

of the Middle East. Muwaffaq (...) defines it as *xardal-i bābilī* "Babylonian mustard"⁶⁵). Thus Henning. In a note he adds that the variety preferred in the Middle East is universally described as "red".

We will resist the temptation to go into black, white or red mustard as this would entail a lengthy and intricate study of other words⁶⁶). It seems clear, however, that the seeds of *sahlû* were red indeed⁶⁷). They were used for this red mustard. They were proverbially small⁶⁸) like all other mustard seeds, as is known from the Gospel, the Talmud, the Koran, and elsewhere⁶⁹).

Now, what is the symbolic meaning of scattering salt and cress over ruined places? Its effect should be that the place never be built again⁷⁰). We now realize that the cress are not just "weeds" and as such a symbol of utter destruction, as has been assumed often. What unites salt and cress are their pungency and sharpness. They have a "caustic" effect on the territory where they are sown⁷¹). Salt and cress are positively applied as appetizers in food, and negatively as magical means to ensure barrenness and infertility⁷²).

Addendum. "Bright" (ZALAG rather than KÙ) cress was used for a swollen throat according to a Late Babylonian medical text, UET 4 178:2 (with E. Ebeling, *OLZ* 48 [1953] 143). "White" cress was used for "opening" a similar ailment, *hinkē*, according to the tractate *Giṭṭin* of the Babylonian Talmud, p. 69a. So the Jews in Babylonia seem to follow an old tradition.

⁶⁵) Originally published in *AION*, Sezione Linguistica, in 1965; reprinted in W. B. Henning, *Selected Papers* 2 (1977) (= *Acta Iranica* 2, VI), esp. 604f. [= 36f.].

⁶⁶) Like Akkadian *kasû*; see B. Landsberger, *JCS* 21 (1967) 152 note 70. But contrast now M. J. Geller, *Afo Beiheft* 19 (1982) 193f. (the Common Beet).

⁶⁷) The *turminabandû*-stone (red; see M. Stol, *MVEOL* 21 97) is like *sah-le-e ki x x* (STT I 108:83). Note that according to Babylonian prognostics a red forehead means appetite for cress; R. Labat, *TDP* p. 44:51.

⁶⁸) *Daqqum*, "very small" (in an incantation). The Assyrian punishment of picking up *sahlû*-seeds with the tip of the tongue, all the way from Kurban to Calah, also suggests this.

⁶⁹) Matthew 13:31, etc. (κόκκος σινάπεως); Jacob Lewy's dictionary on Mishna and Talmud, s.v. *hardāl*; Koran 21:47, 31:16 (*miṭqala ḥabbatin min ḥardalin*); W. B. Henning, 602f. [= 34f.] cites Persian and Buddhist sources.

⁷⁰) S. Gevirtz, *VT* 13 (1963) 52-62. Proved by K. Kessler, *RA* 74 (1980) 64, with historical examples.

⁷¹) I cannot believe in their "cleansing" or "purifying" qualities (S. Gevirtz, 60-62).

⁷²) This article is part of research project no. LETT. 83/6, Faculty of Letters, Free University, Amsterdam.

SIDELIGHTS ON THE AHHIYAWA QUESTION FROM HITTITE VASSAL AND ROYAL CORRESPONDENCE

Two Vassal Letters from Seha River Land, KUB 19-5 + KBo 19-79 (Manapa-Tarhundas) and KUB 23-100 (Masduris), and KUB 31-47, the Hittite Translation of an Assyrian Royal Letter of Adad-nerari I to Muwattallis *

PHILO H. J. HOUWINK TEN CATE (AMSTERDAM)

In this study I shall try to deal with three letters which are in my opinion indirectly relevant to the Ahhiyawa Question¹), although none of them actually

*) The abbreviations are those of the two Hittite dictionaries: Kammenhuber, A., *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, and Güterbock, H. G., and Hoffner, H. A., *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. Additional abbreviations are:

Güterbock 1983 — H. G. Güterbock, 'The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered', *AJA* 83 (1983), 133-138; Güterbock 1984 — H. G. Güterbock, 'Hittites and Akhaeans', *Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc.* 128 (1984), 114-122;

Heinhold-Krahmer 1983 — S. Heinhold-Krahmer, 'Untersuchungen zur Piyamaradu I', *Or* 52 (1983), 81-97;

Hoffner 1982 — H. A. Hoffner, 'The Milawata Letter augmented and reinterpreted', *Afo Beiheft* 19 (CRRAl 28, 1981; 1982), 130-137;

Houwink ten Cate 1974 — Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, 'Anatolian Evidence for the Relations with the West in the Late Bronze Age', in: R. A. Crossland-A. Birchall (eds.), *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean. Archaeological and Linguistic Problems in Greek Prehistory* (Proc. of the First Intern. Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield; London, 1974), 141-158;

Košak 1980 — S. Košak, 'The Hittites and the Greeks', *Linguistica* 20 (1980), 35-48;

Mellink 1983 — M. J. Mellink, 'Archaeological Comments on Ahhiyawa-Achaia in Western Anatolia', *AJA* 83 (1983), 138-141;

Singer 1983 — I. Singer, 'Western Anatolia in the Thirteenth Century B.C. according to the Hittite Sources', *AnSt* 33 (1983), 205-217;

Starke 1981 — F. Starke, '*kuršauar/kuršayan*-, "Insel"', *Kuhn-Zeitschrift* 95 (1981), 142-152;

Steiner 1964 — G. Steiner, 'Die Ahhiyawa-Frage heute', *Saeculum* 15 (1964), 365-392.

¹) Before the current revival of the debate which started with Hoffner's highly important discovery of a join to the 'Milawata Letter' (now KUB 19-55 + KUB 48-90 (Hoffner 1982) and was followed by two equally important, more general articles, Güterbock 1983 and Mellink 1983 (see too Güterbock 1984), three articles of a bibliographical type described the intermediary phases of the debate during the postwar period: Steiner 1964, Houwink ten Cate 1974, and Košak 1981. An important relevant study which appeared after Košak 1981 and preceded the new surge of articles is Starke 1981. The data on Wilusa will form the subject matter of a forthcoming study by Professor Güterbock. The present study constitutes an attempt to treat the early phases of the 'Piyamaradu Affair' most recently discussed by Heinhold Krahmer 1983 and also touched upon and put into new perspective by Singer 1983 in a more general article. I also hope to widen the scope of the research in question by introducing other material which is more indirectly relevant to the subject, but forms part of its background and may in part determine its dating.

mentions Ahhiyawa. In view of the growing consensus that the so-called 'Tawagalawas Letter'²⁾, actually a misnomer since it is now practically certain that 'Piyamaradus Letter' would have been a much more appropriate designation of this third tablet of an exceptionally long State Letter³⁾, should be dated with H.G. Güterbock (1936 and 1983) to the reign of Hattusilis III⁴⁾, it may be of interest to pay some attention to other Hittite sources which are relevant to this general period and more in particular to the initial phase of the Piyamaradus Affair during the reign of Muwattallis.

INTRODUCTION

Two of the letters stem from the Hittite vassal country Seha River Land on the westcoast of Anatolia. The first one, KUB 19-5 + KBo 19-79, is the well-known Manapa-Tarhundad Letter which can now be better understood thanks to the unspecified 'join' recognized by E. Laroche in 1972. For E. Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 90-3, this letter constituted the starting-point for his detailed treatment of the Ahhiyawa = Achaeans Equation. The second letter, KUB 23-100, has not been identified so far, but I think there is little doubt that the name of the writer may be restored as Masduris, the successor of Manapa-Tarhundad on the throne of Seha River Land appointed by Muwattallis. The third letter, KUB 31-47, apparently a letter from the East, has also not yet been identified because the decisive place-name has been misread. This letter may be compared with KBo 1-20, an Akkadian letter in Assyrian ductus found in Hattusa which in the initial phase of Hittite studies after the First World War has been studied by both E. Weidner and Forrer. Weidner returned to KBo 1-20 in 1969 in a long article on "Assyria and Hanigalbat"⁵⁾. I hope to show that KUB 31-47 constitutes a Hittite translation of an incoming letter of the Assyrian King Adad-nerari I (1295-1264 B.C. in the new 'short chronology' advocated by J. Boese and G. Wilhelm⁶⁾) sent to the Hittite King Muwattallis. This letter, apart from being in that case the earliest item in the 'Assyria Dossier' of Hattusa discovered so far, is of considerable interest with regard to the Ahhiyawa Question in its Wilusa (Ilios?) ramification since it may be

²⁾ See Forrer, E., *Forsch.* I/1-2, 1924/6-1929, 95-232 and Sommer, F., *AU*, 1932, 1-194 (Chapter 1).

³⁾ Cf. Cavaignac, E., *Bull. Fac. Lettr. Strasbourg* 1929, 24 (referred to by idem, *RHA* II fasc. 11, 1933, 100^b); Sommer, *AU*, 113, 192; Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 175 and 224; eadem 1983, 82.

⁴⁾ Cf. Güterbock, *ZA* 43 (1936), 321-327 and idem 1983 (cf. note 1), 135 and in more recent years Jewell, E. R., *The Archaeology and History of Western Anatolia during the Second Millennium B.C.* (Philadelphia Diss. 1974; University Microfilms), 328 (unavailable to me); Košak 1980, 41; Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 95-7; Singer 1983 (ibidem), 209. See, too, M. Popko in a paper submitted to AOF in 1983 which the author kindly made available to me.

⁵⁾ Weidner, 'Assyrien und Hanigalbat', *Ugaritica* 6 (Paris, 1969), 519-31.

⁶⁾ Boese, J., and Wilhelm, G., 'Assur-dan I, Ninurta-apil-Ekur und die mittelassyrische Chronologie', *WZKM* 71 (1979), 19-38.

used, I think, to argue that the Treaty of Muwattallis with Alaksandus of Wilusa (= Alexandros?) may stem from a later phase of Muwattallis's reign, i.e. after ca. 1285 B.C. As will be shown below, the date of the Alaksandus Treaty affects the date of the preceding vassal letters from the kings of Seha River Land.

In view of the fact that the personages which appear in the best preserved source treated here, the Manapa-Tarhundad Letter, include the writer, his neighbour and slightly younger contemporary the vassal-king of Mira-Kuwaliya, Kupanta-LAMMA-as, and the Hittite army commander Gassus, all three on the Hittite side and, figuring prominently as the vassal-king's political opponents, both Piyamaradus and Atpas, this may be a convenient moment to summarize briefly what we now think we know about Piyamaradus and Atpas during later times, in the period when the 'Tawagalawas Letter' was written. I readily admit that in my ensuing treatment of the Manapa-Tarhundad Letter, either wittingly or unwittingly, I may have been influenced by these later data. However, care will be taken to formulate alternative interpretations of its general contents which reckon with the possibility that on important points the roles of Piyamaradus and Atpas as well as their mutual relationship may have been of a different character during this earlier phase of the Piyamaradus Affair.

On the basis of the 'Tawagalawas Letter', both Forrer and F. Sommer concluded that Piyamaradus must originally have been a high-ranking subject of the Hittite King(s) who later fled from Hittite territory⁷⁾. From that moment onwards he is supposed to have operated against Hittite interests under the aegis of the King of Ahhiyawa⁸⁾. Sommer deduced that he was the father-in-law of Atpas⁹⁾ who, according to all those who studied the question, resided in Millawanda, being in some way or another a subject of the King of Ahhiyawa. According to Forrer, Atpas acted as the local representative of this King¹⁰⁾. In a number of passages the wording of the letter seems to imply that the King of Ahhiyawa, who, according to the adherents of the equation, is likely to have had his royal residence elsewhere outside of Anatolia proper and preferably on the main land of Greece¹¹⁾, also ruled

⁷⁾ Cf. Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 81-2 points a) and b) together with the references to Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 174-5, 214 and 221 and Sommer, *AU*, 79, 149 and 192.

⁸⁾ Cf. ibidem, points b), c) and e); Forrer, *Forsch.*, I/1-2, 137, 147, 149, 174-5, 176, 178, 181-2, 205; Sommer, *AU*, 192-4.

⁹⁾ Cf. ibidem, point c) together with the reference to Sommer, *AU*, 83.

¹⁰⁾ See Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 132-3, 190, 205, 214, 217, 220, 231, 252, contradicted by Sommer, *AU*, 192, 195, 372.

¹¹⁾ Cf. Güterbock 1983, 133-8: Güterbock's argumentation in favour of the equation is based on the common sense approach that the Hittites must have known the Mycenaean settlements on the southwest coast and that their description of the Ahhiyawa fits the archaeological evidence of these settlements; he gave the definition proof of the 'Great King'-ship during the time of the 'Tawagalawas Letter' and removed the single presumable example of the presence of a King of Ahhiyawa on Anatolian soil from the record. His reasoning that one should preferably think of mainland Greece is based on the attested 'Great King'-ship which would seem to exclude a localization of Ahhiyawa proper in Anatolia itself and would seem to be less compatible with a localization on one of the islands.

over territory in Anatolia¹²). What had been surmised before by E. Cavaignac, Sommer and S. Heinhold-Krahmer has now, since a recent article by I. Singer, become extremely likely, almost a certainty: this third tablet of an exceptionally long Hittite royal letter largely centers around the Piyamaradus Affair¹³). Contrary to what Forrer and all the adherents of the equation after him have thought, it was not Tawagalawas, the brother of the 'Great King' of Ahhiyawa, who asked the Hittite King for a vassal-kingship, but the former Hittite subject Piyamaradus. Independently Heinhold-Krahmer must have made the same highly important discovery. In the first instalment of a series of studies on Piyamaradus she concentrated her efforts on the duration of the Piyamaradus Affair as such, but also made very valuable remarks about the actual contents and the date of the 'Tawagalawas Letter'¹⁴).

Twice the Hittite King complains that Piyamaradus recently availed himself of 7000 civilian captives who had escaped from the Hittites and had fled across the border of Ahhiyawa (§4: I 45-46; §9: III 7-21; see, too, more in general §10: III 51 and §12: IV 11-13), but in view of the fact that such a matter usually plays a role in diplomatic negotiations when the relations between two powers are highly strained, a second and perhaps more serious cause for his anger is likely to have been the twice uttered accusation that from his present whereabouts in the vicinity of Millawanda Piyamaradus continually invades Hittite territory (§4: I 50-52; §11: III 59). Of course an unconditional extradition would have suited the Hittite King best. Actually in a broken passage the subject of extradition seems to be dealt with in more general terms (§10: III 22-50). But also a settlement which implied that Piyamaradus became again a Hittite vassal (a conditional extradition with a sort of guaranteed impunity?) had already once had Hittite approval, but this solution failed when Piyamaradus refused to honour his word that he would come along in order to receive his vassal-kingship when the ^{LÜ}tuḫ(u)kanti-, the 'heir presumptive' (?) or the 'heir designate' (?), came to fetch him (§1: I 6-15). Presumably out of fear for his life Piyamaradus had wanted to receive the vassal-kingship right "here on the spot" (I 14-15). In a not particularly friendly letter, no doubt in reply to an earlier letter of the Hittite King¹⁵), the King of Ahhiyawa thereafter offered some

¹²) See in this respect the twice uttered excuse that the Hittite King who wrote the 'Tawagalawas Letter' had entered into Millawanda (§5: I 58-61; §12: IV 14-15) and his remarks on Atriya (§4: I 36-38) in contrast to those with respect to Iyalanda (§2: I 16-22 and 27-31), the data on the 7000 civilian captives mentioned below, the alternative solution that, from the place where he now is, Piyamaradus should travel to Ahhiyawa proper also mentioned below (cf. Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 229) and, finally, the minor Ahhiyawa fragments which indicate that (presumably Anatolian) territory of Ahhiyawa bordered on Karkiya (KUB 22-56 = Sommer, *AU*, 296-7 (Chapter 12)) and on Mira (KUB 31-29 = Sommer, *AU*, 328 (Chapter 18) and KUB 31-30, two boundary descriptions, as well as KUB 21-34 = Sommer, *AU*, 250-2 (Chapter 5). See, too, below note 95.

¹³) Singer 1983, 209-13.

¹⁴) Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 82, 95-7.

¹⁵) Cf. Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 136. This answer is referred to in §5: I 53-56/7; §6: II 9-10 and 21-23.

sort of political protection to Piyamaradus since he only agreed to a conversation between the Hittite King and Piyamaradus in the presence and apparently also on the terrain of Atpas (§5: I 53-56; §6: II 9-10 and 21-23). When the Hittite King himself arrived in Millawanda, however, Piyamaradus had left by boat (§5: 58-62).

A large part of the tablet is taken up by an attempt on the part of the Hittite King to revive the second-best option of such a 'reconciliation' between himself and Piyamaradus. The favourable conditions and the guarantees offered to Piyamaradus are described at length (§8: II 56-III 6). Partly by way of a summary, but also partly as a set of substitutive, less attractive alternatives, the Hittite King asks his 'brother' to order Piyamaradus from where he now is, either to go to Hittite territory, or to come hither, i.e. to the land of Ahhiyawa proper(?), in order to live where he will settle him, or, thirdly, to go—but then in the company of all his dependents—to a territory in Anatolia between the two powers, and to continue his activities from there without implicating Ahhiyawa in what he is doing (§12: III 63-IV 7). "When you are hostile to the Hittite King, you must be hostile from an other country, but from my country you may not be hostile" (IV 3-5) is what the King should communicate to Piyamaradus in that case.

In this context there is no need for a detailed catalogue of all the contents of the tablet, but nevertheless it may be useful to conclude this summary of the more recent data on Piyamaradus from the 'Tawagalawas Letter' by remarking that in the first, rather indignant part of the tablet the earlier negotiations with Piyamaradus are mentioned at least three times (§1: 6-15; §5: I 67-70 and II 4-7): in slightly varying terms the Hittite King reports that presumably the same very high Hittite functionary¹⁶), once referred to as the ^{LÜ}tuḫ(u)kanti-, the 'heir presumptive' or the 'heir designate' (I 7), and in the other passages called the ^{LÜ}TARTENU, the 'fieldmarshall' or 'second in command' (I 9, 11, 11, 67; II 4), once called "my son" (II 4), had been sent by him over the border (I 67-68) in order to meet Piyamaradus and to accompany him to the Hittite King¹⁷).

¹⁶) Cf. Gurney, O.R., *AnSt* 33 (1983), 97-101.

¹⁷) I am not wholly convinced by Gurney's argumentation that this high functionary would have been the 'heir designate' and thus the crown prince. Moreover, in my personal opinion it is not unlikely that the arrival of this high functionary is alluded to for a fourth time in §5: I 73, though here I am actually reinstating an initial preference of Forrer which he, towards the end of a long discussion in *Forsch.* I 1-2, 98-103 felt unable to sustain. In view of the fact that Gurney may have proved Forrer right with respect to the equation ^{LÜ}tuḫ(u)kanti- = ^{LÜ}TARTENU (see, in addition to M. Liverani, *OrAnt* I [1962], 254-5 together with notes 12-17, also the treatment by G. Wilhelm, *UF* 2 [1970], 277-8 together with notes 1-16), one could go one step further and also reinstitute Forrer's initial preference that ^DLAMMA-as of the passage I 73, "[Previous]ly(?), however, ^DLAMMA-as was here!", would have been identical with this ^{LÜ}tuḫ(u)kanti- and ^{LÜ}TARTENU and "my son" of the other passages. Forrer's final conclusion was: (p. 102) "Das Ergebnis dieser Untersuchung ist also, dass unter keinem der Hatti-Könige des Neuen Hatti-Reiches (1.) ein Sohn (2.) namens Inaras eines Hatti-Königs zu dessen Lebzeiten (3.) Feldmarschall gewesen sein kann".

Actually this conclusion still holds good, but since there is reason to assume that Hattusilis III, naturally together with Puduhepa, adopted a step-son in the wake of his seizure of power, cf. E. von

A. THE MANAPA-TARHUNDAS LETTER, KUB 19-5 + KBo 19-79

Selected bibliographical references: Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2 (1924/6-1929), passim and especially 90-1 (KUB 19-5); Sommer, *AU* (1932), 170¹, 348-9 (KUB 19-5); Garstang-Gurney (*Geogr.*) (1959), 95 (KUB 19-5); O., Carruba, *SMEA* 14 (1971), 81-2 (KBo 19-79); Laroche, *CTH*⁽²⁾ Premier Supplément, *RHA* 30 (1972), 97 n° 191 (unspecified 'join'); Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8 (1977), passim and especially 173-5, 208, 222-4 (KUB 19-5), 309 (KBo 19-79) and *Or* 52 (1983), 81-97 and especially 84¹⁴ with respect to the 'join' which she did not acknowledge before.

At three points, for the ll. 1', 4'-5' and 10' respectively, the right edge of KBo 19-79 almost touches KUB 19-5: 14, 17-18 and 23, as far as its left side is concerned. With respect to a few lines, erasures at the end of a line of KUB 19-5 may be used for the text-restoration of the subsequent line on the left side of the tablet which is totally broken off. During the final stage of this study I was able to make use of an enlarged photograph of KBo 19-79 which Professor Güterbock very kindly made available to me in view of the fact that the handcopy had already been published¹⁸).

a. Transliteration

- 1 [A-NA DUTU-ŠI BE-LÍ-I]A QÍ-BI-MA U[M-M]A M Ma-na-pa-DU IR-KA-MA
- 2 [ka-a-ša-kán ŠÀ KUR]-TI hu-u-ma-an SIG₅-in
- 3 [M Gaš-šú-ú-uš X X(X)] ú-ít EREM. MEŠ KUR HAT-TI-ia ú-ya-te-et
- 4 [na-at X GI]M-an EGIR-pa KUR Uí-lu-ša GUL-u-ya-an-zi pa-a-ir
- 5 [am-mu-ug-m]a iš-tar-ak-zi GIG-zi-ma-mu HUL-lu GIG-aš-mu

Schuler apud P. Meriggi, *WZKM* 58 [1962], 66^{1a} with respect to KUB 21-37 Obv. 39'-40', the question is to a certain extent open for reconsideration. If Hattusilis III adopted ^DLAMMA-as = Kuruntas instead of Ulmi-Tessub, as surmised by A. Ünal, *TdH* 4, 127, Forrer's original idea could have been correct: ^DLAMMA-as might be identical with "my son, the second in command" of the passage "Did I not send my son, the second in command, in order to meet him?" (§5: II 4). I make this remark since I do not believe that the passage §5: I 73-II 1 may be interpreted with Singer 1983, 211-3 to refer to a single counter-visit on the part of ^DLAMMA-as to the 'Great King' of Ahhiyawa. Both grammatical and historical arguments can be marshalled against Singer's interpretation of the ll. I 73 (second part)-II 1: the translation does not reckon with the "Fortsetzungsfrage" of II 1; it is not explained how ^DLAMMA-as could have met with the 'Great King' of Ahhiyawa on Anatolian soil; it is decidedly unlikely that a vassal-king would have been referred to as a *šargus* LUGAL-uš, a "foremost King", this title being in practice reserved for Hittite 'Great Kings'. This implies that Sommer's interpretation of the passage should be retained. Singer's highly attractive proposal that the preceding lines refer to a comparatively recent example of cooperation on the side of Ahhiyawa in the form of a meeting between Tawagalawas and the Hittite King on non-Ahhiyawa territory in Anatolia (§5: I 71-72) may very well be combined with the tentative solution that the sequel to this passage alludes to the two even more recent visits of the ^{LÚ}tuḫ(u)kanti- = ^{LÚ}TARTENU and the Hittite King himself to Millawanda. The visits would have been represented in this passage as counter-examples of such a cooperative attitude on the Hittite side.

¹⁸) While working on this study I corresponded quite frequently with Professor Güterbock; his answer to one of my very specific questions is referred to in note 53.

- 6 [kat-ta²] ta-ma-aš-ša-an ḥar-zi
- 7 [^MPi-ia-m]a-ra-du-uš-ma-mu GIM-an lu-ri-ia-ah-ta nu-mu-kán ^MAt-pa-a-an
- 8 [pi-ra-an U]GU ti-it-ta-nu-ut nu ^{KUR}La-aš-pa-an GUL-aḥ-ta
- 9 [X X X^{LÚ}].MEŠ^{ŠA}RI-PU-TI ku-e-eš ku-e-eš am-me-el e-še-er
- 10 [na-at-kán hu]-u-ma-an-du-uš-pát an-da ḥa-an-da-ir ŠA ^{DUTU}ŠI-ia ku-e-eš
[ku-e-eš e-še-er]
- 11 [^{LÚ}.MEŠ^{ŠA}RI-PU-TI na-at-kán hu-u-ma-an-du-uš-pát an-da ḥa-an-da-ir
- 12 [^MX-X-X]-hu-ḥa-aš ku-iš ^{LÚ}AMA.A.TU ^{LÚ}BANŠUR A-NA ^{LÚ}.MEŠ^{ŠI}RI-PU-TE-kán
- 13 [an-da ú]-e-ri-ia-an-za e-eš-ta nu-kán a-pu-u-uš-ša an-da SI×ŠĀat
- 1'14 [^MX-X]-a²hu-ḥa-aš ^{LÚ}.MEŠ^{ŠI}RI-PU-TI-ma A-NA ^MAt-pa-a kiš-ša-an
- 2'15 [ar-ku-ū]a-ar i[-e]-er an-za-aš-ua-an-na-aš ar-kam-ma-na-al-li-uš erasure of
nu-ya-X?
- 3'16 [nu-ya-kán] A.AB.BA p[ár-ra]-an-ta ú-ya-u-en nu-ya-an-na-aš ar-kam-ma-an
- 4'17 [pid-da-u]-e-ni nu-ya ^M[Š]i-ig-ga-ú-na-aš ya-aš-ta-aš
- 5'18 [an-za-as-ma-ū]a Ú-U[L] ku-ít-ki i[-i]a-u-en nu-uš-ma-aš GIM-an
- 6'19 [ar-kam-m]a¹an ar-ku-ya-a[r i]-e-er ^MAt-pa-a-aš-ma-ya<-ra>-aš
- 7'20 [Ú-UL a]r-nu-ut ma-a-an-ya-ra[-aš a]r-ḥa tar-ni-iš-ta
- 8'21 [^MPi-ia-ma]-ra-du-uš-ma [-aš-š]i² ^MŠi-ig-ga-ú-n]a-an iŠ-PUR nu-uš-ši kiš-ša-an
- 9'22 [me-mi-iš]-ta tu-ug-ya ^{DUTU}ta[r pi-i]a-na-it EGIR-pa-ya-ra-aš ku-ya-at
- 10'23 [pé-eš-ti] ^MAt-pa-a-aš-ma GIM-an INIM ^MPi-ia-ma-ra-du iŠ-ME
- 11'24 [na-as] EGIR-pa Ú-UL pé-eš-ta k[i-n]u-na-kán GIM-an ^MGas-šú-ú-uš
- 12'25 [ka-a an-da] a¹ar-aš ^MKu-pa-an-ta-^DL[AMMA-aš-m]a A-NA ^MAt-pa-a iŠ-PUR
- 13'26 [^{LÚ}.MEŠ^{ŠA}RI-PU-TI]I²HI.A-ya ku-e-eš ŠA ^{DUTU}[TU-ŠI] a-pi-ia erasure of nu
- 14'27 [nu-ya-ra-aš ar-ḥa i]ar-ni nu ^{LÚ}.MEŠ^{ŠA}RI-P[U-TI ŠA] DINGIR.MEŠ ku-e-eš ŠA
^{DUTU}ŠI-ia²]
- 15'28 [ku-e-eš e-še-er n]a-aš hu-u-ma-a[n-du-uš-pát ar]-ḥa¹ tar²na-aš
- 16'29 [nu-mu ^MKu-pa-a]n-ta-^D[LAMMA-aš kiš-ša-an iŠ]-PUR erasure of possibly
nu-ya² X-X-X-en tu-ug[-ya]-mu
- 17'30 [nu-ya i-ia-u-en] tu-ug[-ya-mu ku-ít TÁQ]-BI
 - 31 [A-NA ^MAt-pa-a-ya ŠU-P]UR A-NA ^MAt-pa-a-ya
 - 32 [AŠ-PU]R
 - 33 [^{LÚ}AD.KID-ta-ra-aš-ya <-ra>-
aš-kán
 - 34 [A-NA ^MKu-pa-an-ta-^DLAMMA
 - 35] EN-IA
 - 36 [EG]IR-pa GUL-ḥu-un
 - 37 [[?]DUTU]TU-ŠI?

b. Translation

1 [To 'His Majesty', m]y [lord], speak! Th[u]s Manapa-Tarhundas, your servant!

- 2 [Lo and behold, within the coun]try everything is in order!
 3 [Gassus,] arrived and brought along the Hittite troops.
 4 [And whe]n [they] set out again(?) to the country of Wilusa in order to
 attack (it) (or: [they] set out to the country of Wilusa in order to attack (it)
 again),
 5 [I, howe]ver, became ill. I am seriously ill, illness
 6 holds me [pro]strated!
 7 When [Piyam]aradus had humiliated me, he set Atpas
 8 [again]st me(?) (lit., he brought Atpas [u]p [before] me): he (Piyamaradus or
 9 the *SARIPUTU* who belonged to me) Atpas attacked (the country of) Lazpa;
 10 [a]ll of them without exception joined in and which[ever] [*SAR*]/*PUTU*-men
 11 be[longed] to 'His Majesty', all of them without exception joined in;
 12 [^MX-X-a]huhas, the domestic and table man, who had been
 13 [ass]igned to the *SARIPUTU*-men, [^MX-X-]ahuhas made those, too,
 14 join in. However, the *SARIPUTU*-men a[ddress]ed [a petiti]on
 15 to Atpas in the following words: "We are tributaries (with respect to the Hittite
 King?)
 16 [and] we came o[ve]r the sea. Let us render
 17 (our) tribute! [S]iggaunas committed a crime,
 18 [but we] d[i]d noth[ing] whatsoever!" And when they
 19 had [m]ade their [tribut]e (the subject of) a petiti[on], Atpas
 20 did [not tr]ansport them. He would have let them go home,
 21 but [Piyama]radus dispatched Si[gg]aunas to hi]m and [spok]e to him
 22 in this manner: "A typ[e of] Storm God [prese]nted to you a boon, why shall
 you (now)
 23 re[turn] them?" When Atpas in his turn heard the word of Piyamaradus,
 24 he did not return [them to me]. But now, when Gassus
 25 [ar]rived [here], Kupanta-^DL[AMMA-as] sent a message to Atpas:
 26 "[The *SARIPUTU*-men] of '[His] Ma[jesty]' who are there (with you),
 27 let [them] go [home]!" And he (Atpas) let the *SARIPUTU*-men who belong [to]
 the Gods (i.e. to the temple(s)), [and]
 28 [whichever] belong to 'His Majesty' a[ll] (of them) without exception] go [ho]me.
 29 [And Kupa]nta[-^DLAMMA-as wr]ote [to me as follows]:
 30 "We [di]d [what you sa]id [to me],
 31 "[Wri]te [to Atpas about the *SARIPUTU*-men]!" To Atpas
 32 [I did wri]te [about the *SARIPUTU*-men]!"
 33 [] he [shall/did] the basket-weavers.
 34 [] t]o Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as
 35 []] my lord
 36 [] I raided [ag]ain/I undertook a [coun]ter-
 raid
 37 []] 'His [Ma]jesty'

c. Philological and Historical Commentary (per line)

- 2: See for this text-restoration KBo 9-83 Obv. 3 (presumably a letter of the
 "Syrian" Tudhaliyas of the time of Mursilis II)¹⁹; KUB 23-100: 3 (see
 sub B.), KBo 18-14 Obv. 3-4 (a letter of Pazzus, the high civil servant who seems
 to represent Hittite interests at the court of Mashuiluwas of Mira-Kuwaliya) and
 KBo 18-15: 18, *ŠA KUR-TI A-UA-TE*^{MES} (a letter of Mashuiluwas himself referring to
 the fact that the King, i.e. Mursilis II, should ask information about "the affairs of
 the country" from Pazzus who happened to be back in his home country for
 religious reasons)²⁰; KBo 18-108:3. I have the distinct impression that this formula
 always lacks a Possessive Pronoun which could have been "my" or "your" and that
 it is likely to be especially appropriate for vassal-kings and high civil servants. By
 writing "within the country" instead of "within your" or "within my country",
 a delicate choice is avoided and this might indeed constitute a diplomatic finesse.
 3: Cf. l. 24 and note the cautious suggestion made by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8,
 175²⁷³. In recent years there have been two attempts to deal with the personal
 name Gassus, one by Fr. Pecchioli Daddi in *Mesopotamia* 13-14 (1978-9), 201-12,
 and another by A. Ünal, *RIA*⁵ (1980), 473-4 (with very different results). Heinhold-
 Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 174²³⁴ already suggested that this Gassus could be identical with
 the Gassus who sent KBo 18-54 (l. 2) and 53 (see Güterbock, *Inhaltsübersicht* of
 KBo XVIII, V and now Pecchioli Daddi, l.c., 202-9). This proposal is attractive
 because the Gassus of those other letters is employed in the military sphere²¹.
 However, the name is likely to have been a fairly common one then and still was in
 much later time, cf. Strabo XII 553, as quoted by both Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 92 and
 Laroche, *NH*, n° 538. In spite of this disadvantage it would be possible to collect a
 group of examples of this name in exactly this rendering which could refer to one
 and the same person²². In historical texts, instructions and letters of all periods

¹⁹ Cf. for this political figure Güterbock, *SBo* 2 (1942), 7²² and *JNES* 13 (1954), 105 together with
 note 15; Laroche, *OLZ* 49 (1954), 326, *HH* n° 207 sub 3, and *NH* n° 1389.7; Klengel, H., *Or* 32 (1963),
 38, 44 and 53-4 together with 54¹ and *Gesch. Syr.* 1 (1965), 58 together with note 37 on pp. 91-2.

²⁰ Cf. Ehelolf, *MDOG* 75 (1937), 64-5 together with 64³; see, too, Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 183
 for the position of Pazzus.

²¹ In KBo 18-54 Gassus reports on the inspection and maintenance of fortresses (thus Güterbock,
Inhaltsübersicht, V) or the storming of a fortress held by an enemy (thus Neu, *StBoT* 5, 44-46⁵) and
 Pecchioli Daddi, l.c.). KBo 19-53 proves through its introductory formula that Gassus is concerned
 about the well-being of the *šarikuwa*- and *UKU.ÜS*-troops about which 'His Majesty' has written to him
 (cf. Güterbock, o.c., a restoration of the passage which Pecchioli Daddi apparently did not notice).

²² If one combines the renderings of the name with ^M*Gaš-šū-ū* (presumably akkadographic ^M*Gaš-šū-ū*
 ū) with those of ^M*Gaš-šū-ūš* (cf. Pecchioli Daddi, l.c., 201), the results are not uninteresting. The list may
 be enlarged by adding the examples of KUB 5-11 (+) KUB 49-21 and KUB 49-41. The likely indirect
 join between KUB 5-11 and KUB 49-21 has not been recognized so far because the examples of
^M*Gaš-šū-ū* in KUB 5-11 I 55; II 21' and IV 36' have been misread as ^M*Pi-ši-li* (cf. Laroche, *NH*, n°
 985.2). The name also occurs in KUB 49-21 I 10', while the occurrence of the name of Zuwanzas in KUB
 49-21 IV 2 and KUB 5-11 IV 39' would seem to confirm the join. The name of Zuwanzas only occurs in
 these two texts.

With the possible exceptions of the occurrences of the name in this rendering in KUB 7-61 I 2, dated

uuate- and its counterpart *pehute-* are regularly used with a military commander as subject and troops as object ²³).

4: On purpose I avoid the customary translation of *appa pai-* as “zurückgehen” (Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 90, 189; F. Ose, *Sup.*, 4 together with note 5) and “to go back” (Gurney, *Geogr.* 95) in view of the fact that no mention is made in this letter of any military activities of the Hittite troops in Seha River Land itself. The defeat of Manapa-Tarhundadas by Piyamaradus clearly was an event of the past. It thus seems that the troops led by Gassus are passing through Seha River Land while on their way towards the country of Wilusa, which they had been ordered to attack. From the viewpoint of our assumed knowledge about Anatolian Geography, a return to Hattusa by way of Wilusa from Seha River Land would be difficult to account for. A return to the country of Wilusa in order to attack it without any explanation why the troops would first have come from Wilusa to Seha River Land makes little sense.

I can think of two different interpretations of the sentence. The first one is that in the combination preverb-verb *EGIR-pa pai-*, *EGIR-pa* would mean “again” instead of “back” and the combination preverb-verb “to set out again” instead of “to return” ²⁴). The second would be that *EGIR-pa* should be combined with the infinitive *GUL-u-ua-an-zi*, cf. l. 36 of this letter. Admittedly the scribe would have made a mistake against Hittite syntax since so far no examples have been found of an intransitive verb in combination with a transitive infinitive governing an object accusativus, cf. Kammenhuber, *MIO* 2 (1954), 259 and Ose, *Sup.*, 57. In view of other apparent irregularities in this letter, the position of *-kan* in l. 12, the use of the Medio-Passive *SI×SĀ-at* in l. 13, the word-order in the main sentence of ll. 13-14, *-ma* instead of *nu* in l. 21, and presumably *tug* in l. 30 as nominative, this objection is perhaps not unsurmountable. Moreover, in order to be able to translate the sentence in the conventional manner (“to return”) or in the manner suggested

by Pecchioli Daddi on account of Güterbock, *CHM* 2 (1954), 387⁴ to the time of Tudhaliyas IV, and in KUB 49-41 I 9' (as far as I can make out, not datable at all), the attestations could refer to one and the same person. According to KUB 19-5 + and KBo 18-54 and 53 Gassus functions as a military commander; in KBo 8-57, an oracle inquiry with respect to the anger of Istar of Samuha, perfunctorily treated by R. Lebrun, *Samuha*, 196-7, he is mentioned in Obv. 8', on a par with ‘His Majesty’ in Rev. 12'; in KUB 26-49, CTH 297.6: Documents de procédure and transliterated by Pecchioli Daddi, l.c., 210⁴³ and dated by her to the time of Hattusilis III, a Gassus occurs in Obv. 1' together with a ^MEN LUGAL, a King of the country of Hakmis (possibly Hattusilis III before his own reign) and a Sahurunuwas (Rev. 9'-10'). In the oracle inquiry KUB 5-11 (+) KUB 49-21 concerning a dream of ‘His Majesty’ in Tiliura, a Gassus occurs as augur together with a ^DLAMMA-as. The latter functions as augur in KUB 5-11 I 43 (cf. Laroche, *Receuil* n° 345.3, but in *NH* n° 57.2 Laroche changed the reading to Anna) and in KUB 49-21 II 14', 27' and III 15.

²³) See, as far as historical texts of this general period are concerned, *uuate-* in KBo 5-8 III 24-25 = Götzke, *AM*, 158-9; KUB 19-39 III 13-14 = *AM*, 166-7 = *FsMeriggi* 2, 274, 280 as well as *pehute-* in KUB 14-16 I 21-24 = *AM*, 172-3; ‘The Apology of Hattusilis III’ = Otten, *StBoT* 24, 14-5: § 8 II 50-51 and 16-7: § 9 II 70-72.

²⁴) See Kammenhuber, *HW*, 149 a sub voce *appa*.

above (“to set out again”) one must assume that KUR *Ui-lu-ša* represents a dat.-loc. and that either *A-NA* or *I-NA* has been omitted, cf. Ose, *Sup.*, 4⁽⁵⁾. In its turn, *EGIR-pa GUL-ah-* could mean either “to attack” or “to raid again” or “to carry out a counter-raid”. The first translation would imply that during an earlier phase of the conflict someone on the Hittite side carried out a preceding attack or raid on the country of Wilusa, the second that in the past someone on the side of the enemy (Piyamaradus on the side of Wilusa?) would have carried out a raid on Seha River Land or possibly, but less likely, on some other part of Hittite territory.

From the historical point of view all three alternative proposals imply either that the preceding defeat of Manapa-Tarhundadas did not take place in Seha River Land itself, or that in the meantime the vassal-king had been able all by himself to restore normal conditions in Seha River Land again. Personally I feel inclined to opt for one of the two possible meanings of *EGIR-pa GUL-ah-*, while at the moment I have a slight preference for the former of the two distinguished above, “to attack” or “to raid again” instead of “to carry out a counter-raid”, (see below sub A.d.l.), but I hesitate to press this point already in the translation. Therefore I first suggested that *EGIR-pa* should be combined with *pai-* in the most ‘neutral’ solution of the three alternatives, “to set out again” (instead of “to return”).

5: See for this text-restoration Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 90.

6: See for this translation Gurney, *Geogr.* 95.

7: I believe that with the *CHD* 3-1, sub voce *luriyahh-*, 87b, one should choose for the alternative solution offered by Forrer, *Forsch.* I 1-2, 90¹ instead of for the slightly pathetic “how”, “Wie aber hat mich [Pija]maradus ins Unglück gestürzt!”, he preferred in the translation, followed by Sommer, *AU*, 348 (“Wo Manapa-Datta dem König klagend berichtet”), Gurney, *Geogr.* 95 and Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 222.

8: [*pi-ra-an UG*]U *ti-it-ta-nu-ut*: For this text-restoration proposed by Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 90 the following translations have been used so far: “vorauf (= über mich?) hingesetzt hat” (Forrer, l.c.; see, too, ibidem, 205); ““über” den hethitischen Vasallenfürsten des Seha-Fluss-Landes “gesetzt” hat” (Sommer, *AU*, 170¹ meant as an interpretation); “ihm auf den Nacken gesetzt hat” (Sommer, *AU*, 348, followed by J. Friedrich, *JCS* 1 (1947), 297 and *HW*¹, 225); “he has appointed over me” (Gurney, *Geogr.* 95); “er hat mir Atpa [voran?] gesetzt” (Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 222); “er hat den Atpa (aus Millawanda) vor die Nase gesetzt” (Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 343 and *Or* 52 (1983), 93); “he set up A. in authority over me” (*CHD* 3-1, sub voce *luriyahh-*, 87b). Personally I prefer the more idiomatic German renderings of Sommer, Friedrich and Heinhold-Krahmer to the English translations used by Gurney and the *CHD*. The remainder of the letter in its present form does not suggest that Atpas actually was the superior of Manapa-Tarhundadas, although the latter is dependent on him as far as the return of the various types *ŠARIPUTU*-men to their home-base is concerned. The predicate is

likely to mean, I think, "he set" or "pitted Atpas against me (so that I now have Atpas on my hands)". Although no certainty can be achieved, it is probable that Piyamaradus remains the subject of the following predicate GUL-ah-ta. Sommer, *AU*, 348-9 in his treatment of the ll. 9-11 in which he gave the correct explanation of the meaning of *anda handai-* (in the 13th century apparently also or exclusively Active when used with the intransitive meaning "to join in" instead of the earlier Medio-Passive forms with that meaning)²⁵), complicated matters through his text-restoration [*nu-uš-ši* at the beginning of l. 10: -*ši* would in his opinion refer to Atpas. However, when one adopts his text-restoration for the beginning of that line, the candidature of Atpas to become the subject of GUL-ah-ta rises in probability.

That Lazpa, presumably identical with later Lesbos, cf. in first instance Forrer, *MDOG* 63 (1924), 14, may indeed have been that island, would need to rest on four considerations:

a) the manner in which it is referred to in combination with Ahhiyawa in KUB 5-6 + KUB 18-54 II 57', 60' (cf. Friedrich, *KIF* 1, (1927-30), 99-100; see Sommer, *AU*, 275-94 (Chapter 10))²⁶;

b) the wording of KUB 26-91 (= Sommer, *AU*, 268-74 (Chapter 8)) Obv. 6'-7', a passage which after Starke's determination of the meaning of *kuršayar/kuršayan-*, "island", would seem to indicate that the islands in general were contested territory, (6') "Your islands which ... [.....] (7') the Storm God gave [them] to me in vassalhood" (cf. F. Starke 1981, especially 143; see, too, for his historical point of view 146¹⁸);

c) the sequel to this passage in l. 16 which says in so many words that the *ŠARIPUTU*-men "came over sea" to a new habitat, either from Seha River Land to the island of Lazpa, or, in the course of the events described in this letter, from the island of Lazpa/Lesbos to Millawanda (in both cases Lazpa would highly likely have been an island);

d) the fact that notwithstanding the objections of Sommer, *AU*, 195-6 (Chapter 2), KUB 23-107, badly preserved as it is, may still indicate in l. 19' (17' in Forrer's line-numbering, cf. *Forsch.* I/1-2, 206-9) that ships could have been made available to Piyamaradus (see, too, the commentary to the ll. 14-18).

9-14: As has been mentioned above, Sommer's treatment of the ll. 9-11 in *AU*, 348-9 greatly clarified the meaning of this passage. On two points, however, it is perhaps advisable to take exception to his conclusions. At the beginning of l. 10 [*na-at-kán* in parallelism with *na-at-kán* in l. 11 (see, too, the presence of -*kan* in

²⁵) Cf. KBo 4-14 II 75 quoted by Sommer, *AU*, 348; see Neu, *StBoT* 5, 43 for the Medio-Passive form in Madduwattas II 90.

²⁶) The date of this oracle investigation is disputed, cf. Archi, A., *SMEA* 22, 1980, 19-29 and especially 22-5; Güterbock 1983, 134 together with note 12, is opposed to Ünal, *TdH* 3, 166ff. and especially 168-70; Kammenhuber, *TdH* 7, 27⁵¹ continued on 28, 29 and 146. See, too, below A.d.4. together with note 46.

l. 13) would seem to constitute an improvement on Sommer's [*nu-uš-ši*. The likely presence of a personal name ending in -*huḫaš* in the beginning of l. 12 logically leads to the restoration of this same personal name at the beginning of l. 14. Since in both cases the personal name must be a nominative, Sommer's explanation of *SI×SĀ-at*, followed by E. Neu, *StBoT* 5, 41 together with note 8 on p. 43, as representing *handantat* is likely to be incorrect. It represents rather the 3rd person singular preterite medio-passive of this verb, being in fact a mistake of the scribe who wrongly used the medio-passive instead of the active. The beginning of l. 13 was restored in this way by Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 90.

The presence of a personal name ending in -*huḫaš* in the beginning of ll. 12 and 14 may be argued by referring to Laroche, *NH*, nos 379-385: almost all his examples show the same writing a single -*h*- in the middle which also occurs here; see, too, Laroche, *DLL*, 46. The personal name is likely to be Luwian. The three apparent irregularities in the ll. 12-14, the position of -*kan* in l. 12, the use of the Medio-Passive *SI×SĀ-at* in l. 13 and the remarkable word-order in the main clause of ll. 13-14 (direct object-predicate-subject) may have been caused by the fact that the scribe was unfamiliar with the regular structure of a Hittite relative sentence: the presence of the personal name in both the introductory relative clause and the following main sentence is in fact rather surprising. One would expect that the personal name would have been replaced in the main clause by an enclitic -*aš* or a demonstrative *apāš*. As it is formulated now, the compound sentence puts a maximum of stress on the subject of both clauses.

The *ŠARIPUTU*-men, so far only known from this letter and a few passages in texts from Ugarit (cf. the *AHw* referring to *Ugaritica* 5, 93: 15 and the note 15¹ on the unpublished text RS 25.461)²⁷), are denoted in the *CAD* and the *AHw* as "a class of persons" and "eine Art von Hofleuten" respectively. Nougayrol, o.c., suggested for the Ugaritic attestations that the men might have been employed in metalwork, "fondeurs" on the basis of *šarāpu(m)*, "to refine metals", while on the basis of this letter, l. 33, one might perhaps add basket-weaving to their occupational activities (see below l. 33 and A.d.4.).

Whereas from the linguistic point of view the apparently complicated relationship between Piyamaradus and Atpas mainly hinges upon the exact connotation of [*peran š*] *ara tittanu-* used in ll. 7-8, a historical judgement upon this same question depends on the reconstruction of the incident described in this letter as a whole. It is beyond doubt that at the time this letter was written Piyamaradus behaved as the

²⁷) J. Nougayrol remarked in this note on this unpublished text: "D'autre part, une lettre découverte à Ras Shamra en 1962 (RS 25.461) précise, aussi nettement qu'on pourrait le souhaiter, que les LÚ.MEŠ_{ša-ri-pu-tum} sont "gens du roi", et qu'à ce titre ils ne doivent pas être soumis à des taxes (NIG.KUD.DA.MEŠ) de la part du roi d'Ugarit". With respect to this letter, this would seem to apply to the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty', but not, I think, to those of the vassal-king of Seha River Land (see below sub A.d.4.).

sworn enemy of the Hittite vassal king Manapa-Tarhundas. But unfortunately the letter offers no clear indication that already at this time Piyamaradus and his (future(?)) son-in-law Atpas were operating under the aegis of the King of Ahhiyawa, while we do not know for certain that Atpas was already stationed at Millawanda. Therefore it should be conceded, that, after the initial hypothesis defended above that Lazpa would indeed have been the island of Lesbos, a choice must be made between two possible explanations of the remainder of the letter: 1) to my mind the most likely interpretation, Atpas is already stationed at Millawanda, the most important stronghold of Ahhiyawa on the Anatolian coast from the time of Mursilis II onwards²⁸), he is a supporter of Piyamaradus and becomes now involved in the affair through the incident described in this letter because the *ŠARIPUTU*-men have been brought to Millawanda after the naval raid on Lesbos; 2) during this earlier stage of the affair Atpas belongs to the group of privateers around Piyamaradus, in which case he himself might have undertaken the raid and may in fact still be on the island. In both reconstructions Seha River Land would seem to be the land of origin of these *ŠARIPUTU*-men. According to the second alternative they would refer in the ll. 14-18 to their outward journey from Seha River Land. According to the first alternative the *ŠARIPUTU*-men in question would allude to a journey from the island of Lesbos to Millawanda which, and this is indeed a strong argument in favour of the second alternative, is nowhere expressis verbis mentioned, but may only be construed on the basis of indirect indications.

These indirect indications will be duly set forth below sub A.d.²⁹). Perhaps two tentative arguments in favour of the first, preferred option may already be mentioned at this point. Firstly, the verb *uallh-*, used in l. 8, usually refers to a raid, a razzia and not to a full scale conquest³⁰). Because the invaders must have reached the island using ships as their means of transportation, they must have departed from there by the same means of transportation. Since the 'humiliation' of Manapa-Tarhundas, frankly referred to in l. 7, clearly is an event of the past already known to the King, Piyamaradus's base of operation is likely to have been mentioned in an earlier letter, too, and this implies that it may not have been deemed necessary to mention the town to which the ships eventually returned. In combination with a frank admission of defeat, any omission of painful details need not necessarily cause surprise. Secondly, admittedly the journey of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men would only be

²⁸) According to the Goetze-Güterbock interpretation of the events during the Arzawa War of Mursilis II (cf. Güterbock 1983, 134-5), Millawanda was destroyed during this war by two Hittite generals; see with respect to the time of the 'Tawagalawas Letter' note 12; during the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (cf. Jewell 1974 (note 4), 336, 344; Masson, E., *Journal des Savants* 1979, 37 and Güterbock 1983, 137) parts of its territory were occupied by this Hittite King and the vassal to whom the 'Milawata Letter' was addressed, cf. Güterbock 1983, 137 and, as far as I know, in first instance Cavaignac 1933 (note 3), 103. See, too, note 42.

²⁹) Subsections A.d.2., 3. and 5.

³⁰) See already Forrer, *Forsch.* 1/1-2, 214.

alluded to in their own address to Atpas (ll. 14-18), while according to l. 16 they "came" and were not "brought". But this does not need to surprise us either, since here it is said that all of them "joined in" of their own accord and thus voluntarily. Their position seems to have been somewhat awkward. In their own address they put the blame on Siggaunas, who does in fact belong to the party of Piyamaradus, witness the continuation of the letter (ll. 21-23).

14-18: In its present state the text is of course partly based on KBo 19-79. On two points (ll. 14 and 18, i.e. ll. 15 and 19 in Forrer's line-numbering) this new part of the tablet confirms (part of) Forrer's text-restorations. At the beginning of l. 16 I restored [*nu-ua-kán*], thinking that the erasure at the end of l. 15 could support *nu-ua(-X)*, which is a likely restoration in any case, and adding *-kan* in view of e.g. KUB 31-47 Rev. 5 (see below sub C.III.a.) and the use of this particle in *-kan aruni parranta pai-* in KBo 3-4 II 31-32 and 36 = Götze, *AM*, 50-3 and KUB 14-15 III 40 = *ibidem*, 54-5, three passages which also support the reading and restoration of *parranta*. The remainder of the restorations are either based on the context of this passage itself or have been freely restored.

From the historical point of view it may perhaps be added at this point that among the texts published so far, next to this letter in its l. 16, three other passages refer in connection with Piyamaradus to either the sea or to ships: the 'Tawagalawas Letter' §5 I 61-2 (ship); KUB 23-107: 17', 19' (ship(s))³¹); KUB 23-111: 5' (the sea)³². In a more general sense this also applies to at least four of the Ahhiya(wa) references (this time in historical order):

a) the naval raids of Attarissiyas and the man of Piggaya as well as of Madduwattas on the land of Alasiya (certainly the island of Cyprus), as mentioned in the Indictment of Madduwattas, Rev. 85-90³³);

b) the role of Ahhiyawa and Millawanda, if to be equated with Miletos, during the Arzawa war of the 3rd and 4th years of the reign of Mursilis II³⁴), cf. the recent treatment of both these and the above-mentioned events by Güterbock 1983, 133-8 in the highly important article which in combination with H. A. Hoffner's most rewarding 'join' to the famous 'Milawata Letter', KUB 19-55, (Hoffner 1981) both signalled and defined the renewal of the Ahhiyawa Debate;

³¹) See the commentary to l. 8.

³²) Cf. Sommer, *AU*, 75-6; Meriggi, *WZKM* 58 (1962), 81; Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 84, 95.

³³) Cf. 'The Indictment of Madduwattas' Rev. 85-90 = Götze, *Madd.*, 36-9 = Sommer, *AU*, 337-49 (Chapter 19).

³⁴) This episode is attested by KUB 14-15 I 23-26 = Forrer, *Forsch.* 1/1-2, 45 = Sommer, *AU*, 307-9 (Chapter 14) = Götze, *AM*, 36-9; KUB 14-16 III 25-28 = *AM*, 58-9 (see for the value of this passage Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 99); KBo 3-4 III 1a-5 = *AU*, 310-3 (Chapter 15) = *AM*, 66-7. Also Starke 1981, an article in which he established the likely meaning of the Luwian noun *kuršayar/kuršayan-* (cf. note 1), is relevant to those historical events since his determination of the meaning "island" strengthens the likelihood that the son of Uhhazitis, Piyama-¹AMMA-as(?), first fled to one of the islands off the coast before he went to the country of Ahhiyawa proper, in that case preferably different from a coastal area of Anatolia itself or one of the other islands.

c) the passage in the Treaty between Tudhaliyas IV and Sausgamuwas of Amurru about the politically motivated embargo on commerce between ships from Ahhiyawa and Assyria enforced on Amurru, which has also been treated by Güterbock 1983³⁵);

d) (not dated) the relatively new attestation of Ahhiyawa in KBo 18-135, a letter which refers to a trip to Ahhiyawa in Obv. 9' and to ships Rev. 8'³⁶).

All these passages entail that supporters of Piyamaradus on the side of Ahhiyawa may very well have helped him out with ships and other naval equipment, as far as the inhabitants of the westcoast of Anatolia would have been unable to help themselves in this respect³⁷). Perhaps it is of some relevance to add at this point that the Mycenaean sites on the southwest coast of Anatolia mentioned by M.J. Mellink 1983, 138-41, in her archaeological counterpart to Güterbock 1983, are either situated on an island, those of Rhodes and the other islands, or are situated in a kind of island-like position, Miletos, described as probably an island, connected by a dam with the mainland, Iasos situated on a peninsula, Mūsgebi also on an peninsula; some finding-spots of Mycenaean pottery and other artifacts are close to the coast, Ephesos at a distance of two kilometres, Colophon at a distance of 13 kilometers from the coast. The same also applied to Erythrai, Clazomenai and Bayrakli-Old Smyrna as well as Elaia and Pitane³⁸).

³⁵) Cf. KUB 23-1 + IV 23 = Sommer, *AU*, 325-7 (Chapter 17) = Kühne-Otten, *StBoT* 16, 16-7. Curiously enough Forrer refused to recognize the relevance of this passage, cf. *Klio* 30 (1937), 135¹.

³⁶) Cf. Güterbock, *Inhaltsübersicht*, VI.

³⁷) Actually the passage in the Amarna Letter n° 38: 10-12 of the King of Alasiya = Cyprus to Egypt according to which "Men of the land of Lukka year after year capture a [sm]all to[wn] in my country" supports the evidence from 'The Indictment of Madduwattas' (see note 33) that the inhabitants of the coastal districts were familiar with the sea and with shipping, cf. already Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 209 and 214 and more recently Otten, *StBoT* 11, 34. This in turn indicates that at the time of the attacks of the "Sea Peoples" the inhabitants of the coastal areas of the southwest of Anatolia already had a naval experience of approximately two centuries; see, too, Singer 1983, 205-17.

³⁸) It is precisely this congruity between the location of the Mycenaean finding-spots on the one hand and the data on the Ahhiyawa as well as the presence of Hieroglyphic monuments of Empire times on the other which in last instance proves the equation as such, cf. the map in Güterbock 1984 (see note 1), 115. The underlying assumption for the historical evaluation of the Manapa Tarhundass Letter needs to be that, in combination with the geographical equations Millawanda = Miletos, Apasa = Ephesos, Lazpa = Lesbos and Wilusa = Ilios, Seha River Land should be localized in a northern region of the westcoast, i.e. either the Kaikos valley as assumed by Garstang-Gurney, *Geogr.* 96 (cf. the recent evaluations of the evidence in *TdH* 8, 341-5 and *RGTC* 6, 547-8) or the Hermos valley. The Manapa-Tarhundass Letter shows that Gassus arrived in Seha River Land in the company of Kupanta-DLAMMA-as, presumably having come to Mira-Kuwaliya by way of Sallapa, cf. KUB 14-15 II 7-10 = *AM*, 48-9; the Kupanta-DLAMMA-as Treaty § 5 D 38-39 = *SV* I, 110-1 and the 'Tawagalawas Letter' § 1: I 6 = *AU*, 2-3. This entails that Mira-Kuwaliya was situated both more inland and more to the south than Seha River Land. On two occasions Güterbock argued that the Karabel Inscription C marks a 13th century border of one of the Hittite vassal-states, first choosing for Haballa and then for Mira-Kuwaliya, *IM* 17, 1967, 63-71 and especially p. 70; *Boğazköy* 5 (1975), 51-3. In my opinion the latter solution is best served by the additional hypothesis that at Karabel a more southern Mira borders on a more northern Seha River Land. The Hittites (see below sub A.d.1., for the Campaign of Gassus) may have used the road from Classical times described by G. E. Bean, *Aegean Turkey* (London, 1966), 55-8, 96 which led from

21: Actually one would have expected *nu* instead of *-ma* in Hittite, cf. Friedrich, *HE* 1 (1960²) § 313. This may also constitute a mistake of the scribe.

22: For ^DU-tar cf. KUB 49-84: 9', KUB 50-20 I 11' and 14' and KUB 50-112 I 8' and 10'.

24-25: See for this free restoration KBo 8-23: 6' and 10' (*ka-a ar-*) and ABoT 60 Obv. 11 (*an-da ar-*).

26: See for the reading and restoration of the right half of this line Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 309 and Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 91, respectively. The erasure at the end of this line has been used in the restoration of the beginning of the next.

27-28: See Forrer, *Forsch.* I/1-2, 91 for the reading *tar²-na-as* at the end of the l. 28.

The sign at the beginning of KUB 19-5 is likely to be *-ha* and, after l. 20 above, this leads to *ar]-ha¹ tar²-na-as* which may then be used to restore the beginning of l. 27 (the photograph shows that, while the upper part of KBo 19-79 runs more straight than in the handcopy, the lower part turns off more to the right: this entails that from l. 26 onwards there is perhaps more space to be filled at the left than the handcopy suggests). The restorations at the end of l. 28 and the beginning of l. 29 are based on Sommer's restoration of the ll. 10-11, cf. *AU*, 348 (see above).

29-32: Highly tentative, free text-restorations in order to show the likely syntactic structure of the passage. The erasure at the end of l. 29 has been used to restore the beginning of l. 30 (the photograph of KBo 19-79 seems to show the upper parts of *tu-* and *-ug*). The use of *tug* instead of *zig* would seem to be another mistake of the scribe which could indicate that in his own language the accusative (and the dat.-loc.?) of the Personal Pronoun 2nd person Singular had replaced the nominative.

33: See with respect to ^{LÜ}AD.KID-tara- Sommer, *OLZ* 33 (1930), 757-8 and below sub A.d.3.

36: See below sub A.d.5.

d. The Content of the Manapa-Tarhundass Letter

It now appears that, contrary to the opinion or the expectations of Forrer, *Forsch.* I 1-2, 189, 213, 214, 252, the preserved part of the Manapa-Tarhundass Letter is not devoted to retaliatory measures taken by Atpas, is not devoted either, as expected quite recently by Singer 1983, 210, to an attempt on the part of Manapa-Tarhundass to drum up Hittite aid against Piyamaradus and Atpas³⁹), but

the Tire valley belonging to the territory of Ephesos over the Karabel pass to modern Emirelem, the lowest point at which the Hermos could be forded: even in the 5th Century B.C. no bridge over the Hermos existed. This is an attractive solution in view of the fact that Heinhold-Krahmer's treatment of the history of Arzawa has shown that in the 13th century B.C. especially Mira-Kuwaliya replaced the state of Arzawa after its defeat by Mursilis II. See, too, below sub B. together with note 94.

³⁹) But see below sub A.d.8. (points 2. and 3.) for a renewed attempt to integrate these presupposi-

deals instead with a 'diplomatic incident' concerning two groups of *ŠARIPUTU*-men, presumably workers of a relatively low social standing.

Perhaps it is useful to enumerate what the letter does *not* treat in detail within the context of its actual subject matter: 1) no mention is made of any military activities of the Hittite forces led by Gassus after their arrival in Seha River Land; 2) Manapa-Tarhundas is very frank and outspoken in his reference to his earlier 'defamation' or 'humiliation', but gives no details at all about this military defeat of the past; 3) with the exception of [^MX-X]-Jahuhas none of the persons mentioned is specifically identified with regard to his identity, so the King knew all the others, at least he must already have known who they were and what they had done in the past; 4) (but this only applies to the preferred option set forth in the commentary to ll. 9-14 and thus is highly subjective) it is not mentioned how the *ŠARIPUTU*-men changed hands from Piyamaradus to Atpas.

1. *The Campaign of Gassus*

I believe that the fact that [Gassus] has arrived with his forces and is now progressing towards the country of Wilusa, but that Manapa-Tarhundas has been unable to join him on account of a serious illness constitutes the first news item of the letter. This illness is not associated with either one of the earlier military events, but perhaps it is relevant to add that, at the moment the letter was written, the vassal-king must have been either in his forties or in his fifties, depending on the date of these events during the reign of Muwattallis, either early in his reign during his first decade as a King, or at some time during the second part of his reign ca. 1285 B.C. (see below sub A.e. and C.). The ll. 4-6 probably entail that under normal circumstances participation in the continuation of Gassus's campaign would have been an obligation of Manapa-Tarhundas on account of his duties as a vassal-king⁴⁰). If correctly restored, the ll. 24-25 and 29-32 would suggest that Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as, the vassal-king of Mira-Kuwaliya, did in fact accompany Gassus when the latter reached Seha River Land, presumably also accompanying Gassus when the troops resumed their campaign towards the country of Wilusa.

I concluded above that the customary interpretation of l. 4, "to return to the country of Wilusa in order to attack (it)", is unlikely to be correct. The most 'neutral' of the three alternative solutions proposed in the commentary, "[And whe]n [they . . .] set out again (?) to the country of Wilusa in order to attack (it)", would have no major implications for the historical background of the letter. The translation second in line, "to raid again", would best be served with the additional hypothesis that Manapa-Tarhundas's crushing defeat would have occurred in

tions. Singer, l.c., adheres to the opinion about the contents of the letter formulated by Sommer, *AU*, 348-9; see, too, Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 173.

⁴⁰) Cf. Korošec, V., *HSV*, 62-3, 72-3; Kestemont, G., *Diplomatique et Droit en Asie Occidentale* (1600-1200 av. J.C.) (Louvain-La-Neuve, 1974), 370-99.

connection with a first, unsuccessful raid on Wilusa carried out by Manapa-Tarhundas. The third possible translation, "to carry out a counter-raid", would have the effect of suggesting that there existed a connection between Wilusa and Piyamaradus, while it would offer no indication with respect to the battlefield of the previously mentioned defeat of Manapa-Tarhundas. Such a hypothetical reconstruction of the historical events would have the distinct advantage that the moot problem of Piyamaradus's former position in the Anatolian hierarchy would have been solved: it would be possible to adduce the badly preserved passage in the Alaksandus Treaty according to which, in Friedrich's interpretation, political unrest in Wilusa itself would have forced Alaksandus to retreat temporarily from his homeland (see below sub A.e.); during this period Piyamaradus could have possessed an independent power-base in Wilusa, while it would become intelligible why the 'Tawagalawas Letter' suggests at least a temporal link between a recent reconciliation between the two main powers on the westcoast with regard to Wilusa and the more personal reconciliation between the Hittite King and Piyamaradus. However, the overall feasibility of such a tentative reconstruction can only be appreciated in an over-all treatment of the data on Wilusa which is currently undertaken by Professor Güterbock. It would be unwise, I think, to formulate an in fact probably premature stand in this matter on the basis of these early data alone. Both the second and the third alternative translation would involve that Manapa-Tarhundas, like Muwattallis in a later(?) phase of the conflict, would have sided with Alaksandus⁴¹). The third alternative would imply that, at least temporarily, Wilusa would have been in possession of a political figure who at a later stage of his career cooperated with Ahhiyawa.

2. *The Intervention of Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as*

The preferred option advocated in the commentary to ll. 9-14 implying that the *ŠARIPUTU*-men would have come by ship from the island of Lazpa/Lesbos [to Millawanda] (= Miletos?)⁴²) instead of the alternative possibility that l. 16 would refer to their original journey from Seha River Land to the island of Lazpa/Lesbos, may be supported with a reference to the fact that, according to the ll. 24-25 in the larger context of the ll. 24-32, Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as exerted political pressure on Atpas to release the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty'. Three of the smaller and at first sight less rewarding Ahhiyawa texts seem to indicate that parts of Anatolia in possession of the King of Ahhiyawa bordered on the vassal-country of Mira-Kuwaliya⁴³). It could perhaps be argued that Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as may have

⁴¹) See below A.e. together with note 63 for another earlier common enterprise during the final years of Mursilis II.

⁴²) See for the likely identity of Millawanda and Miletos most recently Güterbock 1983, 138; Mellink 1983, 139-40.

⁴³) See note 12 above as well as note 95 below.

exerted this pressure—possibly together with Gassus, cf. the 1st person Plural of the Preterite in l. 30, as supported by the erasure at the end of the preceding line—as the Hittite ruler of a neighbouring country. However, this role as a mediator for either Kupanta-DLAMMA-as alone, or for him in combination with a Hittite army commander, would necessarily imply that at least Kupanta-DLAMMA-as, but possibly the Hittite King as well, had not been directly involved in the preceding military clashes between Manapa-Tarhundadas and Piyamaradus.

3. *The Position of Atpas*

Throughout the preserved part of the letter, Piyamaradus is clearly and repeatedly described as Manapa-Tarhundadas's embittered opponent, this in contrast to Atpas who seems to be susceptible to pressure from the Hittite side. If, as I tried to argue, Atpas would have already been stationed [in Millawanda] and already functioned as the political representative of the King of Ahhiyawa in this town (but not of course if at that time he was included in a group of partisans of Piyamaradus on the island of Lazpa/Lesbos) such a position might have secured him perhaps a sort of 'diplomatic immunity'. At the same time this position would have obliged him not to offend the Hittites too openly, this at least on the basis of the additional, likely proviso that no state of open warfare would have prevailed between the two powers⁴⁴). This is precisely what he does: (ll. 26-28) asked to send the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' home, he releases the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of the Gods (i.e. of the temples) and of 'His Majesty'. But it seems as if at that point of the negotiations no agreement has yet been reached about the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of Manapa-Tarhundadas.

I should indeed like to suggest that the remainder of the letter is devoted to the question of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of the vassal-king. In the beginning of the passage describing the background of the 'diplomatic incident' which seems to constitute the second and presumably the most important subject of the letter, ll. 9-10, the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of Manapa-Tarhundadas are mentioned before those of 'His Majesty'; in l. 33 the Enclitic Personal Pronoun *-aš* in ^{LU}AD.KID-*ta-ra-aš-ua(-ra)-aš-kán* probably refers to Atpas since the line still belongs to Kupanta-DLAMMA-as's report about the outcome of his intervention (cf. the use of *-ua(r)-*); the subsequent line indicates that Manapa-Tarhundadas did not change the subject of the letter, witness its reference to Kupanta-DLAMMA-as). The ll. 26-28 would seem to indicate that the

⁴⁴) The important issue whether there ever existed a state of open warfare between the two powers is of course closely connected with the localization of Ahhiyawa proper. The four main textual sources, a) the Annals of Mursilis II with respect to his Arzawa War, b) the Manapa Tarhundadas Letter, c) the 'Tawagalawas Letter', and d) the 'Milawata Letter', all four presuppose highly strung diplomatic tension, but none of them shows concrete evidence for a direct military clash between the two powers. The friction seems to have arisen through the dealings with and of vassals, local Anatolian subjects or protégés of either Ahhiyawa or Hattusa, cf. Goetze, A., *Kleinasien*², 183 quoted by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 177. Both scholars, however, only concluded that Ahhiyawa would have been further removed from Hattusa than Arzawa and Lukka, not that it would have been situated outside of Anatolia itself.

release of Manapa-Tarhundadas's *ŠARIPUTU*-men had even not yet been asked for. This point, admittedly as far as the ll. 33-34 are concerned, based on a hopelessly broken part of the letter, could constitute a valuable indication that Manapa-Tarhundadas may have injured the interests of Ahhiyawa.

4. *The Data on the ŠARIPUTU-men*

As intimated above, the *ŠARIPUTU*-men based on Lazpa/Lesbos were partly in the service of Manapa-Tarhundadas (ll. 9-10) and partly in the service of 'His Majesty' (ll. 10-11, 26-27). In the sequel to this second passage, with regard to the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' two groups are distinguished, the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of the Gods, presumably connected with one or more temples on the island (l. 27) and the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' (ll. 27-28). In view of the fact that from Old Hittite times onwards the Temple was dependent on the Palace⁴⁵), one may probably infer that the *ŠARIPUTU*-men working in or for the temple(s) have been included in those of 'His Majesty' of the previous passage. Nevertheless, the passage is of some interest since it may be compared with the well-known paragraph of the Oracle Inquiry KUB 5-6 + KUB 18-54 (II 57'-65') which refers to the Deity of Lazpa next to the Deity of Ahhiyawa (ll. 57', 60')⁴⁶). The two passages in the Hittite texts referring to Lazpa would both seem to point to the likely presence of at least one temple on the island of Lesbos.

The last point to be dealt with in this respect concerns the *ŠARIPUTU*-men led by [Mx-x]ahuhas mentioned in ll. 12-14 of the letter. In principle they may have been identical with the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of the Gods mentioned in ll. 27-28, but, in view of the fact that the latter would seem to constitute a subgroup of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty', it is more logical to assume that [Mx-x]ahuhas was the perhaps minor Hittite official responsible for the defection of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty'.

5. *The role of Piyamaradus and Siggaunas in the Incident*

The letter does not refer explicitly to the whereabouts of Piyamaradus during the 'diplomatic incident' concerning these *ŠARIPUTU*-men. He must have been close enough to the place where Atpas stayed to hear about the request of presumably the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' to be released in order to be able to render their tribute to the Hittite King⁴⁷), but at the same time far enough removed not to interfere personally. His whereabouts is closely connected with those of Siggaunas (unfortunately not mentioned in any other Hittite text) since he dis-

⁴⁵) See Klengel, H., *SMEA* 16 (1975), 181-200, 'Zur ökonomischen Funktion der hethitischen Tempel'.

⁴⁶) See the commentary to l. 8 together with note 26; the text was treated by Sommer, *AU*, 275-94 (Chapter 10); see for this passage *AU*, 282-3 and 289-91.

⁴⁷) It appears from the Ugaritic text referred to above in note 27 that at least part of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men, those of 'His Majesty', were only and specifically obliged to render tribute to the Hittite King. This could confirm my tentative conclusion at the end of the preceding subsection.

patches Siggaunas as his personal messenger to Atpas (l. 21). The second datum on Siggaunas contained in the letter consists of the information of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' to Atpas that, not they themselves, but Siggaunas was responsible for their awkward situation which prevented them from fulfilling their normal obligations towards the Hittite King. Within the preferred option defended above the combination of these data would indicate that Siggaunas was a partisan of Piyamaradus who had brought the *ŠARIPUTU*-men from the island of Lazpa/Lesbos [to Millawanda], that later Siggaunas rejoined Piyamaradus, and that both were now in the vicinity of this town.

In the alternative solution which implies that Atpas himself stayed on the island of Lazpa/Lesbos, the messenger Siggaunas, in that case possibly a Hittite official who had defected to the camp of Piyamaradus, would simply have travelled from one part of the island to another in order to deliver his message. With respect to the alternative solution, the broken off sentence of l. 36 is highly tantalizing: only the predicate is preserved, "I raided [ag]ain" or "I undertook a [cou]nter-raid". One would like to know whether, with Manapa-Tarhundadas as the likely subject, the island of Laspa/Lesbos may have constituted the direct object. In principle it would be possible to surmise that Manapa-Tarhundadas might have undertaken a counter-raid against Lazpa/Lesbos in order to retrieve his personal *ŠARIPUTU*-men and that in this part of the letter he reports this action to the Hittite King. In that case the island of Lazpa/Lesbos could in fact have formed the scene of action of the main previous events mentioned in the letter.

However, in favour of the preferred option it may be remarked that the manner in which the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' refer to their outward journey, "We came o[ve]r the sea" (l. 16), possibly meaning in practice "We were brought" since they are dependent on Atpas as far as their transport for the return journey is concerned (cf. the usage of *arnu-* in l. 20), and then proceed with their appeal by putting the blame on Siggaunas, "[S]iggaunas sinned, [but we] d[i]d noth[ing] whatsoever (i.e. we were not to blame at all)" (ll. 17-18), may very well entail that neither they themselves, nor, for that matter, Atpas had actively been involved in their arrival at their present whereabouts, presumably Millawanda. When one combines these data with the fact that thereafter Piyamaradus intervenes by sending Siggaunas to Atpas, the same Siggaunas who has been blamed by the *ŠARIPUTU*-men for their present awkward situation, and then reads that the gist of the message of Piyamaradus, reported by Siggaunas, is, "A ty[pe of] Storm God [prese]nted to you a boon, why shall you (now) re[turn] them?", i.e. more or less "You got them as a present from heaven!" (ll. 22-23), it becomes attractive to infer that they may have been brought to [Millawanda] without Atpas's explicit consent and not through his own efforts. This would entail that they had in fact been brought from the island of Lazpa/Lesbos by Siggaunas on the orders of Piyamaradus. One may call to mind that, according to the later "Tawagalawas Letter", Piyamaradus raided

Hittite territory and that according to the same source he had recently brought Hittite civilian captives over the border of Ahhiyawa and that Hittite fugitives were in the habit of seeking refuge with him⁴⁸). Interpreted in this manner the second section of the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter beautifully illustrates, I think, how Atpas, the political representative(?) of the King of Ahhiyawa in [Millawanda], got caught between two fires, being first put under pressure by Piyamaradus that he should not return the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' and later by Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as that he should in fact send them home.

6. *The Position and location of Piyamaradus*

The preceding attempt to extract the maximum of historical information from the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter admittedly is highly tentative as well as strongly adjusted to the evidence of the later 'Tawagalawas Letter'⁴⁹), at least as far the character of the relationship between Piyamaradus and Atpas is concerned and with respect to the behaviour ascribed to Piyamaradus. However, this hypothetical interpretation leaves two major questions unanswered which also arose out of the interpretation of the 'Tawagalawas Letter': 1) when and for which reason did Piyamaradus change sides to Ahhiyawa, and 2) what was his position in the Anatolian hierarchy before that date. So far I have only reckoned with either one of two possibilities, a) that also during this earlier phase of the affair Piyamaradus would have acted with the tacit support of Atpas, already in the service of the King of Ahhiyawa (the preferred option), or b) that Atpas, his future(?) son-in-law, was dependent on Piyamaradus and did not yet reside in Millawanda (the alternative solution). But it is in fact not necessary to operate with such a clear opposition of two alternatives which only differ as to the dependence of the one on the other. It would be possible to assume that the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter could stem from exactly this hypothetical earliest phase during which Piyamaradus still possessed a personal independent power-base and that Atpas was already stationed in Millawanda. In the previous literature on the subject three scholars suggested that (a part of) Arzawa could constitute a suitable choice in this respect⁵⁰). This suggestion would have the unmistakable benefit that it would explain the close cooperation between Piyamaradus and Atpas attested by the Manapa-Tarhundadas

⁴⁸) It may perhaps be recalled at this point that the *Iliad*, Book IX, ll. 270-276 and 663-665 refers to a raid of Achilles and other assailants of Troy on the island of Lesbos which also resulted in human spoils. In an admittedly tentative manner this evidence strengthens the likelihood that warlike efforts concerning Wilusa may have taken place in connection with a raid on Lazpa/Lesbos. See the Introduction for the later activities of Piyamaradus of this type.

⁴⁹) The most relevant other texts would seem to be KBo 19-78 and KBo 16-35, both recently treated by Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 90-3; see with respect to the former also Singer 1983, 209. I am not sure whether KUB 6-50, dealt with in more recent years by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 226-7 and 310-1, should be added to this list.

⁵⁰) Cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 224³³³ referring to Kinal, A., *Arzawa*, 44; Landsberger, B., *JCS* 8 (1954), 126³⁰⁰ and Mellaart, J., *Mélanges Mansel I* (1974), 508.

Letter. Above sub A.d.1. I mentioned the possibility that one could also speculate about the possibility that, during the earliest phase of the Piyamaradus Affair attested by the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter, Wilusa could have been (possibly temporarily?) the independent power-base of Piyamaradus.

7. *The Possibilities for wider Political Implications*

Within the letter the name of Ahhiyawa is absent, a fact which proves the philologist Sommer right in not including the letter in his major work on the Ahhiyawa Question, while, nevertheless, on account of the combined evidence the letter offers on Piyamaradus, Atpas and the countries Wilusa and Lazpa/Lesbos, the historian Forrer may have been right in taking the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter as his starting-point for his treatment of the 'Tawagalawas Letter' and the Ahhiyawa Question in general. In *Forsch.* I/1-2, 183, 187-90, 213 and 252-3, Forrer stated, truly within a different chronological reconstruction⁵¹), that before the Alaksandus Treaty Wilusa would have been an independent state which traditionally maintained good relations with Hattusa, but after the treaty a vassal-state included in the group of henceforth four vassal-states of Arzawa⁵²). Forrer repeatedly argued that the attack on the country of Wilusa mentioned in the letter would have constituted the reason for the conflict between Hattusa and Ahhiyawa referred at the end of the 'Tawagalawas Letter', §12: IV 7-10⁵³). Whether this conflict really is relevant or not, depends on the dating of the 'Tawagalawas Letter' during the reign of Hattusilis III and the resulting time span between the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter and this later source, but these considerations leave the possibility of a connection between the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter and the treaty unscathed. It is, I think, legitimate to consider the possibility that the contents of the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter in its enlarged form may have had in fact wider political implications. Three data stand out: 1) In both explanations of the main subject of the second part of the letter the island(?) Laspa/Lesbos would seem to have been coveted by representatives of the two important powers on the west coast, Ahhiyawa and Hattusa, in the persons of Piyamaradus and Manapa-Tarhundas

⁵¹) Forrer dated the events mentioned in the 'Tawagalawas Letter' to the reign of Mursilis II. cf. *Forsch.* I/1-2, 97-8 and 104-5.

⁵²) Also the contents of the term "the four Arzawa countries" must nowadays, after the appearance of Heinhold-Krahmer's major study on the history of Arzawa, be differently interpreted: three highly important theses of her book, *TdH* 8, are that a) after Mursilis II's fourth year no 'Arzawa minor' existed, that b) no later change took place with respect to the political position of Seha River Land, and that c) after the conclusion of the Alaksandus Treaty the above-mentioned four Arzawa countries consisted of Haballa, Mira-Kuwaliya, Seha River Land and Wilusa.

⁵³) (The King of Ahhiyawa should tell Piyamaradus): "We, the King of Hattusa (and) I, were at odds over the [matt]er of (the town of) Wil[us]a, but he persuaded [m]e in th[at] matter, and we became reconciled. [Now, however,] hostility between us is not permitted" (cf. the *CHD* 3-1 sub voce *laknu-*, 20 a). More recent doubts expressed with respect to the reading of [IN]M URU *U-i-l[u]-[š]a* (IV 8) by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 175-6 and 350; eadem 1983, 90; Singer 1983, 213-4, are in fact unfounded (personal communication by Professor Güterbock, July 9, 1984); see, too, Güterbock 1984, 120.

respectively. 2) Wilusa also played a role in the conflict (see below sub A.e.). 3) Direct and personal involvement of Atpas and thus an open confrontation between Atpas and the Hittite King seems to have been warded off through his yielding to the pressure exerted by Kupanta-DLAMMA-as with respect to the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty'. In the following enumeration of the main events attested by the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter, highly speculative remarks have been added within parentheses. The majority results from an admittedly biased attempt to try out whether Forrer's point of view is still reconcilable with the data contained in the letter.

8. *The Data attested by the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter*

The letter would seem to refer and to attest to the following events which are likely to have taken place in the following sequence: 1) the 'defamation' of Manapa-Tarhundas by Piyamaradus (which may either have taken place in connection with a first, unsuccessful raid on the country of Wilusa by Manapa-Tarhundas, or else was brought about by Piyamaradus operating from or on the side of Wilusa);

2) (implicitly) an appeal sent by Manapa-Tarhundas in which he asked the Hittite King for support (cf. Singer's suggestion referred to above about the contents of the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter) after which Gassus departs with a regular Hittite army (possibly for a second attack on the country of Wilusa or else for a reprisal);

3) a raid on the island of Lazpa/Lesbos by Piyamaradus(?) (possibly in retaliation of Manapa-Tarhundas's attempt to intervene in Wilusa, or else undertaken in the wake of an earlier attack on Seha River Land itself; possibly ventured upon with the support of Atpas, cf. Forrer's repeatedly uttered suggestion that the Manapa-Tarhundas Letter could have been devoted to retaliatory measures by Atpas);

4) the transportation of the two types of *ŠARIPUTU*-men from the island of Lazpa/Lesbos to [Millawanda] (only valid within the preferred option: presumably on the orders of Piyamaradus and put into effect by Siggaunas; the fact that also *ŠARIPUTU*-men of the Hittite King were taken along may have threatened to widen the conflict and may therefore have been unwelcome to Atpas);

5) a petition of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men (of 'His Majesty') to be allowed to render their tribute (to the Hittite King) addressed to Atpas (within the preferred option they would have indirectly requested transportation for a return journey to Seha River Land);

6) Atpas's rejection of this petition after an intervention by Piyamaradus, who sends Siggaunas (the 'bearer of the original gift');

7) the arrival of Gassus and his regular army in Seha River Land in the company of Kupanta-DLAMMA-as;

8) (but the order of 8) and 9) may have to be reversed) a letter, from either Kupanta-DLAMMA-as alone or from Kupanta-DLAMMA-as together with Gassus,

sent to Atpas with the request that the *ṢARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' should be released;

9) continuation of the march by Gassus (and Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as) towards Wilusa in order to attack it (again or to undertake a counter-raid);

10) a report sent by Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as to Manapa-Tarhundadas on the outcome of his diplomatic efforts;

11) a counter-attack(?) [on the island of Lazpa/Lesbos(?)] by Manapa-Tarhundadas (in that case the island would appear to have changed hands from him to Piyamaradus and/or Atpas during the earlier raid); I mention this possibility because it would favour the alternative solution;

12) Manapa-Tarhundadas's letter to the Hittite King in order to apologize for the fact that he did not participate in the (presumed second) attack on the country of Wilusa, but above all in order to report on the events concerning the attack or raid on the island of Lesbos/Lazpa by Piyamaradus(?) (and the subsequent abduction of the two types of *ṢARIPUTU*-men, the latter only in the preferred option)⁵⁴).

e. The Date of the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter

Manapa-Tarhundadas, the writer of the letter, was a son of Muwa-UR.MAH, the preceding ruler of Seha River Land⁵⁵), who—after the death of his father during the final years of Suppiluliumas I—had been forced by two of his brothers to flee from his country to Karkisa⁵⁶). Apparently both Suppiluliumas I and Arnuwandas II had already provided him with some sort of political support⁵⁷). The latter may already have restored him to power⁵⁸). These data would seem to indicate that Manapa-Tarhundadas, referred to as "a young man" with respect to this earliest phase of his political career⁵⁹), started to rule over Seha River Land

⁵⁴) The two main reservations expressed in the preceding treatment, a) it is also possible that Lazpa/Lesbos constituted the scene of action of the main events described in the ll. 7-32 of the letter, and b) one must reckon with the possibility that Piyamaradus may have been (temporarily) based in Wilusa, may be combined into a coherent historical pattern. One might assume that Manapa-Tarhundadas reports on events which took place in more northerly regions of the westcoast for which a combination of warlike activities encompassing both Wilusa and Lazpa/Lesbos, also according to Greek tradition, would not seem to have been unlikely. However, in that case both his personal involvement and the role of Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as would be more difficult to explain. Naturally also the localization of Seha River Land plays a role (see above note 38).

⁵⁵) Cf. Laroche, *NH* and *Hethitica* 4 (1981), n° 839.1 and Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 75⁵⁰) and 381-2.

⁵⁶) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 4-5: §1 2-7; see with respect to Karkisa del Monte, G.F., *RGTC* 6, 182-3; Heinhold-Krahmer, *RIA* 5 (1976-80), 446-7 and especially Otten, *FsNeumann*, 247-9. See with respect to Manapa-Tarhundadas in general Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 376-7.

⁵⁷) See with respect to Suppiluliumas I Friedrich, *SV* 2, 12-3: §8** B 3, referred to by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 75.

⁵⁸) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 4-5: §2 14-18, referred to by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 76, 102; earlier Forrer, *Forsch.* 1/1-2, 85.

⁵⁹) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 4-5: §1 [2], 3.

before 1322 B.C., the new accession date of Mursilis II. Notwithstanding this Hittite support he chose the side of Uhhazitis of Arzawa in Mursili's Arzawa War of the 3rd and 4th years of his reign⁶⁰), but after his mother, heading a procession of old men and women, had pleaded on his behalf with Mursilis II, Manapa-Tarhundadas was pardoned and reinstated as the Hittite vassal-ruler over Seha River Land (and Appawiya)⁶¹).

A fragmentary passage of Mursilis's Extensive Annals, 8th year of his reign, indicates that in one way or another Mursilis II was involved in a marriage arrangement concerning Manapa-Tarhundadas⁶²), while, towards the end of Mursilis's reign, according to another broken passage of the Extensive Annals, Manapa-Tarhundadas participated in a campaign of a Hittite provincial governor which seems to have begun in Mira-Kuwaliya and affected Arwana and Assarassa. Possibly also [Alaksan]dus was involved in this military undertaking⁶³). Thus Manapa-Tarhundadas is likely to have been over forty years of age when Muwattallis succeeded to the throne of his father.

In view of the fact that Kupanta-^DLAMMA-as was installed as vassal-king over Mira-Kuwaliya in the 12th year of Mursilis II⁶⁴), 1311 B.C. constitutes the earliest possible date for the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter, while it must have been written before the year in which Muwattallis replaced Manapa-Tarhundadas with Masduris. Below sub B.d. it will be argued that this succession took place *after* instead of *before* Muwattallis's Treaty with Alaksandus of Wilusa. The contents of the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter would seem to plead, I think, for a date during the reign of Muwattallis before the same Treaty⁶⁵). It would be difficult to explain under

⁶⁰) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 6-7: §3 29-33; Götze, *AM*, 66-9: KUB 14-15 IV 14-18 and KBo 3-4 III 10-11; see, too, Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 102 referring in note 33 to KUB 19-29 = 2 BoTU (2) 49 IV 1ff. = *AM*, 16-7, a passage in which one of his evil brothers may be mentioned.

⁶¹) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 6-11: §4 34-62; Götze, *AM*, 68-73: KUB 14-15 IV 18-33 and KBo 3-4 III 11-22; *AM*, 74-5: KUB 14-15 + KBo 16-104 IV 52-53 and KBo 3-4 III 24. See Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 119-20, 123-4.

⁶²) Götze, *AM*, 100-1: KUB 26-79 = 2 BoTU (2) 56 III 1-2; cf. Meriggi, *WZKM* 58 (1962), 74 and Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 86, 220.

⁶³) Götze, *AM*, 186-7: KBo 2-5 + 5a + KBo 16-17 II 53-III 10. The name [Alaksan]dus was restored by Forrer, 2 BoTU (2), p. 129, Bo 5 a = 2 BoTU (2) 57 = KBo 2-5 a II 24' = 57 in Götze's line-numbering; this text-restoration was accepted by Cavaignac *RA* 26 (1929), 186 (see, too, Cavaignac 1933, 101¹¹) and Cavaignac, *Le Problème Hittite* [Paris, 1936], 50), called enticing by Götze, o.c., note (57)f, revived by Otten in the Introduction to KBo 19, VI under KBo 19-75, accepted by this writer, *BiOr* 30 (1973), 253, put in doubt by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 160 (referring in note 191 to Cornelius, F., *Gesch. d. Heth.*, 215³⁹ on p. 334 who suggested [Piyamara]dus), accepted by Del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 270-1 (sub voce Mira) and apparently now considered more likely than [Piyamara]dus by Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 86²⁵ and 90⁵¹. See for this campaign also Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 221.

⁶⁴) See most recently this author *FsMeriggi* 2/1, 267-92. The argument was first used by Forrer, *Forsch.* 1/1-2, 92.

⁶⁵) The historical fragments referred to above in note 49 and below in note 95 render it likely that Muwattallis did encounter opposition from the side of Piyamaradus, cf. the remarks made by Heinhold-Krahmer and Singer with respect to KBo 19-78: 5' and KBo 16-35: 5' in the treatments specified in note 49.

which set of circumstances Muwattallis could have ordered Gassus to attack the territory of a Hittite vassal-state. The date of the Alaksandus Treaty thus becomes of major importance⁶⁶).

The Prologue to this treaty secures that, with one exception in a more distant past when the country of Wilusa would seem to have been disloyal to the Hittite cause⁶⁷), the inhabitants and its Kings maintained "from afar" good relations with the Hittite Kings, being wont to send messengers to Hattusa⁶⁸). The paragraphs which describe the mutual relations during the reign of Mursilis II may indicate that already then Wilusa came within the direct sphere of influence of Hattusa, witness the support possibly rendered during the Arzawa War by Alaksandus's predecessor Kukunnis, the King of the country of Wilusa, who maintained friendly relations with Suppiluliumas I and Arnuwandas II before that time⁶⁹). Alaksandus himself, who apparently succeeded to the throne of Wilusa during the reign of Mursilis II and may have taken part in the military campaign to which I referred above, adhered to this traditional policy of Wilusa since he "was loyal" to Muwattallis on the occasion of his succession to the Hittite throne⁷⁰).

In the Alaksandus Treaty itself Muwattallis mentions how "in accordance with the word of your father" he protected Alaksandus "in a friendly disposition"⁷¹) in an apparently recent past, came to his aid and struck an enemy on his behalf⁷²). In an earlier passage, in the Prologue, Muwattallis describes in greater detail this Campaign in the West of Anatolia in which he rendered this 'military aid'. The passage in question, recently treated by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 161-3, induces the manifest picture that there was a more widespread unrest on the westcoast which prompted Muwattallis to carry out this Campaign in order to defeat his own enemies and to render assistance to his 'friends'. The King mentions that he destroyed Masa and another country, the name of which is broken off. In the further continuation of the Campaign he destroyed those countries [which had

⁶⁶) The date of the Alaksandus Treaty will be discussed more fully sub C. where I shall try to argue that, in addition to a date in the very first beginning of the reign of Muwattallis, also a later date after ca. 1285 B.C. may be both defended and preferred.

⁶⁷) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 50-1: § 1 B 4-7; copy C₁ in Friedrich's notation, KUB 21-2 + KUB 48-95 (I⁶-11), now indicates that the matter under which King the country of Wilusa defected from Hattusa is no longer considered relevant because this affair is superannuated: "The country of Wilusa did not want to defect", cf. Hoffner, *GsKronasser*, 38-45 and especially 43²³.

⁶⁸) *ibidem*: B 7-9; see Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 157.

⁶⁹) Cf. Friedrich, *SV* 2, 52-3: § 3 B 18 for the Kingship of Kukunnis during the reign of Suppiluliumas I and *ibidem*: § 4 A 28' for the possibility that Kukunnis rendered aid during Mursilis's Arzawa War; see Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 81⁽⁶⁶⁾ and 158 (but the passage is broken).

⁷⁰) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 54-5: § 6 A 43'-45'; the fact that H. Winckler still noticed *zi[-ig]* (cf. Otten, *MIO* 5 (1957), 27 and Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 161) in l. 44' confirms Friedrich's restoration of the passage.

⁷¹) Cf. Sommer, *AU*, 172 (: "in freundlichem Worte = in freundlicher Meinung (Gesinnung)").

⁷²) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 56-7: § 6 A 71'-73', cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 163; see for this enemy also *ibidem*, 60-1: § 8 A 19.

started hostilities against Alaksandus]⁷³). It is likely that even in a third passage the same event is mentioned again. Friedrich's text-restorations of that part of the text, which unfortunately is very badly preserved, imply that there would have been political unrest within the country of Wilusa as well and that Alaksandus would have been expelled from his own country⁷⁴). Although one may concede to Heinhold-Krahmer that the evidence that Alaksandus would have been expelled by his own subjects depends on Friedrich's restoration of the text⁷⁵), the combination of § 6 A 54'-56' and § 8 A 17-19 renders it highly likely that through Muwattallis's intervention effects which had earlier been given to his father were now re[turned] to Alaksandus and, as surmised and restored by Friedrich, these effects could hardly have been anything else than the country, the fatherly estate and the throne. In other words Muwattallis restored Alaksandus to a former position which he had lost during a period of more general disturbances which, perhaps, but this is merely conjectural, after other attempts to deal with the matter had failed, finally were suppressed through Muwattallis's personal presence on the westcoast. As a result of the treaty Alaksandus became a Hittite vassal-king of his own Kingdom, one of the henceforth four vassal-kingdoms of Arzawa, Haballa and Mira-Kuwaliya, both possibly more inland, and Seha River Land and Wilusa, both presumably on the westcoast⁷⁶).

Following the lead of the Ancient Historian Cavaignac, *RHA* II fasc. 11 (1933) 100-4, a number of scholars, including Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 177, have been inclined to date the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter between the Alaksandus Treaty and the 'Tawagalawas Letter' in a historical reconstruction which implied that all three documents should be ascribed to the reign of Muwattallis. In her recent contribution to the *FsKammenhuber*, *Or* 52 (1983) 81-97, Heinhold-Krahmer who now sides with those scholars who tend to date the 'Tawagalawas Letter' to the reign of Hattusilis III, repeats this ordering on p. 93. I now believe that she is mistaken and that the order of the first and the second constituent of the series must be reversed⁷⁷). Moreover, the ascription of the 'Tawagalawas Letter' to a

⁷³) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 54-5: § 6 A 45'-56'; see now the treatment by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 161-3.

⁷⁴) Friedrich, *SV* 2, 58-61: § 8 1 15-19.

⁷⁵) Cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 161, but of course the fact that Friedrich's interpretation depends on his text-restorations does not need to imply that they are incorrect. However, Heinhold-Krahmer, *o.c.*, 160 agrees with Friedrich that Muwattallis made use of political straits facing Alaksandus in order to force him to become a Hittite vassal-king, cf. Friedrich, *SV* 2, 43³.

⁷⁶) See above note 52.

⁷⁷) In an earlier, more general treatment of the Ahhiyawa Question I also showed myself impressed by Cavaignac's pointed reasoning, (Houwink ten Cate 1974, 150). During the time Heinhold-Krahmer studied the history of Arzawa, she seems to have hesitated about the ordering proposed by Cavaignac: in two passages of her book she reckons with the possibility that the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter might have preceded the Treaty (163²⁰⁰ and 173-5), while elsewhere she prefers the opposite point of view (175-8, 208). Actually her reasoning that Manapa-Tarhundadas would have been mentioned in the Alaksandus

possibly late phase of the reign of Hattusilis III renders it advisable, I think, to investigate whether the Alaksandus Treaty, which has been differently dated within the reign of Muwattallis, may in fact stem from a later phase of his reign than its very first beginning. In the past a number of scholars opted for the beginning of the reign of Muwattallis.

It should be acknowledged that it is notoriously difficult to narrow down the limits to be set for both the date of its conclusion and the time of its duration. However, there now is a new indication which, particularly because it concerns Manapa-Tarhundadas, deserves to be taken into account. In numerous passages of her painstaking and exhaustive study on the history of Arzawa, *TdH* 8, Heinhold-Krahmer argued that ^M*Ma-an-pa*-^DLAMMA, the new reading of §17, A III 32, published by Otten on the basis of an entry in the diary of H. Winckler⁷⁸), could or should be emended into ^M*Ma-an-pa*-^DU⁷⁹). The likelihood that Manapa-Tarhundadas is mentioned in the list of contemporary vassal-kings of Arzawa—the passage will be quoted in full below sub B.d.—, may only be used of course to date the treaty before the installation of Masduris, the successor of Manapa-Tarhundadas on the throne of Seha River Land, and the presence of Manapa-Tarhundadas in this list is only the more to be expected, if the treaty would stem from the very first beginning or an early phase of the reign of Muwattallis. One detail of its wording quoted below sub C.I. seems to indicate precisely this. I am referring to the fact that in §14, which deals with the obligations of Alaksandus to take part in the exterior and interior warfare of Muwattallis as far as these operations were organized with the Hittite capital as base, Hattusa is mentioned as this capital. In the opinion of Heinhold-Krahmer this raises the date ante quem of the treaty to the time before the residence of Muwattallis was moved to Tarhuntassa⁸⁰).

Unfortunately an argumentation that Wilusa would have contributed troops to Muwattallis's army fighting the Egyptians at Qadesh in 1275 B.C. cannot be considered to provide conclusive evidence that Alaksandus would have remained in power and loyal to Muwattallis until the end of the latter's reign because the reference to Wilusa in the Egyptian sources is not beyond doubt. This means that the period during which the treaty was in force is not known. Thus at the moment a

Treaty (see note 79) rather effectively undermines part of Cavaignac's argumentation. Moreover, in two different passages of her study she does mention the possibility that fear for intervention from the side of Ahhiyawa could linger behind some of the rulings of the Alaksandus Treaty, o.c., 167⁽²¹⁹⁾ and 175-8.

⁷⁸) Cf. Otten, *MIO* 5 (1957), 29.

⁷⁹) *TdH* 8, 91, 146-7, 152-7, 169-72, 208, 232-6, 238, 376-7, but note that Forrer, *Klio* 30 (1937), 179² claims that KUB 21-5 III 47 would show more of his text-restoration for A III 32 than is suggested by Götze's text-copy (":Auch hier braucht (I-)SUM-ma- nicht eingeklammert und nicht erst ergänzt zu werden, sondern das untere Zweidrittel der drei Zeichen ist in Bo. 2079, III 47 erhalten, aber in A. Götze's Autographie wiederum als nicht vorhanden schraffiert").

⁸⁰) Cf. *TdH* 8, 164 together with note 204 where she concluded that the Alaksandus Treaty would need to be dated before the transfer of the residence to Tarhuntassa.

date of the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter after instead of before the treaty cannot be altogether excluded⁸¹).

Nevertheless, within a historical reconstruction which entails that the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter would have preceded the Alaksandus Treaty, the three major facts attested by the former, the raid on the island of Lazpa/Lesbos, presumably during this general period in Hittite possession and possibly forming part of the vassal-country Seha River Land, the attack or raid on the country of Wilusa by a regular Hittite army, and, finally, the likely diplomatic endeavour to restrict the political dimensions of the conflict through the release by Atpas of the *ŠARIPUTU*-men of 'His Majesty' (see A.d.7. above) could attest not so much to a similar, but to the same state of widespread unrest on the west coast in an earlier stage of its development as the one witnessed by the Alaksandus Treaty. Moreover, in this same hypothetical reconstruction the presence of Manapa-Tarhundadas in the list of Arzawa vassal-kings could shed additional light on his position during the initial phase of this crisis. The admittedly subjective detail mentioned above in the introduction to A.d., Manapa-Tarhundadas's frank admission of his defeat by Piyamaradus, would fall in line. The fact that, witness the list of the later treaty, Manapa-Tarhundadas would have remained in power, could support the contention that he would have suffered this setback while fighting for a worthy Hittite cause. Furthermore, the likelihood that his own *ŠARIPUTU*-men would seem to have remained in the custody of Atpas (A.d.3.) may indicate that Atpas bore a personal grudge against him because he had initiated the Hittite involvement in the affairs of Wilusa, perhaps originally 'non-aligned' from the viewpoint of Ahhiyawa. For Forrer this was a corollary to his, taken by itself, likely hypothesis that before the Alaksandus Treaty Wilusa would have been an independent power, but after it a Hittite vassal-state⁸²).

Although Heinhold-Krahmer finally preferred Cavaignac's ordering of the events, at least two passages of her book strongly suggest that she, too, has hesitated on the point of the sequence of and the connection between the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter and the Alaksandus Treaty⁸³). With the evidence available now, i.e. unless one would prefer to settle the matter already now by an equation of Piyamaradus with the enemy mentioned in the treaty⁸⁴), it is in the last resort a choice one has to make between two possibilities. Either Alaksandus came twice in political difficulties with the consequence that the reference in the Manapa-Tarhundadas Letter in its brevity would have been particularly unfortunate and misleading, as far as the modern reader is concerned, or else, it happened just once

⁸¹) See below sub C.I.

⁸²) *Forsch.* I 1-2, 187-90, 213, 252-3 where he even suggests that there could have existed a treaty on the basis of parity between Ahhiyawa and Wilusa.

⁸³) See above note 77.

⁸⁴) Cf. A.d.1. and 8. note 54.

and in that case the letter and the treaty would seem to stem from approximately the same historical context, the letter preceding the treaty.

B. KUB 23-100, A LETTER OF MASDURIS TO A HITTITE KING

a. Transliteration

- 1 [A-NA ^DUTU-ŠI] EN[-IA QÍ-BI/BÍ-MA]
- 2 [UM-MA ^MMa-aš]-du-ri [İR-KA-MA]
- 3 [ka-a-ša-k]án ŠÀ KUR-TI [hu-u-ma-an SIG₅-in]
- 4 [nu-mu ^DUTU]-ŠI ku-ua-pi EN[-IA ku-it]
- 5 [kiš-sa-an I]Š-TU É.GAL-LIM [ua-tar-na-aḫ-ta]
- 6 [ma-a-an-m]a-ua-at-ta LÚ.MEŠ [ták-šu-ul[?]]
- 7 [tu]-ē-da-za-ua-ra-at n[ua-ua-ra-at-mu[?] EGIR-pa[?] ŠU-PUR]
- 8 [ma-a]-an-ma-ua tu-ug-ma [ku-ru-ur]
- 9 [I]u-e-da-za-ua-ra-at Ú[-UL]
- 10 [nu]-ua-mu a-pád<-da>-ia EGIR-pa [ŠU-PUR]
- 11 [KUR ^{URU}Ma]-ad-du-na-aš-ša ar-ḫa [ti-ia-at]
- 12 [X X ša-ku-ua-a]š-ša-ri-it ZI-ni[-it X X]
- 13 [X X X (X) ma-a-na-a]t ša-ku-ua-aš-ša[-ri-it]
- 14 [ZI-ni-it n]a-aš-ma-kán Ú-UL [[?]
- 15 [ku-ru]-ú-ri-it an-da[?]
- 16 [X pé-e-ti-iš-š[i]
- 17 [I/A-N]A ^{URU}Ú-ri-X[
- 18 []-lu-ša(-)i[?][

b. Translation

- 1 [To 'His Majesty, my] lord, [speak]!
- 2 [Thus Mas]duris, [your servant]!
- 3 [Lo and behold,] within the country [everything is in order]!
- 4 [Since you,] 'His [Majesty', my] lord, once
- 5 [ordered me thus fr]om the Palace,
- 6 "[whether no]w the inhabitants are [at peace] with you,
- 7 while they are on [y]our side, [report(?) it to me],
- 8 but [wheth]er there is [hostility] towards you,
- 9 while they are no[t] on [y]our side,
- 10 re[port] also that to me",
- 11 [the country of Ma]ddunassa [has become] dis[loyal]!
- 12 [] with [loy]al intenti[on]
- 13 [If the]y (or: i)t [with] loyal
- 14 [intention o]r (if) not [
- 15 []with [emn]ity

- 16 [].. in h[is] place
- 17 [t]o (or: i)n (the town of) Uri-..[
- 18 [].[

c. Commentary (per line)

3: See the preceding letter l. 2.

4-5: Cf. KUB 23-87: 11'-12'.

6-8: See for the highly tentative restorations of *takšul-* and *kurur*, the most recent treatment of both by Neu, *FsMeriggi* 2/II, 407-27 and for the renderings of *kurur-* and its derivatives Kühne-Otten, *StBoT* 16, 46-7 and H. Hoffner apud H. Craig Melchert, *JNES* 37 (1978), 2¹.

7: Or, alternatively if this restoration would be too long, "[write(?) it to me].",

10: Cf. the parallel passage KUB 23-103 Obv. 8', 12' = Otten, *AfO* 19 (1959-60), 40, 41 ("schreibe mir und [sende] mir ei[lends Nachricht]!", "auch das schreibe mir!").

11: See for this text-retoration del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 266; see, too, Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 201-2 and 339.

18: Unfortunately this line is useless even if Wilusa would have been referred to.

d. The Date and the Content of the Letter

The recognition of the *kāša-kan* ŠÀ KUR-TI *human* SIG₅-in formula in l. 3 led to the conclusion that also the very small letter KUB 23-100, later recognized as a letter addressed to ^MMa-aš]-du-ri[, the successor of Manapa-Tarhundadas on the throne of Seha River Land, constitutes an example of this type of letter within the Hittite royal correspondence⁸⁵). A well-known and often quoted passage from the Sausgamuwas Treaty of Tudhaliyas IV secures that Muwattallis made Masduris his brother-in-law by giving him his younger sister DINGIR.MEŠ-IR-is in marriage and, possibly at a later moment during his reign⁸⁶), appointed him as vassal-king of Seha River Land, presumably as the successor to his father Manapa-Tarhundadas: (KUB 23-1 + II 16-19 = Kühne-Otten, *StBoT* 16, 10-11) ¹⁶ "(This) Masduris who was King of Seha River Land, ¹⁷ Muwattallis took him (in his service) and made him his brother-in-law ¹⁸ and gave him DINGIR.MEŠ-IR-is, his sister, in marriage ¹⁹ and made him King in Seha River Land"⁸⁷).

In all likelihood Masduris was installed as vassal-king after the conclusion of the treaty between Muwattallis and Alaksandus of Wilusa since Manapa-Tarhundadas seems to be included in the list of Arzawa kings occurring in that treaty. The

⁸⁵) Cf. A.c. sub l. 2.

⁸⁶) See with respect to this possibility Güterbock 1936, 327.

⁸⁷) For Masduris, see Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 227-32, 235-6, 239-40, 381. She quotes this passage on pp. 227-8 and its continuation on p. 240.

sentence, "Furthermore, you who are the four Kings in the Arzawa countries, Alaksandus (of Wilusa), Manpa-D^{LAMMA} (?; of Seha River Land?), Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as (of Mira-kuwaliya) and Ura-Hattusas (of Haballa?)", serves as the introductory line to the paragraph in which Alaksandus is exhorted to give the necessary support to Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as of Mira-Kuwaliya. As has been mentioned above, Heinhold-Krahmer argued in numerous passages of *TdH* 8 that Manpa-D^{LAMMA}, the new reading of §17, A III 32, should be emended into Manpa-D^U. She used this likely emendation as an argument to date the accession of Masduris after the conclusion of the treaty⁸⁸).

The introduction and the sequel to the passage of the Sausgamuwas Treaty quoted above render it certain that Masduris continued to reign in Seha River Land up to the time of the later Hittite Kings Urhi-Tessub and Hattusilis III. Actually the fact that this was the case constitutes the reason he is mentioned at all. Tudhaliyas IV refers to him in a warning 'example' meant to impress upon Sausgamuwas of Amurru, his own brother-in-law⁸⁹), that a vassal-king ought to remain loyal to the lawful successor of the Hittite King who has installed him, apparently the more so if the latter is his brother-in-law. The quintessence of the 'example' is that Masduris had failed to do this in the struggle for power between Urhi-Tessub, the son of 'second rank' who had succeeded to Muwattallis, and Muwattallis's brother Hattusilis (III). Influenced no doubt by DINGIR.MEŠ-IR-is, his wife⁹⁰), Masduris had sided with Hattusilis III.

The lower limit of the reign of Masduris depends on the dating of KUB 23-13, a well-known item in the Ahhiyawa dossier and a fragmentary historical text which describes the defeat of Tarhunradus, a vassal-king of Seha River Land of presumably later times. A new text-restoration with respect to this fragment, recently advocated by both D. Easton and H. G. Güterbock, renders it highly likely that the victorious Hittite King of this fragment must have been a son instead of a grandson of Mursilis II and thus either Muwattallis (Easton) or Hattusilis III and preferably the latter (Güterbock followed by Singer)⁹¹). Referring to E. Edel's tentative identification with DINGIR.MEŠ-IR-is of Matanazi, a sister of Hattusilis III who is mentioned in a relatively late letter of Ramses II to Hattusilis as a fifty to

⁸⁸) Cf. note 79; Heinhold-Krahmer quotes this passage on p. 152 and uses this argument for the dating of Masduris's accession on p. 232.

⁸⁹) According to common opinion the two royal families of Hattusa and Amurru were bound together by a triple marriage alliance: two successive Kings of Amurru, first Bentesina and later Sausgamuwas, married a daughter of Hattusilis III, while Nerikkailis, a younger brother of Tudhaliyas IV and LU^{tuḫ(u)}kanti- during (the beginning of ?) his reign, was married to a princess of Amurru, a sister of Sausgamuwas, cf. Weidner, *PD* 2, 126-9; Obv. 17-21 in addition to this passage.

⁹⁰) Cf. Edel, E., *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen königshof* (Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge — G 205; Göttingen 1976), 34 in his treatment of the letter of Ramses II 652/f + 28/n + 127/r, o.c., 31-6, 41-4, 53-8, 67-75.

⁹¹) Cf. Sommer, *AU*, 314-9 (Chapter 16) and more recently Güterbock 1983, 137-8⁽²⁶⁾; Singer 1983, 207 together with notes 11-13; Güterbock 1984, 119 together with note 23.

sixty years old lady who somewhat optimistically still longes for the birth of a child⁹²), Singer recently put forward the highly tentative suggestion that the child in question was meant to become Masduris's successor on the throne of Seha River Land⁹³). In that case Masduris would have reigned until the decade between 1260 and 1250 B.C. In accordance with its ascription to the reign of Hattusilis III by Güterbock, KUB 23-13 would need to stem from the later years of this Hittite King.

In theory the Masduris Letter may thus be ascribed to the reigns of no less than three Hittite Kings, but in view of its contents, apparently bad news which the writer had hesitated to convey, an attribution to the reign of the last one, Hattusilis III, could perhaps be preferred. The manner in which Tudhaliyas IV refers to Masduris, this other brother-in-law of an earlier Hittite King, may be taken to imply that his generation still knew that in the end Masduris had been punished for his treason in respect of Muwattallis and Urhi-Tessub. This could mean that his ultimate punishment was an event of a relatively recent past.

Moreover, the town of Maddunassa is mentioned in the boundary description of the country of Mira-Kuwaliya in the Treaty of Mursilis II with Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as, §9, C 29-30 = Friedrich *SV* 1, 116-7: ²⁹ "From this side, from (the town of) Maddunassa, the Fortified Camp of Tudhaliyas ³⁰ shall be (included in) your frontier". The Masduris Letter renders it likely that at this point the boundary description delineates the frontier between Mira-Kuwaliya (the Fortified Camp of Tudhaliyas) and Seha River Land (Maddunassa), two vassal-countries which in view of the contents of the recently almost completely reconstructed third Column of the Manapa-Tarhundad Treaty of Mursilis II must indeed have shared a common border⁹⁴).

Since in the last fully reconstructible line of this letter Masduris acknowledges that he has lost control over the country of Maddunassa, it may be of relevance to note that there exists evidence for political friction between Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as and Hattusilis III, not only concerning the Piyamaradus Affair⁹⁵) but also concerning the fate of Urhi-Tessub, in that case rather late evidence to be dated after

⁹²) Edel 1976 (cf. note 90), 32-6; see, too, Otten, *Puduhepa* (Akademie der Wiss. und der Lit., Abh. d. Geist. und Sozialwiss. Kl. 1975), 9-10.

⁹³) Singer 1983, 208.

⁹⁴) Cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 88-90, 292-301 and del Monte, *Or* 49 (1980), 58-66 for this column of the treaty; in numerous passages of her book Heinhold-Krahmer stresses the contiguity of both countries: 120, 125, 134-5, 139, 168, 180, 203, 209, 211, 220, 235, 337-8, 343.

⁹⁵) The sons of Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as are referred to in one of the Piyamaradus fragments (KBo 19-80: 9' (Piyamaradus in l. 8')), cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 309-10 and eadem 1983, 96, while Kupanta-D^{LAMMA}-as himself and Piyamaradus occur together in KBo 19-78: 4' and 6', 8' and KBo 27-4: 4' and 7' respectively, cf. *TdH* 8, 208-9, 227, 247, 308, and eadem 1983, 83-4, 91-2, 94, 95 for these contacts; the country of Mira is mentioned in the younger retrospective text KBo 16-35: 8', cf. *TdH* 8, 174-5, 209-10 and eadem, 1983, 91-3, 95-6; see, too, Singer 1983, 206-7, 209. These data reinforce the impression that Piyamaradus operated in the vicinity of Mira-Kuwaliya, cf. notes 12 and 50.

the conclusion of 'The Eternal Treaty' between Hattusilis III and Ramses II in 1259 B.C. The so-called 'Mira Letter' would seem to indicate that in a violation of normal vassal obligations Kupanta-DLAMMA-as had approached the Egyptian Pharaoh to make inquiries about the situation of Urhi-Tessub, who seems to have fled to Egypt at a date preceding the conclusion of this International Treaty⁹⁶). It has often been surmised, perhaps on the evidence of the more recently published Piyamaradus fragments, that this political tension may have begun at the time of Urhi-Tessub's ousting by Hattusilis III⁹⁷). In that case an attribution of the Masduris Letter to the period between 1267 B.C. and a later year of the decade between 1260 and 1250 B.C. would seem to represent the utmost of precision one may hope to achieve.

C. KUB 31-47, THE HITTITE TRANSLATION OF AN ASSYRIAN STATE LETTER OF ADADNERARI I(?) TO MUWATALLIS(?), AND THE DATE OF THE ALAKSANDUS TREATY

By way of an appendix I should like to deal with the evidence concerning the date of the Alaksandus Treaty and more specifically with KUB 31-47, in my opinion a Hittite translation of an Assyrian letter which indicates that, on the grounds of the reference in the Alaksandus Treaty to the State of Hanigalbat, a later date during the reign of Muwattallis should not be excluded with respect to this treaty. At two points of the preceding treatment of the Vassal Letters from Seha River Land the date of the Alaksandus Treaty during the reign of Muwattallis appeared to be of considerable interest. A late date of the Manapa-Tarhundad Letter would seem to be bound up with a still later date of the Alaksandus Treaty; the Masduris Letter would need to be dated after the Alaksandus Treaty. In the absence of reliable sources from the reign of Muwattallis himself, in the form of e.g. Annals, the history of his reign is usually divided up in three phases which are derived from Hattusilis's retrospective description in the 'Apology' of his own career during the reign of his older brother⁹⁸): a) from the year of his accession to the moment on which he moved his residence from Hattusa; b) the period during which he resided elsewhere, i.e. in Tarhuntassa if he went there at once, or else, first somewhere in the lower country⁹⁹) and later in Tarhuntassa, if, as has been surmised, the transfer

⁹⁶) Cf. Archi, *SMEA* 14 (1971), 209 (with a wrong dating of the Mira Letter KBo 1-24 + KUB 3-84); Ünal, *TdH* 3, 116, 154, 161-2; Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 240-2, 245 and eadem 1983, 96⁷⁹; Singer 1983, 206, 209. Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 96⁷⁹ refers in this respect to Jewell 1974, 335-6.

⁹⁷) Most of the authors mentioned in the preceding note assume that the enmity between Hattusilis III and Kupanta-DLAMMA-as began in the time of the former's seizure of power. Singer 1983, 209 explicitly refers in this respect to KBo 19-78: 3'-4'.

⁹⁸) Cf. E. von Schuler, *Kašš.*, 53³⁵⁸; Otten, *StBoT*, 24, 11 the note to § 6 II 16ff.; Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 164ff.

⁹⁹) This is the opinion of Ünal, *TdH*, 3, 51, 63 and 69.

of the Capital took place in two stages¹⁰⁰); c) the period before and after the battle of Qadesh in 1275 B.C. up to the end of his reign shortly afterwards. The moot question whether the transfer of the Capital took place in two stages or in one straightforward move is of course connected with the later arrangements concerning Hattusa. Unfortunately it is an undecided issue whether, after Muwattallis's departure, the capital was entrusted to Mittannamuwas or not, and, if it was, whether at some later moment the responsibility for Hattusa was added to the duties and prerogatives of Hattusilis¹⁰¹).

Within this chronological scheme the preceding campaign of Muwattallis in western Anatolia and the Alaksandus Treaty itself have been differently dated. In more recent decades Rowton and Weidner adhered to the old opinion of Forrer, *RIA* 1 (1928), 256 sub voce Assyrien, that, on the basis of the passage in the Alaksandus Treaty to be quoted below sub I. in combination with the fact that in the 'Apology' Hattusilis III does not refer to an Assyrian Campaign of Muwattallis, the Alaksandus Treaty should be dated to the very first years of the reign of Muwattallis. The underlying assumption of Forrer was that during the final phase of the reign of Mursilis II the Hittites would have recaptured terrain that would have been lost to the Assyrians during the earlier phases of his reign. This, up to a point, Assyriological approach is no doubt influenced by the Assyrian data with respect to the reign of Adad-nerari I, Muwattallis's contemporary as King of Assyria, who during his reign twice defeated a King of Hanigalbat (see below sub II.). Forrer's reasoning was quite legitimate at the time he pronounced these opinions, but in actual fact neither the loss nor the subsequent reconquest of parts of Hanigalbat during the reign of Mursilis II is as yet sufficiently secured by the

¹⁰⁰) See for Otten's former opinion that the transfer might have taken place in two stages *FWgesch.* 3, 1966, 154 and now *StBoT* 24, 15 in his commentary on II 52ff. and II 62ff. (much less positive or even negative in this respect). In the English edition of his book, *Hattusa, the Capital of the Hittites* (1970), 20-2 K. Bittel adhered to the thesis of a transfer in two stages, expressis verbis mentioning Kummanni in this respect on account of the prayer KBo 11-1 (see now, too, KBo 22-11 I 4'-5'?). But in the more recent German edition, 1983, 29-30 the transfer is referred to in the conventional manner as having been mentioned twice in the text, *StBoT* 24, 10-1: § 5 I 75-II 2 and ibidem, 14-5: § 8 II 52-53.

¹⁰¹) Ünal, *TdH* 3, 60 rightly quoted KBo 4-12 Obv. 15-17 = Götze, *Hatt.*, 42-3 in order to argue that Muwattallis delegated the administration of Hattusa to Mittannamuwas at his departure from the former capital, but this does not preclude at all that Otten may very well be right in his opinion that the wording of *StBoT* 24, 20-1: § 10b III 36'-37' suggests that, at the time of the death of Muwattallis, the former capital was included in the territory administrated by Hattusilis. The two passages of Royal Prayers from the time of Hattusilis III and Puduhepa quoted by Ünal, o.c., 73¹²⁷, KUB 21-19 (+ KUB 14-7) III 9-11 = Sürenhagen, D., *AOF* 8 (1981), 94-5 and (KUB 21-27 +) 761/v (+ 564/u) I 25-30 = Sürenhagen, l.c., 110-1, probably imply that the rule over Hattusa and Katapa (also the seat of a royal Palace) was added to his earlier obligations at a fairly late stage during the reign of his brother: the former passage indicates that Hattusilis refused to accept this assignment before he recovered Nerik; the latter that Hattusa and Katapa were given to him before the Egyptian Campaign and the death of Muwattallis shortly afterwards. It follows from the 'Apology' = *StBoT* 24, 20-1: § 10b III 46'-54' that it lasted until the reign of Urhi-Tessub before Hattusilis actually rebuilt Nerik.

extant Hittite sources¹⁰²). In the thirties the Hittitologist L. Delaporte, perhaps wisely, abstained from pronouncing an opinion¹⁰³). Cavaignac, who was fully aware of the relevance of the Assyriological evidence, dated the treaty to the first phase of the reign of Muwattallis narrowing down its actual date to the period during which Sattuara I, the first of the two Kings of Hanigalbat mentioned by Adad-nerari I, ruled over his country as a faithful vassal of the Assyrian King¹⁰⁴). Goetze and Otten took a stand with either an implied (Goetze)¹⁰⁵ or a clearly expressed (Otten)¹⁰⁶ assumption that the campaign and the treaty must have preceded the third phase of the reign of Muwattallis, as defined above. In three relatively recent studies, in each case, however, without an argumentation, R. Stefanini, F. Cornelius and A. Ünal chose for the middle section, either for its tentative first part, the first stage of the transfer of the capital (Ünal)¹⁰⁷, or for the middle section pure and simple (Stefanini and Cornelius)¹⁰⁸, during the time Muwattallis resided in Tarhuntassa.

Admittedly with some difficulty and with a sort of roundabout reasoning a case can be built, I think, for an alternative date of the treaty during the latter half of Muwattallis's reign and thus after ca. 1285 B.C. This case would need to rest on the combined evidence of § 14 of the treaty which deals with the obligations of the vassal-king of Wilusa to take part in the exterior and interior warfare of the Hittite King and scattered date on the history of the East during the reign of Muwattallis, in particular with respect to the relations between the Hittites, Assyria and Hanigalbat, in theory a Hittite vassal-state, but curiously enough in the treaty referred to as if it were not only a possible enemy, but also one of the 'Great

¹⁰²) See, too, Rowton, M.B., *JCS* 13 (1959), 1-11 and especially p. 3, period A with which Rowton refers to the time prior to the defeat and the captivity, the release and the remainder of the life-span of Sattuara I, cf. C II; Weidner 1969 (cf. note 5), 522. The uncertainty referred to in the text specifically applies to the events of Mursilis II's ninth year, KBo 4-4 II 40-62 = Götz, *AM*, 116-21: On the decisive points (II. II 40, 43) the name of the enemy is broken off; both Assur and Egypt have been suggested.

¹⁰³) Delaporte, *Les Hittites* (Paris, 1936), 127-8, 195, 196 and 202; similarly Gurney, *The Hittites* (1981; revised edition), 35, 59-60, with a faint suggestion that the Campaign might have taken place not too long after Muwattallis's accession.

¹⁰⁴) Cavaignac, *Le Problème hittite* (Paris, 1936), 58 and note 61² on p. 62.

¹⁰⁵) Goetze, *CAH* II/2, 1975², 125 and 127ff.: presumably following Forrer, Goetze reckons with the fact that, during his later years, Mursilis II could have undertaken a successful campaign in Upper Mesopotamia or at least could have sent out one of his generals towards that region. Goetze uses as evidence that Muwattallis counts Mittanni as one of his vassal-states. He mentions the Western Campaign and the Alaksandus Treaty not in his treatment of the conflict with Egypt, but where he deals with the preceding phases one and two, possibly dating them to the beginning of the second phase by treating them as the reason for the problems with the Gasean nomads which confronted Hattusilis during that period.

¹⁰⁶) Otten, *FWGesch.* 3, 1966, 154 expressis verbis dated the Alaksandus Treaty before the third phase; see, too, Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 164-6 (during the first phase).

¹⁰⁷) Ünal, *TdH* 3, 51ff.; see, too, note 99 and especially, o.c., 52⁽²¹⁻²⁴⁾.

¹⁰⁸) Stefanini, *JAOS* 86 (1964), 28 together with notes 40 and 41; Cornelius, *Gesch. d. Heth.* (1973), 224.

King'-doms of the period. The reasoning used is of the type also applied by Rowton in an article of 1959, where he took as his starting point the valid question during which phases of the reign of Adad-nerari I (1295-1264 B.C.) there actually existed an independent state of Hanigalbat¹⁰⁹).

I. The Alaksandus Treaty, § 14:A 9-15 = Friedrich, *SV* 2, 68-9: "From Hattusa¹¹⁰), however, ¹⁰ these are your military obligations (i.e. with the capital as base, in contrast to those based in the vassal's own country)¹¹¹), the Kings who are equal in rank to 'His Majesty', ¹¹ the King of the country of Egypt, the King of the country of Babylon (Sanhara), the King of the country of Hanigalbat, ¹² the King¹¹²) of the country of Assur, if thereabouts someone comes ¹³ for battle, or if in the interior someone causes a revolt in the face of 'His Majesty', ¹⁴ I, 'His Majesty', however, write to you for foot-soldiers and charioteers, ¹⁵ you must instantly set the troops into motion in order to aid me".

Although in the opinion of W. Helck the Egyptian sources attest to the presence of troops from the country of Wilusa among the many countries and regions which contributed troops to the army of Muwattallis fighting at Qadesh (1275 B.C.)¹¹³), the evidence does not seem to be fully conclusive¹¹⁴). Moreover, it has been argued that not all the Anatolian regions which are mentioned must have done so on account of official treaties. Troops may also have served on a mercenary basis¹¹⁵). Nevertheless, it would seem to be overcritical to raise doubts about the participation of troops from Hanigalbat, a country which is mentioned in second place, after the country of Hatti itself¹¹⁶).

II. The Assyrian royal inscription of Adad-nerari I, relevant to Hanigalbat, is available in A. K. Grayson, *ARI* I, 60, §§ 392-3. The King succinctly says: "When

¹⁰⁹) It is, I think, highly remarkable that with the exceptions of Forrer and Goetze nobody raised the question when Hanigalbat could have been recovered by the Hittites; their answer is of course now less convincing than at the time it was first formulated. It is also surprising that with the exception of Cavaignac everybody stressed the 'Great King'-ship aspect of the passage to be quoted below sub C I. See note 102 for this highly important chronological contribution by Professor Rowton.

¹¹⁰) See A.e. together with note 80.

¹¹¹) Cf. the *CHD* 3-1, 10 a-b sub voce *lahhiyatar*.

¹¹²) Friedrich, o.c., 68-9 together with the notes 68⁷ and 69⁶ is probably right in preferring LUGAL of copies B and C to LÚ of copy A which shows more mistakes. Nevertheless, with respect to the Hittite-Assyrian relations it is perhaps of importance to add that the treaty of Sattiwaza with Suppiluliumas I and the historical texts from the time of Mursilis II describing the period of Suppiluliumas I and himself (enumerated in note 137) consistently refer to "the Assyrian" and not to "the King of Assyria". Goetze, o.c. (cf. note 102) restored the title for KBo 4-4 II 40.

¹¹³) Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrht. v. Chr.* (= *Bez.*: Wiesbaden, 1971²), 196: *ul-sá* (C 12) = Wilusa.

¹¹⁴) Cf. Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8, 166 together with note 211 and note that the current handbooks on Ancient History do not reckon with this equation.

¹¹⁵) Cf. Singer 1983, 206 referring to T. R. Bryce, *BiOr* 36 (1979), 63 and *Or* 48 (1979), 96²⁰.

¹¹⁶) Cf. Helck, *Bez.*², 195.

Shattuara, king of the land Hanigalbat, rebelled against me and committed hostilities; by the command of Ashur, my lord and ally, and (by the command) of the great gods who decide in my favour, I seized him and brought him to my city Ashur, I made him take an oath and then allowed him to return to his land. Annually, as long as (he) lived, I regularly received his tribute within my city, Ashur. After his death (i.e. of Shattuara I) Uasashata, his son, revolted, rebelled against me, and committed hostilities. He went to the land Hatti for aid. The Hittites took his bribes but did not render him assistance".

The inscription continues with a detailed description of Adadnerari I's successes and conquests with respect to Wasasatta and Hanigalbat which have been received with a certain amount of scepticism by modern scholars, not only by Weidner to whom I already referred in the Introduction¹¹⁷), but also by E. von Weiher and G. Wilhelm¹¹⁸). In his article of 1959 Rowton referred with respect to the existence of an independent state of Hanigalbat during the beginning of the reign of Adad-nerari I to the time prior to the defeat of Sattuara I¹¹⁹. According to the Assyrian text, at a later date during his reign, Adad-nerari I defeated Wasasatta without however capturing Wasasatta himself¹²⁰). In his chronological study Rowton dated this later victory over Wasasatta on the evidence of the known occurrence of at least six, and probably seven, eponyms from the final phase of the reign of Adad-nerari I to a period of more than six years before his death, i.e. before 1270 B.C.¹²¹). Rowton rightly concluded, I think, that, between the capture of Sattuara I and the renewed independence of Hanigalbat under Wasasatta, there must have been an intermediary period during which a reference in a treaty to a "King of Hanigalbat, equal in rank", would have made little sense.

III. In accordance with an early date during Muwattallis's reign of the Alaksandus Treaty, Weidner 1969, 522 defended the position that in the treaty Sattuara I would have been referred to at the time prior to his defeat by Adad-nerari I. However, reformulating a proposition which had been defended in the initial phase of Hittite studies after the First World War, Weidner 1959, 523-5 proposed that the LUGAL

¹¹⁷) Weidner 1969, 530.

¹¹⁸) von Weiher, *RIA* 4, 1972-5, 105-7 sub voce Hanigalbat (f.); Wilhelm, *Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurrer* (Darmstadt, 1982), 55-6. Apparently not all Assyriologists agree, cf. Rowton 1959, 2 together with notes 11 and 12; H. Klengel, *Or* 32 (1963), 291 together with note 5, both after M. Falkner, *AfO* 18 (1957-8), 95. See, too, Grayson, *ARI* I (Wiesbaden, 1972) 83¹⁷⁸.

¹¹⁹) Cf. note 102.

¹²⁰) See Grayson, *ARI* I, 60-61, §353 and especially: "The great gods gave me to rule from the city Taidu to the city Irridu, the city Eluhat and mount Kashiari in its entirety, the fortress of the city Sudu, the fortress of the city Harranu, to the bank of the Euphrates". See Wilhelm, *Grundzüge* (note 118), 56 for a historical appraisal in which he stresses that Wasasatta must have escaped and apparently was able to regain part of his former possessions.

¹²¹) Cf. Rowton 1959, 1-2 together with note 6: "We may conclude then that the defeat of Wasasatta is to be located a considerable time after the beginning of Adad-nerari's reign, but more than six years before his death".

šu-ub-ri-ú, "the Sub(a)rian king", referred to in the badly preserved Assyrian letter from Hattusa, KBo 1-20 Obv. 12'; Rev. 3' and 10'¹²²), could have been the released Sattuara I who had been set free from his Assyrian captivity and could not have been called in a letter from North Mesopotamia "King of Hanigalbat" because he had lost the major part of his Kingdom to Adad-nerari I. According to Weidner, KBo 1-20 constitutes a letter sent by an Assyrian vassal to a group of Hittite vassals (or high functionaries) in order to warn them against Sattuara I after he had returned from his captivity in Assyria. In the twenties Forrer, who gave a rather different interpretation of KBo 1-20 in *RIA* I, 1928, 258-9 and 262, sub voce Assyrien, believed that the letter dates from a historical context in which, after Adad-nerari I's victory over Sattuara I and the latter's release, Wasasatta again broke away from Assyrian rule¹²³.

I should like to contend that the Hittite fragment KUB 31-47 is relevant to these matters and may be interpreted as a Hittite translation of a letter sent from Northern Mesopotamia, preferably by Adad-nerari I, the Assyrian King, to Muwattallis. The letter could vindicate Weidner's opinion that from the Assyrian side "Sub(a)rian" equals Hanigalbat in the Alaksandus Treaty and other sources on the Hittite side¹²⁴), while it could indicate that during the reign of Muwattallis the Hittites did indeed maintain contacts with either the released Sattuara I or more likely with Wasasatta, as assumed by Weidner and Forrer respectively. Its contents resemble the Assyrian letter KBo 1-20. The recognition of its likely background has been hampered by the fact that LÚ.MEŠ SÚ-UB-RI-E-ma-ta (Rev. 1) has been misread as (LÚ.MEŠ) ^{URU}Up-ri-ia- (Sommer, *HAB*, 91), ^{URU}Up-ri-e-ma-ta (Ertem, *Cografya*, 152) and ^{URU}Up-ri-e- (del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 457). The proposition that also this letter refers to a "Subrian king" rests on the combined evidence of Obv. 9'-11' and Rev. 1. The readable parts of KUB 31-47 run as follows:

a. Transliteration

- 9' obv. zi-ig-ma-aš-ši ya-ar-ri ku-ya-at ú-it
 10' nu-uš-ši LUGAL-iz-na¹tar¹ pē-eš-ki-it na-[a]t-ši-kán ŠU-i
 11' ti-iš-ki-it nu-za KUR-IA ta-at-ta nu-mu DINGIR-LIM-IA
 12' ya-ar-ri-iš-ši-ia am-me-el-za A-NA QA-AQ-QA-RI-IA
 13' GIM-an EGIR-an ar-ḫa-ḫa-ri

¹²²) Short bibliography of this letter: Weidner, *RIA* 1 (1928) 28 sub voce Adana(i)rari; *AfO Beiheft* 12 (1959), 40³⁶ (Assyrian ductus), *Ugaritica* 6 (1969), 523-5; Forrer, *RIA* 1, 258-9 and 262 sub voce Assyrien; Ungnad, A., *Subartu*, 51-2, 122; Rowton, *JCS* 13 (1959), 5; Otten, *AfO Beiheft* 12 (1959), 64⁵; von Weiher, *RIA* 4 (1972-5), 106. See I.J. Gelb, *HS*, 30⁽⁵²⁾ and idem, ibidem, 45-6 and 81 and Weidner 1969, 524⁽¹⁹⁻²¹⁾ for two opposing views on the usage of the term "Sub(a)rian" in Assyrian historical texts of this period; see more in general for this term Wilhelm, *Grundzüge*, 1, 3, 6 and 9-10.

¹²³) See note 131 below for Forrer's interpretation of the contents of the letter.

¹²⁴) See the literature quoted in note 132.

- 1 ^{rev.} LÚ.MEŠ SÚ-UB-RI-E-ma-ta ku-i-e-eš ŠA A-BI-IA A-BI A-BI-IA
 2 kat-ta-an EGIR-pa ú-ua-an-te-eš e-šir
 3 ú-ua-qa ku-i-e-eš kat-ta-an EGIR-pa ú-ua-an-te eš e-šir
 4 na-at UGU ti-i-e-er QA-DU₄ NÍG.GA.ĤI.A-ŠU-NU
 5 na-at-kán A-NA KUR-KA pár-ra-an-ta ú-e-er
 6 nu-us-ma-as-k[án?] X[ú]-ni-ir na-at?-ta a-pi-ni-eš-ša-an
 7 pí-ra-an ú[-e-er n]a-at ha-an-ta-a-an erasure
 8 ZAG EGIR-pa[] IR.MEŠ-mu-za ku-i'-e[-eš] X X

b. Translation

- 9' ^{obv.} Why did you come to his aid
 10' and did you repeatedly give him a kingship and did you put it
 11' regularly into his hand and did you appropriate land of mine? My god
 12' came to my aid, as soon as I stand
 13' behind (i.e. take care of) my soil!
 1 ^{rev.} The Sub(a)rians of (i.e. of the time of) my father (and) my grandfather
 2 who had come back to you
 3 and who had come back to me,
 4 they rose together with their possessions
 5 and came over the border to your country.
 6 And they [dr]ove(?) their [cattle and sheep]. And they
 7 c[ame] before you [. A]nd they truly
 8 [crossed] the border again []. The subjects wh[o]me

c. Commentary (per line)

10': Cf. Starke, *StBot* 23, 30; the text shows three examples of -i as the ending of the 2nd person singular of the preterite of the *mi*-conjugation also known from other texts of this general period.

11'-12': Cf. [ŠU-i i]e-eš-ki-iti (3rd person singular of the preterite) in the Prayer of Hattusilis III, KUB 21-27 + I 28 = Sürenhagen, *AOF* 8 (1981), 110-1 and ŠU-i tai-/tiia- in other texts from the time of Hattusilis III: the 'Apology' = *StBot* 24, 8-9: I 59, 64; 14-5: II 64; 20-1: III 44; 26-7: IV 45; *Hatt.*, 40-1: KBo 4-12 Obv. 7; the 'Tawagalawas Letter' = *AU*, 4-5: §5 I 56. The approximate meaning would seem to be: "Why did you make it available to him?". The usage of DINGIR-LIM functioning as nom. (or voc.) is not uncommon in the Prayers of Muwattallis: KUB 6-46 II 45, KUB 6-45 III 57 = KUB 6-46 IV 26, KUB 6-46 IV 27; KBo 11-1 Obv. 18, 42 (voc.).

Rev. 1. 1: See for the usage of this ethnic in Akkadian, Hurrian and Hittite texts from Hattusa (as far as the Akkadian and Hittite examples are concerned, texts with an Akkadian background): Ungnad, *Subartu*, 51⁽¹⁻⁴⁾-52⁽¹⁾; Goetze, *Kizz.*,

35⁽¹³⁸⁾; Gelb, *HS*, 30 together with notes 53 (KUB 3-77: 7' and 15', also a text in Assyrian ductus) and 54; Bossert, H. Th., *Or* 27 (1958), 345-9; del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 367 (*Šubartu*); Laroche, *Gl. Hourrite*, 238 (*šubri*).

1-5: Cf. del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 457 (*Uprija*).

4: The usage of *ug* for the dat.-loc. is also attested in KUB 6-45 III 60 (*ú-ga-kán*) = KUB 6-46 IV 29 (*[am]-mu-ga-kán*) and *ú-ua-qa* in the 'Tawagalawas Letter' = *AU*, 2-3, 33: §1 I 4.

d. The Content and the Date of the Letter

Laroche, *CTH*² 209.22, characterized the fragment as "une lettre d'un roi à un voisin agressif". The ethnic of Rev. 1 limits the choice of the Kings concerned to the Kings of Hattusa and Assur, a "Subrian king" and perhaps—in analogy with Weidner's explanation of KBo 1-20—a minor king living between the two or, in theory, three major powers of the region, Hattusa, Assur and this "Subrian king". Such a hypothetical minor king as third party would need to have been either writer or addressee and either a Hittite or an Assyrian vassal. However, in view of the fact that the fragment on its Reverse refers to events of the past which are likely to have taken place between Kings of equal standing, while on the Obverse the writer first complains about support rendered by the addressee to another, apparently less important king and then continues rather menacingly that in the past he has been able to defend with divine aid his own borders, one may exclude, I think, the in fact rather far-fetched possibility that another minor king might have been involved in the matter, functioning either as writer or as addressee.

In principle the fragment may either constitute part of a draft in Hittite for a letter to be sent elsewhere or part of the translation of an incoming letter. However, the remarkable ethnic favours the second alternative¹²⁵). Moreover, the mentioning of the "coming back", the 'home-coming' as it were of the Subarians in especially the ll. 1-2 of the Reverse would be hard to account for if the letter would have been addressed from Hattusa to Assur, since this would have implied a reversal of the historical reality: in a more distant past Assyria had been dependent on Mittanni and not Mittanni on Assyria. Spoken by an Assyrian King the passage refers to the vassal-state Hanigalbat instituted by Suppiluliumas I and apparently at later times partly conquered by Assyrian Kings, the grandfather and the father of the writer.

¹²⁵) The passages from the texts found in Hattusa mentioned in the literature quoted in the commentary to Rev. 1 mostly stem from letters in Akkadian addressed to Hattusa or from Hurrian texts. Apart from the numerous passages in Hurrian referred to by Laroche, o.c., 238, two of the examples stem from Akkadian letters in Assyrian ductus sent to Hattusa (in addition to KBo 1-20 also KUB 3-77), one from a letter sent by Ramses II (KBo 1-22), and only one counter-example from an Akkadian letter sent from Hattusa to Babylon (KBo 1-10 +). A final example occurs in a Hittite divination text of Akkadian inspiration (KUB 8-35). The phenomenon of originally Akkadian letters translated into Hittite is known from KUB 21-36 = Helck, *JCS* 17 (1963) 96-7 = Stefanini, *KUB XXI* 38, 58-62; KUB 26-89 = Stefanini, o.c., 62¹ on pp. 62-3; see, too, FsGüterbock 1, 140^{o3}.

Thus interpreted the letter supplies the still lacking information mentioned in the introduction to this subsection that parts of Hanigalbat would have been lost by the Hittites during the reign of Mursilis II to Assyria, with this important difference that not Mursilis II but Muwattallis would have reconquered the territories in question.

During the reign of at least one later King on both sides, i.e. during the reigns of Shalmaneser I on the Assyrian and of Hattusilis III on the Hittite side, the Assyrians fought against the remnants of the Hittite vassal-state Hanigalbat. Also Sattuara II asked for Hittite support on that occasion¹²⁶). However, if the movements of the Subarians described in the Reverse may be identified with changes in the allegiance to either Hattusa or to Assur, the known events during the reign of Adad-nerari I would seem to plead strongly for an ascription of this fragment to this earlier phase of the 13th Century B.C. The linguistic evidence adduced in the commentary supports this dating of the letter¹²⁷). As a Hittite translation of a letter sent by Adad-nerari I, it should preferably be dated to the period prior to the defeat of Wasasatta. Perhaps it may be added that 2539/c, treated and published by Güterbock, *SBo* 2, 38 and 82, may very well constitute a letter sent by Wasasatta to a Hittite King of this general period and thus to either Muwattallis or Urhi-Tessub¹²⁸).

The Subrian king of the fragment strikingly reminds me of the description of Wasasatta in the Assyrian inscription (II) and shows affinities with picture of the "Subrian king" who emerges from Weidner's treatment of a retrospective passage in KBo 1-20 in Weidner 1983, 523-4: obv. 9' "In the time during which Adad-Nerari, my lord, was hostile^{10'} [to]wards the country of Ha[nigalbat], (the inhabitants of) the country of Hanigalbat, a[ll (of them)],^{11'} left their towns and entered into [the country of Hatti(?)],^{12'} what (happened) in the time that this^{13'} Su[brian] king whom you [called] for aid,^{14'} rose up to me and seiz[ed] the throne,^{15'-16'} (the inhabitants of) the towns and the refugees whom they turned from the country of Han[igalbat(?)] to you, he to[ok away] all (of them)"¹²⁹).

¹²⁶) This applies to Sattuara II during the reigns of Hattusilis III and Shalmaneser III, cf. the inscription of the latter in Grayson, *ARI* I, 82, §530; see, too, the letter of a King of Hanigalbat (Sattuara II?) to either Hattusilis III or Tudhaliyas IV, cf. Klengel, *Or* 32 (1963), 280-91 and *OrAnt* 7 (1968), 71²⁷; *IBoT* 1-34, especially II. 7-8, 10-14, 18.

¹²⁷) See, too, the judgement of del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 457.

¹²⁸) Cf. Güterbock, *SBo* II, 38, 53-4 = K. Kessler, *TAVO* B/26, 87-8; Güterbock defended the position that the letter may have been sent to the Hittite King by Wasasatta either before or after his defeat by Adad-nerari I.

¹²⁹) Weidner transliterated the passage as follows: (Obv.) 9' *i-na u₄-mi* ^{MD} *adad-narâri bêli [i]š-tu kur_{ha}[ni-gal-bat]* 10' *na-ak-ru-ni kur_{ha}[ni-gal-bat] g[ab-bu]* 11' *âlân^{as}.as-šu-nu û-ta-as-še-ru a-na[...]* 12' *e-tar-bu ša i-na u₄-mi šarru šu-u[b-ri-û]* 13' *an-ni-û ša a-na ni-ra-ru-te ta-[...]* 14' *e-li-an-ni û* ^{is} *kussû is-bu-[tu-ni]* 15' *âlân^{as}.as û mu-nab-ti ša iš-tu kur_{ha}[ni-gal-bat]* 16' *û-sa-ši-ru-ni ku-nu-ni gab-ba il-le-qi*. After *AHW* sub voce *sahârum* (D) (*û-sa-ši-ru-ni-ku-nu-ni*) I adapted Weidner's translation of the II. 15'-16', "Die Bewöhner der Städte und die Flüchtlinge, die sich aus dem Lande Han[igalbat] gewendet hatten, insgesamt na[hm er fort]", while with respect to l. 11' I adhered to an earlier proposal of Weidner himself.

According to Weidner, in this passage of KBo 1-20 reference is made to fugitives from Hanigalbat who had entered into [another country] and were later retrieved by this "Subrian king". In an earlier, more succinct characterization of KBo 1-20, Weidner had claimed that the fugitives had entered [Hittite territory]¹³⁰), but in his later treatment he reckoned with the possibility that they might have entered the country of the Assyrian vassal in question who, in his opinion, wrote the letter in order to forewarn a group of Hittite vassals against the activities of the released Sattuara I. In his, as I have been told by Mr. W.H. van Soldt, less reliable treatment of the letter, Forrer thought that the fugitives would have entered [Hittite territory] and that the Hittite King and the "Subrian king", in Forrer's opinion not identical with a king of Hanigalbat, were ruling in a sort of condominium over a deposed or degraded king of Hanigalbat in whom Forrer recognized Wasasatta. The latter would have written KBo 1-20¹³¹). Reading the treatment of KBo 1-20 by both Weidner and Forrer one feels tempted to speculate whether the reference in l. 13' to aid asked from the "Subrian king" by the Hittite vassals to whom the letter was addressed might refer to the support rendered by Hanigalbat during the battle of Qadesh. KBo 1-20 could have been written after 1275 B.C. and before Wasasatta's defeat.

In my opinion both KBo 1-20 and KUB 31-47 attest to the likelihood that in letters of Assyrian origin of this period "Subrian king" may indeed be used for a rather independently operating King of Hanigalbat, as proposed by Weidner, while the Assyrian inscription and especially KUB 31-47 would seem to indicate that for a perhaps not inconsiderable period of time Muwattallis did render support to Wasasatta to a degree which surpasses the expectations of Weidner and Forrer with respect to either Sattuara I (Weidner) or Wasasatta (Forrer) on the basis of KBo 1-20. The Reverse of KUB 31-47 would seem to indicate that the fugitives mentioned in KBo 1-20 did in fact enter into Hittite territory. Muwattallis, the hypothetical addressee of KUB 31-47, would have offered the aid and the recognition referred to in the Obverse of KUB 31-47 in order to keep the Assyrians at a

¹³⁰) *RIA* I (1928), 281: "Auch in einem assyrischem Briefe, der in Bohazköy gefunden wurde, wird Adadnarâri I, im Zusammenhang mit dem Lande Hanigalbat (.....) genannt (KBo I, Nr 20, Vs. Z. 9). Es scheint dass dort auf vergangene Zeiten angespielt wird und Flüchtlinge reklamiert werden, die sich während der Kämpfe Adadnarâris in Nord-Mesopotamien nach Hatti begeben hatten".

¹³¹) Cf. Forrer, *RIA* I (1928), 257-8 and 262: "Auf die Vorgänge, die sich hierbei abgespielt haben, scheint mit einiges Licht zu fallen durch den in assyrischer Schrift geschriebenen Text VAT 6173 (= KBo I, Nr. 20) aus Boghazköy, dem ein guter Sinn abzugewinnen ist, wenn man ihn als Brief eines abgesetzten oder degradierten Königs von Hanigalbat an die benachbarten 'Grossen', d.h. Bundesfürsten des Hatti-Reiches von Karkemis und Isuva ansieht. Dieser König ist vorher dem namentlich genannten (Vs. Z. 9) Adadnirâri untertan gewesen, und der Brief ist unmittelbar nach der Eroberung von Hanigalbat durch den Hatti-König und den Subriu-König geschrieben von denen er daher ersteren als 'mein Herr' bezeichnet". In the continuation of his treatment of the reign of Adad-nerari I, Forrer emphasizes that between the defection and the defeat of Wasasatta would have passed the years of the Hittite-Sub(a)rian condominium over Hanigalbat. The superior interpretation of Obv. 9' given by Weidner and Otten eliminates the condominiumship and turns the writer into a minor Assyrian vassal.

distance, while the fragment would show that Muwattallis's policy with respect to Hanigalbat irritated and even angered the Assyrian King Adad-nerari I.

Seen against this background the manner in which the Alaksandus Treaty refers to the King of Hanigalbat, both as a 'Great King' and as a possible enemy, need not cause surprise, nor would it cause surprise that in this document for Anatolian use the country ruled by this Subrian king is named Hanigalbat, the customary designation for the former (and present(?)) Hurrian vassal-state¹³², after Sattiwaza, presumably the grandfather of Wasasatta, had been re-instated by Suppiluliumas I towards the end of his reign.

The reasoning that in addition to a date during the first phase of the reign of Muwattallis¹³³, also a later date of the Alaksandus Treaty may be both defended and preferred rests on the following argument (in a reversed chronological order): 1) A victory of Adad-nerari, I over Wasasatta between 1275 B.C., the year in which presumably Wasasatta contributed troops to the army of Muwattallis fighting at Qadesh, and before 1270 B.C., cf. Rowton's estimate with respect to its date on basis of the eponyms available for the period after this defeat, would make good sense from a historical point of view since Adad-nerari I could have reacted to the altered political situation both with respect to the outcome of the battle itself and with respect to the succession of Muwattallis by Urhi-Tessub¹³⁴.

2) Perhaps already before 1275 B.C. Muwattallis could have rendered the political aid to the 'Subrian King' = the King of Hanigalbat = Wasasatta (KUB 31-47).

3) In view of the combined evidence of a) the Alaksandus Treaty that at the time of its conclusion Hattusa still functioned as the State Capital, and of b) the 'Apology of Hattusilis III' that the second phase of Muwattallis's reign began approximately ten years before the battle of Qadesh¹³⁵, the decade beginning in 1285 B.C. constitutes a suitable choice for the period during which either the released Sattuara I or the apparently more independently operating Wasasatta, possibly in an early phase of his reign before it became necessary for him to rely heavily on Hittite support, might have been the King of Hanigalbat referred to in the Alaksandus Treaty.

If Muwattallis moved the Capital in two stages, staying first elsewhere before he made a more permanent choice for Tarhuntassa, or, if the installation of the new residence quite understandably required a number of years during which the former Capital, Hattusa, was first entrusted to Mittannamuwas, only to be added to the territories governed by his brother Hattusilis after the full completion of

¹³²) Cf. von Weiher, *RIA* 4 (1972-4), 105-7 and *FsOtten*, 321-6.

¹³³) See now, too, KUB 31-47 Rev. 1-2.

¹³⁴) The well-known final passage of KBo 1-14 attests to the fact that also during the reign of Urhi-Tessub the relations between Hattusa and Assyria had been strained, cf. Goetze, *Kizz.*, 30-1: Rev. 15-16.

¹³⁵) The period of in total more than ten years assigned to the second phase is based on a combination of the passages referring to Hapissa and Istahara in the 'Apology', *StBoT* 24, 10-1: § 6 II 14-16; 14-5: § 8 II 61-68; 16-7: § 9 II 69-72 and III 10-13; 18-9: § 10 b III 31'-35'; see, too, KBo 6-29 I 25-26/28 = *Hatt.*, 46-7.

Tarhuntassa¹³⁶), it would become feasible to take Wasasatta in consideration. In that case Hattusa could still have functioned as the official starting point for military operations in foreign countries during the first part of the second phase of Muwattallis's reign.

Personally I would hesitate to choose for the first phase of the reign of Muwattallis (Sattuara I before he was captured by Adad-nerari I), not only on account of the fact that KUB 31-47 would seem to indicate that Muwattallis first restored Hittite power over (part of) Hanigalbat, but also since I consider it rather unlikely that a Hittite vassal-king of Hanigalbat would have been referred to in a State Treaty, be it indirectly, as a security risk as far as his future behaviour is concerned. If the passage stresses the possibility of hostile behaviour from the side of Hanigalbat, the released Sattuara I would be the obvious choice, since the Assyrian inscription shows that during the remainder of his life he was a loyal Assyrian vassal. If the independent position of the King to Hanigalbat had been stressed, Wasasatta would seem to be the better choice.

If the fragmentary letter KUB 31-47 is interpreted as a Hittite translation of an incoming letter of Adad-nerari I (1295-1264 B.C.), the writer would refer in turn to, as far as I know, not generally acknowledged 'successes' of his grandfather Enlil-nerari (1317-1308 B.C.) and his father Arik-den-ili (1307-1296 B.C.) (Rev. 1)¹³⁷, to initial but transient successes of Muwattallis before his own reign (Rev. 1-2)¹³⁸, to accomplishments of himself (Rev. 3), and finally to a possibly prolonged period of intervention on the part of Muwattallis in the affairs of Hanigalbat at large (Obv. 9, 11; Rev. 4ff.). We may conclude from his own inscription that also the second intervention of the Hittites finally was unsuccessful. From the prosopographical point of view the Rev. 1-3 would add the additional information that Muwattallis ascended the Hittite throne before Adad-nerari I succeeded to his predecessor.

¹³⁶) See the beginning of this subsection together with the notes 100 and 101.

¹³⁷) The passages referring to "the Assyrian" with respect to the vassal-kingdoms of Hanigalbat and Carchemish during the reigns of Suppiluliumas I and Mursilis II describe events which, within the new 'shortened' chronology, took place during the reigns of Assurballit (1353-1318 B.C.) (a and b) and of Enlil-nerari (1317-1308 B.C.) (c) respectively: a) the aid rendered to Suttarna, the adversary of Sattiwaza and the King of Carchemish, described in *PD* I, 2, 38-9: Obv. 6'-7' and 46-7: Obv. 51' and more clearly in the 'Deeds' Fr. 35 ii 34'-37' = *JCS* 10 (1956), 111; b) the Assyrian threat during the first and second year of Mursilis II countered by the sending of Nuwanzas to Carchemish, *AM*, 26-9: KUB 14-16 I 13-22; c) the comparable likely Assyrian threat to the security of Carchemish after the death of Sarri-Kusuh = Piyassilis during the ninth year of Mursilis II referred to in the beginning of this subsection (see note 102), this time countered by a campaign undertaken by Mursilis himself, cf. *AM*, 116-21: KBo 4-4 II 40-62. As has been mentioned above, the name of the enemy is broken off at the decisive points. So far no evidence has come to light with respect to the presumed successes of Mursilis II concerning Hanigalbat during the second half of his reign, which would seem to have been roughly contemporary with that of Arik-den-ili (1307-1296 B.C.).

¹³⁸) On the basis of this ascription one may now consider the possibility that Muwattallis would have rewon terrain in Hanigalbat lost during the reign of Mursilis II, but in that case it should be acknowledged that these losses are at the most implied or hinted at in the Annals of Mursilis II, taken by itself a rather interesting point in view of the moot question of the veracity of the Hittite Annals.