology, in that it presents separately the gods of Hatti and the gods of Karkamiš. That this is not a singular late occurrence is shown by the appearance of the same gods of Karkamiš, again in very fragmentary context, in the Šuppiluliuma - Šarre-Kušuḫ treaty mentioned above. The relevant comparison is with treaties concluded with other states ruled by Hittite monarchs, i.e., Ḫalab and Tarḫuntašša. In the Talmi-Šarruma treaty there is a distinction between the gods of Hatti and the gods of Ḫalab (KBo 1.6 rev. 9 f.; Beckman 1996: 90, § 13), but none of the categories is further specified. As for Tarḫuntašša, neither in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty, nor in the Kurunta treaty is the long list of divine witnesses divided between the contracting parties. Rather, the Storm-god of Lightning (*piḫḫaššašši*), the supreme god of Tarḫuntašša, is included at the end of the list of local Storm-gods. The combined list is then concluded with the typical formula "male gods, female gods, etc. ... of Hatti and of

⁷ Only traces of six lines are left from the obverse of KBo 13.225.

Tarḫuntašša (Beckman 1996: 107, 116). Incidentally, the same applies to the gods of Kizzuwatna, who are occasionally mentioned in state treaties after the gods of Hatti, but are never specified by name (Kestemont 1976: 152). Without delving into the complex structure of the Hittite imperial pantheon, the new evidence on Karkamiš seems to reinforce the distinction between "inland" and "outland" deities (see Singer 1994: 94 ff.), the Hittite states in Anatolia belonging to the former category, the Hittite states in Syria to the latter.

Turning finally to the identity of Šuppiluliuma's protagonist, one must first emphasize the singularity of this text within the corpus of Hittite treaties and loyalty oaths. On one hand, it has the appearance of a personal loyalty oath comparable to that of [...]Šarruma, Chief of the Scribes-on-Wood (*CTH* 124)⁸. Both texts are written in the first person and emphasize the personal loyalty of their authors to Šuppiluliuma at a time when the people of Hatti caused him much trouble. On the other hand, as already pointed out, this text (*CTH* 125) has clear characteristics of a state treaty, such as clauses of military assistance, extradition, and divine witnesses. The author was no less an authority than the kingmaker who installed Šuppiluliuma on the throne after the premature death of Arnuwanda. The only candidate I can think of to fulfill this most influential position is indeed the viceroy of Karkamiš, the highest imperial authority after the Great King and the crown prince. Talmi-Tešub would be the obvious choice, although one cannot exclude the possibility that Ini-Tešub was still reigning in Karkamiš at the time of the succession crisis in Hatti.

If the suggested identification of the texts discussed above is valid, we end up with four fragments containing portions of treaties between Šuppiluliuma II and the viceroy of Karkamiš. His partner is certainly Talmi-Tešub in the parallel preambles, KBo 12.41 and KUB 40.37, and probably also in the two other restored texts, KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25 and KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225. It is worth noting that all those fragments whose findplace is recorded were found in the House on the Slope.

Šuppiluliuma is the speaker in KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25, the king of Karkamiš in KUB 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225. What we may have here are reciprocal treaties between the two contractors, distantly recalling the parallel treaties between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza of Mittanni (*CTH* 51-52). But, whereas in the latter the wording of the two documents is very similar, and both were probably composed by the same chancellery on behalf of the Great King (Beckman 1996: 37), the two treaties of Karkamiš

⁸ For which see Singer forthcoming.

are, as far as one can tell from their preserved parts, quite different from each other, and they seem to genuinely represent the formulation chosen by the chancelleries of Hattuša and Karkamiš, respectively.

Bibliography

- Beckman, G.
 1996 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (WAW 7), Atlanta.
- Giorgieri, M. / C. Mora
 1996 *Aspetti della regalità ittita nel XIII secolo a. C.*, Como.
- Gurney, O.R.
 1983 "The Hittite Title *tuhkanti*-", *AnSt* 33, 97-101.
- Kestemont, G.
 1976 "Le panthéon des instruments hittites de droit public", *OrNS* 45, 147-177.
- Klengel, H.
 1999 *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, Leiden.
- Laroche, E.
 1953 "Šuppiluliuma II", *RA* 47, 70-78.
 1956 "Documents hiéroglyphiques hittites provenant du palais d'Ugarit", in: C. F.-A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica III*, Paris, 97-160.
 1964 Critical Review of H. Otten, *KBo XII*, *OLZ* 1964, 562-566.
- Lebrun, R.
 1993 "Aspects de la présence louvite en Syrie au VIII^e siècle av. J.-C.", *Transeuphratène* 6, 13-25.
- Meriggi, P.
 1962 "Über einige hethitische Fragmente historischen Inhaltes", *WZKM* 58, 66-110.
- Mora, C.
 1993 "Lo 'status' del re di Kargamiš", *OrNS* 62, 67-70.
- Neu, E.
 1968 *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (STBoT 5), Wiesbaden.
- Otten, H.
 1963 "Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches", *MDOG* 94, 1-23.
 1969 "Fundstücke der hethitischen Grossreichszeit", in: W. Schirmer, *Die Bebauung am unteren Büyükkale-Nordwesthang in Boğazköy* (Boğazköy 6), Berlin, 52-53.
- Singer, I.
 1994 "'The Thousand Gods of Hatti'. The Limits of an Expanding Pantheon", in: I. Alon / I. Gruenwald / I. Singer (eds.), *Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions* (IOS 14), Leiden, 81-102.
 1998 "The Mayor of Hattuša and his Duties", in: J. Goodnick Westenholz (ed.), *Capital Cities, Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem*, 169-176.
- Forthcoming. "The Great Scribe Taki-Šarruma", in: Fs Hoffner.