

GERNOT WILHELM

Zur Datierung der älteren hethitischen Landschenkungs-
urkunden

Bekanntlich besteht keine Einigkeit über die Datierung der älteren hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden (LSU), die nicht mit Königsnamen verbunden sind und die mit sog. anonymen Tabarna-Siegeln gesiegelt sind. Durch den Fund zahlreicher Landschenkungsurkunden in den 80er und vor allem den frühen 90er Jahren haben sich neue Erkenntnisse ergeben, die hier vorgestellt werden sollen.¹

Güterbock datierte die ältesten Landschenkungsurkunden „unmittelbar vor bzw. nach Telepinu“.² Diese Datierung blieb mit leichten Modifikationen für mehr als drei Jahrzehnte *communis opinio*. So setzte K. Riemschneider die Landschenkungsurkunden mit anonymem Tabarna-Siegel in die Zeit „vor Alluwamna“³; er zog die Möglichkeit in Betracht, daß die anonymen Tabarna-Siegel auf einen einzigen König zurückgehen, „für den dann am wahrscheinlichsten Telepinu in Frage käme“. Er hielt es aber auch für möglich, „daß der Beginn der Tabarna-Siegel und somit auch der Landschenkungsurkunden vor Telepinu liegt“, wenn auch seiner Meinung nach nicht früher als Hantili I. Dem folgt auch Th. Beran, wenn er die anonymen Tabarna-Siegel nicht lange vor Alluwamna

¹ Die seit langem angekündigte Vorlage dieser Texte als StBoT Beiheft 4 hat sich stark verzögert. Die geplante gemeinsame Arbeit von E. Neu und Ch. Rüster – die letztere hatte bereits Anfang der 90er Jahre Autographien, Transkriptionen, Übersetzungen, Tabellen und Indizes angefertigt – kam wegen anderweitiger Verpflichtungen E. Neus nicht zum Abschluß. Nach seinem Tod 1999 fanden sich keine diesbezüglichen Materialien in seinem Nachlaß. Der Verf. hat dann auf Wunsch von H. Otten und Ch. Rüster die Aufgabe übernommen, die Bearbeitung fertigzustellen. Dabei galt es zunächst, die Reihenfolge der Urkunden zu überprüfen und soweit wie möglich eine relative Chronologie zu erarbeiten. Der vorliegende Aufsatz reflektiert die Ergebnisse dieses Bemühens. Sie werden in ausführlicherer Form in der Einleitung von StBoT Beiheft 4 dargestellt werden. Die in diesem Aufsatz verwendete Textnumerierung ist die der in Vorbereitung befindlichen Edition. Für die Aufschlüsselung vergleiche man die Tabelle 1.

² H. G. Güterbock (1940), 54.

³ K. K. Riemschneider (1958), 326 ff.

ansetzt.⁴ „Die Tabarna-Siegel sind – ob sie nun erst mit Telepinu einsetzen oder schon vorher aufkamen – die charakteristischen Königssiegel des Mittleren Reiches“ (nach der konventionellen Terminologie müßte es hier heißen: „des ausgehenden Alten Reiches“).

Erst mit der Publikation der in İnandık gefundenen Urkunde durch Balkan (1973) wurde diese Datierung der Urkunden mit anonymen Tabarna-Siegeln in Frage gestellt.⁵ Auf Grund der drei in der İnandık-Urkunde bezeugten Namen Zidi, Pappa und Aškalija, die auch in der sog. „Palastchronik“ CTH 8 erscheinen und die Balkan auf dieselben Personen bezog, gelangte er zu einer Datierung „etwa in die Mitte der Regierungszeit des Hattušili I.“ (S. 74 // 36). Darüber hinaus neigte er dazu, alle anonymen Tabarna-Siegel auf diesen König zu beziehen.

D. Easton übernahm Balkans Datierung der İnandık-Urkunde, erkannte aber – vor allem auf Grund von prosopographischen Kriterien –, daß die meisten Urkunden mit anonymem Tabarna-Siegel (hier Nr. 4, 13, 17, 18, 19 = Eastons Gruppe 2a; Nr. 5, 23 = Eastons Gruppe 2b; Nr. 6 = Eastons Gruppe 2c; Nr. 9, 36, 37 = Eastons Gruppe 2d; Nr. 7, 10, 20 = Eastons Gruppe 2e) etwas jünger sind als die İnandık-Urkunde, und datierte sie daher in die Regierungszeit Muršilis I.⁶

O. Carruba 1993 schlug unter Übernahme der von Easton vorgenommenen Verteilung der älteren Urkunden mit anonymem Tabarna-Siegel auf zwei aufeinanderfolgende Herrscher eine noch frühere Datierung dieser Urkunden vor. Ausgangspunkt hierfür ist die Tatsache, daß Zidi, Pappa und Aškalija auf der İnandık-Tafel andere Titel tragen als die in der „Palastchronik“ genannten Personen mit denselben Namen. Da die İnandık-Urkunde sie als „noch junge Privatpersonen“ (S. 80) zeige, während sie nach der „Palastchronik“ hohe Ämter innehaben, datiert Carruba die İnandık-Urkunde in die Zeit Labarnas I. und die von Easton der Zeit Muršilis zugeschriebenen Urkunden in die Zeit Hattušilis I.

Zwei Äußerungen aus jüngerer Zeit folgen den von Balkan ausgelösten Frühdatierungen nicht, bringen aber keine eingehende Begründung. So schreibt F. Starke: „t.[= *tabarna*] kommt also erst gegen Ende des 16. Jhs. auf ... und dürfte demnach wahrscheinlich nicht vor Telepinu (Tabarnasiegel) verwendet worden sein“⁷, und J. Klinger datiert das Aufkommen von Landschenkungsurkunden in die Zeit „während oder kurz vor der Regierung Alluwannas“.⁸

Wie bereits erwähnt, wurde die in İnandık gefundene Urkunde (Nr. 1) von dem Ersteditor (Balkan 1973: 72 ff.) auf Grund einer Identifikation einiger der

⁴ Th. Beran (1967), 68.

⁵ O. Carruba (1974), 85 datiert noch ohne Kenntnis der Publikation der İnandık-Urkunde einige Landschenkungsurkunden (hier Nr. 5, 13, 17, 18, 23) in die Zeit vor Telepinu, und zwar „bis Hantili“ (I.); dies beruht allerdings auf einer Zuordnung der Urkunden Huzzijas II. zu Huzzija I., welche der Autor später wieder aufgab.

⁶ D. Easton (1981), 3–43.

⁷ F. Starke (1980–83), 405 b.

⁸ J. Klinger (1995), 76.

dort genannten Personen mit Würdenträgern, die in der „Palastchronik“ erwähnt werden, in die Zeit Hattušilis I. datiert. Die Namen (Zidi, Pappa, Aškali) sind allerdings nicht selten, und es gibt keine weiteren Übereinstimmungen, z. B. in den Amtsbezeichnungen. Das Argument wiegt daher nicht schwer.

Die Zeugen und der Schreiber erscheinen – mit der Ausnahme von Nr. 2 – in dieser Funktion in keiner anderen Schenkungsurkunde. Ob in Nr. 4 Rs. 13' mit Balkan⁹ (// 19) [m^aA-*aš-ka*]-[li-*ja*] zu lesen ist, ist möglich, aber nicht völlig sicher. Ein Schreiber namens Aškali (m^aA-*aš-ka-li-ja*) ist neuerdings in der mittelhethitischen topographischen Beschreibung Bo 2004/1: 31 bezeugt; nach seiner Handschrift zu urteilen, ist er aber nicht mit dem Schreiber von Nr. 1 identisch. Die einzige sichere Verbindung mit anderen Urkunden, nämlich mit Nr. 4 und Nr. 5, ergibt sich aus der Nennung eines Šandamei (Z. 26), der das Amt eines UGULA I LI LÜ.MEŠ KUŠ₇ innehat. Der seltene Name¹⁰ in Verbindung mit dem Titel ist so spezifisch, daß mit Balkan 1973: 75 (// 37) Personenidentität zwingend angenommen werden muß. Da Šandamei in Nr. 1 und 2 als Zeuge begegnet, während in Nr. 4 und 5 anscheinend über Teile seines Grundbesitzes verfügt wird¹¹, sind (mit Easton 1981: 9) Nr. 1 (und damit auch Nr. 2) sicherlich älter als Nr. 4 und 5. Easton, l.c., nimmt einen Regierungswechsel zwischen Nr. 1 und Nr. 4 an, worin ihm Carruba¹² folgt.

Der Siegelstock, von dem der Abdruck auf der Inandik-Tafel (Nr. 1) stammt, muß spiegelverkehrt geschnittene Schriftzeichen aufgewiesen haben, ein Merkmal also, das als typologische Fortentwicklung gegenüber den im Abdruck spiegelverkehrt erscheinenden Zeichen gilt, wie dies bei dem Siegelabdruck auf den Urkunden Nr. 3–5, 6², 7, 9–10 (Siegel Beran 143) der Fall ist. Andererseits stehen die Keilköpfe auf der Innenseite, was unter dem Gesichtspunkt der optimalen Raumnutzung als typologisch weniger entwickelt gilt. Dies allerdings ist kein gültiges Datierungskriterium, da mit dem Siegel des Alluwamna auf den Urkunden Nr. 21 und 22 (Siegel Beran 146) ein eindeutig jüngeres Siegel dieses Merkmal aufweist. Die Keilschriftfringe sind weder gegeneinander noch gegen das weitgehend zerstörte Innenfeld, das nach der Beobachtung von K. Balkan wohl die drei „Heilssymbole“ aufwies, mit einer Linie oder einem Steg abgegrenzt, was wiederum dem Kriterium „typologisch wenig entwickelt“ zuzuordnen ist. Das Zeichen KIŠIB ist nicht mit NA₄ determiniert, ein Merkmal, das das Siegel mit dem der Urkunden Nr. 3–5, 6², 7, 9–10 verbindet.

⁹ K. Balkan (1973), 58.

¹⁰ Außerhalb der Schenkungsurkunden ist der Name sonst anscheinend nur in dem Fragment eines (erzählenden?) Textes KBo 25.196 7' bezeugt: [m^a]Ša-an-da-me-iš-*ya* x[; s. Easton (1981), 6, Anm. 15. Neu in Neu/Rüster (1975), 2, Anm. 3 denkt an eine Zusammensetzung mit dem Gottesnamen Šanda. Zu vergleichen ist der Name Išpudašmei Nr. 23:7, 71 Vs. 5', der gleichfalls mit dem Element -*mei* gebildet ist.

¹¹ R. Beal (1992), 377.

¹² O. Carruba (1993), 80.

Die Urkunden Nr. 3–5, 6²¹³, 7, 9–10) sind mit dem Siegel SBo Nr. 87 = Beran Nr. 143 = BoHa 14, Nr. 250 gesiegelt, das im Anschluß an Riemschneider 1958 an den Anfang einer typologischen Entwicklungsreihe gestellt wird: „... die Inschrift noch positiv eingeschnitten, so daß der Abdruck ein Negativ ergibt. ... Kreuzschleife ..., Dreieck ... und Rosette sind ohne ersichtliche Ordnung ins Mittelfeld eingeschrieben, das Bildfeld ist nicht voll genutzt. ... Mittelfeld und Inschriftenrand [sind] nicht voneinander abgesetzt“.¹⁴ Im Unterschied zu allen anderen Siegeln außer dem für Nr. 1 benutzten ist das Zeichen KIŠIB nicht mit NA₄ determiniert.

Bei Nr. 3 und 7–10 ist der Text in der Weise beschädigt, daß der Passus mit Nennung des Zeugenkollegiums stark zerstört oder gar nicht erhalten ist. In Nr. 4 ist jedoch der Name des am Anfang der Zeugenliste stehenden „Obersten der Palastbediensteten“ [m^aHa-p]u-*ua-a-aš-šu* (Rs. 10') weitgehend erhalten. Derselbe Name erscheint auch in Nr. 6 ([m^aHa-pu-*u*]-*a-aš-šu* Rs. 10'), und er dürfte nach dem allein erhaltenen Rest des letzten Zeichens auch in Nr. 5 Rs. 39 stehen.

Eine Gemeinsamkeit dieser Gruppe ist es, daß die Mehrzahl der Urkunden das „Haus von Hatti in Šarišša“ begünstigt (Nr. 3–5, 7, 8).

Die Urkunde Nr. 4 ist, wie oben gesagt, über die Person des Šandamei UGULA I LI LÜ.MEŠ KUŠ₇ mit den Urkunden Nr. 1 und 2 verbunden, und zwar in der Weise, daß Nr. 4 (und Nr. 5) mit Verfügungen über den Grundbesitz des Šandamei jünger sein muß als Nr. 1 und 2, in denen Šandamei im Zeugenkollegium erscheint. Der zeitliche Abstand ist aber damit nicht größer als die Dauer der Amtsperiode des Šandamei.

Über den „Obersten der Palastbediensteten“ Ha(p)uwaššu ist die Gruppe der Urkunden Nr. 3–10 mit zahlreichen weiteren Urkunden verbunden, die ihrerseits durch weitere Übereinstimmungen in den Zeugenlisten als einander zeitlich nahestehend gekennzeichnet sind. Es handelt sich um folgende Personen:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mārakui LÜ ₁ uriannu | Nr. 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19(?) |
| 2. Tuthalija LÜ ₁ uriannu | Nr. 22, 23(?) |
| 3. Zidānni GAL LÜ.MEŠ(KAŠ/) <i>GEŠTIN</i> | Nr. 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 22, 23 |
| 4. Haššuwaš-inar GAL LÜ.MEŠ <i>mešedi</i> | Nr. 11, 17 |
| 5. Hutarli DUB.SAR | Nr. 11, 12, 17 |
| 6. Zūya DUB.SAR | Nr. 14 |
| 7. Išpunnuma DUB.SAR | Nr. 22 |
- (In Nr. 13, 15, 16, 23 und 24 ist die Zeugenliste vollständig abgebrochen.)

Die Siegelabdrücke der Urkunden Nr. 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 (Güterbock (1940), Nr. 88 = Beran (1967), Nr. 144) zeigen so große formale Übereinstimmungen, daß die Annahme naheliegt, sie stammten von demselben Siegelstock. Dasselbe nahm Güterbock (1940), auch für die aus Tarsus stammende Urkunde Nr. 21 an, doch

¹³ H. Otten (1971), 66.

¹⁴ Th. Beran (1967), 67.

hat Müller-Karpe (1998), 104 Anm. 5, kleine Unterschiede festgestellt, die auf unterschiedliche Siegelstöcke schließen lassen. Auch für den Siegelabdruck 835/b (= Beran (1967), Nr. 144/b), der zu einer Urkunde gehört, von der kein Text erhalten ist, schließt Müller-Karpe auf einen anderen Siegelstock als den bei der Siegelung von Nr. 16 verwendeten. Daß in der Zeit des von Ḫap(p)uwaššu angeführten Zeugenkollegiums in der Tat mehrere, formal sehr ähnliche Siegel Verwendung fanden, zeigt der Siegelabdruck auf Nr. 14; auch hier sind die beiden Schriftringe, deren Köpfe nach außen weisen, nicht durch eine Linie oder einen Steg getrennt, auch hier ist das Mittelfeld mit den drei Heilssymbolen umrandet. Die Anordnung der Keilschriftzeichen stimmt ebenfalls überein, so daß auch hier LUGAL GAL im äußeren Ring über BA.ÚŠ im inneren steht. Der Unterschied besteht nur in einer gegenüber den Keilschrifttringen verschobenen Anordnung der Heilssymbole. – Die Siegelungen der Urkunden Nr. 17–20 sind nicht erhalten.

Mit dieser Textgruppe verknüpft ist auch die Urkunde Nr. 22, in der der „Oberste der Palastbediensteten“ Ḫap(p)uwaššu zwar nicht in der Zeugenliste erscheint, wohl aber als Betroffener im Urkundentext genannt wird: Nach Z. 62f. übergibt der Großkönig ausgedehnten Grundbesitz des Ḫap(p)uwaššu an den Prinzen Labarna. Das Zeugenkollegium entspricht nur in der Position des „Weinoberen“, die auch hier Zidanni innehat, den Urkunden Nr. 11ff. In der Stellung des *urianni* befindet sich hier ein Tuthaliya, als Schreiber fungiert ein Išpunnūma, der auch die Urkunde Nr. 26 geschrieben hat, letztere aus der Zeit des Alluwamna.

Das auf Nr. 22 abgedruckte Siegel ist das einzige aus bzw. unmittelbar nach der langen Amtsperiode des „Obersten der Palastbediensteten“ Ḫap(p)uwaššu, das im Mittelfeld eine Rosette zeigt, wie dies dann mit dem Siegel Alluwamnas, das auf der Urkunde Nr. 26 abgedruckt ist, bis zu Muwattalli I. verbindlich wird. Daß mit dem Siegelabdruck auf Nr. 22 ein Übergang von der älteren zur jüngeren Siegelgestaltung greifbar wird, zeigt sich daran, daß von den drei Heilssymbolen zwar die Rosette in den Mittelpunkt rückt, die beiden anderen aber noch nicht aufgegeben, sondern in den äußeren Keilschrifttring eingefügt werden.

Damit dürfte eine Datierung von Nr. 22 in die Spätphase des Königs Telipinu oder – falls zwischen Telipinu und Alluwamna noch eine Regierung einzufügen ist – in die Zeit unmittelbar danach, allenfalls in die ersten Jahre Alluwamnas gesichert sein. Dies hat weitreichende Folgen, da die vorausgehenden Urkunden Nr. 4–20 durch die Person des „Obersten der Palastbediensteten“ Ḫap(p)uwaššu verbunden sind und damit ganz oder überwiegend in die Regierungszeit Telipinus fallen müssen. Die İnandik-Urkunde Nr. 1 (und mit ihr Nr. 2) ist etwas älter und stammt vielleicht aus der Regierungszeit Huzzijas I. oder sogar Ammunas. Jedenfalls wird man an einer Datierung dieser Urkunden in die Frühzeit des Alten Reiches nicht festhalten können.

StBoT Bei- heft 4	Inventar-, Museumsnr.	LSU	Edition	
Anonyme Tabarna-Siegel				
1	İK 174-66	–	Balkan, <i>İnandik</i>	<i>m</i> Pu-ul-li GAL LÜ.MEŠGEŠ[TIN] <i>m</i> A-aš-ka-li-ia DUMU.LUGAL <i>m</i> Ti-ua-zi-di LÜ-ri-an-ni <i>ù</i> <i>m</i> Ša-an-da-me-i UGULA 1 li LÜ.KUŠ ₇ M[ES] <i>m</i> A-aš-ka-li-ia DUB.SAR
2	235/p	–		[<i>m</i> Ša-an-da-me-]i UGULA 1 li [LÜ.KUŠ ₇ MEŠ
Siegeltyp Beran 143 (soweit Siegelung erhalten)				
3	Bo 90/722	–		É URU ^{Ha-at-ti} URU ^{Ša-ri-iš-ša-ki} []
4	1312/u	–	Otten, <i>MDOG</i> 103, 61, Abb. 2	Ša É sm Ša-an-d[a-me-i UGULA 1 lim] LÜ.MEŠKUŠ ₇ [É URU ^{Ha-a} -t-ti URU ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša-a-i} [<i>m</i> Ḫa-p]u-ua-a-aš-su GAL DUM[UMES.É.GAL]
5	VAT 7463	3	SBo I 3	[Ša É] <i>m</i> Ša-an-da-me-i UGULA 1 li LÜ.MEŠKUŠ ₇ É URU ^{Ha-at-ti} URU ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša-a-i} [<i>m</i> Ḫa-pu-ua-aš-š]u GAL DUMUMES.É.GAL
6	162/k+38/1	18 + 20	KBo 8.27 (38/1); Otten, <i>MDOG</i> 103, 63, Abb. 3	UR]U ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša} [<i>m</i> Ḫa-pu-ua-aš-š]u [GAL DUMUMES.É.]GAL (Siegel Beran 143?)
7	2064/g	4	SBo I 4	[É URU ^{Ha-at-ti}] URU ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša-a-i} [a-i] []
8	2078/g	–		É URU ^{Ha-at-ti} URU ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša-a-i} [] , Siegel abgebrochen
9	275/f	5	SBo I 5	[]
10	165/h	6	SBo I 6	[]
Siegeltyp Beran 144 (soweit Siegelung erhalten)				
11	Bo 90/729	–		La-a-ri-ia UGULA 1 li LÜ.MEŠKUŠ ₇ <i>m</i> Ḫa-pu-ua-š]u GAL DUMUMES.É.GAL <i>m</i> Ma-a-ra-ku-i LÜ-ri-an-ni <i>m</i> Zi-da-a-an-ni GAL LÜ.MEŠGEŠTIN <i>m</i> Ḫa-aš-š]u-ua-aš-i-na-ar GAL LÜ.MEŠme-še-di <i>m</i> Ḫu-tar-li DUB.SAR
12	Bo 90/750	–		IŠ-TU É URU ^{Ša-a-ri-iš-ša-ki} La-a-ri-ia UGULA 1 li LÜ.MEŠKUŠ ₇ <i>m</i> Ḫa-pu-ua-a-aš-š]u GAL DUMUMES.É.GAL <i>m</i> Ma-a-ra-ku-i LÜ-ri-an-ni <i>m</i> Zi-da-an-ni GAL LÜ.MEŠGEŠTIN <i>m</i> Ḫu-tar-li DUB.SAR
13	680/f	12	SBo I 12	La-a-ri-ia UGULA 1 li LÜ.MEŠKUŠ ₇ <i>m</i> Ḫa-pu-ua-a-aš-š]u GAL DUMUMES.É.GAL <i>m</i> Ma-a-ra-ku-i LÜ-ri-an-ni <i>m</i> Zi-da-an-ni GAL LÜ.MEŠGEŠTIN

StBoT Beiheft 4	Inventar-, Museumsnr.	LSU	Edition	
14	Bo 91/1791	-		^m H[a-pu-ua-aš-šu] GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} . [É.GAL] ^m Ma-a-ra-ku-i [L ^U u-ri-an-ni] ^m Zi-da-an-[ni] GAL L ^U .MEŠ[GESTIN] ^m Zu-ú-ua DUB.SAR
15	Bo 91/1602	-		[]
16	621/f	7	SBo I 7	[]
17	140/f	11	SBo I 11	^m Ha-pu-ua-aš-šu [GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} . É.GAL] ^m Ma-a-ra-ku-i [L ^U u-ri-an-ni] ^m Zi-da-an-ni G[AL L ^U .MEŠGESTIN] ^m Ha-aš-šu-ua-aš-[i-na-ar] GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m [e-še-di] [^m]Hu-tar-[i] DUB.SAR
18	518/z	-	Otten, MDOG 103, 63, Abb. 3	^m H[a]-pu-ua-aš-šu GAL [DUMU.É].[GAL] [^m Ma-a-r]a-a[k-k]u-[i L ^U]u-ri[-an-ni]
19	301/z	-		[^m Ha]-pu-ua-aš-šu GA[L DUMU ^{MEŠ} . É.GAL]
20	605/f	15	SBo I 15	[^m Ha-pu-ua-aš-]šu GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} . É.GAL
21	Tarsus 1	28	Goetze, JAOS 59, 2	Siegelabdruck von einem Siegelstock, der Beran 144 typologisch gleicht.
Siegeltyp Beran 145 (soweit Siegelung erhalten)				
22	Bo 90/732	-		ša ^m Ha-ap-pu-ua-aš-šu GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL a+na La-ba-ar-na DUMU.LUGAL ^m Tu-ut-ha-li-ia [L ^U u-ri-an-ni] ^m [Da]-[] GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL(?) ^m Zi[-d]a-a-an-ni GAL L ^U .MEŠKAŠ.GESTIN [^u] [] GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m me-še-di ^m Is-pu-un-nu-u-m[a DUB.SAR]
23	Bo 6964	26	KUB 48.102	[ša ^m Ha-ap-pu-ua-aš-]šu GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL [^m Tu-ut-ha-li-i]a [L ^U u-ri-an-ni] ^m Zi-da-a-an-ni GAL L ^U .MEŠGESTIN Siegel abgebrochen
24	VAT 7767	8	SBo I 8	[]
25	Bo 2003/07	-		[], Siegel abgebrochen
Siegel Alluwannas				
26	Bo 82/162	-	KBo 32.136	[a-na] ^m Ha-an[-ti-li] DUMU-ri-šu ^m Ha-[aš-šu]-[i-li] GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m me-še-di ^m Is-l ^U pu-un-n[u-u-ma DUB.SAR]
27	304/e	-		[]
Siegel Hantilis II.				
28	Bo 90/728	-		^m Ša-a-ar-pa GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL ^m Ha-aš-šu-i-li GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m me-še-di ^m I-la-li-u-ma [L ^U u-ri-an-ni] ^m Mu-u-uš-šu GAL L ^U .MEŠGESTIN ^m Ha-ni-ku-i-li DUB.SAR

StBoT Beiheft 4	Inventar-, Museumsnr.	LSU	Edition	
29	Bo 90/568 + Bo 90/752 + Bo 90/1080 + Bo 91/143A + Bo 91/187A	- - - - -		^m Š[a-a-ar-pa GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL] ^m Ha-aš-šu-i-li [GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m me-še-di] ^m I-la-li-u-ma ^m .[...] L ^U .MEŠ ^m u-ri-an-ni ^m Mu-u-uš-šu GAL L ^U .MEŠGESTIN ^m Ha-ni-ik-ku-i-li DUB.SAR
30	Bo 90/758	-	Rüster, IstMitt. 43, 66	a-na ^m Ha-aš-šu-i-li GAL L ^U .MEŠ ^m me-še-di ^m Ša-a-ar-pa GAL DUMU ^{MEŠ} .É.GAL ^m Is-ku-na-a-aš-šu UGULA L ^U .MEŠNIMGIR.ÉRIN ^{MEŠ} ^m Ha-ni-ik-ku-i-li DUB.SAR

Literatur

- Balkan, K., İnandık'ta 1966 bulunan eski Hitit çağına ait bir bağış belgesi / Eine Schenkungs-urkunde aus der althethitischen Zeit, gefunden in İnandık 1966 (AMAVY 1), Ankara 1973.
- Beal, R. H., The Organization of the Hittite Military (THeth 20), Heidelberg 1992.
- Beran, Th., Die hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy (BoHa 5 = WVDOG 76), Berlin 1967.
- Carruba, O., Tahurwaili von Hatti und die heth. Geschichte um 1500 v. Chr., in: K. Bittel u. a. (Hg.), Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, Istanbul 1974, 73–93.
- Carruba, O., Zur Datierung der ältesten Schenkungsurkunden und anonymen Tabarna Siegel, IstMitt. 43, 1993, ersch. 1994 (= FS Peter Neve), 71–85.
- Easton, D. F., Hittite Land Donations and Tabarna Seals, JCS 33, 1981, 3–43.
- Güterbock, H. G., Siegel aus Boğazköy I (AfO Beiheft 5), Berlin 1940.
- Güterbock, H. G. – Boehmer, R. M., Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy (BoHa 14), Berlin 1987.
- Klinger, J., Das Corpus der Mašat-Briefe und seine Beziehungen zu den Texten aus Hattuša, ZA 85, 1995, 74–108.
- Müller-Karpe, A., Untersuchungen in Kuşaklı 1997, MDOG 130, 1998, 93–174.
- Neu, E. – Rüster, Ch., Hethitische Keilschrift-Paläographie II (StBoT 21), Wiesbaden 1975.
- Otten, H., Das Siegel des hethitischen Großkönigs Tahurwaili, MDOG 103, 1971, 59–68.
- Riemschneider, K. K., Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden, MIO 6, 1958, 321–381.
- Starke, F., Labarna, RIA 6 (1980–83), 404–408.

- Klinger, J., Instruktionen und Verwandtes: 1. Instruktion für die LÜMEŠDUGUD (CTH 272); 2. Urkunde der Königin Asmunikkal (CTH 252); 3. Instruktion für Tempelbedienstete (CTH 264), TUAT, Ergänzungslieferung, Gütersloh 2001, 70–81.
- Košak, S., Ein hethitischer Königserlaß über eine gesellschaftliche und wirtschaftliche Reform, in: Neu E./Rüster C. (ed.), *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae*. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag Wiesbaden 1988, 195–202.
- McMahon, G., Hittite Canonical Compositions – Instructions: Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials, in: W. W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, 217–221.
- Marazzi, M., Note in margine all'editto reale KBo XXIII, in: *Imparati F. (ed.), Studi di storia e filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli (Eothen 1)*, Firenze 1988, 119–129.
- Mascheroni, L. M., *Istituto Lombardo (Rend. Lett.)*, 131 (1997), 137–164.
- Otten, H., *Materialien zum hethitischen Lexikon (StBoT 15)*, Wiesbaden 1971.
- Otten, H., Der Anfang der HAZANNU-Instruktion, in: Frantz-Szabó, G. (ed.), *Festschrift Annelies Kammenhuber*, Or 52, 1983, 133–142.
- Otten, H., Ein Siegelabdruck Duthalijas I. (?), AA 2000, 375–376.
- Otten, H./Rüster, Ch., Textanschüsse und Duplikate von Bogazköy-Tafeln (41–50), ZA 67, 1977, 53–63.
- Otten, H./Rüster, Ch., Textanschüsse und Duplikate von Bogazköy-Tafeln (51–60), ZA 68, 1978, 150–159.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., *Il hāzan(n)u nei testi di Hattuša*, OA 14, 1975, 93–136.
- Pecchioli Daddi, A proposito di KBo XV 124 (+) 25, *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti VIII/34* (1979), 51–55.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Il re, il padre del re, il nonno del re, OAMisc I, 1994, 75–91.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Le così dette „cronache di palazzo“, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Pavia 28 giugno – 2 luglio 1993 (StMed 9), Pavia (1995), 321–33.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Rev. of: Güterbock, H. G./van den Hout, Th. P. J. (1991), *BiOr* LIII 1/2, 1996, 139ff.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Lotte di dei per la supremazia celeste, in: S. Ribichini – M. Rocchi – P. Xella (Hrsg.), *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca*, Roma 2001, 403ff.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., A „New“ Instruction from Arnuwanda I, in: P. Taracha (Hrsg.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to M. Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw (2002a), 261–268.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Testi politico-amministrativi: formazione, tipologia, attribuzione, SMEA 44, 2002b, 330–332.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Il vincolo per i governatori di provincia, *Studia Mediterranea* 14 (Series Hethaea 3), Pavia 2003.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Palace Servants and their Obligations, Or 73 (2004) 451–468.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., (...), *Akten des V. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, Çorum 2002 [im Druck].
- Riemschneider, K. K., Zum Lehnswesen bei den Hethitern, *ArOr* 33, 1965, 333–340.
- Rüster, Ch., Eine Urkunde Hantilis II., in: *Festschrift für Peter Neve, zum 65. Geburtstag am 3. April 1994 von Freunden und Kollegen (IstMitt 43, 1993)*, 63–70.
- Süel, A., *Hitit Kaynaklarında. Tapınak Görevlileri. Bir Direktif Metni*, Ankara 1985.

STEFANO DE MARTINO

Hittite Letters from the Time of Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III

The aim of this work is the singling out of a *corpus* of Hittite letters that can be dated from the Middle Kingdom. Therefore, only Hittite correspondence which can be given a date (using *ductus*, linguistic aspects, prosopography and content) has been considered. After having singled out a group of Middle-Hittite letters I have tried to check possible relationship of those found in Hattuša with those found in the archives of Mašat, Kuşaklı and Ortaköy. Last of all, I have considered the internal chronology of the *corpus* of these Middle-Hittite letters.

This study is part of a research on Hittite textual documentation that has been directed by Prof. Onofrio Carruba (University of Pavia) and has been funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Scientific Research.

The Letters

1.1./2. Texts from the Boğazköy/Hattuša Archives

The Hittite letters have recently been collected and published by A. Hagenbuchner in the volume *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (THeth 16), Heidelberg 1989. This edition is noted for its accuracy and wealth of information. Hagenbuchner asserts, however, that the letters found at Hattusa, except in a very few cases, belong to the period following Šuppiluliuma I.¹

On the other hand, other scholars, like F. Starke in his review of Hagenbuchner's book², or S. Košak in his on-line catalogue of Hittite texts³, have indicated some documents that can be dated from the Middle Kingdom on the basis of palaeography and of linguistic features.

In my opinion, too, there are some Boğazköy letters that can be dated almost certainly from the Middle Kingdom. As far as the international correspondence

¹ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b); see also A. Hagenbuchner (1989a), 37–38.

² F. Starke (1992), 808–809 and n. 16.

³ See www.hethiter.net: Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

is concerned there are only two fragmentary texts left which may, or may not, be datable to the Middle Kingdom. The situation regarding the internal correspondence looks much better. In presenting these documents a distinction is made between those ones that can be dated from the Middle Kingdom (following cross-referenced research on the basis of *ductus*, language and content) and those whose dates can be based only upon an examination of the *ductus* carried out on few signs due to the poor state of conservation of the tablets.

1.1. International Correspondence

Within the *corpus* of letters of international correspondence two missives conserved in the archives of the Hittite capital may be perhaps dated from the Middle Kingdom. As already mentioned, the dates of these two letters cannot be known with absolute certainty (whether or not they are Middle Hittite texts or they belong to the period of Šuppiluliuma I) due to the fragmentary state of the texts and impossibility of knowing the exact context, the events and the people that are referred to.

1.1.2. – KBo XXXI 40⁴: this is a fragment of a letter belonging to the correspondence between the Egyptian and Hittite courts. The sender of the letter is the Hittite king and the receiver the Pharaoh. Unfortunately the text is fragmentary and we have no indication regarding its content. E. Edel notes that the spelling *Mi-iz-za-ri* appears in text from the time before Šuppiluliuma I. This spelling is also to be found in the Middle Hittite text KBo XVI 42 rev. 9', 14'⁵, as well as in EA 31 and 32.⁶ It can also be underlined, however, that the same spelling is present in one of the fragments of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I written by Muṣili II, KUB XIX 4 + KBo XIX 45, 10' (DŠ 31)⁷, and next to *Mizri* in the treaty of Tuḫaliya IV with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru.⁸

S. Košak⁹ dates KBo XXXI 40 as belonging to the Middle Kingdom, whilst H. Klengel¹⁰ prefers the period of Ḫattušili III.

If this text was really a Middle Hittite document and not dating from the time of Šuppiluliuma I, it could be placed within the reign of Tuḫaliya I/II, when the Hittite court began having diplomatic ties with the Egyptian court and when the treaty between Ḫatti and Egypt (known as the Kuruštama Treaty)¹¹ could be dated.

⁴ See E. Edel (1996), 114–117.

⁵ See J. Klinger (2000), 11.

⁶ On the contrary in the two letters EA 41 and 44 there is KUR ^{URU}*Mizri*.

⁷ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 48, 107–108.

⁸ See C. Kühne – H. Otten (1971), 32–33, 74.

⁹ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁰ Klengel (1999), 244.

¹¹ See H. Klengel (1999), 106–107, 110; I. Singer (2004), 591–607, both with previous literature.

1.1.3. – KBo XXVIII 71¹²: this fragment is in Akkadian. The names of the sender and receiver have not been preserved. In ll. 11' and 13' Mittani (KUR ^{URU}*Mi-it-ta-an-ni*) is quoted. A. Hagenbuchner¹³ mentions that the very name Mittani, instead of Ḫanigalbat or Ḫurri, suggests that the date of the text may be from a period before Muwattalli II. Furthermore, she also suggests that the mention of the sender's father's death (l. 12') could lead us to presume that Arnuwanda II or Muṣili II were the Hittite king who had written the text. On the other hand, S. Košak¹⁴ suggests that the letter might have been written in the Middle Kingdom. A date towards the beginning of Šuppiluliuma I's reign might, in my opinion, be the more probable hypothesis.

1.2. Internal Correspondence

a) Letters datable from the Middle Kingdom:

1.2.1. – KBo VIII 18¹⁵: this is a letter sent to the king by a person called Muwattalli as well as another person whose name is not preserved. A woman Kamma-wiya¹⁶ (obv. 5) and the city of Durmitta (rev. 9') are mentioned. A. Hagenbuchner¹⁷ suggests dating the letter from the Imperial Age. On the other hand, O. Carruba¹⁸ and S. Košak¹⁹ date the letter from the Middle Kingdom on the basis of its *ductus* and R. Beal²⁰ supports this date.

The most significant aspect of this letter is the mentioning of Muwattalli. This is because a Muwattalli before GAL *MEŠEDI*, then Ḫuzziya II's assassin, then successor to his throne before being assassinated in turn by Ḫimuili and Kantuzili, appears in a series of texts.²¹ Furthermore, a Muwattalli also appears in two fragments of historiographical character KUB XXI 20 (= DŠ 50) and KBo XIV 18 (= DŠ 51), although it is not certain whether these two fragments actually belong to the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I.²² It would appear, however, reasonable to suppose that the first of these two fragments referred to events that had happened in a period before Šuppiluliuma I.²³ Finally, a person by the name of Muwattalli

¹² See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 446–447.

¹³ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 447.

¹⁴ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁵ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 47–48.

¹⁶ This name is *hapax*.

¹⁷ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 48.

¹⁸ O. Carruba (1990), 545.

¹⁹ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

²⁰ R. Beal (1992), 332 n. 1267.

²¹ See H. Otten (1987), 21–34; O. Carruba (1990), 539–554; R. Beal (1992), 331–332.

²² See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 49–50; O. Carruba (1990), 543–545. J. Freu (1995), 136–137, proposes that this fragments may belong to the Annals of Tuḫaliya I.

²³ See J. Klinger (2002), 449.

is also present in KBo XVI 97 (obv. 3), which has been dated either from the period of Arnuwanda I²⁴ or from the period of Tuthaliya I.²⁵

H. Otten²⁶ believes that Muwattalli GAL *MEŠEDI* (documented in KBo XIV 18) can be identified as the person who occupied the throne and had usurped Huzziya II. This hypothesis is supported by R. Beal²⁷, who even suggests that this dignitary may be the same as the one in letter KBo VIII 18.

1.2.2. – KBo VIII 22²⁸: this is a fragmentary letter in which neither the name of the sender or receiver is preserved. A. Hagenbuchner does not mention any date for this text while S. Košak²⁹ as well as the authors of CHD³⁰ assigns it as coming from the Middle Kingdom. Two people are mentioned: Ušgana and Tarḫumima. Whilst the first anthroponymy is a *hapax*, the second³¹ is documented (as GAL *LÜ.MEŠKUŠ*, *GÜB-laz*) in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 52³², as well as in a few letters from Mašat (HKM 49, 65, 69) and, finally, in some Ortaköy's letters.³³

As observed by R. Beal³⁴, Tarḫumima in HKM 65 might be a functionary (by the same name) of a lower rank compared to Tarḫumima GAL *LÜ.MEŠKUŠ*, *GÜB-laz*, whilst the identification of Tarḫumima "bird watcher" in HKM 49 remains uncertain.

The letter HKM 69 (see § 3.4.) is sent to Kaššu by Tarḫumima, by a functionary with the title UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ}, whose name is not given, and by Pišeni. The latter might well be the same officer who is mentioned in the Indictment of Madduwatta (as supported by J. Klinger³⁵).

The identifying of Tarḫumima in KBo VIII 22 with the one in the letter HKM 69 and with the one of KBo V 7 is an attractive hypothesis, even though, due to the lack of information in KBo VIII 22, we know nothing of the context within the person is mentioned in this letter.

1.2.3. – KBo XII 62³⁶: this fragmentary letter (the names of the sender and receiver are not preserved) is datable from the Middle Kingdom according to

²⁴ See St. de Martino (1992a), 33–46.

²⁵ See J. Klinger (1998), 104–111; Klinger (2002), 449.

²⁶ Op. cit. 32.

²⁷ R. Beal (1992), 332–333 n. 1267; this Muwattalli would be the same who appears in KUB XXI 20.

²⁸ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 90–91.

²⁹ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

³⁰ P. 2 (MS?).

³¹ See J. Klinger (1995a), 99.

³² See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338–340, 344–354.

³³ See A. Süel (1998), 552.

³⁴ R. Beal (1992), 370 n. 1408.

³⁵ J. Klinger (1995a), 99 and n. 99; see also G. Beckman (1995), 24–25. On Pišeni see also J. Klinger (1998), 108–109.

³⁶ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 120–123.

many scholars on the basis of palaeography and of linguistic features.³⁷ A. Hagenbuchner suggests assigning the letter to the period between Arnuwanda I and Šuppiluliuma I.

Zidi is mentioned in the text (rev. 4'–5'): he has to send a letter to the sender of KBo XII 62. We do not know whether this Zidi is the same as the one who appears as a scribe on the seal SBo II 192, dated by Th. Beran as from the Old/Middle Kingdom.³⁸

1.2.4. KBo XV 28³⁹: this is a letter sent to the queen by three "bird watchers" called Awawa, NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI₆ and PU.SIG₅. The results of the bird oracles are referred to in this letter. A *post scriptum* is sent by NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI₆ to Tumni, Tumnaziti and Tuttuwaili requesting, on behalf of the sender, the receivers to help him in a matter related to his house.

A. Hagenbuchner⁴⁰ writes that, from the point of view of the *ductus*, the letter could be datable from the period of Šuppiluliuma I, but that the oracular content would suggest a date from around the beginning of Muršili II's time. A date from the Imperial Age is also supported by F. Imparati.⁴¹ On the other hand, this letter is placed within the Middle Kingdom by F. Starke⁴², Th. van den Hout⁴³, J. Klinger⁴⁴, V. Haas – I. Wegner⁴⁵ and S. Košak.⁴⁶

Supporting the Middle Kingdom date for this document is the presence of NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI₆, who can be identified as the scribe who supervises the drafting of the Hurrian invocation to the gods KUB XXXII 19 + IV 50 (ChS I/1 nr. 41), attributed to Tašmišarri/Tuthaliya III. In fact, this king is mentioned in the text (II 55).⁴⁷ The identity of NU.^{GIŠ}KIRI₆ as "bird watcher" and as scribe by the same name is possible⁴⁸, since scribes were often "bird watchers".⁴⁹ Therefore, it would seem more than plausible to date KBo XV 28 from the period of Tuthaliya III as suggested by V. Haas and I. Wegner⁵⁰ (see also § 3.6.).

³⁷ See H. C. Melchert (1977), 91; E. Neu (1985), 144–145; F. Starke (1992), 809 n. 16; CHD Š, 22 (*contra* L-N, 472); S. Košak, Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

³⁸ WVD OG 76 (1976) tav. II.

³⁹ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 81–84, 178, with previous literature; see now also Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate (1998), 176–177; Th. van den Hout (2001), 427 and n. 22.

⁴⁰ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 82.

⁴¹ F. Imparati (1985), 257.

⁴² F. Starke (1992), 808–809.

⁴³ Th. van den Hout (1995), 147–148; Th. van den Hout (2001), 427.

⁴⁴ J. Klinger (1995a), 101.

⁴⁵ V. Haas – I. Wegner (1996), 106 and n. 7.

⁴⁶ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁴⁷ See V. Haas (1984), 5 and n. 3.

⁴⁸ So J. Klinger (1995a), 101.

⁴⁹ See F. Imparati (1985), 255–269.

⁵⁰ V. Haas – I. Wegner (1996), 106 and n. 7; J. Klinger (1995a) dates KUB XXXII 19 to Arnuwanda I.

1.2.5. KBo XVIII 14⁵¹: the sender of this letter sent to the king is Pazzu. Another person by the name Duwa (obv. 6, rev. 8') is also mentioned. Pazzu appears also in the letter KBo XVIII 15⁵², sent to the sovereign by Mašhuiluwa, most probably the same person who became king of Mira during the time of Muṣili II.⁵³ This hypothesis identifying Pazzu in KBo XVIII 14 as the same one in KBo XVIII 15 has encouraged some scholars, like S. Heinhold-Krahmer⁵⁴, A. Hagenbuchner⁵⁵ and H. Klengel⁵⁶, to also date KBo XVIII 14 from the time of Muṣili II. On the other hand, KBo XVIII 14 has already been considered to be a Middle Hittite letter by J. Klinger⁵⁷ e S. Košak⁵⁸ (see also CHD⁵⁹). This dating is based not only upon the *ductus*, but also upon the mention in KBo XVIII 14 of Duwa. As a matter of fact, a dignitary with this name bearing the title of GAL DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL is mentioned in Arnuwanda I' land donation KBo V 7 rev. 51⁶⁰ (see § 1.2.11.). For a more accurate chronological analysis of KBo XVIII 14 see further ahead at § 3.7.

1.2.6. – KBo XVIII 38⁶¹: the letter was sent from someone whose name is preserved only in one final syllable *-zi*. In my opinion a possible restoration of this name could be *Duwazzi* that appears in HKM 65 obv. 22; this person seems here to be a functionary working in Tapigga. The receiver of the letter is another functionary of equal rank (obv 1: "my brother"). The letter has been considered as Middle Hittite by E. Neu⁶², F. Starke⁶³ and S. Košak⁶⁴; A. Hagenbuchner does not support this date.⁶⁵

The hypothesis of restoring the name of the sender of the letter, as *Duwazzi*, a person known to Mašat's documents, is coherent with the Middle Kingdom date suggested for KBo XVIII 38. The Chiefs of the Kaška are mentioned in this letter (obv. 7); this mention can be easily put into the context of the conflicts between Hittites and Kaškas during the Middle Kingdom.

1.2.7. – KBo XVIII 40⁶⁶: this is a very fragmentary letter and neither the name of the sender nor receiver has been preserved. S. Košak has suggested the

⁵¹ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 50–51.

⁵² See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 367–369.

⁵³ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 368.

⁵⁴ S. Heinhold-Krahmer (1977), 183.

⁵⁵ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 51.

⁵⁶ H. Klengel (1999), 175.

⁵⁷ J. Klinger (1995a), 102.

⁵⁸ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁵⁹ P, 362.

⁶⁰ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338–340, 344–354.

⁶¹ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 167–168.

⁶² E. Neu (1986), 115–116 n. 29.

⁶³ F. Starke (1992), 809 n. 16.

⁶⁴ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁶⁵ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 168.

⁶⁶ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 192.

Middle Hittite date⁶⁷ on the basis of the *ductus* (see the signs ŠA, obv. 3, and TAR, rev. 3'). Supporting this date are the following geographical names mentioned in the fragment: [KUR^{URU}/URU]Aš]šaratta (obv. 3) and ^{URU}Ura (obv. 6). The site of Aššaratta is, actually, mentioned in the Annals of Arnuwanda I (KUB XXIII 21 III 4)⁶⁸ *à propos* the conflict between the Hittites and Kupanta-Kurunta of Arzawa. Instead, Ura is in two Middle Hittite texts, KBo XVI 47 and KUB XXVI 29 +, which refer to the reintroduction of this centre into the sphere of Hittite power, in the time of Arnuwanda I, after it had been under the domination of Arzawa.⁶⁹

1.2.8. – KBo XVIII 51⁷⁰: this letter fragment (whose sender's and receiver's names are missing) contains the name of Wašuwatarla (ll. 2', 12'). The name of this person also appears in the letter KBo XVIII 69 which dates from the Middle Kingdom as can be understood by the presence of Hulla, a functionary documented in Middle Hittite sources (see § 1.2.12.; § 3.4.). The date of KBo XVIII 51 from the Middle Kingdom is suggested by J. Klinger⁷¹ and S. Košak⁷², whilst A. Hagenbuchner⁷³ believes the letter to be from the XIII century.

1.2.9. – KBo XVIII 54⁷⁴: this is the well-known letter sent by Kaššu to the king. At first, this letter was dated as belonging to the late Imperial Age on the analysis of personal names, but a later examination of the *ductus* and the publication of the Tapigga letters, in which Kaššu UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} appears as a busy functionary, have encouraged many scholars to prefer a Middle Kingdom date.⁷⁵ Although with some measure of doubt, S. Košak⁷⁶ also favours for the Middle Hittite date. The problem of dating KBo XVIII 54 is left open by S. Alp⁷⁷ and by A. Hagenbuchner⁷⁸; the authors of CHD first dated the letter from the Imperial Age, only later on opting for a Middle Hittite date.⁷⁹

Tuttu can also be found in this letter. He appears to be an officer with military duties. A person bearing this name can be found in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, where Tuthaliya III's defeat of the city of Šallapa⁸⁰ is mentioned, KUB XIX 12 II 3, 11[(DS 4) and KUB XXXI 34 II 6' (DS 6).

⁶⁷ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁶⁸ See O. Carruba (1977), 168–169.

⁶⁹ See St. de Martino (1996), 63–79.

⁷⁰ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 99–100.

⁷¹ J. Klinger (1995a), 92.

⁷² Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁷³ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 100.

⁷⁴ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 57–63.

⁷⁵ See J. Klinger (1995a), 102; Th. van den Hout (1995), 170; St. de Martino – F. Imparati (1995), 113–114; H. Klengel (1999), 127; A. Ünal (1998), 36.

⁷⁶ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁷⁷ S. Alp (1991), 71.

⁷⁸ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 60.

⁷⁹ See CDH, L-N, 108 (NH); P, 102 (MH/MS).

⁸⁰ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 60–61.

In my opinion, the following elements point to KBo XVIII 54 as dating from the Middle Kingdom and to the identification of Kaššu of this text as the one in the letters of Mašat. The confidential tone of the salutation (obv. 3-6) reminds us of similar formulas in many of Mašat's letters, result of a close (although not always easy)⁸¹ relation between Kaššu and the Hittite king. The military context referred to in the reverse of the letter (requests for victuals and military strategies) reflects Kaššu's duties, as known to through the Mašat letters. The mention (rev. 6') of the Chief of the scribes may be related to the letter HKM 72, where it is one of the Chief of the scribes (= Ḫattušili)⁸² who writes to Kaššu. Furthermore, in this letter of Mašat the Chief of the scribes asks Zū to write to him in Babylonian. This brings to mind the unfortunately fragmentary passage of KBo XVIII 54 obv. 11-18, where a tablet in Babylonian is mentioned. The presence of Tuttu, who lived in the time of Tuthaliya III, as shown in fragments 4 and 6 of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, is also relevant. Finally, we have to keep in mind that both Kaššu and Tuttu appear in the Ortaköy texts.⁸³

1.2.10 - KBo XVIII 57a+57⁸⁴: this is a letter sent to the king as can be understood from lines 1-5 of the left edge. The sender, however, is unknown. This letter is dated from Middle Kingdom by J. Klinger⁸⁵, S. Košak⁸⁶ and by the authors of CHD.⁸⁷ A. Hagenbuchner⁸⁸ also believes the text to be rather old. A. Kammenhuber⁸⁹ and P. Cotticelli⁹⁰, on the other hand, believe the text to date from the Imperial Age. This letter is very fragmentary. It deals with topics of military nature and some geographical names are also mentioned, like Šaḫḫupa (obv. 10', 15'), Lalḫa (obv. 15'), Pala (rev. 35'), Mount Ašḫarpa (obv. 5'), as well as personal names, like Iyaliya (obv. 6', 13', rev. 33'), Šayanu (obv. 8', rev. 31'[]), Šunaili (obv. 4'). The last one may be the same Šunaili ^{LÜ}DUGUD who appears in HKM 103 obv. 9.⁹¹

1.2.11. - KBo XVIII 66⁹²: the names of the sender and receiver have not been preserved. The text mentions a case of river ordeal (rev. 8'-9').⁹³ The text dates from the Middle Kingdom according to S. Košak⁹⁴ on the basis of the *ductus*. A further element aiding the dating of the text is the name of Duwa[(-) (rev. 13').

⁸¹ See St. de Martino - F. Imparati (1995), 112-114.

⁸² See Ph. Houwink ten Cate (1998), 177.

⁸³ See A. Süel (1998), 552.

⁸⁴ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 101-106.

⁸⁵ J. Klinger (1995a), 104 n. 117.

⁸⁶ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

⁸⁷ CHD L-N, 87; P, 21, 265 (MH/MS); *contra* L-N, 156 (NH).

⁸⁸ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 105.

⁸⁹ HW² I, 290.

⁹⁰ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 109.

⁹¹ See R. Beal (1992), 557-559; see also J. Klinger (1995a), 103-104.

⁹² See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 108-111.

⁹³ See E. Laroche (1973), 185; R. Lebrun (1995), 250 n. 3.

⁹⁴ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

If it can be hypothesised that Duwa is the person mentioned here, it might well be the same one who appears in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 51⁹⁵ as GAL DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL; he is also mentioned in the letter KBo XVIII 14 (see § 1.2.5.) examined previously. The hypothesis that KBo XVIII 66 may be dated from the time of Arnuwanda I upon the basis of the presence of Duwa is taken into consideration by A. Hagenbuchner⁹⁶, along with other feasible dates.

1.2.12. - KBo XVIII 69⁹⁷: neither the sender's nor the receiver's names have been preserved. The text is datable from the Middle Kingdom as supposed by F. Starke⁹⁸, J. Klinger⁹⁹ and S. Košak¹⁰⁰, whilst A. Hagenbuchner believes the date to be closer to the time of Šuppiluliuma I.¹⁰¹

Some elements in the text would point to the actual date of this letter as being from the Middle Kingdom. One of these elements has to be the mention of the "priest" ^{LÜ}SANGA (rev. 7'). As has already been underlined by F. Imparati¹⁰², a "priest" with no further specification is often mentioned in a whole host of Middle Hittite texts and it is also more than likely that a reference to Kantuzili is always made.¹⁰³ One should also add that in our letter the "priest" makes an appearance concerning a matter of borders and therefore, in the same context as the one in the letter HKM 74.¹⁰⁴ In fact, this letter is sent by the "priest" (= Kantuzili) to Kaššu concerning a problem of sending back people who have crossed the border (see also §§ 2.2.; 3.3.).¹⁰⁵

Furthermore, Ḫulla appears in KBo XVIII 69 rev. 8', already known from the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 52¹⁰⁶ as GAL ^{LÜ}MEŠKUŠ₇ ZAG-az and present in the letters of Mašat HKM 17, 25, 61, 62, 66.¹⁰⁷ In my opinion, the hypothesis suggested by J. Klinger¹⁰⁸, who considers Ḫulla in all these texts as the same person, is fully correct. It would also seem more than likely that the person to deal with a border problem involving Kantuzili would actually be a high-ranking dignitary like Ḫulla GAL ^{LÜ}MEŠKUŠ₇ ZAG-az¹⁰⁹ (see also § 3.4.).

⁹⁵ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338-340, 344-354.

⁹⁶ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 110.

⁹⁷ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 112-115.

⁹⁸ F. Starke (1992), 809 n. 16.

⁹⁹ J. Klinger (1995a), 92 n. 114.

¹⁰⁰ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁰¹ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 114.

¹⁰² F. Imparati (2003), 238; see also J. Klinger (1995a), 93-99.

¹⁰³ G. Beckman (1992), 176, proposes that in KBo XVIII 69 the "priest" may be Telipinu.

¹⁰⁴ See S. Alp (1991), 262-263.

¹⁰⁵ See J. Klinger (1995a), 93.

¹⁰⁶ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338-340, 344-354.

¹⁰⁷ See S. Alp (1991), 64; on Ḫulla in Mašat letters see R. Beal (1992), 370-372.

¹⁰⁸ J. Klinger (1995a), 92-93.

¹⁰⁹ See R. Beal (1992), 368-375.

1.2.13. – KBo XVIII 132¹¹⁰: this is a letter sent to the king by a person called Himuili. The text is very fragmentary and nothing can be understood of its content. On line 6 oracle enquires are mentioned, carried out through flesh-oracles (S^{UMES}). According to the *ductus*, the letter seems to be Middle Hittite (compare the signs UN and TAR, l. 4), as suggested by S. Košak¹¹¹. An important element as far as dating the text is concerned in the presence of the name Himuili, since a person by this name is mentioned frequently in the Mašat letters¹¹² (where, in all probability, he bears the title *BĒL MADGALTI*¹¹³) and a dignitary, also by the same name, with the position of GAL GEŠTIN, is mentioned during the time of Šuppiluliuma I.¹¹⁴

A. Hagenbuchner¹¹⁵ prefers dating this text as belonging to the beginning of the Imperial Age due to the mention of the flesh-oracles, since she believes they were being used in Hattuša only from the beginning of the period of Muršili II. One has to mention, however, that Hurrian Oracles are documented in the Middle Kingdom¹¹⁶ and that at the Hittite court during the time of Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III flesh-oracle techniques were already known.

I think, therefore, that J. Klinger¹¹⁷ and H. Klengel¹¹⁸ hypothesis of identifying the Himuili of KBo XVIII 132 with the one in the letters of Mašat might be accepted. In this case, KBo XVII 132 would be a letter sent by Tapigga to the king who was residing at Hattuša. According to this hypothesis the GAL GEŠTIN mentioned in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I would be a different person.

1.2.14. – KBo XXXII 145: this is a very fragmentary text. H. Otten and Chr. Rüster define it as being “wohl brieflicher Bericht”¹¹⁹, with its writing only on one column, which continues along the lower edge as well as the recurrence of the verb *hatrai* “to write” (obv. 10', rev. 20', 22'). The text is datable to the Middle Kingdom as agreed by a few scholars.¹²⁰ A person called Hattušili¹²¹ is quoted (obv. 7'); he could be the same as ABoT 65 and as the one in the other Mašat letters.

¹¹⁰ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 67–68.

¹¹¹ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5; in CHD L-N, 474, all occurrences of *nu(n)tarnu-* (KBo XVIII 32 l. 4') are considered NH.

¹¹² See S. Alp (1991), 59–62.

¹¹³ See S. Alp (1991), 60; R. Beal (1992), 404.

¹¹⁴ See E. Laroche (1966) nr. 361, p. 67.

¹¹⁵ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 67.

¹¹⁶ See G. Wilhelm (1987), 232; St. de Martino (1992b), 32, 61; van den Hout (2001), 423–440.

¹¹⁷ J. Klinger (1995a), 91.

¹¹⁸ H. Klengel (1999), 127–128.

¹¹⁹ KBo XXXII, Inhaltsübersicht p. VI.

¹²⁰ H. Otten – Chr. Rüster, KBo XXXII, Inhaltsübersicht p. VI; A. Hagenbuchner (1999), 54–55; J. Klinger (1995b), 243–244 n. 28; J. Klinger (1995a), 89; S. Košak, Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹²¹ See J. Klinger (1995b), 243–244 n. 28; Klinger (1995a), 89.

1.2.15. – KBo XXXII 202¹²²: H. Otten and Chr. Rüster¹²³ classify this very fragmentary text as a historical Middle Hittite document. In my opinion, its context points to be it a letter:

rev.

4' [MA-HAR LUGAL/DUTUŠ¹²⁴ MUNU]S.LUGAL ḥu-u-ma-an SIG₅-in [t]u-u[g-ga]

5' [kat-ta ḥ]u-u-ma-an SIG₅-i[n] e-eš-tu nu(-)x[

6' [DINGIR^{MEŠ} TI-a]n ḥar-kán-du nu-ut-t[a] SAG.DU-KA p[a-aḥ-ša-an-ta-ru]

7' [A-NA] [D¹]UTUŠ¹²⁵ ku-it ḥa-at-ri[-eš-]na-aš tup-pí up-pa[-aš]

8' [na-a]t PA-NI DUTUŠ¹²⁶ ḥal-zi[-ú-en] [nu-]ut-ta k[a-a-aš-ma]

9' [ud-da-n]i[-i] a-ap-pa ar-ku-a[r i-] [e-]et nu am-m[e-el]

10' BE-LI-YA [ud-]da-ni-i EGIR-an [ti-i-y]a ma-na-aš-ta URU[

11' ša-ra-a li-li-wa-aḥ-ti ma-an[-aš-t]a A-NA DUTUŠ¹²⁷ [

12' ḥu-u-da-a-ak a-ri ŠA UD^{HIA}-ta ut-tar DUTUŠ¹²⁸ ma-a-aḥ-ḥa[-an]

13' ḥa-at-ra-a-it na-at QA-TAM-MA ḥa-an[-da-]a-an

14' ka-a-aš [ITU] GIBIL [ku-iš] ar-ta na-aš-ta UD 7^{KAM} [pa-iz-]zi¹²⁵

15' DUTUŠ¹²⁹-ma-kán URUḥa-at-tu-ša-az m[a-] [a-] [a]n UD 10^{KAM} [pa-iz-]zi

16' DUTUŠ¹³⁰-uš-ma URUŠal-pi¹²⁶ nu am-m[e-el] BE-LI-YA QA-TAM-MA ša-a-ak

17' nu A-NA DUTUŠ¹³¹ [ki-]i 1-an ut-tar EGIR[-an] ḥu-u-da-a-ak B[BE-LI-YA]

18' [ḥ]a[-at-]ra-a-i DUTUŠ¹³²-wa-mu ITU GIBIL UD^{HIA} x[] x-x[

19' nu-wa ŠA DUTUŠ¹³³ me-mi-an ḥu-u-da-a-ak i-ya-m[i] x[] x-x

20' ša-ra-a li-li-wa-aḥ-x-ḥi ÉRIN^{MEŠ}-ma-ši-kán MA-HAR DUTUŠ¹³⁴ x[]

21' x[] x-x ne-eḥ-ḥi nu D[UT]UŠ¹³⁵ ki-i 1-an ut-tar EGIR-pa[ḥu-u-da-a-ak]

22' ḥ[a-a]t-ra[-a-u] nu SIG₅-in [me-ek-ki-ma ud-da-a-a[r]

23' ar-ḥa-ya ku-it-ma-an [d]a-a-la/x na-at x[

25' ḥa-at-ri-eš-ki-m[i]

26' [] x x [] x-ti-i ta-pa-a-aš-ša-aš x[

¹²² See St. de Martino (1996), 56–58.

¹²³ KBo XXXII, Inhaltsübersicht p. VII; I would like to thank Mrs. Christel Rüster (Mainz) for having checked some passages of this text on the photographs of the tablet.

¹²⁴ DUTUŠ¹²⁴ is also in KBo IX 81 l. 4.

¹²⁵ So G. Beckman (1998), 592.

¹²⁶ This city cannot be Šallapa, because the distance between Hattuša and Šallapa cannot be covered in three days.

The lines of the reverse shown here could be part of a *post scriptum*.¹²⁷ The obverse is very fragmentary: on ll. 5'-7' the cities of Kašiya¹²⁸ and Iškazuwa¹²⁹ are mentioned. It would be useful, here, to mention that the site Kašiya appears in KUB XIX 10 I 10' (DS 13), in connection with military actions carried on by Šuppiluliuma I and his father Tuthaliya III.¹³⁰ Furthermore, the city of Iškazuwa appears only in KBo XXXII 202 and in KBo XVI 97 rev. 7¹³¹; the latter text is datable from the time of Tuthaliya III or Arnuwanda I.¹³²

1.2.16. – KUB XXXI 79¹³³: this tablet is fragmentary and the sender's and receiver's names are in the break. It dates from the Middle Kingdom according to H. A. Hoffner jr.¹³⁴, F. Starke¹³⁵, S. Košak¹³⁶ (see also CHD¹³⁷). Whilst supporting the impossibility of drawing definite conclusions on the date of the text, A. Hagenbuchner recognises the fact that it may be from the time before the Imperial Age.¹³⁸ The part of the letter that has been preserved deals with the sending of goods by river on boats. Some place names are mentioned. Šamuḫa, Pitteyarika, and Arziya.¹³⁹ Some people are involved in the control and expedition of the goods, whose names cannot be better identified as Kuruntaziti, Zidašdu, Taškuwanni and Ḫillani.¹⁴⁰

The mention of Šamuḫa and Arziya could be a clue for dating this letter to the time of Tuthaliya III. As a matter of fact, we learn from the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I (DŠ 10)¹⁴¹ that at the time of Tuthaliya III Šamuḫa acted as a royal residence.¹⁴² Furthermore, the site of Arziya is also mentioned in fragment 3 of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, even though it is in a very fragmentary passage.¹⁴³

¹²⁷ Sender of this letter is neither the king nor the queen. For other letters where mention is found of king and/or queen's health and not of that of the sender see, for example, KBo IX 81 rr. 4-5 (THeth 16 nr. 96) and KBo XVIII 1 rr. 6'-8 (Theth 16 nr. 50); see also J. de Roos (1985-86), 79.

¹²⁸ See G. del Monte – J. Tischler (1978), 188-189; G. del Monte (1992), 70.

¹²⁹ See G. del Monte – J. Tischler (1978), 148; G. del Monte (1992), 54.

¹³⁰ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 65.

¹³¹ See M. Schuol (1994), 104, 108.

¹³² See St. de Martino (1992a), 33-46; J. Klinger (1998), 104-111.

¹³³ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 136-141; A. Hagenbuchner (2002), 47; G. Wilhem (2002), 886-887; O. Gurney, (2003), 123-126.

¹³⁴ H. A. Hoffner (1972), 33.

¹³⁵ F. Starke (1992), 809 n. 16.

¹³⁶ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹³⁷ CHD Š, 114 (MH/MS?).

¹³⁸ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 139.

¹³⁹ On these three places see T. Ökse (2001), 506; G. Wilhelm (2002), 886-887; O. Gurney (2003), 123-126.

¹⁴⁰ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 138.

¹⁴¹ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 62-63.

¹⁴² See H. Klengel (1999) 132.

¹⁴³ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 60.

1.2.17. – KUB XXXI 101¹⁴⁴: this is a fragmentary letter. Neither the name of the sender nor receiver is preserved. However, by reading what remains to us of the tablet we are able to understand that the sender is the king (who obviously is not in Hattuša when writing the letter)¹⁴⁵ whereas the receivers are "bird watchers". The sovereign is reprimanding the "bird watchers" for not having accurately carried out the observation of bird flight, recommending useful indications. This letter is datable from the Middle Kingdom according to E. Neu¹⁴⁶, V. Haas – I. Wegner¹⁴⁷, Th. van den Hout¹⁴⁸ and S. Košak.¹⁴⁹ Supporting this Middle Hittite date is also the use of the expression *uwat duwaddu* (rev. 37') which appears in the letters of Mašat and which, as A. Hagenbuchner¹⁵⁰ writes, is not to be found in the letters from the Imperial Age. The content of this text is similar to the content of the letter KBo XV 28 (see §1.2.4.).

b) Letters that may be dated to the Middle Kingdom only on the basis of palaeography.

1.2.18. – KBo XIV 49¹⁵¹: this is a fragment which preserves neither sender nor receiver. The sender addresses the receiver as *BELI=YA* (l. 3'') and *EN=YA* (l. 5''). There are no personal names or place names which might allow us to identify the fragment within a historical context. S. Košak¹⁵² dates it as from the Middle Kingdom as do the CHD authors¹⁵³, although the latter with a fair amount of doubt.

1.2.19. – KBo XVIII 37¹⁵⁴: this is an extremely fragmentary letter sent by someone whose name begins with *Ka[-* to his lord. S. Košak¹⁵⁵ supports a Middle Kingdom date.

1.2.20. – KBo XVIII 44¹⁵⁶: neither sender or receiver is known and there is no other anthroponym. On l. 3': *ÉRIN^{MEŠ} KUR URU^{URU} Mi-i[š-ri]*; on l. 4': *ÉRIN^{MEŠ} URU^{URU} Hu[r-ri]*.¹⁵⁷ S. Košak¹⁵⁸ dates this fragment to the Middle Kingdom. The mention of

¹⁴⁴ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 37-40; Th. van den Hout (2001), 428-429.

¹⁴⁵ See Th. van den Hout (2001), 429.

¹⁴⁶ E. Neu (1982), 172 n. 4.

¹⁴⁷ V. Haas – I. Wegner (1996), n. 7.

¹⁴⁸ Th. van den Hout (2001), 428.

¹⁴⁹ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁵⁰ A. Hagenbuchner (1999), 55.

¹⁵¹ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 123-124.

¹⁵² Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁵³ CHD L-N, 191 (MS?).

¹⁵⁴ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 151.

¹⁵⁵ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

¹⁵⁶ See A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 192-193.

¹⁵⁷ A. Hagenbuchner (1989b), 192, reads: *URU^{URU} U-g[a-ri-it]*, even if in Hittite texts this place name is usually written with the sign *Ú*, see G. del Monte – J. Tischler (1978), 451; G. del Monte (1992), 457.

¹⁵⁸ Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

identified with the scribe of the Arnuwanda treaty with the Kaškas KBo XVI 27 + KBo XL 330²¹⁸, as suggested by J. Klinger²¹⁹, and with the sender (maybe also a scribe)²²⁰ of the *post scriptum* of the letter from Ortköy Çorum 21-9-90 obv. 18'²²¹; Atiuna (rev. 8', inferior ledge 1,3) could be the same person as the sender (the name is partially missing) of the Mašat letters HKM 49 and 50.²²²

1.3.4. – VS NF 12, 129²²³: it is not known where the tablet comes from. The text has been dated to the Middle Kingdom.²²⁴ A. Hagenbucher²²⁵ convincingly supports the hypothesis that the tablet belongs to the Mašat *corpus* of letters, on the basis of formal and content elements. The sender's name is partially damaged and cannot be read with certainty.²²⁶ The receivers are the GAL LÚ.MEŠUKU.UŠ, Nananza and Ḫattušili, the latter presumably being the same as the one mentioned in ABoT 65 and in the aforementioned texts.

1.4. Kuşaklı/Şarišša Letters

The Middle Hittite letters found at Şarišša are, for the moment, only two, KuT 49 e 50.²²⁷ Both letters are relative to oracle enquiries. The first one, KuT 49, is sent to the GAL DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL and to the “mayor” (*HAZANNU*). The second one, KuT 50, is sent by Ḫalpaziti to a dignitary of higher rank whose name or position are not, however, indicated. In this text (rev. 5-9) a letter sent by a certain Ḫandapi DUMU É.GAL is referred to. Ḫandapi had reported what the queen had previously written. A person called Ḫandapi with the title DUMU É.GAL appears in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 27, 33, 39.²²⁸ The fact that in these two texts Ḫandapi bears the same title may indicate that both documents refer to the very same person.²²⁹ See also § 3.7. for the date of KuT 50.

²¹⁸ See F. Imparati (1988), 87 and n. 53.

²¹⁹ J. Klinger (1995 a), 88-89.

²²⁰ See A. Ünal (1998), 31.

²²¹ See A. Ünal (1998) 20, 31.

²²² See S. Alp (1991), 55, 212-213; Ph. Houwink ten Cate (1998), 162.

²²³ See A. Hagenbuchner (1999), 50-58; see also H. Otten (1956), 182-183; L. Jakob Rost (1956), 348; G. del Monte (1975), 4-5; S. Rosi (1984), 124-125; R. Beal (1992), 389 n. 1470; D. Groddek (1999), 200.

²²⁴ See A. Hagenbuchner (1999) 55; *contra* see S. Košak, Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln, Online-Datebank Version 0.5.

²²⁵ A. Hagenbuchner (1999), 53-58.

²²⁶ See A. Hagenbuchner (1999), 52-53.

²²⁷ See G. Wilhelm (1998 a), 175-187.

²²⁸ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338-340, 344-354.

²²⁹ See G. Wilhelm (1998 a), 180; A. Müller-Karpe (2003), 386.

1.5. Ortaköy/Şapinuwa Letters

A large part of the tablet discovered in the excavations at Şapinuwa (lead by Mustafa and Aygül Süel) is made up of letters.²³⁰ Only three texts have, for the moment, been published on this vast amount of documents.²³¹ The five letters recently published by A. Ünal²³² and found at Ortaköy before the beginning of the aforementioned dig should also be added. All these eight texts are Middle Hittite.²³³

The letter published by A. Süel in 2001²³⁴ is full of people's names and situations of important historical interest. The sender of the letter is a person called Uḫḫamuwa²³⁵ and the receiver of the letter is the king. In a passage (obv. 6-7) there is mention of the fact that a man from the city of Maraša (most probably in western Anatolia)²³⁶ has gone, as a fugitive, to the “priest”. As has already been said for the letter KBo XVIII 69 it would appear probable that the “priest” in question here is Kantuzili (see § 2.2.). It can also be read in the text that some other persons (Kupanta-Kuruntaya, Tarḫunnaradu, Mašduri, Piyamaradu and Kupantazalma) are going to Ḫappuriya, a city in western Anatolia.²³⁷ These people are also known from other documents.²³⁸ Some of them lived in the Middle Kingdom like Kupanta-Kurunta (a form that can be considered a variant spelling of Kupanta-Kuruntaya) king of Arzawa at the time of Tuthaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I.²³⁹ Others lived in the Imperial Age like Piyamaradu²⁴⁰ or Mašduri.²⁴¹ If the Middle Kingdom date is to be accepted as the mention of the “priest” would lead us to believe, then it has to be believed that Piyamaradu and Mašduri are different people from later homonymous persons. We do not know, however, who Tarḫunnaradu is. If we support the hypothesis that he is the same person who then becomes king of Arzawa and who is known as Tarḫundaradu from the Tell el Amarna letters EA 31 and 32, he could, therefore, be a brother or a son of Kupanta-Kurunta(ya).

The letter Or. 90/800²⁴², sent by the queen to the king also contains a *post scriptum* sent to a certain Zuwa. Another Zuwa LÚ GIŠGIDRU is to be found in a passage of the Indictment of Madduwatta (rev. 51, 52), where he is in charge of a

²³⁰ See A. Süel (1995), 271-283.

²³¹ See A. Süel (1992), 487-491; A. Süel (2002 a), 818-822.

²³² A. Ünal (1998), Nrr. 1-5, pp. 17-45.

²³³ See A. Ünal (1998), 16 e n. 53; A. Süel (2002 b), 165.

²³⁴ A. Süel (2001), 670-678.

²³⁵ See A. Süel (2001), 671.

²³⁶ See G. del Monte - J. Tischler (1978), 260-261; G. del Monte (1992), 102.

²³⁷ See G. del Monte - J. Tischler (1978), 82; G. del Monte (1992), 28.

²³⁸ See A. Süel (2001), 672-678.

²³⁹ See St. de Martino (1996), 93.

²⁴⁰ See H. Klengel (1999), 264-265.

²⁴¹ See H. Klengel (1999), 262-263.

²⁴² See A. Süel (2002 a), 819-826.

military operation. We do not know, however, if it is the same person since the Ortaköy letter does not give us any information on the responsibilities or role of Zuwa.

Three letters Or. 90/1400²⁴³, Çorum 21-8-90 and Çorum 21-12-90²⁴⁴, sent by the king regard a mistake or a fall committed by someone²⁴⁵, who has to perform a ritual on Mount Haluna²⁴⁶ to make amends.

The letter Çorum 21-9-90²⁴⁷ has already been mentioned (see § 1.3.2.): the *post scriptum* is the work of Armaziti, perhaps the same as the one who appears in ABoT 65.

Lastly, in the letter Çorum 19-9-90²⁴⁸ (unfortunately very fragmentary with neither the sender's nor receiver's name) a person by the name of Kaššu, with military responsibilities, is mentioned. In a passage of the text (obv. 5') a son of Kaššu is mentioned, probably sharing a military operation.

2. Comparison of Letters from the Various Archives

2.1. If we compare the Middle Hittite letters from Hattuša with those from Mašat/Tapigga, Ortaköy/Šapinuwa²⁴⁹ and Kuşaklı/Šarišša we realize that not many persons are mentioned in texts of different archives. It may happen that well-known persons in the letters of one particular archive do not appear in other archives. This is the case, according to A. Süel, with a man who appears most frequently in the letters of Šapinuwa, a certain Kuikušanduwa²⁵⁰, and who does not appear in the texts from the other aforementioned archives.

On the other hand, some people's names are to be found in texts from different sites. The most relevant example from this point of view is the case of Kaššu. He is the better-known dignitary in the Tapigga texts, the receiver and sender of many letters as well as the sender of the letter KBo XVIII 54. Kaššu is also mentioned in the letter from Šapinuwa Çorum 19-9-90 along with his son. The presence of an adult son of him, never mentioned in the Tapigga letters, might be an element, which could date the Šapinuwa letter at a later date than the Tapigga texts in which Kaššu appears.

Other people who are mentioned in letters from different archives are: Tarhumima (in KBo VIII 22 and in HKM 69), Hulla (in KBo XVIII 69; in HKM 17, 25,

²⁴³ See A. Süel (1992), 487–491.

²⁴⁴ See A. Ünal (1998), 40–45.

²⁴⁵ In the letter Çorum 21-8-90 obv. 4ff. it is written that the fault of a scribe will be investigated.

²⁴⁶ See A. Ünal (1998), 43.

²⁴⁷ See A. Ünal (1998), 31.

²⁴⁸ See A. Ünal (1998), 32–38.

²⁴⁹ On personal names from the Šapinuwa letters see A. Süel (1995), 272, 274.

²⁵⁰ See A. Süel (1995), 272.

61, 62, 66), Armaziti (in ABoT 65 and in Çorum 21-9-90), Tuttu (in KBo XVIII 54 and in some Šapinuwa letters²⁵¹).

Other examples present more difficult problems although it is still worth mentioning them. Himuili in the letter KBo XVIII 132 could be, as already said²⁵², the same as the one known as *BĒL MADGALTI* in Tapigga texts. Hattušili mentioned in KBo XXXII 145 may be the same one as the person to be found in the Tapigga texts²⁵³ and also the Chief of scribes in the letter HKM 72.²⁵⁴ The person whose name can be restored as Pal[lana] or Pal[la] in the letter of Šapinuwa Or. 90/800 rev. 7 might, in the first case, be the same one as the person who appears in HKM 60 e 68, and, in the second case, be the same dignitary as the one mentioned in ABoT 65. Therefore, the receiver of letter KBo XVIII 38 (whose name may be restored as [Duwaz]zi) might be the same person as the one encountered in HKM 65.

2.2. A group of letters mentions a person who is never called by name but only by the title of “priest”. We have already said that the “priest” of these letters is to be identified as Kantuzili²⁵⁵, priest and governor of Kizzuwatna.²⁵⁶ We must distinguish him from the person by the same name that was the father of Tuthaliya I/II.²⁵⁷ Kantuzili “priest” is considered by some scholars to be Tuthaliya I/II's son²⁵⁸ or, by others, the son of Arnuwanda I.²⁵⁹

The “priest” is mentioned in the letter KBo XVIII 69 (see § 1.2.12.); here the matter of a border which had been brought up in a previous letter sent by the “priest” is referred to. Problems relating to the borders between the various provinces of the Hittite kingdom arose frequently, due, also, to the moving around of non-sedentary groups of people who lived on a pastoral economy.

Regarding the above mentioned point, we should be reminded of the letter of Mašat/Tapigga HKM 74²⁶⁰ sent to Kaššu by the “priest”. This document states how Kaššu had previously written to the “priest” announcing that he would not return him the twenty people (originally from Kizzuwatna) who had settled in Ziggasta. He puts his reasoning down to the fact that Tapigga was a “border area”.²⁶¹ The “priest” answered that Kizzuwatna was also a “border area” and,

²⁵¹ See A. Süel (1998), 552.

²⁵² See § 1.2.13.

²⁵³ See § 1.2.14.

²⁵⁴ See G. Beckman (1995), 25; Ph. Houwink ten Cate (1998), 158.

²⁵⁵ See lastly J. Klinger (1995 a), 93–99; Ph. Houwink ten Cate (1995–96), 68–69; F. Imparati (2003), 233–239; *contra* see G. Beckman (1992), 176.

²⁵⁶ See J. Freu (2002), 65–74.

²⁵⁷ See G. Wilhelm (2002), 56–57 n. 5.

²⁵⁸ See F. Imparati (2003), 233 and n. 15. On Kantuzili “priest”, see now also S. Herbordt, AA (2003/1) 21–24.

²⁵⁹ See F. Imparati (2003), 234 n. 16; J. Freu (2002), 67–68.

²⁶⁰ See S. Alp (1991), 262–265; J. Klinger (1995 a), 93.

²⁶¹ On HKM 74 obv. 6–7, see G. del Monte (1995), 93; *contra* see S. Alp (1991), 262.

therefore, that he would apply the very same right of no return to those people of Tapigga who had moved to Kizzuwatna.

Lastly, the letter from Ortaköy/Šapinuwa published by A. Süel²⁶² (see § 1.5.) refers to the fact (obv. 6–7) that a man from the western Anatolian city of Maraša had gone as a fugitive to the “priest”. Therefore, someone from another area, different from Kantuzili’s area had gone to him in search of protection.

It is significant that three letters from different archives, Hattuša, Tapigga and Šapinuwa give evidence of the political role that the “priest” Kantuzili had in Kizzuwatna and that these letters deal with border and fugitives issues. See § 3.3 for the date of these texts.

A further mention of Kantuzili “priest” in Kizzuwatna might be also seen in the letter from Kuşaklı/Šarišša KuT 49 (see § 1.4.) where (obv. 4) the expression DUMU.MUNUS SANGA “daughter of the priest”²⁶³ can be found.

2.3. Still on the subject of the people’s names in Middle Hittite letters, it is important to note that only in the Šapinuwa documents²⁶⁴ do we see functionaries with Hurrian names, like Mušu²⁶⁵, Purra²⁶⁶ (name which is also present in the “Prism of Tikunani”²⁶⁷, in the texts of Alalah VII e IV²⁶⁸ and in the Hurro-Hittite “Song of Release”²⁶⁹), Akiya²⁷⁰, AMAR-ti (=Hubidi). On the other hand, names of Hurrian people do not appear in the letters from Hattuša. As far as Tapigga is concerned, the only person’s name that could be understood as Hurrian is ^DŠIN-EN from the letter ABoT 60 rev. 9’, if we wish to read ^mKušuh-ewri²⁷¹ in the Sumero-Akkadian writing of this name.

All of this could mean that, during the Middle Kingdom, people of Hurrian origin were part of the administrative state structures in Šapinuwa more than in other areas of the Hatti kingdom.

2.4. I think it would be interesting to present a case here in which two letters from different archives can refer to the same persons and situations.

As has been said (see § 1.4) in the letter Kuşaklı/Šarišša KuT 50, that was sent by Halpaziti DUMU.É.GAL to the king, we can read: (obv. 3) MAHAR DUMU.MUNUS^{MEŠ} SIG₅-in Ū ANA MAHAR BELI=Y[A] (4) SIG₅-in eštu.²⁷² Results of oracle enquiries are referred to that have been undertaken for these daughters (v. obv.

²⁶² A. Süel (2001), 670–678.

²⁶³ We might also intend this expression as DUMU MUNUSANGA; see G. Wilhelm (1998a), 178 n. 10; F. Imparati (2003), 238–239.

²⁶⁴ See A. Süel (1995), 272, 274; A. Süel (1998), 552.

²⁶⁵ On Hurrian personal names see G. Wilhelm (1998b), 121–127; M. Giorgieri (2000), 278–295.

²⁶⁶ On the linguistic analysis of this name see Th. Richter (1998) 126.

²⁶⁷ M. Salvini (1996), 26.

²⁶⁸ See G. Wilhelm (1997), 283 n. 33.

²⁶⁹ See E. Neu (1996), 592.

²⁷⁰ See M. Giorgieri (1999), 64–65.

²⁷¹ See M. Giorgieri (2000), 290.

²⁷² See G. Wilhelm (1998a), 181, 185.

41). The queen had taken particular interest herself about this matter (rev. 5–9). The tone of the letter, the greeting to the “daughters” and to the king lead us to believe that these girls are princesses of the royal family.²⁷³

In my opinion it is of special interest to mention at this point that another greeting made towards the “daughters” is also and only to be found in the Mašat letter HKM 49²⁷⁴ (obv. 4–5): (4) MAHAR DUMU.MUNU^{MEŠ} humandaš [] (5) [h]u[m]an SIG₅-in [] (see also *ultra*). This letter was sent to the king by Dudduši, Atiuna, Tarhumima and by a fourth person whose name is illegible. The letter HKM 49, like KuT 50, deals with oracle enquiries.

The coincidence between the content of KuT 50 and the content of HKM 49 as well as the presence in both letters of the same greeting to the “daughters” which is not found in other Middle Hittite letters encourage me to believe that these two tablets are contemporary and both concern oracle enquiries for daughters of the royal couple, maybe during a moment in which they were suffering from health problems or it was feared they would have suffered from such problems (for the date of these letters see § 3.4.).

3. The Chronology of Middle Hittite Letters

3.1. It is not an easy task to solve the problem concerning the chronology of Middle Hittite letters. Only two Tapigga letters HKM 4 and 14 reveal the impression of a royal seal. The name of the king on the seal is Tuthaliya and, along with S. Alp, it would seem quite possible that the king in question is Tuthaliya III.²⁷⁵

One criterion regarding the chronological order of the letters is given by the study of the dignitaries who are mentioned. However, it is often difficult to identify them and, furthermore, we do not know how long they lived.

What’s more, it is also very difficult to establish whether letters which deal with similar subject can actually be put in any sort of chronological sequence within a brief space of time. In fact, theoretically, these letters might refer also to a series of similar cases that happened within a certain amount of distance between them. So for example, if we take the Tapigga letters relative to the sites of Kašaša and Kašipura (HKM 1, 5, 6, 19, 24, 25, 27, 31, 37, 45) which had undergone raids and attacks by the Kaškas, it is not possible to establish if all the letters deal with events that had happened in the same season or in a couple seasons one after the other. Or rather, we do not know if they mention episodes which were repeated in continuation, year after year and, therefore, whether they regard a period that stretched for a longer amount of time. The same case

²⁷³ See G. Wilhelm (1998a) 181.

²⁷⁴ See S. Alp (1991), 210–211.

²⁷⁵ See S. Alp (1991), 48–49; J. Klinger (1995a), 80–83.

occurs with those letters which refer to a situation of famine or a food crisis, like HKM 24, 50, 65, 80.

3.2. It is not easy to find a solution to the problem of dating the Tapigga letters. As has already been said, two documents from this archive bear the impression of a royal seal that could be identified with that of Tuthaliya III. In the opinion of S. Alp²⁷⁶, all those letters in our possession could belong to the reign of this king. J. Klinger²⁷⁷ has, however, put this possible date into some doubt after having carried out a greatly-detailed prosopographical study which revealed how many of the dignitaries who were present in the Tapigga letters where documented in texts from the time of Arnuwanda I.

As has already been said (§ 3.1.), we do not know which is the span of time that is covered by the Tapigga archives. In S. Alp's opinion²⁷⁸, the Mašat letters concern a period of around twenty-five/thirty years, up to a maximum of fifty. J. Klinger²⁷⁹ believes that this amount of time could be reduced to just a generation. I think that one can safely say that most of the Mašat letters can be dated as belonging to the times of Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III. It is possible too that some of the documents are from the times of Tuthaliya I/II.

I think that one should pay particular attention to the observation made by O. R. Gurney²⁸⁰ regarding the Mašat letter HKM 96. In this letter Išuwa is mentioned as a territory in Hittite hands, within which troops for Hatti's army are being mobilized. In O. R. Gurney's opinion, this would imply a date from around the time of Tuthaliya I/II.²⁸¹ Išuwa was, indeed, conquered by Tuthaliya I/II whilst it would seem that during the time of Arnuwanda I (as mentioned in Mita of Paḫḫuwa text CTH 146) and during the time of Tuthaliya III (as shown by KBo VI 28 obv. 12) the Hittites had already lost control of this region²⁸², even though it is difficult to say if what the documents report actually refers to a momentary loss of Išuwa, or to independence achieved by a part of the region.

On the other hand, in favour of a Tuthaliya III date for HKM 96 is the mention of the region of Ḫayaša (rev. 12'-16'), against which it would seem that the Hittite troops were forced to make some form of movement. Hittite documents do not record any news of campaigns that were waged against this particular region by king Tuthaliya I/II, whilst such campaigns were recorded under Tuthaliya III (see DS 13²⁸³ or the treaty between Tuthaliya III and Ḫayaša, CTH 42²⁸⁴).

²⁷⁶ S. Alp (1991), 109-112.

²⁷⁷ J. Klinger (1995a), 74-108.

²⁷⁸ S. Alp (1991), 112.

²⁷⁹ J. Klinger (1995a), 82.

²⁸⁰ O. R. Gurney (2003), 122-123.

²⁸¹ G. del Monte (1993), 70 n. 35, dates this letter to Šuppiluliuma I.

²⁸² See D. Hawkins (1998), 282-283.

²⁸³ See H. G. Güterbock (1956), 65-66.

²⁸⁴ See H. Klengel (1999), 130.

3.3. As has already been said (§ 2.2.), three letters from Ḫattuša, Tapigga and Šapinuwa mention the "priest", that is Kantuzili. These letters are: KBo XVIII 69, HKM 74 and the letter presented by A. Süel at the Fourth International Conference of Hittitology.

In an attempt to date these three documents we must note that in KBo XVIII 69, as has previously been shown²⁸⁵, Ḫulla (mentioned also in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 52 and in some of the Mašat letters, see § 2.5.) makes an appearance. The presence of Ḫulla might suggest a date for KBo XVIII 69 from the time of Arnuwanda I. This hypothesis of dating KBo XVIII 69 to the reign of Arnuwanda I suggests a similar date for the letter KBo XVIII 51 in which a certain Wašuwatarla is mentioned, also present in KBo XVIII 69 (see § 1.2.8.).

Letter HKM 74 was sent by the "priest" to Kaššu, also known in other Tapigga letters like KBo XVIII 54. As will be mentioned at a later stage, Kaššu's activities could be dated as belonging to the reigns of Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III.

Finally, the Šapinuwa letter could also be from the time of Arnuwanda I. A certain Kupanta-Kuruntaya is mentioned in the letter in connection to sites and people who point to western Anatolia. As has already been said (§ 1.5.), such a name could be considered as a different spelling of the name Kupanta-Kurunta, king of Arzawa in the time of Tuthaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I.²⁸⁶

The supposition that three letters come from the time of Arnuwanda agrees with what is known of Kizzuwatna which became part of the Hittite territories during the reign of this king.²⁸⁷

3.4. As mentioned previously, the Tapigga letters refer, in my opinion, to a period which corresponds both to the reign of Arnuwanda I as well as to the reign of Tuthaliya III. This impression derives from a study of the period of activity of the people mentioned in these letters, some of whom already studied by J. Klinger.²⁸⁸

Let's take some functionaries, for example, Tarḫumima, Pišeni, Ḫulla and Kaššu. Tarḫumima, as J. Klinger²⁸⁹ has noted, is in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 52²⁹⁰ with the title GAL LÜ.MEŠ KUŠ, GÜB-laz and could be the same as the one who is mentioned in the letter KBo VIII 22 and also the same as one of the senders of HKM 69. This letter has been sent to Kaššu by Tarḫumima, by Pišeni and by a functionary with the title UGULA NIMGIR-ÉRIN^{MEŠ} and whose name is not mentioned.

As has already been shown (see § 1.2.2.), Pišeni could be identified as the person with the same name found in the Indictment of Madduwatta. The episode

²⁸⁵ See § 1.2.11.

²⁸⁶ See St. de Martino (1996), 93.

²⁸⁷ See R. Beal (1986), 437-440; G. Wilhelm (1989), 30; H. Klengel (1999), 125; R. Beal (2002), 69.

²⁸⁸ J. Klinger (1995a), 74-108.

²⁸⁹ J. Klinger (1995a), 99.

²⁹⁰ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338-340, 344-354.

from this text (§§ 8–10) and relative to Pišeni (the defeat by the Hittites of a military contingent of Arzawa near Šalawašša) dates from the time of Tuḫaliya I/II.²⁹¹ Therefore, this functionary was active during the time of this king²⁹² and then during the time of Arnuwanda I.

Pišeni is, together with Kaššu, the receiver of letter HKM 23 (where Atiuna is also mentioned; for dating this functionary to the time of Arnuwanda I, see § 3.5.). Furthermore, he is the receiver of letter HKM 24 and is mentioned in letter HKM 25 sent by the king to Tatta and Ḫulla. Therefore, Pišeni is a contemporary, more or less, of Tarḫumima, Kaššu and Ḫulla.

As has already been said, the work of Ḫulla can be placed in the time of Arnuwanda I. He is mentioned in the Tapigga letters HKM 17, 25, 61, 62, in the letter KBo XVIII 69 (where there is also the “priest” Kantuzili) and one must presume it is the same Ḫulla who is in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 52²⁹³ as GAL LÜ.MEŠ KUS₇ ZAG-az.

Returning to the letter HKM 69, a first problem concerns the fact that one of the senders bears the title UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} and the receiver is Kaššu who, as has already been said, bears the title UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} in the Tapigga letters. One may suppose here that more than one person bore this title at the same time.²⁹⁴ Otherwise, it may be assumed that Kaššu, when the letter HKM 69 was drawn up, was no longer, or not yet, UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ}. In order to solve the issue, we must keep in mind that Kaššu is also the receiver of letters HKM 4 and 14 which preserve the impression of the seal of Tuḫaliya (III). If we accepted the second hypothesis that Kaššu in HKM 69 was no longer UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} we would, therefore, have to accept the fact that most of the Tapigga letters in which this functionary appears with military duties should be dated as belonging to a period before the drawing up of HKM 69, the letter which we have dated as from the time of Arnuwanda I due to the presence of Tarḫumima e Pišeni. In this case we could not really accept the date of HKM 4 and 14 as belonging to the reign of Tuḫaliya III, since Kaššu's activities would cover a time span that was excessively long (final part of Tuḫaliya I/II's reign, Arnuwanda I's reign and part of Tuḫaliya III's reign). We would have to presume that the impressions on letters HKM 4 and 14 are Tuḫaliya I/II's seal.²⁹⁵

On the other hand, if we accept the second hypothesis, that is that Kaššu was not yet UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN^{MEŠ} at the time of HKM 69, we might presume that the functionary had begun his *cursus honorum* in the time of Arnuwanda I (alongside dignitaries like Tarḫumima, Pišeni, Ḫulla) and had undertaken part of his career in the time of Tuḫaliya III.

²⁹¹ See St. de Martino (1996), 44, 48.

²⁹² According to J. Klinger (1998), 111, Pišeni might be a son of Tuḫaliya I/II.

²⁹³ See K. Riemschneider (1958), 338–340, 344–354.

²⁹⁴ See R. Beal (1992), 398.

²⁹⁵ See J. Klinger (1995a), 80–83.

Supporting this second hypothesis is not merely the presence of Kaššu in letters HKM 4 e 14 (datable as from Tuḫaliya III, in my opinion), but his presence also in KBo XVIII 54. As has already been said (see § 1.2.9.), Tuttu, who also appears in fragments 4 and 6 of Šuppiluliuma I's Deeds (therefore, where Tuḫaliya III's exploits are presented), is also quoted in this letter; this could lead us to place the drawing up of KBo XVIII 54 as from the time of Tuḫaliya III.

3.5. We have already said that letters KuT 50 and HKM 49 can be considered contemporary (see § 2.4.). Both could be dated as from the time of Arnuwanda I. In fact, in KuT 50 rev. 5–9 Handapi DUMU É.GAL is mentioned and a person called Handapi, bearing the title DUMU É.GAL, is in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7 rev. 27, 33, 39.²⁹⁶ As far as letter HKM 49 is concerned, Atiuna is quoted in letter ABoT 65 (rev. 8', inf. ledge 1, 3), a letter which can be dated as from Arnuwanda I due to the mention of Armaziti, perhaps identifiable with the scribe of the treaty between Arnuwanda I and the Kaška KBo XVI 27 + KBo XL 330.

3.6. As has already been mentioned, letter KBo XV 28 can be dated from the reign of Tuḫaliya III (as proposed by V. Haas e I. Wegner²⁹⁷) due to the presence of NU.GIŠKIRI₆ (see § 1.2.4.).

3.7. Letter KBo XVIII 14 was sent by Pazzu. In the letter Duwa is also mentioned. As has already been said (see § 1.2.5.), Duwa appears also in the land donation of Arnuwanda I KBo V 7. Pazzu, on the other hand, is also present in KBo XVIII 15, datable to a time not before Šuppiluliuma I, since this letter was sent by someone called Mašḫuiluwa who, as has previously been written, could be the person who became king of Mira at the time of Muṣili II.

In my opinion, we can hypothesise that Duwa in KBo V 7 is the same as the one in KBo XVIII 14, as is also the case with Pazzu of KBo XVIII 14 who could be the very same person mentioned in KBo XVIII 15.

In fact, we might suppose here that Duwa was at the peak of his career during the time of Arnuwanda I (compare KBo V 7) whilst during the time of Tuḫaliya III he was still alive but already old and infirm, as would show the letter KBo XVIII 14 where (rev. 8'–12') an illness suffered by this dignitary is mentioned. The old age and death of Duwa during the reign of Tuḫaliya III could explain the absence of his name in the Mašat archive.²⁹⁸ Under Tuḫaliya III the name of Pazzu in KBo XVIII 14 makes an appearance. During the time of Šuppiluliuma I, when Mašḫuiluwa wrote KBo XVIII 15, Pazzu was also old and infirm as would indicate the following passage: “(ll. 4–7) [illness] has struck Pazzu and his father's gods have begun to torment him”.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁶ See § 1.4.

²⁹⁷ V. Haas – I. Wegner (1996), 106 and n. 7.

²⁹⁸ *Contra* see J. Klinger (1995a), 102.

²⁹⁹ See CHD L-N, 371.

3.8. In conclusion, the Middle Hittite letters appear datable above all from the period of Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III. The presence in the Hatti archives of letters from the times of these kings and the absence or scarcity of similar documents from earlier periods might be due to the chance factor involved in their discovery. However, it could also be due to the formation of a steady and well-organized bureaucratic apparatus (requiring continuous and close contacts between functionaries and dignitaries) under kings Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III. This correspondence could also imply, therefore, that it was with these three kings that a deep-rooted change in the structures of state organisation had been undertaken.

Bibliography

- Alp, S., Die hethitischen Tontafelentdeckungen auf dem Maşat-Höyük. Vorläufiger Bericht, *Belleten* 44, 1980, 25–59.
- Alp, S., Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük, Ankara 1991.
- Beal, R., The History of Kizzuwatna and the Date of the Šunaššura Treaty, *Or* 55, 1986, 424–445.
- Beal, R., The Organization of the Hittite Military (THeth 20), Heidelberg 1992.
- Beal, R., The Hurrian Dynasty and the Double Names of Hittite Kings, in: St. de Martino/F. Pecchioli Daddi (edd.), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), Firenze 2002, 55–70.
- Beckman, G., Rez. zu: A. Hagenbuchner, Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter 1. Die Briefe unter ihren kulturellen, sprachlichen und thematischen Gesichtspunkten 2. Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar (THeth 15–16), Heidelberg 1989, *WO* 23, 1992, 174–179.
- Beckman, G., Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria. The View from Maşat and Emar, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Pavia 28 giugno – 2 Luglio 1993 (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995, 19–37.
- Beckman, G., Rez. zu St. de Martino, *L'Anatolia Occidentale nel medio regno Ittita*, Eothen 5, Firenze 1996, *JAOS* 118, 1998, 592.
- Carruba, O., Beiträge zur mittelhethitischen Geschichte I. Die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas. II. Die sogenannten Protocoles de succession dynastique, *SMEA* 18, 1977, 137–195.
- Carruba, O., Muwattalli I., in: *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi* (Ankara 1986), Ankara 1990, 539–554, Taf. 297–300.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, P., Das hethitische Verbum ‚sein‘. Syntaktische Untersuchungen (THeth 18), Heidelberg 1991.
- del Monte, G., I testimoni del trattato con Aleppo (KBo 1 6), *RSO* 49, 1975, 1–10.
- del Monte, G., Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement (RGTC 6/2), Wiesbaden 1992.
- del Monte, G., *L'annalistica ittita*, (Testi dei Vicino Oriente Antico 4; Letterature dell'Asia Minore 2) Brescia 1993.
- del Monte, G., I testi amministrativi da Maşat Höyük/Tapika, *OAM* 2,1, 1995, 89–138.
- del Monte, G./Tischler, J., Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte (RGTC 6), Wiesbaden 1978.
- de Martino, St., Personaggi e riferimenti storici nel testo oracolare ittito KBo XVI 97, *SMEA* 29, 1992a, 33–46.
- de Martino, St., Die mantischen Texte (ChS I/7), Rom 1992b.
- de Martino, St., *L'Anatolia Occidentale nel medio regno Ittita* (Eothen 5), Firenze 1996.
- de Martino, St./Imparati, F., Aspects of Hittite Correspondence. Problems of Form and Con-

- tent, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Pavia 28 giugno – 2 Luglio 1993 (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995, 103–115.
- de Roos, J., Who was Kiliuşhepa?, *JEOL* 29, 1985–86, 74–83.
- Edel, E., Bo 92/129, ein neues Brieffragment in hethitischer Sprache aus der Korrespondenz zwischen Ägypten und Hatti, *ZA* 86, 1996, 114 ff.
- Forlanini, M., La regione del Tauro nei testi hittiti, *VO* 7, 1988, 129–169.
- Forlanini, M., *L'Anatolia occidentale e gli Hittiti: appunti su alcune recenti scoperte e le loro conseguenze per la geografia storica*, *SMEA* 40, 1998, 219 ff.
- Freu, J., De l'ancien royaume au nouvel empire. Les temps obscurs de la monarchie hittite, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*. Pavia 28 giugno – 2 Luglio 1993 (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995, 133–148.
- Freu, J., Deux princes-prêtres de Kizzuwatna, Kantuzzili et Telepinu, *Hethitica* 15, 2002, 65–80.
- Giorgieri, M., Zu den hurritischen Personennamen in den Amarna-Briefen, *SMEA* 41, 1999, 63 ff.
- Giorgieri, M., Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica, in: *La civiltà dei Hurriti* (PdP 55), Napoli 2000, 171–277.
- Güterbock, H. G., Hittitolojinin bugünkü durumu ve ödevleri (Stand und Aufgaben der Hethitologie. [Deutsche Zusammenfassung 629–632], Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Cografya Fakültesi Derisi II/3 (1944), 621–628.
- Güterbock, H. G., The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma as Told by his Son Mursili II, *JCS* 10, 1956, 41–130.
- Groddek, D., Rez. zu: L. Jakob-Rost, Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy im Vorderasiatischen Museum (VS-NF 12), Mainz 1997, *OLZ* 94, 1999, 193 ff.
- Gurney, O., The Upper Land, *mätum elitum*, in: G. Beckman/R. Beal/G. McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honour of H. A. Hoffner Jr.*, Winona Lake, Indiana 2003, 119–126.
- Haas, V., Die Serien itkaḫi und itkalzi des AZU-Priesters. Rituale für Tašmišarri und Tatuḫepa sowie weitere Texte mit Bezug auf Tašmišarri, (ChS 1/1) Roma 1984.
- Haas, V./Wegner, I., Die Orakelprotokolle aus Kuşaklı. Ein Überblick, *MDOG* 128, 1996, 105–120.
- Hagenbuchner, A., Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 1. Teil: Die Briefe unter ihren kulturellen, sprachlichen und thematischen Gesichtspunkten (THeth 15), Heidelberg 1989a.
- Hagenbuchner, A., Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil: Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar (THeth 16), Heidelberg 1989b.
- Hagenbuchner, A., Bemerkungen zu kürzlich edierten Briefen, *ZA* 89, 1999, 50 ff.
- Hagenbuchner, A., Maßangaben bei hethitischen Backwaren (DBH 1), Dresden, 2002.
- Hawkins, D., The Land of Išūwa: the Hieroglyphic Evidence, in: S. Alp – A. Süel (edd.), III. Uluslararası Hittitoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 16–22 Eylül 1996 – Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996, Ankara 1998, 281 ff.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S., Arzawa. Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen (THeth 8), Heidelberg 1977.
- Hoffner, H. A., Rez. zu: Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (c. 1450–1380 B.C.), Leiden 1970, *JNES* 31, 1972, 29–35.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J., *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (ca. 1450–1380 B.C.), Leiden 1970.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J., The Genealogy of Mursilis II. The Difference Between a legalistic and a Genealogical Approach to the Descent of Suppiluliumas I., *JEOL* 34, 1995–96, 51 ff.
- Houwink ten Cate Ph. H. J., The Scribes of the Maşat Letters and the GAL DUB.SAR(MEŠ) of the Hittite Capital during the Final Phase of the Early Empire Period, in: M. Dietrich/O. Loretz (eds.), *dubsar anta-men – Studien zur Altorientalistik. Festschrift für Willem H. Ph. Rö-*

- mer zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen (AOAT 253), Münster 1998, 157 ff.
- Imparati, F., Auguri e scribi nella società ittita, in: S. F. Bondi et al. (eds.), *Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani*, Pisa 1985, 255–269.
- Imparati, F., Armaziti: attività di un personaggio nel tardo impero ittita, in: F. Imparati (ed.), *Studi di storia e filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli* (Eothen 1), Firenze 1988, 79–94.
- Imparati, F., Significato politico dell'investitura sacerdotale nel regno di Hatti e in alcuni paesi vicino-orientali ad esso soggetti, in: P. Marrassini et al. (edd.), *Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli*, Wiesbaden, 2003, 230–242.
- Jakob-Rost, L., Die außerhalb von Boğazköy gefundenen hethitischen Briefe, MIO 4, 1956, 328–350.
- Klengel, H., *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches* (HdO I/34), Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999.
- Klinger, J., Das Corpus der Maṣat-Briefe und seine Beziehungen zu den Texten aus Ḫattuša, ZA 85, 1995a, 74–108.
- Klinger, J., Synchronismen in der Epoche vor Šuppiluliuma I. – einige Anmerkungen zur Chronologie der mittelhethitischen Geschichte, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 28 giugno – 2 Luglio 1993 (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995b, 235–248.
- Klinger, J., Zur Historizität einiger hethitischer Omina, AoF 25, 1998, 104–111.
- Klinger, J., Zur Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches, Rez. zu: H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, (HdO I/34) Leiden-Boston-Köln 1999, OLZ 95, 2000, 5 ff.
- Klinger, J., Die hethitisch-kaškäische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Großreichszeit, in: St. de Martino/F. Pecchioli Daddi (Hg.), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), Firenze 2002, 437–451.
- Kühne, C./Otten, H., Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag (StBoT 16), Wiesbaden 1971.
- Laroche, E., *Les Noms des Hittites*, Paris 1966.
- Laroche, E., Fleuve et ordalie en Asie Mineure hittite, in: E. Neu/Chr. Rüster (eds.), *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*, 27. Dezember 1973, Wiesbaden 1973, 179–189.
- Lebrun, R., Continuité culturelle et religieuse en Asie Mineure, in: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 28 giugno – 2 Luglio 1993 (StudMed 9), Pavia 1995, 249–256.
- Mascheroni, L., Un'interpretazione dell'inventario KBo XVI 83 + XXIII 26 e i processi per malversazione alla corte di Ḫattuša, in: O. Carruba (ed.), *Studia Mediterranea* Piero Merigi dicata, Pavia 1979, 353–371.
- Melchert, H. C., *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*, PhD Diss., Cambridge Mass. 1977.
- Müller-Karpe, A., *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C. II*, Wien 2003.
- Neu, E., Rez. zu: A. Ünal, *Ḫattušili III. Teil 1: Ḫattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung* (THeth 3), Heidelberg 1974, IF 81, 1976, 321–327.
- Neu, E., Zum Alter der Pleneschreibung "ma-a-ah-ha-an" in hethitischen Texten, *Hethitica* 6, 1985, 139–159.
- Neu, E., Zur unechten Nominalkomposition im Hethitischen, in: A. Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si*. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag, Berlin – New York (1986), 107–116.
- Neu, E., Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša (StBoT 32), 1996.
- Ökse, T., Hethitisches Territorium am oberen Maraššantia: Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch, in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999, (StBoT 45) Wiesbaden 2001, 499 ff.
- Otten, H., Hethitische Schreiber in ihren Briefen, MIO 4, 1956, 179–189.
- Otten, H., *Das Hethitische Königshaus im 15. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Österreichisches Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1987, 21–34.

- Richter, Th., Anmerkungen zu den hurritischen Personennamen des *ḫapiru*-Pismas aus Tiguṇānu, SCCNH 9, 1998, 125–134.
- Riemschneider, K. K., Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden, MIO 6, 1958, 321–381.
- Rosi, S., Il ruolo delle "truppe" UKU.UŠ nell'organizzazione militare ittita, SMEA 24, 1984, 109–129.
- Salvini, M., *The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani*, Rome 1996.
- Schuol, M., Die Terminologie des hethitischen SU-Orakels. Eine Untersuchung auf der Grundlage des mittelhethitischen Textes KBo XVI 97 unter vergleichender Berücksichtigung akkadischer Orakeltexte und Lebermodelle, AoF 21, 1994, 73–124; 247–304.
- Siegelová, J., *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventurdokumente*, Praha 1986.
- Singer, I., The Kuruštama Treaty Revisited, in: D. Groddek/S. Rössle (eds.), *Hethitische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer* (19.02.1894–10.01.1986), Dresden 2004, 591–607.
- Starke, F., Rez. zu: A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (THeth 15–16), Heidelberg 1989, BiOr 49, 1992, 804–815.
- Süel, A., Ortaköy: Eine hethitische Stadt mit hethitischen und hurritischen Tontafelentdeckungen, in: H. Otten et al. (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara 1992, 487–492.
- Süel, A., Ortaköy'ün Hitit Çağındaki, *Belleten* 59, 1995, 271–283.
- Süel, A., Šapinuwa tabletlerinin tarihlendirilmesi, in: S. Alp – A. Süel (edd.), *III. Uluslararası Hittitoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*, Çorum 16–22 Eylül 1996 – *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*, Çorum, September 16–22, 1996, Ankara 1998, 551 ff.
- Süel, A., Ortaköy Tabletleri Işığında Batı Anadolu İle İlgili Bazı Konular Üzerine, in: G. Wilhelm (Hrsg.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie* Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999 (StBoT 45), Wiesbaden 2001, 670–678.
- Süel, A., Šapinuwa'daki kraliçe hakkında, in: St. de Martino/F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), Firenze 2002a, 819–826.
- Süel, A., Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History, Winona Lake 2002b.
- Ünal, A., *Hittite and Hurrian Cuneiform Tablets from Ortaköy*, Istanbul 1998.
- van den Hout, Th., Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden 1995.
- van den Hout, Th., *The Purity of Kingship. An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tuthaliya IV* (DMOA 25), Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998.
- van den Hout, Th., Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten, in: Th. Richter – D. Prechel – J. Klinger (ed.), *Kulturgeschichte. Altorientalische Studien für V. Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken (2001), 423 ff.
- Wilhelm, G., Eine hurritische Sammlung von danānu-Omina aus Ḫattusa, ZA 77, 1987, 229–238.
- Wilhelm, G., *The Hurrians*, Warminster 1989.
- Wilhelm, G., Die Könige von Ebla nach der hurritisch-hethitischen Serie „Freilassung“, AoF 24, 1997, 277–293.
- Wilhelm, G., Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı, MDOG 30, 1998a, 175–187.
- Wilhelm, G., RIA 9 (1998b), 121–127.
- Wilhelm, G., Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients, Münster 2002, 56–57.
- Wilhelm, G., Noch einmal zur Lage von Šamuḫa, in: St. de Martino/F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), Firenze 2002, 885–893.
- Yoshida, K., *The Mediopassive Endings in -ri*, Berlin New York 1990.