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Summary

The article discusses the formal features of the Aleppo Treaty (CTH 75) and its position in the diversified corpus of documents issued by the Hittite kings for the rulers of subjugated territories, especially for those who were members of the Hittite royal family. A renewed analysis of the text as well as comparison with the Tarḫuntašša treaties allows to hypothesize that its peculiarities do not depend on its being an official copy of an older document, but may well belong to the original document issued by Muršili II and reflect the very nature of CTH 75, which in many ways bears more similarity to a land grant than to a subjugation treaty. An appendix is dedicated to the prosopographical analysis of the human witnesses who are listed at the end of the Treaty.

1. Preliminary remarks

The text catalogued by Laroche as CTH 75 and commonly known as the Aleppo Treaty is an official copy, authorized by the Hittite king Muwattalli II, of a document originally issued by his father and predecessor Muršili II for Talmi-Šarruma, Muršili’s nephew and king of Aleppo. CTH 75 has drawn scholars’ attention mainly because of its long historical excursus that constitutes the first part of the text and reports on the relations among Hatti, Mittani and Aleppo from the time of Ḫattušili I until that of Šuppiluliuma I, and possibly even later, until the reign of Muršili II. Many of the historical issues raised by this prologue are still debated, but this article will concentrate on the formal features of the text and its position in the diversified corpus of documents issued by the Hittite kings for the rulers of subjugated territories, especially for those who were members of the Hittite royal family.

---

1 This article, which is based on a chapter of my PhD dissertation “Editti e trattati nel mondo ittita: tipologia, struttura e modalità di redazione” (Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia 2008), is a revised and expanded version of a paper presented at the 55ème Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris 6–9 July 2009). I wish to thank Stefano de Martino, Theo van den Hout, Shai Gordin, Marco Marizza and Jared L. Miller for having read this paper and offered me a number of useful remarks. I owe important improvements on the reading of some witnesses’ names to the kind suggestions of Jared L. Miller and Daniel Schwemer.

2. The manuscripts

The Aleppo Treaty was written in Akkadian and handed down only by archival copies recovered at the site of the Hittite capital, Ḫattuša. The best preserved copy, published as KBo 1.6 (CTH 75.A), now belongs to the collection of the British Museum, which kindly allowed me to collate the tablet (BM 140856).³ Four other manuscripts have been identified as exemplars of the Aleppo Treaty,⁴ but only one of them (CTH 75.B) can be ascribed to it with certainty, since it also preserves the part added by Muwattalli to his father’s document. The other three fragments preserve only a few lines of the historical prologue (CTH 75.D) and the normative section (CTH 75.C and E) and could theoretically be ascribed to either Muršili’s original text or Muwattalli’s later copy. It should also be noted that manuscripts A, B, C and E run quite parallel, while the text of D often diverges from the other copies in both wording and content.⁵

Copies A and B share some orthographic features that distinguish them from the rest of the Akkadian corpus of Boğazköy. Peculiar is for instance the form a-bu-ú-a, “my father” (CTH 75.A obv. 3, 7, 33; CTH 75.B obv. 3),⁶ which witnesses a typical Middle Babylonian phonetic phenomenon attested especially in the forms of abu and ahú.⁷ Also noteworthy are the Assyrian forms of the present of nadānu (CTH 75.A obv. 5 ad-dan-na-ás-šu; CTH 75.B obv. 5’ ad-dá-an-na-a[š-šu]),⁸ which occur in Akkadian texts from Ḫattuša only here and in the treaty between Ḫattušili III and Bentešina of Amurru (CTH 92 obv. 14, 15, 30).⁹

3. Dating of the text

Two different dates have been proposed for the drafting of CTH 75. On the one hand it has been suggested that Muwattalli II issued it during his military campaign in Syria, usually dated to the end of his reign, in order to stabilize and strengthen Hittite power in the region.¹⁰ According to the testimony of the document itself, however, the Hittite king issued it because the original

---
³ Of great help were also the three-dimensional, high-resolution images taken by Hendrik Hameeuw in July 2009 with the “mini-dome” of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/assyriologie/cuneiform.htm).
⁴ CTH 75.B = KUB 3.6; CTH 75.C = KUB 3.5; CTH 75.D = KBo 28.120; CTH 75.E = KUB 48.72.
⁵ See also Klengel 1964, 213.
⁶ Labat 1932, 88–89.
⁷ Aro 1955, 33 and 67.
⁸ According to a typical Middle Babylonian habit (GAG §78e η and Aro 1955, 80), the present is used here to indicate an action that took place in the past.
⁹ Labat 1932, 171 and CAD N I, nadānu 1a 6’, 44.
had been stolen, and it therefore must be considered very unlikely that the main reason for issuing it was strategic or political. On the other hand, it has been noted that the presence of CTH 75 in the archives of Ḫattuša could indicate that it might have been issued before Muwattalli moved the capital to Tarḫuntašša, an event which is tentatively dated to the early years of his reign. This hypothesis might find further support in the absence of the epithet “beloved of the Storm God of Lightning” among the titles of Muwattalli in the text’s preamble, a detail that might indicate that at the time he issued the text he had not yet adopted the Storm God of Lightning as his personal deity.

4. Classification of the text

The Aleppo Treaty shows a number of formal and structural peculiarities that distinguish it from what one might call the “standard” subjugation treaties, like those ratified by the Hittite kings with their Syrian (CTH 49, 53, 62, 66, 92, 105) and Anatolian vassals (CTH 67, 68, 69, 76). These “standard” subjugation treaties are characterized by two basic elements, namely the bond, which represents the sovereign’s will, and the oath, which is sworn by the vassal in acceptance of the bond. These two elements are represented in a subjugation treaty by a number of features of the terminology and structure of the text.

If one compares CTH 75 with a standard subjugation treaty, however, one notices the absence of all the typical elements that represent the oath, i.e.:

(a) the words for oath (māmītu, nīš ili/īlāni);
(b) the hypothetical formulation in the normative section, where the usual apodosis is “you will have transgressed the oath” (i.e. “if you do/do not …, you will have transgressed the oath”);
(c) a paragraph with the conferral of kingship and the fidelity request;
(d) a proper list of divine witnesses with curses and blessings.

Furthermore, the text shows another peculiar feature, a list of human witnesses, which is never found in the standard subjugation treaties.

The exceptionality of the Aleppo Treaty was of course noticed already long ago, and scholars have focused mainly on two of its anomalies, namely the absence of a proper list of divine witnesses and the presence of human witnesses, which they have explained with reference to its being an official copy

---

13 See however Singer 1996, 187 who is sceptical about using the presence/absence of this epithet as a dating element for Muwattalli’s texts.
14 See Devecchi forthcoming.
15 Von Schuler 1965, 457ff.
of an older document. However, renewed analysis of the text as well as comparison with the Tarḫuntašša treaties (CTH 106.A and 106.B) seem to point in another direction, suggesting that the peculiarities of the Aleppo Treaty may well belong to the original document issued by Muršili II and reflect the very nature of the text.

Before turning to the analysis of CTH 75, it may be instructive to recall two passages of Muršili’s Extensive Annals, which clearly show that the Hittite king made a distinction between the status of Talmi-Šarruma and that of a proper subject:

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) \quad & \text{am} \text{za} \text{lu} \text{gal} \text{man} \text{ma}\text{za} \text{m} \ldots \text{lu gal} \text{ma} \\
(13) \quad & \text{dumu} \text{m} \text{lugal} \text{d}30 \text{uh ina kur} \text{uru} \text{Kargamış lugal} \text{un iya nun} \\
(14) \quad & \text{nu} \text{šši kur} \text{uru} \text{Kargamış šer lingenun} \\
(15) \quad & \text{Telipinu ina kur} \text{uru} \text{Halpa} \text{lugal} \text{un iyanum nu} \text{šši kur} \text{uru} \text{Halpa šer lingenun}
\end{align*}
\]

Then [I ma]de […-Ša]rruma, son of Šarri-Kuṣuḫ, king in the land of Karkamiš and made the land of Karkamiš swear loyalty to him, while I made Talmi-Šarruma, son of Telipinu, king in the land of Aleppo and made the land of Aleppo swear loyalty to him.

CTH 61.II, KBo 4.4 III 12–16

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu} \text{za} \text{m} \text{Manapa} \text{d}10 \text{an kur} \text{in Šeḫa}=\text{ya} \text{ir-anni daḫḫun}
\end{align*}
\]

Then I took into servitude Manapa-Tarḫunta and the Land of the Šeḫa River.17

CTH 61.II, KUB 14.15 IV 33

In the first passage the appointments of Talmi-Šarruma as king of Aleppo and of […-Ša]rruma as king of Karkamiš are described with the expression “to make king” (lugal-uniyan), while in the second, where the subjugation of Manapa-Tarḫunta of the Land of the Šeḫa River in the fourth year of his reign is recorded, Muršili uses the expression “to take into servitude” (ir-anni da-). Also of interest is the different terminology used with regard to the territory ruled by a member of the Hittite royal family and that ruled by a proper vassal: in the first case, it is said that Muršili made the land of Karkamiš and the land of Aleppo swear loyalty to […-Ša]rruma and Talmi-Šarruma, respectively, probably a necessary procedure since they did not belong to a local dynasty that could claim hereditary rights to their thrones;18 in the case of Manapa-Tarḫunta, on the contrary, the Anatolian ruler together with his own kingdom enters into servitude of the Hittite king.

---

16 See e.g. McCarthy 1978, 70, who lists CTH 75 among “the treaties which are special not from their different purposes and circumstances, but simply because, whatever kind they were, they have come to us as copies of an original which they quote” (McCarthy’s cursive).

17 Described in the same way in Muršili’s Ten Years Annals (KBo 3.4 III 21–22).

18 Interestingly enough, this procedure was considered necessary even though the fathers of both […-Ša]rruma and Talmi-Šarruma had held the kingship of Karkamiš and Aleppo before them.
5. Structure of the text

5.1. The first paragraph (CTH 75.A obv. 1–2) simply relates the identity of the Hittite king issuing the document, Muwattalli II. The second paragraph (CTH 75.A obv. 3–8) explains how Muwattalli issued, sealed and presented the document to Talmi-Šarruma because the original \textit{t uppa rikilti}, “tablet of the binding agreement”, prepared by Muršili had been stolen. This explanation is followed by a formula that is very peculiar for a treaty:

\begin{align*}
(5) & \text{urram š¯eram amåtu ša pi [tuppi]} & \text{(6) annı mamma lā ušpāh awāt Tabarna lugal gal ša l[ā] nadē [ ]} & \text{(7) ša lā šebēri ša ušpāhlu} & \text{ba.ö$s}
\end{align*}

In the future nobody will alter the words of the content of this [tablet]. The word of Tabarna, Great King, is not to be cast away or to be broken. Whoever will alter (them), must die!

CTH 75.A obv. 5–7

This wording, of course, is borrowed from the formulary of the royal Hittite land grants, or \textit{Landschenkungsurkunden}:

(a) The expression \textit{urram šēram}, “in the future”, typical of Syrian juridical documents,\(^{19}\) was adopted as an Akkadogram already in the time of Telipinu and used to introduce the vindication formula of the royal land grants.\(^{20}\) In the treaties it is attested only in the agreement between Muwattalli and Alakšandi of Wuluśa (CTH 76.B II 29), in a passage too fragmentary to establish its function.

(b) The expression “the word of Tabarna, Great King, is not to be cast away or to be broken” (\textit{awāt Tabarna lugal gal ša l[ā] nadē [ ] ša lā šebēri}) is a short version of a formula used in the land grants, where one finds “the word of Tabarna, Great King, is of iron, is not to be cast away or to be broken” (\textit{awāt tabarna lugal gal ša an.bar ša lā nadiam ša lā šebērim}).\(^{21}\) The writing \textit{awāt} is typical of the Akkadian texts predating the reign of Šuppiluliuma\(^{22}\) and is probably to be explained as residue of the fixed formulary used in the land grants, especially in view of the typical Empire period forms \textit{amātu} (CTH 75.A obv. 5) and \textit{amāti} (CTH 75.A obv. 18, rev. 9’) in the rest of the text. The formula is also attested in the edict issued by Muršili II to acknowledge the status of Piyaššili of Karkamiš (CTH 57), in the edict of Ḥattušili III for the \textit{hekur} of Pirwa (CTH 88) and in Tutḫaliya IV’s edict for Šaḫurunuwa’s descendants (CTH 225).

---

\(^{19}\) The majority of the attestations is found in juridical documents from Mari, Alalah and Ugarit (CAD Š II, šēru A 3, 334; AHw III, \textit{urra(m)} 3, 1432–1433).


\(^{22}\) Durham 1976, 430.
(c) The curse “whoever will alter it, must die” (ša ušpahhu ba.ûš) occurs also in the legends of some royal seals, especially in the so-called ‘Tabarna seals’ used for the royal land grants.23 The Š form of puḫḫu (ušpâḫ, ušpahhu) is attested only in this text and in some of the Hittite royal land grants (CAD P, puḫḫu 3, 483; AHw II, puḫḫu Š, 876). The Hittite parallel to this curse is attested in the edict issued by Šuppiluliuma I for Piyaššili of Karkamiš (CTH 50).24

How should one interpret Muwattalli’s choice to use in the explanatory preamble a formulary that so explicitly recalls textual typologies like the royal land grants and the edicts? Since form corresponds to substance in politics and law, it may be seriously doubted that it is a matter of simple coincidence. The choice was likely conditioned by the very nature of the text, which Muwattalli and his scribes considered more comparable to the documentary typologies of the royal grants and/or edicts than a subjugation treaty. The absence of elements relating to the swearing of an oath and the presence of human witnesses would also fall in line with this explanation.

The introduction to the text ends with the following statement:

(7) u ūppa rikihš ša abû[a] (8)Muršili ēpušaššu akanna šat어er

The tablet of the binding agreement that [my] father Muršili made for him was written as follows.

CTH 75.A obv. 7–8

This statement, set off by a paragraph line, clearly indicates that from this point on the text literally quotes the original document issued by Muršili II, and indeed the rest of the text is formulated as a dictate of Muršili. Thus, barring evidence to the contrary, one can safely assume that only the first two paragraphs of CTH 75 should be ascribed to Muwattalli, while the rest of the text should correspond to Muršili’s original. In other words, the peculiarities found in the rest of the text would date back to Muršili and should be explained with this in mind.

5.2. Muršili’s original document, as preserved in Muwattalli’s copy, began with a paragraph with his name and titles (CTH 75.A obv. 9–10), which poses no interpretative difficulties. It is followed by the historical prologue (CTH 75.A obv. 11 ff.), which is a goldmine of information on the relations among Ḫatti, Mittani and Aleppo, and has thus been the object of many studies, but provides no data relevant for the issue at hand. The last preserved lines of the prologue deal with the time of Šuppiluliuma I, and it is very likely that in the missing part the narration continued with events that took place during the reign of

23 See Güterbock 1967, 45 (seal n. 80) and 51–53 (seals nn. 85–91). In the formulary of the royal land grants one finds instead ša ušpahhu sag.du su inakkis ša (Riemschneider 1958, 335ff.).
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Muršili II. None of the extant copies of CTH 75 preserves this final part of the historical prologue, but considering that only a few lines are missing at the end of the obverse and the beginning of the reverse of the best-preserved copy, one can safely assume that the prologue continued until the end of the obverse and maybe also for a few lines of the reverse. 25

5.3. The text resumes with the normative section, of which seemingly only a few lines are missing. The extant part of the normative section (CTH 75.A rev. 1’–16’) is composed of only two clauses, each consisting of one paragraph. The first clause (CTH 75.A rev. 1’–10’) is formulated in terms of absolute parity, stating that Muršili II, Talmi-Šarruma and their offspring should help (rēṣu) and protect (naṣāru) each other, since “we are all descendants of Šuppiluliuma, Great King”. In the second paragraph of the normative section (CTH 75.A rev. 11’–16’) it is stated that the kingship of Aleppo shall not prevail over the kingship of Ḫatti, the clause on reciprocal protection is repeated, and the rights of accession to the throne of Aleppo for the descendants of Talmi-Šarruma are guaranteed. An oft debated element of the normative section is the statement found at the end of the first paragraph:

\[ \text{ina amāti annīti dingirMES ša kur URU Ḫatti u dingirMES ša kur URU Ḫalap lū šibūtu} \]

May the gods of Ḫatti and the gods of Aleppo be witnesses to this matter!  

CTH 75.A rev. 9’–10’

This invocation reminds one of the incipit of the lists of divine witnesses of the subjugation treaties, and indeed von Schuler proposed that it should be seen as a remnant of the list of divine witnesses that would have been contained in Muršili’s original text. 26 The absence of a complete list of divine witnesses and of the curses and blessings that usually accompany it has been or could be explained in at least three ways, whereby a lack of comparable cases makes it difficult to definitively argue for one against the others. First, it has been assumed that the oath sworn by Talmi-Šarruma at the time of Muršili would still have been valid when Muwattalli issued his copy of the document, and that it was therefore not necessary to recopy the section with divine witnesses, curses and blessings, a section closely linked to the swearing

25 Cf. the inaccurate statement by Altman 2004, 60: “almost the entire stipulatory section is missing, and only the first part of its historical prologue is preserved”.

26 Von Schuler 1965, 458. Cf. McCarthy 1978, 71 n. 67: “the allusion in r. 9–10 is merely part of a rhetorical exhortation to mutual fidelity in the treaty and not its god list”. It should also be noted that the invocation of the gods of Ḫatti and Aleppo at the end of the first paragraph of the normative section does not end Muršili’s original document (pace McCarthy 1978, 70), because the wording of the second paragraph clearly shows that Muršili remains the speaker.
of an oath.\textsuperscript{27} Alternatively, one could ascribe the absence of these elements to the fact that the text is an archival copy, which is not without precedent. The Hittite manuscript of the subjugation treaty imposed by Šuppiluliuma on Aziru of Amurru (CTH 49.II), for instance, does not contain the section with divine witnesses, curses and blessings,\textsuperscript{28} which is present in at least one of the copies of the Akkadian version (CTH 49.I A rev. 1’ ff.). Thus, if only the Hittite version of Aziru’s treaty had been recovered, one might well have come to the conclusion that this was an exception among the standard subjugation treaties, while comparison with the Akkadian version shows that this section was simply not copied by the scribe. Third, the absence of these sections might suggest that the original text issued by Muršili contained nothing \textit{explicitly} requiring Talmi-Šarruma to take an oath before the Hittite king, i.e. one might doubt whether Talmi-Šarruma actually had to swear an oath to the Great King at all. This would of course represent a striking anomaly in the normal procedure followed by the Hittite kings for ensuring the loyalty of their subjects. Still, the perfectly symmetrical formulation of the first paragraph of the normative section would seem to require an oath to be sworn by both parties, as they are equally bound by its provisions, while the second paragraph prescribes measures quite favourable to Talmi-Šarruma, whose interest lay in respecting them whether he was bound by a loyalty oath or not.

5.4. The Aleppo Treaty ends with a list of human witnesses (CTH 75.A rev. 17’–22’) introduced by the formula \textit{tuppa anna ina URU Hatti ana [pāni]}, a section that never occurs in the standard subjugation treaties. Both the list of human witnesses and this specific introductory formula are, however, typical of the Hittite royal land grants.\textsuperscript{29} The common interpretation of this section goes back to del Monte and his prosopographical study of this list of dignitaries, where he showed that at least four of them (Šahurunuwa lugal kur ur [\textsuperscript{[pāni] Karkamiš}], Aranhapilizzi gal [\textsuperscript{[pāni] Karkamiš}], Lu[pakki gal du]mu\textsuperscript{MES} \textsuperscript{[\textit{[\textsuperscript{[pāni] Karkamiš]}]}}, and Mittannamuwa gal dub.sar meš) were surely in office during the reign of Muršili II while only two of them (Šahurunuwa and Mittannamuwa) were certainly still active at the time of Muwatalli II. He concludes that Muwatalli summoned as witnesses individuals who were present when Muršili issued his document in order to guarantee that his copy of the Aleppo Treaty was faith-

\textsuperscript{27} Von Schuler 1965, 463; del Monte 1975, 2: “il giuramento era già stato pronunciato decenni prima, né erano intervenuti fatti nuovi che imponessero la sanzione di nuovi patti diversi dai precedenti, e quindi la pronuncia di un nuovo giuramento e l’annullamento dell’antico”; McCarthy 1978, 70–71 n. 67; Balza 2008, 410–411.

\textsuperscript{28} The text ends with the invocation of the divine witnesses (CTH 49.II IV 31’–33’), followed by an unwritten space of ca. 6 lines, after which the tablet breaks off. For reasons of space, it can be excluded that a list of divine witnesses, curses and blessings could have been contained in the break.

ful to Muršili’s original. In other words, it is usually assumed that all these dignitaries were contemporaries of both Muršili II and Muwattalli II and were present at the issuing of both documents, but that the list with their names was added to the text only at the time of Muwattalli’s intervention.

It may be argued, though, that the results of del Monte’s prosopographical study far more convincingly support precisely the opposite scenario, namely that it was Muršili II who summoned these officials as witnesses to the treaty, and that this list was contained already in the first version of the document, not added to the text at the time of Muwattalli II. Such an interpretation of the list of human witnesses is supported not only by the – at times admittedly uncertain – prosopographical data, but also and especially by comparison of the Aleppo Treaty with other documents that show similar features and/or were drafted in similar situations.

The Taḫuntašša treaties (CTH 106.A and 106.B) are especially suitable for comparison, because Taḫuntašša, like Aleppo, was ruled by a branch of the Hittite royal family. Both include a double list of witnesses (a complete list of divine witnesses, followed by curses and blessings, and a list of human witnesses), thus showing that one type of witness list does not necessarily exclude the other. According to the explanation traditionally used to justify the absence of a proper list of divine witnesses with curses and blessings in the Aleppo Treaty, the presence of the complete list of divine witnesses in the Taḫuntašša treaties would be justified by the fact that both versions change the terms of previous agreements, thus requiring the vassal to swear a new oath. If this were the case, however, why would the human witnesses also be summoned if, as assumed by del Monte with regard to the Aleppo Treaty, their function was to guarantee that the new document was faithful to the old one? Furthermore, assuming this to be the case, one would expect to find both divine and human witnesses also in the subjugation treaties of the second and third generations, which partially confirm previous agreements and partially introduce new stipulations.

Further evidence that official copies of earlier documents did not need to be drafted in front of witnesses in order to guarantee their validity is provided by RS 17.334 (CTH 77), a copy produced by Ini-Teššub, king of Karkamiš, of a document originally issued by his grandfather, Šarri-Kušub/Piyaššili, for Niqmadu, king of Ugarit, in order to regulate the latter’s military engagement against Tette of Nuḫašše. As stated in the colophon, the tablet originally sealed by Šarri-Kušub/Piyaššili had been destroyed, so Ini-Teššub sealed a new copy and sent it to Ugarit. The situation is thus very similar to that which required the issuing of a new copy of the Aleppo Treaty, and no human witnesses were

---

30 Del Monte 1975, 1, followed by Balza 2008, 411.
summoned in order to confirm that Ini-Teššub’s new document was faithful to the original.

In light of these considerations it seems quite unlikely that issuing the Aleppo and the Tarḫuntašša treaties in the presence of human witnesses was necessitated by their being later versions of previous agreements. Their peculiarity should rather be traced back to the very nature of these documents, which in many ways bear more similarities to the land grants than to the subjugation treaties, and to the status of the treaty partners, who were all members of the Hittite royal family.

A further element of the Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša treaties that supports this interpretation is a paragraph in all three documents dealing with the right of ownership of the territory granted by the Hittite king to the addressee and the right of succession to the throne. These passages are embedded in the documents as follows:

CTH 75 – Aleppo Treaty
(1) Normative section
(2) Divine witnesses (short list)
(3) “[…] No one shall take anything from the possession of Talmi-Šarruma or the possession of his son and grandson. The son and grandson of Talmi-Šarruma, king of Aleppo, shall hold the kingship of Aleppo” (CTH 75.A rev. 14’-16’).
(4) Human witnesses

CTH 106.A – Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša
(1) Normative section
(2) Divine witnesses (complete list with curses and blessings)
(3) “[…] In the future no one shall take away from the progeny of Kurunta that which I have given to Kurunta, king of the land of Tarḫuntašša, or the frontiers which I have established for him. […] In the future only the progeny of Kurunta shall hold the kingship of the land of Tarḫuntašša. […]” (CTH 106.A IV 21–27).
(4) Human witnesses

CTH 106.B – Ulmi-Teššup of Tarḫuntašša
(1) Normative section
(2) Divine witnesses (complete list with curses and blessings)

---

32 Imparati 2004, 447 considered both explanations as possible.
33 In this regard it should be stressed once again that human witnesses are an institution of private law (see already von Schuler 1965, 461; van den Hout 1995, 7). Altman 2004, 61 and 355 further connects the presence of human witnesses to the rank of the counterpart; similarly Balza 2008, 414, but only with reference to the Tarḫuntašša treaties.
3. “[…] In the future no one shall take them (i.e. the frontiers) away from the descendant of Ulmi-Teššup, nor contest them with him at law. […] In the future only a descendant of Ulmi-Teššup shall hold the kingship of the land of Tarḫuntašša. […]” (CTH 106.B rev. 22–25).

4. Human witnesses

The wording of this paragraph differs somewhat in each of the three documents; especially in the treaties with Tarḫuntašša it is more extensively articulated than in that with Aleppo. But it always occupies the same position in the text, namely between the invocation of the divine witnesses and the list of human witnesses, and it clearly delivers the same core message, i.e. that nobody shall raise claims on the possessions of Talmi-Šarruma, Ulmi-Teššub and Kurunta, and that no one but their descendants will have the right to retain the kingships of Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša. In light of this paragraph, it may be suggested that the human witnesses were summoned to acknowledge and guarantee that nobody would be able to threaten the rightful succession to the thrones of Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša.

Finally, the attribution of the list of human witnesses to Muṣili’s original document is also supported by comparison with a much earlier, though in many ways similar, Syrian text, the treaty issued by Abba-an, king of Yamhad,34 for his brother Yarim-Lim when granting him Alalah (AIT 456).35 Like the Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša treaties, this document includes a clause about the loyalty owed one another by the two counterparts, describes the rights retained by Yarim-Lim and his successors to the territory granted by Abba-an, and ends by listing the names of the persons who witnessed Yarim-Lim swearing an oath in acknowledgement of the treaty stipulations. The affinity between this text and those issued by the Hittite kings for Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša is striking and is very likely to be traced back to the fact that all these treaties were concluded among members of royal families.36

6. Conclusions

The list of human witnesses of CTH 75 likely belonged to the original document issued by Muṣili II for Talmi-Šarruma of Aleppo. This list, as well as the other peculiarities of the Aleppo Treaty, need not be attributed to Muwatalli’s presumed intervention in the text, but rather to the very nature of the original

34 It is not clear whether the name should be read Abban or Abba’el (Klengel 1992, 60).
35 The text was published by Wiseman 1958, but see also Draffkorn 1959 for important improvements of Wiseman’s readings.
36 See also Altman 2010, 23–24, for the discussion of further similarities between Abba-an’s text and the Hittite treaties.
document, which in many ways bears more similarity to a land grant than to a subjugation treaty.\(^{37}\)

In lieu of a proper conclusion, I would like to close by pointing out what may be seen as a question for further research. It is interesting to compare the group just discussed with the documents issued by the Hittite sovereigns for the kings of Karkamiš, the other kingdom ruled by a branch of the Hittite royal family. These texts are extant in rather poorly preserved copies, which often disallow a full understanding of their structure and content, but it seems that in general they share very few traits with the documents issued for Aleppo and Tarḫuntašša. Should one explain these differences with the special, more influential role played by the king of Karkamiš in the administration of the Hittite empire? Possibly, but at the same time one should remember that officially the kings of Karkamiš and Tarḫuntašša retained the same status, as they were both second only to the tuh(u)kanti, the Hittite crown prince.\(^{38}\) Or should one invoke the haphazard nature of the archaeological finds and assume that similar documents must have existed for Karkamiš as well but that they have not yet been recovered? While no satisfactory answer to these questions can be offered here, it is hoped that these remarks on the Aleppo Treaty demonstrate that it is still possible to improve our understanding and classification of the political and normative tools developed by the Hittite kings for the administration of their empire.

### Appendix: The human witnesses of CTH 75

Since the publication of del Monte’s prosopographical study in 1975 the information available on these dignitaries has been increased by the publication of further cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic sources, which have only occasionally been discussed with regard to their relevance for dating CTH 75. Further, del Monte did not discuss the sources pertaining to the witness Kaššu. And finally, after his study the reading of four personal names was improved,\(^ {39}\) necessitating a renewed prosopographical analysis.

At the outset it should be noted that, because of the difficulty in determining whether the list of human witnesses of CTH 75 should be dated to Muršili II

---

37 Indeed, the similarity with the land grants is even more striking in the case of the Tarḫuntašša treaties, in which a significant portion of the text is devoted to the description of the frontiers of the territory owned by Ulmi-Teššup/Kurunta. Considering the topic of CTH 75’s historical prologue, then, one could easily imagine that also the lost part of its normative section might have dealt with some territorial issues and the definition of Aleppo’s borders.

38 Mora 1993, 67–70.

39 D. Schwemer proposed reading duumu \textit{m}nu.\textit{š}iš\textit{kiriš} in rev. 22’, and J. Miller pointed out the reading \textit{m}lu for the immediately preceding signs; the latter also suggested the reading of the name Tuthaliya in rev. 18’.
or to Muwattalli II, the Aleppo Treaty alone should not be cited as conclusive evidence for the contemporaneity of any of the witnesses with either of the two kings.

The names of only nine of the twelve dignitaries who acted as witnesses are sufficiently preserved to allow a confident reading (CTH 75.A rev. 17’–22’):

17’ *tup-pa an-na-a i-na *Uruk Ha-at-ti a-na [pa-ni *m.UR] *Ur Ur-pa-aš-šu-šu-lu-pi GAL *LU KUŠ7
18’ *mŠa-hu-ru-nu-wa Lugal Kur [*m Kargamiš] *mTū-ut-ša-li-ya GAL *LU KUŠ7
19’ *mGa-aš-šu-u GAL *Sanga [] *mDu/Ušša-ta-[xx x x x x x] *lLU ur-ri-ia-an-ni
20’ *mA-ra-an-ša-pi-li-iz-zi GAL *[u][k][u][u][u] *[ša zag xx x] *“gALlu ku.Uš ša GUB
21’ *mLu-pa-ak-ki GAL DUMU *MES É.GAL *Mi-it-ta-an-na-mu-uu GAL DUB.SAR *MES x [x]
22’ *LU an-[t] u-wa-šal-li *MLU DUB.SAR *DUMU *NU *KIRI *DUB.SAR iś *tu-r

The witnesses are listed here according to their order of appearance.

1. Ḫalpašulupi GAL *LU KUŠ7 (CTH 75.A rev. 17’)

Del Monte and Beckman retain the reading *]-li*-bi GAL *LU KUŠ7, which goes back to Weidner’s edition of the text. The suggestion of reading the traces of the PN as [*m.UR] *Ur *Hal-pa-aš-šu-šu-lu-pi was initially put forward by Beal. The same spelling is attested in one manuscript of Ḥattušili III’s Apology (CTH 81.B I 9 *Hal-pa-aš-šu-lu-pi-in), which reveals that one of Muršili II’s sons, probably the eldest, bore the name. The PN Ḫalpašulupi ([*mHal]-pa-šu-lu-pi) appears also in the inventory fragment HFAC 10 l. 9’, which, however, provides no further relevant information. Beside these cuneiform sources,

---

40 This figure is based on the assumption that in the gap between *mDu/Ušša-ta-[x] and ]-*li *LU ur-ri-ia-an-ni (CTH 75.A rev. 19’) one should integrate the end of the name of *mDu/Ušša-ta-[x], his title and the beginning of the uriyanni’s name. The hypothesis that *mDu/Ušša-ta-[x]…*li would be the name of the uriyanni (Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 268 and Beal 1992, 361) is highly unlikely, because the space in the gap is too large for only one personal name. Another possibility would be that *mDu/Ušša-ta-[x] bore two titles, but this also seems unlikely, since all the other witnesses of CTH 75 have only one title.

41 A sign that looks like *me and might be the beginning of a repeated meš.

42 Since the title GAL *LU KUŠ7 could be followed by the specification “of the Right” or “of the Left”, and since in rev. 18’ there is another GAL *LU KUŠ7, it is generally assumed that one must have been the GAL *LU KUŠ7 of the Right and the other the GAL *LU KUŠ7 of the Left (del Monte 1975, 5; Beal 1992, 374).

43 Weidner 1923, 86; Del Monte 1975, 5; Beckman 1999, 95.

44 Beal 1992, 374 and n. 1420; see also Ünal 1993–1997a, 440.

45 This assumption (cf. Ünal 1993–1997a, 440 and Klengel 1999, 207) is based on the order followed by Ḥattušili III in listing Muršili’s sons: Ḫalpašulupi, Muwattalli, Ḥattušili (CTH 81.A I 9–10).

46 KUB 31.23 rev. 6’ is listed in the card catalogue in the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz among the sources for Ḫalpašulupi (I should thank Gabriella Stivala for having informed me of this attestation). From the picture, however, one can see only *mHal-pa-x [], whereby x represents what seems to be the beginning of a horizontal, which is usually read *mHal-pa-l[u] (Ünal 1974, 133 and van den Hout 1998, 58). Ḫalpa-x [] is mentioned here together with Urḫi-Teshupp.
the only other attestation of this PN comes from the Nişantepe archive, where a cretula bearing the seal of a certain Ḥalpasulupi (TONITRUS. ḤALPA-AVIS) was recovered. Because of the title, which is only partially preserved but can be restored as rex.[filius], and due to the noteworthy size and quality of the seal, it has been proposed to identify its owner with Muršili’s son. Despite the lack of any conclusive evidence indicating that these two individuals were one and the same person, the rarity of this PN makes the identification of the witness of the Aleppo Treaty with Muršili’s son quite likely. This assumption is supported also by the fact that Ḥalpašulupi is the first dignitary to be mentioned in the list, thus presumably the most important in the hierarchy; and since the title GAL \(^{1.0}\) KUŞ is certainly not the highest in the Hittite administration, Ḥalpašulupi’s position at the head of the list should presumably be explained by assuming that he was a prince. Because of the paucity of information on this prince it is impossible to establish for certain the reason(s) why he did not become king after his father, but precisely the fact that he is so rarely and vaguely mentioned in the documents touching on the end of Muršili’s reign and the beginning of Muwattalli’s suggests that an early death might have prevented him from ascending the throne. If Ḥalpašulupi indeed died during Muršili’s reign, his presence among the witnesses of the Aleppo Treaty would be a strong indication in favour of dating this section to Muršili’s original document.

2. Şahûrunuwa lugal kur URU[Karkamiš] (CTH 75.A rev. 18’)

Beside the Aleppo Treaty there is no other source explicitly recording the contemporaneity of this witness with either Muršili II or Muwattalli II, but the approximate extent of Şahûrunuwa’s reign can be inferred from other sources. As for the beginning of his reign, the main problem is whether he should be identified with […]-Şarruma, son of Piyaššili/Şarri-Kušuḫ, who was appointed king of Karkamiš by Muršili II in his ninth year. Based on the genealogy Şarri-Kušuḫ – Şahûrunuwa – Ini-Teššub – Talmi-Teššub recorded by texts found at Ugarit, it is usually assumed that Şahûrunuwa and […]-Şarruma would be the Anatolian and Hurrian names, respectively, of the same person. This scenario would present no difficulties for the hypothesis argued in this paper.

49 One should recall the seemingly exceptional case of Muršili II, who became king of Ḥatti as a young boy even though (at least) two older brothers of his (Piyaššili/Şarri-Kušuḫ and Teliçini) were still alive and competent.
51 This hypothesis, which goes back to Klengel 1965, 77, has been widely accepted (see e.g. Hawkins 1976–1980, 430; d’Alfonso 1999, 317; Skaist 2005, 609; Klengel 2006–2008, 542). It was also suggested that […]-Şarruma could be equated with the Tuthaliya mentioned in KBo 3.3+++ IV 3’ and 6’ next to the title “king of Karkamiš” (d’Alfonso 2005, 58 fn. 164), but see Miller 2007, 134 for counterarguments.
as it would enable an identification of Šaḫurunuwa of the list of witnesses with the newly installed king of Karkamiš, Šaḫurunuwa = […-Ša]rruma. However, Liverani, and then more thoroughly Heinhold-Krahmer, pointed out that this identification is far from certain.52 One must consider the possibility that the genealogy recorded by the Ugarit texts might be limited to the direct line of descent (grandfather – father – son – grandson), thereby omitting any brother or cousin who might have reigned in between. Heinhold-Krahmer also notes that, assuming Piyaššili/Šarri-Kušuḫ would be the father of both […-Ša]rruma and Šaḫurunuwa, this would seem to indicate that the kings of Karkamiš used an Anatolian name before their ascent to the throne, while a Hurrian one was adopted only afterwards; and this, in turn, would clash with the hypothesis that […-Ša]rruma would have adopted the Anatolian name Šaḫurunuwa. In light of Liverani’s and Heinhold-Krahmer’s considerations, one cannot exclude the possibility that a son of Piyaššili/Šarri-Kušuḫ named […]-Ša]rruma may have reigned over Karkamiš before Šaḫurunuwa.53 Of course, this possibility does not mean that Šaḫurunuwa could not have become king of Karkamiš following […]-Ša]rruma but still during the reign of Muršili II; but rejecting the identification of […]-Ša]rruma with Šaḫurunuwa is problematic if one assumes that the original version of the Aleppo Treaty was issued by Muršili II in his 9th year when he installed Talmi-Šarruma and […]-Ša]rruma on their thrones.54 For the end of Šaḫurunuwa’s reign, the most important source is the text Emar 201, an act issued in the presence of Ini-Teššup during the very first years of his reign and mentioning previous decisions made by Muršili, likely to be identified with Muršili III/Urḫi-Teššup55 and executed on his behalf by Šaḫurunuwa. Thus, Šaḫurunuwa’s contemporaneity with both Muršili II and Muwattali II can be regarded at least as very likely, if not completely certain.

3. Tuthaliya gal LUGAL-KUS7 (CTH 75.A rev. 18’, see figs. 1–3)

Among the several documents that record individuals named Tuthaliya,56 one can isolate a group that is likely related to the witness of the Aleppo Treaty. The most important source is a relief recovered at Alalah showing a man and a woman in attitude of adoration. The male figure is identified by a Luwian

---

53 Miller 2007, 149 n. 70 proposed a possible alternative, suggesting that […]-Ša]rruma might be “nothing more than an anticipatory scribal error conditioned by the occurrence of mTal-mi-lugal-ma-an-ma just two lines later”.
54 It should be noted that this would represent a problem for those who argue that the list of human witnesses was added by Muwattali II, too, because they assume that he summoned dignitaries who were present at the time when Muršili issued the original version of the treaty.
hieroglyphic inscription as “Tuthaliya magnus.auriga rex.filius.” It was originally proposed to equate this individual with Tuthaliya IV, but it is now commonly accepted that he should be identified with a Hittite prince in charge of governing Alalah. Considering that the hieroglyphic title magnus.auriga is equivalent to the cuneiform gal 1\̣ kuš, it is very tempting to assume that the witness of the Aleppo Treaty is the same official portrayed on the Alalah relief. The latter has often been regarded as a contemporary of Muršili II on the basis of his identification with the Tuthaliya mentioned in Muršili II’s dictate CTH 63, but in his recent treatment of this text Miller excludes that the Tuthaliya mentioned there could have been stationed in Alalah and suggests instead that he might have been a governor or mayor at Aštata. Even if the identification of Tuthaliya from Alalah with the Tuthaliya mentioned in CTH 63 cannot be maintained, there are other sources suggesting that the magnus.auriga of the Alalah relief might have been active during the early Empire. Of central importance, despite the poor state of preservation, is a letter recovered at Alalah (AIT 35) sent by “His Majesty” to Tuthaliya. The text, of which only the heading and part of the greeting formula are preserved, shows palaeographical features pointing towards a date during the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I/Muršili II. Another document that can be roughly dated to this period and linked to Tuthaliya from Alalah is the letter KBo 9.83 sent by Tuthaliya to the Hittite king. The sender mentions some matter related to the town of Gaduma, probably located south-east of Aleppo, thus in an area that could have belonged to Alalah’s jurisdiction. In sum, the identical title and the time span to which Tuthaliya of the Alalah relief can be dated make him a very likely candidate for the witness of CTH 75. A further element that might lend support to this assumption is the fact that the kingdoms of Alalah and Aleppo were neighbours, which makes the summoning of Alalah’s governor to serve as a witness to a treaty with Aleppo quite reasonable. Even if the identification of the witness with the Tuthaliya from Alalah seems the most convincing solution, it is worth mentioning the existence of another official named Tuthaliya and active during the reign of Muršili II. In his subjugation treaty with Kupanta-Kurunta of Mira-Kuwaliya, Muršili warns his vassal that “in the direction of Maddunašša, the fortified camp of Tuthaliya shall be your frontier” (CTH 68.C I 29–30). Considering the military context, one cannot exclude that this

57 A picture of this relief can be found in Bittel 1976, 202 fig. 231. See de Martino 2010, 94, for a recent overview of and literature on this relief.
59 Miller 2007, 137 fn. 40. It should be noted that these two Tuthaliyas might still be the same person at different stages of his career, i.e. previously stationed in Alalah and later in Aštata, or the other way around.
60 The text was published by Niedorf 2002, who also discussed its dating. See also Marizza 2009, 156 and Hoffner 2009, 374.
Tutḫaliya was a gal $^L_G$ kuš$^7$, but the evidence in his favour is clearly much weaker than for Tutḫaliya magnus.auriga from Alalah. Among the other attestations of individuals named Tutḫaliya none can be unequivocally dated to the time of Muwattalli II, but it is of course possible that the previously discussed officials were still active during his reign.

Figs. 1–3. KBo 1.6 obv. 18': texture, shaded and line drawing screen shots from the “mini-dome” images

4. Kasšu gal sanga (CTH 75.A rev. 19')

In his thorough analysis of the several sources mentioning individuals named Kasšu, van den Hout proposed reading the title in CTH 75 as gal nimgir,$^{62}$ instead of gal sanga as usually assumed,$^{63}$ but collation of the tablet seems to confirm the reading gal sanga. It should also be recalled that according to Beal it is impossible to demonstrate that the title gal nimgir was still in use after the reign of Hattušili I.$^{64}$ The summoning of a gal sanga as a witness represents an exception in comparison with the other known list of witnesses,$^{65}$ but it can perhaps be explained by the importance of Aleppo as a religious centre, whose first ruler of Hittite origin was Telipinu, “the sanga-priest”. In view of the attestations that mention Hittite kings and princes bearing the title of $^L_G$san$^g$, $^{66}$ one could hypothesize that this gal sanga might be identical with the Kasu rex.filius known from a seal impression found at Boğazköy.$^{67}$

63 Weidner 1923, 88; Laroche 1966, 89; Beckman 1999, 95; Balza 2008, 409.
64 Beal 1992, 360.
65 No gal sanga or more generally members of the priestly class appear as witnesses in the Tarḫuntašša treaties or in the Landschenkungsurkunden.
67 SBo II n. 32. It should be noted, however, that only the title $^L_G$san$^g$ is attested in association with kings and princes, not the title gal sanga.
This possibility, even if it would prove to be correct, does not seem to be helpful for dating purposes, because presently it is not known which Hittite king was the father of prince Kaššu. After van den Hout’s study only one new source mentioning a Kaššu has been published, namely a bulla from Nişantepe sealed by a certain Kasu rex x x x regio, whose identification with any of the previously known Kaššu is open to debate.68

5. Aranh˘apilizzi gal uku.uˇs [ša zag]69 (CTH 75.A rev. 20’)

The name Aranh˘apilizzi70 occurs in sources covering a time period from the reign of Mušili II to at least that of Urḫi-Teššup, or even later if one accepts Singer’s hypothesis that the events described in HT 7 should be dated to Ḫattušili III.71 Del Monte attributes all the occurrences of the name to the same individual, i.e. the witness of the Aleppo Treaty,72 but the only attestations that can be safely regarded as referring to the Aranh˘apilizzi summoned as witness in CTH 75 are found in Mušili II’s Complete Annals (CTH 61.II). Here a homonymous individual bearing the titles ga[l.uku.u]š dumullugal is mentioned as leading a military campaign into Western Anatolia during the king’s 15th year, and the Aranh˘apilizzi mentioned in similar context, but without title, in Mušili’s 18th year is very likely again the same person. An individual named Aranh˘apilizzi is the author of the letters KBo 18.45 (to His Majesty) and KBo 18.47 (to his lord) as well as the addressee of KBo 18.46, but the very fragmentary state of the texts and the lack of the name of his correspondents hamper any more precise reconstruction. Another Aranh˘apilizzi is mentioned without title in connection with the transfer of the gods from Taḫuntašša to Ḫattuša in the oracle KUB 16.66 I 14’, which has to be dated to or immediately after the reign of Urḫi-Teššup,73 and this would be the only indirect evidence linking a high dignitary named Aranh˘apilizzi to Muwattalli II. Thus, it is sure that an official named Aranh˘apilizzi was serving as gal uku.uˇs under Mušili II and it is likely that an Aranh˘apilizzi was active during the reign of Muwattalli II, but it cannot be proven that they were one and the same person.

---
68 Herbordt 2005, 141 (cat. n. 158) and Hawkins 2005, 258.
69 The integration [ša zag] is based on the assumed symmetry with the title of the following witness, who was gal uku.uš ša gub and whose name is lost.
70 All the sources referring to Aranh˘apilizzi are collected by Hagenbuchner 1989, 17; Trémouille’s list at http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetonom/books no new entries, and no seals belonging to individuals named Aranh˘apilizzi are mentioned by either Herbordt 2005 or Dincol – Dincol 2008. The list of persons in KUB 26.54, where a certain Aranhap[i- is mentioned at l. 8’, is dated in the Konkordanz to the late Hittite empire but does not provide any information allowing a more precise date.
71 Singer 1991, 168 fn. 50.
6. Lupakkı \textit{gal dumu}^\textit{mes} \textit{é.gal} (CTH 75.A rev. 21')

Also in this case the Aleppo Treaty is the only source linking the witness with either Muršili II or Muwattalli II. Individuals named Lupakki are attested from the time of Šuppiluliuma I to the time of Tuthaliya IV, but in no other case does one bear the title \textit{gal dumu}^\textit{mes} \textit{é.gal}. Thus, one can only suggest some possible identifications, without reaching any certain conclusion. A possibility, proposed by del Monte but rejected by Marizza, is to identify the witness of the Aleppo Treaty with the Lupakki \textit{ugula} 10 \textit{ša karaš} known from CTH 40 as a contemporary of Šuppiluliuma. After the time of Šuppiluliuma the PN Lupakki appears again during Ḥattušili III’s reign associated with the title \textit{kartappu} (KUB 31.68 l. 39'), whose identification with the witness of the Aleppo Treaty was discarded by del Monte because the office of \textit{kartappu} is much lower than that of \textit{gal dumu}^\textit{mes} \textit{é.gal} held by Lupakki in CTH 75. For chronological reasons it can be excluded that the witness of the Aleppo Treaty should be identified with the priest Lupakki mentioned in a cult inventory dated to Tuthaliya IV’s reign (KUB 42.100 III 30' and 39'). A number of other cuneiform texts, mostly datable to the reigns of Ḥattušili III and Tuthaliya IV, record individuals named Lupakki, but with no title, thus making any identification highly speculative. As for the hieroglyphic sources, several seals belonging to a Lupakki \textit{scriba} are dated by Herbordt to the time of Šuppiluliuma I. Potentially this Lupakki could be the same person of the Aleppo Treaty, since it is known that the office of scribe could be coupled with that of \textit{gal dumu}^\textit{mes} \textit{é.gal}, but the identity of these dignitaries cannot be demonstrated for certain. Another Lupakki, who bears the title \textit{exercitus.scriba}, is attested in the TAŞ_CI inscription, and according to the interpretation offered by Hawkins he was the first cousin of Muršili II and first cousin once removed of Muwattalli II and Ḥattušili III, and could thus on the merely chronological level also come into question as a contemporary of both kings. Finally, a bulla bearing the seal

74 Del Monte 1975, 6–7 and Marizza 2006, 162.
75 Del Monte 1975, 6–7. It was also hypothesized that Lupakki bore the higher title of \textit{gal kartappu} and was the addressee of the letter KBo 18.4, sent by the king of Isuwa to his father, an anonymous Chief of the Charioteers (Marizza 2009, 158–159 with previous literature), but see Hoffner 2009, 331 for a different opinion on the identity of the recipient.
76 These are (a) KBo 9.81 obv. 3, a letter sent by Lupakki to the king of Karkamiṣ and probably dating to Ḥattušili III (Klengel 1999, 246, but cf. Marizza 2009, 138 who proposes dating the letter to Šuppiluliuma I or Muršili II); (b) the Bronzetafel (Bo 86/299 IV 43), where Lupakki appears as the father of the scribe Halwaziti, who drafted the tablet; (c) KBo 18.1 rev. 2’ ff., a letter sent by Lupakki to the queen probably to be dated to Tuthaliya IV (Hagenbuchner 1989, 4 and 84–85); (d) KUB 31.28, 2’ and 6’, a fragment of an historical text datable to Ḥattušili III or Tuthaliya IV due to the presence of Lupakki together with Tattamaru (Mauer 1986, 192–193); (e) KUB 31.52 obv. 11’, Puduhêpa’s vow to the goddess Lelwani (Otten – Souček 1965, 18–19); (f) KUB 23.45 39’, a fragment of a letter.
77 See Herbordt 2005, 77 and 150 (cat. n. 207), and Hawkins 2005, 262.
78 On Hittite scribes see lately van den Hout 2009, 273ff. (esp. 276–277) with previous literature.
79 Hawkins 2005, 293.
of a Lupakki urceus was recovered in the Nişantepe archive. His equation with the witness of the Aleppo Treaty would be possible only if one assumes that he bore the title of urceus before becoming gal dumuMEŞ É.GAL, but since Herbordt proposes no date for this sealing, this hypothesis can for the moment not be demonstrated.

7. Mittannamuwa gal dub.sarMEŞ (CTH 75.A rev. 21’)

The career of this dignitary is documented first and foremost by an edict issued by Ḫatrušili III for Mittannamuwa’s successors (CTH 87). From this text one learns that Mittannamuwa was chief of the scribes during the reign of Muršili II, and that Muwatattali II “gave him Ḫattuša” (nu=šši URU Ḫattušan pešta, CTH 87 obv. 17) and made his son chief of the scribes. The expression “he gave him Ḫattuša” is usually interpreted as the appointment of Mittannamuwa as ḫazannu, “mayor, governor”, of the Hittite capital, and it is generally assumed that this event took place when Muwatattali moved the capital to Tarḫuntašša. However, Ḫatrušili’s edict does not provide any specific hint in that direction, but simply states that Muwatattali “gave Ḫattuša” to Mittannamuwa after he became king. Moreover, texts like Arnuwanda I’s instructions for the ḫazannu (CTH 257.1 A) suggest that this position was regularly occupied, so that the appointment of Mittannamuwa is not necessarily to be seen as a special measure taken by Muwatattali on the occasion of the transfer of the capital. In short, Mittannamuwa was chief of the scribes during Muršili’s reign and at the beginning of Muwatattali’s reign, then, probably soon after the latter’s ascension to the throne, became governor of the city of Ḫattuša. In case the list of human witnesses was added to the text by Muwatattali II, the presence of Mittannamuwa as chief of the scribes would be another element in favour of dating the issuing of CTH 75 to Muwatattali’s first years of reign.

8. Kuruntapiya LÔ antuwašalli (CTH 75.A rev. 21’–22’)

Apart from the Aleppo Treaty there is no explicit evidence linking this dignitary with either Muršili II or Muwatattali II. Kuruntapiya’s title was previously read LÔ antuwašalli LUGAL DUB.SAR “antuwašalli of the king, scribe”, which induced many scholars to equate him with a homonymous scribe, but since it has become clear that LUGAL DUB.SAR should be read MÔ DUB.SAR, this identification must be reconsidered. A Kuruntapiya explicitly attested as scribe

80 Herbordt 2005, 151 (cat. n. 208).
81 The recently published tiny fragment KBo 50.180 provides a further attestation of this PN (l. 4’ [M]i-it-ta-n-a-m[u-wa]), but no new substantial information on his career.
is known only from the hieroglyphic sources, and he is probably the same individual as that attested in scribal context by the cuneiform sources, but no text certainly signed by him has been recovered. Considering the lack of any precisely datable information on this Kuruntapiya as well as the different title, his equation with the witness of the Aleppo Treaty cannot be proven. Similarly, it seems impossible to prove with certainty the identity of the Kuruntapiya of the Aleppo Treaty with the homonymous person(s) in the oracle fragment KBo 41.218 and the cult inventory fragment 473/z, because in both cases he bears no title.

9. Ziti dub.sar dumu mnu₆ Ki₆ (CTH 75. A rev. 22', figs. 4–6)

Until now the only known Ziti, son of a mnu₆ Ki₆, was a scribe whose activity can be dated to the reigns of Ḫattušili III and/or Tuḫḫaliya IV, since he worked under the supervision of Anuwanza and copied texts “restored” by Šipaziti. If the last paragraph of CTH 75, in which Ziti’s name appears, were a standard colophon, one could hypothesize that the author of the tablet might be the Ziti active at the time of Ḫattušili III-Tuḫḫaliya IV and that he produced an archival copy of the Aleppo Treaty some time during the reign of one of these two kings. However, the last paragraph of CTH 75 is not a colophon, but a list of witnesses which can be ascribed only to Mušili II’s original version or to Muwattalli II’s official copy, as there is no reason why such a section should have been added to the document by a later king who did not issue it. Therefore, it may be excluded that this Ziti can be identified with the Ziti of CTH 75. There is, moreover, another scribe named Ziti whose identification with the author and witness of the Aleppo Treaty is chronologically much more likely. He was the father of a mnu₆ Ki₆ and very likely the grandfather of the Ziti just discussed. The kinship relation between Ziti (I) and Ziti (II) is nowhere explicitly attested and can only be inferred on the basis of the genealogy of Ḫanikkuil, another son of mnu₆ Ki₆ and thus presumably a

85 Cf. the bulla Bo 82/134, sealed by Kuruntapiya (cervus₂-ta/ti-pi-ia) bonus scriba (Đinçol–Đinçol 2008, 46 n. 192), the bulla Tarsus 3, sealed by Kuruntapi(ya) (cervus₂-ta/ti-pi) bonus scriba (Mora 1987, 304 with previous literature) and maybe also a bulla from Nişantepe (cervus₂-ti-ia(?)) scriba, Herbordt 2005, 147 cat. n. 191 and Hawkins 2005, 261).

86 The colophon of KBo 13.240 reads m₃ kal-sum istur, but one should note that m₃-kal-sum istur comes immediately after a fracture, thus it is impossible to demonstrate whether the text was written by Kuruntapiya himself or by one of his descendants/pupils; Kuruntapiya is also known as grandfather of Aššapala, who signed a copy of Kumarbi’s myth (KUB 33.120+).

87 I am thankful to Marco Marizza, who was so kind to share with me a number of useful observations on this scribal family and his material for a future work on papponymy among the Hittites.

88 He signed the texts KUB 29.4+ IV 45, KUB 35.41 IV 5’, KBo 14.86+ IV 29’, and likely also KBo 45.168+ left edge 1–2, even though in this last case his genealogy is not mentioned. See Miller 2004, 37–38 fn. 66 and 297; Gordin forthcoming.
brother of Ziti (II).\textsuperscript{89} The main source for this link is the colophon of KBo 6.4 (CTH 291.III), which records Ḥanikkuli’s most complete genealogy (edge 1–4):\textsuperscript{90}

\begin{verbatim}
1 mḤanikkū-duňgir-lim-īš dub.sar dumu mnu.G₂š[KI₆]
2 dumu.dumu-šu ša mšú gal dub.sar mens u dumu.dumu.mens-[šu]
3 ša mKarunuwa lō ḫalipi ša kur u [gu]
4 u dumu.dumu.mens-šu-ma ša mḤanikkū-duňgir-lim gal na.gad
\end{verbatim}

Since Ziti (I) was the grandfather of scribes who worked at the time of Ḥattušili III/Tuţaliya IV, his activity can be roughly dated to the reigns of Muršili II/Muwattali II, which would make him a plausible candidate for the scribe and witness of the Aleppo Treaty. The texts record also that Ziti (I) bore the title of gal dub.sar meš at some stage of his career, and it has been proposed that he might have been made Chief of the Scribes by Urhi-Teššup, who allegedly removed Mittannamuwa’s son from this function.\textsuperscript{91} That Ziti (I) became Chief of the Scribes after Mittannamuwa would be confirmed if indeed it was he who signed the Aleppo Treaty with the simple title dub.sar, while Mittannamuwa is mentioned as gal dub.sar meš. One objection to the identification of Ziti (I) with the scribe of the Aleppo Treaty might be the fact that in CTH 75 he is the son of nu.G₂š[KI₆], but in Ḥanikkuli’s genealogy there is no mention of a nu.G₂š[KI₆] as the father of Ziti (I). This objection, however, can be countered by recalling Beckman’s remarks on some peculiarities of the colophon containing Ḥanikkuli’s genealogy: according to Beckman the Sumerogram dumu.dumu.mens may well have been used here, instead of the more common ša.bal, to indicate an indefinite remote ancestry. Thus, “while we may be certain that the earlier Ḥanikkuli was an ancestor of Karunuwa, and the latter in turn a forebear of Ziti, we do not know how many generations might have intervened in either of these cases”\textsuperscript{92} This leaves open the identification of the father of Ziti (I). Among the relatively few individuals bearing the name nu.G₂š[KI₆] in the Hittite sources, the most likely candidate for the father of Ziti (I) seems to be the nu.G₂š[KI₆] active as scribe and augur at the time of Tuţaliya III.\textsuperscript{93} The identification of this nu.G₂š[KI₆] with the father of Ziti (I)
is not only possible on the chronological level, it may also find support in the fact that the practice of naming a son after his grandfather is already attested in the case of Ziti (I) and Ziti (II), so that it would not come as a surprise to have also a Nu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6 (I) and Nu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6 (II).94 Therefore the genealogical tree of this scribal family can be tentatively drawn as follows:95

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Anu-ˇsar-ilānī}\footnote{This practice is attested also among other Hittite scribal families, as for instance in the case of Pikku (I), father of Tatta and grandfather of Pikku (II) (see the remarks on KBo 48.133 in Otten – Rüster – Wilhelm 2007, VI–VII).} \\
:\quad:\\ 
\text{Hanikkuili (I)} \\
:\quad:\\ 
\text{Karunuwa} \\
:\quad:\\ 
\text{Nu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6 (I)} \\
\quad| \\
\text{Ziti (I)} \\
\text{scribe and witness of the Aleppo Treaty} \\
\quad| \\
\text{Nu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6 (II)} \footnote{Cf. Beckman 1983, 105; van den Hout 1995, 148; Gordin forthcoming fig. 2. In the graphic, a solid line indicates attested filiation, a dotted line conjectural filiation.} \\
\quad| \\
\text{Hanikkuili (II)} \quad \text{Ziti (II)} \quad \text{ˇSauˇsgaziti} \\
\end{align*}
\]

the end of Muwattalli’s /beginning of Urhi-Teššup’s reign (Houwink ten Cate 1974, 147) or to the reign of Ḥattušili III (Singer 1991, 168 fn. 50), so it seems more likely that the Nu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6 mentioned here was the son rather than the father of Ziti (I); (2) the scribe mNu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6, son of mSAG GAL DUB.SARMES and student of Ḥulanabi, known from the colophon of KUB 44.61: his career can accordingly be dated to between the reigns of Ḥattušili III and Tuthaliya IV (Gordin forthcoming), and he therefore does not come into question as father of the author of the Aleppo Treaty. Note that this PN can be written mNu.ˇGİˇSKIRI6, m.ˇGİˇSNU.ˇKIRI6 and m.ˇGİˇSKIRI6.NU.

For the hypothesis that Anu-šar-ilānī might have been the founder of this scribal family see Beckman 1983, 103–106.
Figs. 4–6. KBo 1.6 obv. 22’: texture, shaded and line drawing screen shots from the “mini-dome” images.
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