



talugaeš wittes

Ancient Near Eastern Studies
Presented to Stefano de Martino
on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday

Edited by Michele Cammarosano,
Elena Devecchi and Maurizio Viano

Kasion 2

Zaphon

talugaeš witteš

Ancient Near Eastern Studies
Presented to Stefano de Martino
on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday

Edited by Michele Cammarosano,
Elena Devecchi and Maurizio Viano

Kasion

Publikationen zur ostmediterranen Antike
Publications on Eastern Mediterranean Antiquity

Band 2

Herausgegeben von Sebastian Fink,
Ingo Kottsieper und Kai A. Metzler

talugaeš witteš

Ancient Near Eastern Studies
Presented to Stefano de Martino
on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday

Edited by Michele Cammarosano,
Elena Devecchi and Maurizio Viano

Zaphon
Münster
2020

Illustration auf dem Einband: Ausschnitt aus KBo 21.22 (406/c).
Courtesy Hethitologie-Portal Mainz: hethiter.net/:3DArchiv 406-c.

talugaeš witeš

Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino
on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday

Edited by Michele Cammarosano, Elena Devecchi and Maurizio Viano

Kasion 2

© 2020 Zaphon, Münster (www.zaphon.de)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed in Germany
Printed on acid-free paper

ISBN 978-3-96327-110-6

ISSN 2626-7179



Stefano a Venezia

Indice

Prefazione	XI
Pubblicazioni di Stefano de Martino.....	XV
Silvia Alaura	
La vera storia di un clamoroso falso ittita di fine Ottocento	1
Metin Alparslan – Meltem Doğan-Alparslan	
Ein neues Tontafelfragment aus Boğazköy: Boğazkale 1-1-2018	23
Alfonso Archi	
Personal Names of Proto-Anatolian Indo-European-Speaking Populations East of the Euphrates (24 th Cent. BC).....	27
Giorgio Buccellati	
“ <i>Awīliš īwē</i> ”: L’uomo mesopotamico come figlio della città	37
Alessandra Cellerino	
Il sigillo a cilindro IM 115642 dalla Tomba Reale III a Nimrud: Una raffigurazione enigmatica.....	51
Yoram Cohen – Netanel Anor	
Forging an Empire: The Borders of Carchemish According to <i>CTH 50</i> (KUB 19.27)	71
Lorenzo d’Alfonso	
Reorganization vs. Resilience in Early Iron Age Monumental Art of Central Anatolia.....	81
Belkıs Dinçol – Hasan Peker	
Sealings from Renewed Excavations at Alalakh	103
Rita Dolce	
Visual Communication and the Audience: An Observation Point on Mesopotamia.....	109

Frederick Mario Fales	
The Rural Hinterland of Assyrian Cities: Clusters of Toponyms	121
Massimo Forlanini	
Il contesto storico delle istruzioni “umanitarie” hittite e l’“invasione” dei caschei (Kaška)	141
Rita Francia	
The Name of Babylon in Hittite Texts.....	175
Helmut Freydank – Doris Prechel	
Nochmals zum Brief des Labarna an Tunija von Tikunani	193
Amir Gilan	
“She did not call me father, so I will not call her my daughter!” The Episode of the “Daughter” in <i>CTH</i> 6 and Its Historical Significance.....	203
Federico Giusfredi	
On the Old Assyrian <i>tuzzinum</i>	215
Fatma Kaynar	
KUB 32.121: il quinto frammento del rituale di Šalašu?	225
Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati	
The Urkesh Mittani Horizon: Ceramic Evidence	237
Jörg Klinger	
Nochmals zur Schreibung der Konjunktion <i>mahḥan</i> und ihrer Geschichte.....	257
Carlo Lippolis – Roberta Menegazzi	
From Turin to Karakorum: Archaeology for the Public through Asia.....	275
Romolo Loreto	
Sulle origini del commercio carovaniero tra la Penisola Arabica e il Vicino Oriente antico.....	287
Massimiliano Marazzi	
PORTA, PORTA ₂ und „Hofeingang“ in den Hieroglypheninschriften des 2. Jts. v. Chr.	301
Paolo Matthiae	
On the Historical Events of the Hurro-Hittite “Song of Release”.....	317

Vito Messina

A Statue of the *mušhuššu* of Marduk at Babylon?..... 331

Jared L. Miller

Two Notes on Kizzuwatna's Status as a Hittite Vassal
in the Middle Hittite Period345

Clelia Mora

Cylinder Seals as a Status Symbol in Hittite Anatolia.....351

Frances Pinnock

Far nascere una statua, uccidere una statua: Ebla e gli Ittiti (?)
nel periodo paleosiriano.....361

Simonetta Ponchia

Essere senza un padre: Una nota su Gilgamesh.....377

Robert Rollinger

Some Considerations on Empire and Mental Mapping:
Conceptualizing the Ends of the World in the First Millennium BCE383

Andreas Schachner

The Power of Geography: Criteria for Selecting the Location of Hattuša,
the Capital City of the Hittite Empire399

Aygül Süel

A Mould from Ortaköy/Şapinuwa421

Giulia Torri

Potters and Pottery in Hittite Society, According to Written Sources433

Roberta Venco Ricciardi – Enrico Fioletta

Cinture di sovrani, nobili e cavalieri nella statuaria di Hatra.....453

Mark Weeden

Hurrian in a Tablet from Tigonānum.....469

Gernot Wilhelm

Allaituraḫe489

Two Notes on Kizzuwatna's Status as a Hittite Vassal in the Middle Hittite Period

Jared L. Miller

It is a pleasure to offer this short paper to my friend and colleague Stefano de Martino, who has contributed so much to the field over the years, and who has concentrated so much of his energies on encouraging and supporting younger scholars in his wake. I trust these lines will be of interest to him, as he himself has often written on these and related topics.

1. Pa/illiya's Kizzuwatna as "independent state" or Hittite subject?

Schwemer (2007, 152) has recently questioned the common view according to which the treaty between Idrimi of Alalaḫ and Pa/illiya of Kizzuwatna (AIT 3) suggests that both these vassals would have been subordinate to the same overlord, Barrattarna I of Mittani, before whom it was ratified (Beal 1986, 428–431, Miller 2004, 354, Bryce 2005, 117–118, Devecchi 2015a, 69, de Martino 2018, 39, 42). He thereby also calls into question the assumption that Kizzuwatna must have switched or must have been forced to switch overlords at some point during Pa/illiya's reign, since this king of Kizzuwatna is also attested as a vassal of Zidanza II of Ḫatti (*CTH* 25, KUB 36.108). Schwemer sees Pa/illiya's Kizzuwatna rather as "an independent state allied with the Hittites, but free to conclude basic agreements with neighbouring kingdoms like that of Idrimi. It was certainly not unusual for an independent ruler of a small kingdom to conclude a treaty with a neighbouring king who was a vassal of one of the big players." Indeed, as Devecchi (2015b) recently made quite clear, it was normal and expected that a vassal would make agreements with another vassal of his own overlord or with a vassal of an overlord who was allied with his own overlord. However, this freedom certainly did not extend to a vassal of an overlord who was in a state of enmity with his own overlord.

As a parallel to the situation with Idrimi and Pa/illiya Schwemer (2007, 152) refers to the treaty between Ir-Teššub of Tunip and Niqmepa of Alalaḫ (AIT 2), assuming that while Niqmepa would be a vassal of Mittani in this document, "Ir-Teššub is apparently acting independently." Much speaks against this interpretation, however. First, most researchers see this very text, AIT 2, as an indication of

Tunip having been a Mittanian vassal at this point (e.g. Klengel 1992, 89, 98). The passage in ALT 2 that Schwemer cites—“[The kin]g of the Hurrians is my lord. (Even) if you are at war with the king of the Hur[ri]ans, I will not break the oath to the king of the Hurrians, my lord, (unless) he cancels the words of the oath.”—constitutes no evidence for Tunip having been independent of Mittani, as the speaker’s words are meant as a hypothetical eventuality, intended to emphasize his loyalty to his overlord. One might paraphrase his statement as, “Even if you become hostile to our lord, I will remain loyal to him!” Further, if one follows von Dassow (2008, 52f.) in her reasonable suggestion, according to which the speaker of ALT 2 is not Niqmepa of Alalah, but Ir-Teššub of Tunip (cf. e.g. van Soldt 2016, 141), then the passage just cited would conclusively show that Tunip was indeed a Mittanian vassal.

Finally, the treaty between Zidanza II and Pa/illiya itself, despite its fragmentary condition, makes it clear that Pa/illiya’s Kizzuwatna would not have been an “independent state.” It is not—nor is any other Hittite treaty with Kizzuwatna clearly—a “parity” treaty.¹ The tablet (*CTH* 25; KUB 36.108) preserves enough text to make clear that Zidanza is the sovereign, Pa/illiya his vassal, who must swear to his Hittite overlord an oath of loyalty (Devecchi 2015a, 68f.). That Ḫatti’s treaties with Kizzuwatna in some instances show favourable treatment of this important vassal, so that some clauses are formulated reciprocally—as do a number of other treaties—should not obscure this point. Pa/illiya was thus a Hittite subject, not an independent state, at the juncture in question.

2. Sunaššura’s Kizzuwatna as “(independent) ally” or Mittani as “(voluntary) vassal”?

The precise meaning of lines 5–6 of the first column of Tudḫaliya I’s Akkadian language treaty with Sunaššura of Kizzuwatna is not immediately transparent and has been discussed repeatedly in the secondary literature. Most recently Devecchi

¹ Some maintain, of course, that *CTH* 21 (Ispuḫsu of Kizzuwatna and, presumably, Telipinu of Ḫatti), *CTH* 26 (Paddatissu of Kizzuwatna and a Hittite King) and/or *CTH* 29 (Eḫeya of Kizzuwatna and Taḫurwaili of Ḫatti) are or might be parity treaties (e.g. most recently Devecchi 2015a, 63–73). While the sorry state of preservation of these three texts prevents any unequivocal confirmation or denial of the possibility, the mere fact that the Hittite partner in all three bears the title Great King, the Kizzuwatnean partner only that of King, is enough to cast serious doubt on the assumption. Assuming that *CTH* 21, especially, is a parity treaty based on its few partially preserved paragraphs is highly dubious: a significantly greater number of paragraphs of Tudḫaliya I’s treaty with Sunaššura would suggest parity in isolation, but its further context makes it perfectly clear that it is a subordination treaty, demonstrating how risky such an assumption is. The fact that *CTH* 21, e.g., indicates parity ‘as far as preserved’ is hardly the same thing as *CTH* 21 being a parity treaty. As Beckman rightly states (2006, 288), the Hittite-Egyptian treaty is the only clear example of a parity treaty.

(2015a, 78) translated, in accordance with the most commonly accepted interpretation, “Anticamente, all’epoca [a di] mio [n]onno, il paese di Kizzuwatna era diventato (parte) del paese di Ḫatti” (KBo 1.5 i 5–6: *pa-na-nu-um a-na pa-n[i a]-bi a-bi-ia* KUR^{URU} *Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni ša* KUR^{URU} *Ḫa-at-t[i i]b-bá-ši*).

Schwemer (2007, 152) has argued that the crucial clause, “became (that) of Ḫatti” (*ša* KUR^{URU} *Ḫa-at-t[i i]b-bá-ši*), suggests that Kizzuwatna was an “(independent) ally” rather than a subject of Ḫatti. He does so, inter alia, with reference to a passage in a Hittite fragment of the same (or a closely related) treaty showing the parallel Hittite usage, which he renders, “But if he (Šunaššura) does not become (that) of My Sun, I (My Sun) will protect my land against the enemy” (KUB 36.127 obv.¹ 4’–5’: *ma-a-na-aš-za Ú-UL-ma ŠA* ^dUTU-ŠI *ki-i-ša nu-za* KUR-IA *A-NA* ^{LÚ}KÚR² [... *me-na-a]ḫ-ḫa-an-da pa-aḫ-ḫa-aš-ḫa*). Schwemer comments that, “it is clear that the free genitive can only mean “(independent) ally of My Sun” and not “vassal of My Sun.”

It is, however, not self-evident that Sunaššura is at issue in this passage of the Hittite version (KUB 36.127 obv.¹ 4’–5’), which is the assumption—indicated by Schwemer’s parenthetical insertion of the name Sunaššura—that forces Schwemer to opt for his translation “(independent) ally” rather than “vassal.” To the contrary, it is likely that the king of Mittani is the subject of this sentence, not Sunaššura, as examination of the context of these passages and especially comparison with the following paragraph suggests.² In the fragmentary and thus still partially obscure obv.¹ 1’–6’ is laid out how Sunaššura and the Hittite king are to conduct themselves in case Mittani “does not become (that) of My Majesty,” i.e. does not become a Hittite vassal. The better preserved and clearer obv.¹ 7’–10’ detail how Sunaššura and the Hittite king are to conduct themselves if the Mittanian king not only declines to become a Hittite subject, but also decides to take up arms against Ḫatti (Devecchi 2015a, 89f.). The Mittanian king would thus be the =*ssi* in obv.¹ 3’: *Š[u-na-aš-šu]-ra-ša’-aš-ši*, and indeed, it is difficult to imagine who else the pronoun might refer to. In any case, even if one rejects the possibility of Mittani being at issue in lines 4’–5’, the subject here surely cannot be Sunaššura. With the treaty at hand Sunaššura had clearly entered into the relationship in question with Hittite, however it is to be understood, so that any statement beginning with a conditional “If he should become (that) of My Majesty” can hardly be referring to Sunaššura.

Another comparison is offered by a passage from Mursili II’s treaty with Kupanta-Kuruntiya of Mira-Kuwaliya, where one reads, “And how did Masḫuluwa behave? He transgressed against My Majesty, and then he defected from him; [his servants, though], became (those) of My Majesty ([^{MES}IR-ŠU-ma]-za ŠA ^dUTU-ŠI *ki-ša-an-ta-at*) and they spoke thus: ‘You have transgressed [against]

² For considerations on the possibility that Ḫatti and Mittani had in fact been bound by a treaty at some point before the tensions described in the treaty with Sunaššura, see Devecchi 2015c, 172–173.

His Majesty, but we are servants of His Majesty alone” (*an-za-a-aš-ma-wa-an-na-aš* $\dot{\text{IR}}^{\text{MES}}$ dUTU-ŠI-pát ; KBo 4.3++ iv 12–15). In this narrative it is essentially defined what it means “to be(come) (that) of His/My Majesty,” namely, “to be(come) servants of His/My Majesty alone.” Here the locution seems to point to voluntary submission, or at least submission that had not been imposed by the sword, as becomes apparent in the succeeding lines, which read, “And if you, Kupanta-Kuruntiya, behave thus, so that your servants defect from you and they take the side of My Majesty (*na-at IŠ-TU ŠA* dUTU-ŠI ti-an-zi), then I, My Majesty, will not support you in that matter” (KBo 4.3++ iv 16–18; CHD L–N, 274a).

Finally, a passage from the so-called Indictment of Madduwatta (KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 obv. 15, 21) makes clear that one who had “become (that) of His Majesty” was one who had sworn an oath of fealty to the king, i.e. become a Hittite vassal: “Further, thereafter the father of My Majesty made you, Madduwatta, his sworn ally. He made [you] swear an oath, and he placed these matters under oath for you, (saying): ‘I, the father of His Majesty^(sic), have hereby saved [you], Madduwatta, [from the sword] of Attarsiya. Be (that) of the father of His Majesty^(sic) and of Ḫatti! (*nu-wa'-za ŠA A-BI* $\text{dUTU-ŠI} \dot{\text{U}} \dot{\text{ŠA}} \text{KUR}^{\text{URU}} \text{Ḫa-at'-ti e-eš}$) I have [now] given you the land of Mount Zippasla [to rule].’” And in line 21 this command is reformulated, again confirming what the locution meant: “Be m[y] servant, and your troops shall be my troops!” (*nu-wa-za' am-[me-el] 'İR-TU₄' e-eš* $\dot{\text{ERIN}}^{\text{MES.HI.A}} \text{-KA-ia-wa am-me-el } \dot{\text{ERIN}}^{\text{MES.HI.A}} \text{ a-š'a-an-du}$ ”; cf. Beckman – Bryce – Cline 2011, 73).

Moreover, it would be unique and entirely unexpected in a Hittite treaty of any type if the treaty partner were to remain “free in his decision whether or not to support the Hittite king in the case of aggression against Ḫatti” (Schwemer 2007, 152).³ Even Ugarit, which received the most generous terms of any vassal in this respect, was required to support the Hittite king’s military efforts financially, with the huge sum of 50 mina of gold, upon being relieved of its duty to supply troops (RS 17.59; Lackenbacher 2002, 101f.). Nor does the only extant parity treaty, that with Egypt, grant the signatories the freedom to refuse support in case of aggression (Devecchi 2015a, 267–270), but require precisely this.

Thus, the phrase “to be(come) (that) of Ḫatti or His/My Majesty,” whether in Hittite or in Akkadian, indicates a subordinate relationship. Instead of “(independent) ally” for those entering such a relationship, one should rather translate, if not simply “vassal”, then “a vassal of one’s own volition.” KBo 1.5 i 5–6 of Tudḫaliya’s treaty with Sunaššura refer to Kizzuwatna having become a Hittite vassal, and KUB 36.127 obv.¹ 4’–5’ refer to the possibility of Mittani becoming a Hittite subject.

³ Cf. also Schwemer 2012, 313b: “Bemerkenswerterweise wird Kizzuwatna ausdrücklich das Recht auf Neutralität zugesprochen.”

Bibliography

Beal, R.H.

1986 "The History of Kizzuwatna and the Date of the Šunaššura Treaty," *OrNS* 55, 424–445.

Beckman, G.

2006 "Hittite Treaties and the Development of the Cuneiform Treaty Tradition," in: M. Witte and J.C. Gertz (ed.), *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und Religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus“-Diskussion in Tora und Vorde- ren Propheten*. Berlin–New York, 279–301.

Beckman, G.M., T.R. Bryce and E. Cline

2011 *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (WAW 28). Atlanta.

Bryce, T.R.

2005 *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (new ed.). Oxford.

de Martino, S.

2018 "Political and Cultural Relations between the Kingdom of Mittani and its Subordinated Polities in Syria and Southeast Anatolia," in: A. Gianto and P. Dubovský (ed.), *Changing Faces of Kingship in Syria–Palestine 1500–500 BCE*. (AOAT 459). Münster, 37–50.

Devecchi, E.

2015a *Trattati internazionali ittiti*. Brescia.

2015b "The International Relations of Ḫatti's Syrian Vassals, or How to make the Best of Things," in: B. Eder and R. Pruzsinszky (ed.), *Policies of Exchange: Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E. Proceedings of the International Symposium at the University of Freiburg Institute for Archaeological Studies, 30th May – 2nd June 2012* (Oriental and European Archaeology 2). Vienna, 117–126.

2015c "Missing Treaties of the Hittites," *KASKAL* 12, 155–182.

Klengel, H.

1992 *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.* Berlin.

Lackenbacher, S.

2002 *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit* (LAPO 20). Paris.

Miller, J.L.

2004 *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (StBoT 46). Wiesbaden.

Schwemer, D.

2007 Rev. of T.R. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford 2005, *BSOAS* 70, 151–153.

2012 "Šunaššura," *RIA* 13, 313–314.

van Soldt, W.H.

- 2016 “The Orontes Valley in Texts from Alalah and Ugarit during the Late Bronze Age, ca 1500–1200 BC,” in: D. Parayre (ed.), *Le fleuve rebelle: Géographie historique du moyen Oronte d’Ebla à l’èpoque médiévale. Actes du colloque international tenu les 13 et 14 décembre 2012 à Nanterre (MAE) et à Paris (INHA)* (Syrie, Supplément IV). Beyrouth, 137–144.

von Dassow, E.

- 2008 *State and Society in the Late Bronze Age: Alalah under the Mittani Empire* (SCCNH 17). Bethesda.