THE PROPAGANDA OF ḤATTUŠILÎŠ III

DI ALFONSO ARCHI

In contemplating the personality of Ḥattušiliš III, who seems to us the most complex of the Hittite sovereigns (perhaps almost accidentally, in as much as the surviving sources illustrate in various aspects not only the activity of his government but also moments from private life), modern historiography has assumed basically two attitudes. On the one hand, there are those like Gurney who, while not discounting the obvious tendentiousness of the autobiography, nevertheless are inclined to credit Ḥattušiliš with good reasons for his actions. In so doing, they are perhaps unconsciously appealing to the judgement of history, since the epoch of Ḥattušiliš was a period of peace and reorganization for various regions of the realm. Others, on the other hand, try to adduce events even as far back as the time of Muwatalliš to demonstrate the patient underground work which Ḥattušiliš must have done to prepare the coup d’état in consequence of which he took his nephew’s place on the throne of Ḥattušaš. And in some cases it seems

1 The principal source is the so-called “autobiography” of Ḥattušiliš, studied by A. Goetze, Ḥattušiliš, MVAeG 29, 3, Leipzig 1925, and completed with new fragments by A. Goetze, Neue Bruchstücke..., MVAeG 34, 2, Leipzig 1930. See there also an abbreviated version: KBo VI 29 (+), and the edict for Mittannamūnas: KBo IV 12. For the complete list of the cuneiform fragments which constitute the various manuscripts, for the duplicates, and in some cases also for the bibliography, in the course of this study see: E. Laroche, Cat(alogue des Textes Hittites), RHA 58-60, 61, 1956-58 (the texts above cited in nos. 59-61).


almost as though the scholar of Hittite history, usually drawn to note either the military victories of the two Muršiliš or the austerity of Telepinuš, or else intent upon reconstructing the uncertain chronologies of the elusive sovereigns of the Middle Kingdom, does not wish to miss the opportunity of showing that he also can even arrive at an historical reconstruction which goes beyond the official version. From a comprehensive survey of the data, which, for the most part, does indeed reflect the version imposed by Ḫattušiliš, there should emerge a judgement which is at least more complex, and for some aspects of the question, less summary.

The autobiography of Ḫattušiliš is in reality a decree of constitution for a sacred foundation dedicated to the goddess Ištar of the city of Šamuja. Its first part comprises almost the entirety of the text, and consists of a narration of the events which lead to the foundation. In form, the autobiography resembles other decrees of Ḫattušiliš which have particularly lengthy introductions because they give an exposition of the historical background; it resembles, too, the rather complex decree of Telepinuš. The political treaties, with historical introductions, belong to a very similar genre. What makes the autobiography a unique document is that the ostensible reason for its composition is only a pretext for propagating instead a certain view of the facts which go beyond those which constitute the terms of the foundation, and which outweigh them in importance. For here are given the events which lead to a coup d'état, and which are to justify it. The task is accomplished with such skill that it gives us what is doubtless the most refined Hittite literary composition. Almost every phrase is calculated to persuade the reader to accept the version which it wishes to establish, influencing him with recurrent themes, and placing it all in a religious key. Ḫattušiliš I and Telepinuš had also to resolve difficult dynastic problems, but their vigorous edicts are set on the human plane, whereas here — and...

---

4 Cf. H. G. Güterbock, ZA XLIV, 1938, p. 94f. Of the opposite opinion is A. Kammenhuber, Saeculum 9, 1958, p. 153 note 94, who relates the document to the annalistic genre; but in addition to the formal point of view — and to understand a composition of antiquity one must keep well in mind the formal aspect — it is also in fact, a decree (consider also the choice of the historical events narrated). For a comparison, remember that Telepinuš also dedicated a document in order to clarify at greater length than in the decree (§§ 22-26) his relationship with Ḫuzzijaš, whom he deposed (KBo XII 8, duplicate 9; Ḫuzzijaš is cited in I 4 and IV 20 ff.). Despite the fact that he was spared by Telepinuš, who even granted to him some landed properties, he was massacred, along with his family, on the initiative of some palace functionaries who were consequently severely punished by Telepinuš.

5 In addition to the "minor text" of the autobiography, Cat. 60, see Cat. 58, 61, 63, 65.

6 Cat. 21; partial transcription and translation in Sturtevant, Chrest., p. 182ff.

7 For Telepinuš see note 6; for Ḫattušiliš I see F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB, Cat. 6.
the contrast is very clear — the religious dimension is sought. First of all, it is constructed on a series of opposing points, sometimes only veiled. These, on the one hand, underline the difficulties faced by the protagonist (and the happy solutions of these, often influenced by supernatural help, attest his own personal value and the constant divine support accorded him). On the other hand, they serve to emphasize his ever-loyal conduct in contrast to the wickedness of his adversaries. Ḫattušiliš, ailing, is not destined to live long: for him «the years are brief» (in contrast to the «long years» which are constantly invoked for kings); Ištar, however, cures him (I 13-21). He is the victim of the envy of his rivals; but this is provoked by the very favors granted him by the goddess and the king (I 30ff.; II 74ff.; III 54ff.). He is made the object of slander and acts of magic, which he contests by means of a regular trial before the king, and the favorable results demonstrate the rectitude of Ḫattušiliš (I 33ff.; II 74ff.). He, on the other hand, does not use magic against Urḫi-Tešup (III 66ff.), even though the latter recalls from exile Sippazitiš, who had already been convicted of the crime of using magic (IV 3ff.). Ḫattušiliš reconquers the Upper Region without benefit of Muwatallis’ support, and in spite of being opposed by decisively superior forces (II 20ff.; 35ff.; 48ff.); but he himself does not hesitate to side with his brother against the Egyptians (II 69ff.). He reciprocates the many favors received from Muwatallis, and after his death, places his son, Urḫi-Tešup, on the throne. Urḫi-Tešup, on the contrary, is vexatious toward him, but he tolerates this from piety to his brother’s memory (III 38ff.; III 62).

Comparing the autobiography with certain north-Syrian compositions, some have wished to see in it elements of epic and fable, but even if some
standard elements were used, it is certainly not possible to assert that the facts were altered in order to fit them into a preconstituted scheme. That they could not have been, is proved, at least for certain aspects, by certain other texts, together with the version of the events given in the decree in favor of Mittannamuwaš, which adheres to the precise situation. It is true that the autobiography can also be reduced to structural schemes and compared with other documents: see the table on the following page. It is doubtful however whether a similar method of research can be justified. Here it is sufficient to have indicated a certain number of correlations arranged in various categories; but to comprehend such a sophisticated text one must go further, following its major themes, and allowing oneself to be guided by the « key words. »

The theme is given by I 5: « I wish to tell of the divine justice (parâ bandatar) of Ištâr », and this justice protects Ḩattušiliš, who acts according to it (I 45 and 48); it manifests itself in the crucial moment of a political trial (III 15), or in the struggle with Urḫi-Tešup, which assumes the guise of a divine judgment (IV 18, 23). And in similar situations, when the just cause triumphs, the same expression is sometimes used in the annals of Muršiliš, but not only there: in addition to the sphere of private behaviour one finds it in the prayers. Thus the Sun-goddess of Arinna is « the lady(!) of justice, inspired with divine justice (bânešnaš-az parâ

extended also to the ritual sphere (see KUB XXXII 130 r 18: J. Danmanville, RHA 59, 1956, p. 42; but the eras in Kumarpi are counted as enneads, and in the song of Ullikummi five and its multiples recur often). As for delineating the use of youth as a period of adversity, as Muršiliš does in his annals, the literary motive will have acted for the purpose of individualizing and underlining such a moment, but behind the literary motive there surely stood a real situation, as the very pragmatic decree for Mittannamuwaš shows: KBo IV 12, A. Goetze, Ḥatt. p. 40ff. For the rest, let it suffice to recall that in epochs of relative security states ruled by a hereditary monarchy could enter upon a crisis every time the heir was not in a position to receive firmly the succession. Compare for Muršiliš I, F. Sommer - A. Falkenstein, ḤAB; the uncertainties and the states of mind which could be seen in such cases are well delineated in the letter of Ḩattušiliš III to Kadašman-Enlil II, KBo I 10 (+), Cat. 55, transl. by J. Friedrich, AO 24, 3, 1925, p. 24ff. « At that time my brother (the king of Babylonia) was still small, and they did not read the letter to you... Now those scribes are not in life, where are the letters? » (r 17ff.); « At that time my brother was small, and Irri-Marduk-balātu (a functionary of the Babylonian court) is a bad man, how can I accept his word? » (r 34ff.); « [I have] heard that my brother has become great and goes to hunt... I rejoice much... go and sack the country of the enemy! » (v 49ff.). Cf. also the texts cited in CAD S, sibru 2b, p. 183f.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idrimi</td>
<td>flight and exile among the Ḫapiru, ll. 3-30</td>
<td>return to Alalakh, treaty with Suttarna, relations with other political entities, ll. 30-63</td>
<td>expedition against the Hittite country, ll. 64-77</td>
<td>internal administration, restoration of the cults, ll. 77-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anitta</td>
<td>war against Neša, Ḫattuṣaš, Zalpuwa, ll. 2-54</td>
<td>reconstruction of Neša, restoration of the cults, ll. 55-63</td>
<td>war against Šalatiwara, ll. 64-72</td>
<td>consignment of the insignia of power on the part of the man of Purušhanda, ll. 73-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫattušiliš III</td>
<td>illness, trial of Arma-Datdlaš, war in the north and against the Egyptians, I 9-II 79</td>
<td>marriage, nomination to the throne of Ḫakpiš, definitive condemnation of Arma-Datdaš, installation of Urḫi-Tešup, restoration of Nerik, II 79-III 54</td>
<td>enmity of Urḫi-Tešup and war, III 54-IV 40</td>
<td>accession to the throne of Ḫattuṣaš, well-being in the country, homage of the other sovereigns, foundation for Ištar, IV 41-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
handanza EN-aš), and that man is dear to her who is of a like mind» 13. Again, the will of the Goddess manifests itself directly through dreams (tešha-), from the invitation made to Muršiliš to dedicate to her the young Ḥattušiliš, to the promise of the throne of Ḥattušaš, and the urgings addressed to the lords of Ḥattušaš to side with Ḥattušiliš (I 13ff.; IV 7ff. and 20ff.; compare again I 36). The theme of dreams as a means of communication between the divinity and human beings is fundamental to Hittite religious experience: see especially the texts in Cat. 224-226. Moralistic aspects are stressed: gentleness toward the old Arma-Dattas and his sons (III 25ff.), and for the same Urhi-Tešup (IV 29ff.); respect for Muwatalliš (nakkijatar, look under the word in the indices of A. Goetze, Ḥatt. and NBr), and before Ištar, a state of servitude (I 18; IV 82). Men are wicked; the autobiography is full of terms expressing negative qualities, such as alwanzabb- «to bewitch», and alwanzatar, alwanzesšar «bewitchment», aršaniya- «to envy», and aršanatalla- «envious», ḫarpanalli- «enemy», ḫuwap(p)- «to do harm», and ḫuwappā- «wicked», papratar «impurity» (see the indices cited above). Ḥattušiliš, in contrast, is righteous. He has feelings of veneration towards Ištar (nahḫan-, I 8), who leads him by the hand (I 20f., 39 etc.). He benefits continually from the acknowledgment (kaneššuwar) of the Goddess: «I defeated the enemy countries, and mine was the acknowledgment», and mine was the acknowledgment of Ištar, my lady» (I 69f.; see the frequent citations in the indices s. v. kaneš(i)-). This is a term of common parlance («as parents acknowledge their children... »), which Ḥattušiliš especially, uses in his edicts to indicate the favour of the superior towards the inferior (to Ura-Dattaš in KUB XXVI 58 I 7; Muwatalliš towards Mittanamüwaš in KBo IV 12, see the index in A. Goetze, Ḥatt.), while to find the expression referred to a divinity one must look in the prayers: KUB VI 45 (+) III 52, Cat. 285 or KUB XXI 27 II 31, Cat. 287 14 (compare aššul- «favour», used more frequently, but not exclusively, of the communications between one man and another: see the indices cited).

If we read the following passage of a prayer by Pudu-Ḫepa, the wife of Ḥattušiliš, addressed to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (here identified with Ḫepat), even though it is singularly rhetorical, nonetheless we do not feel a difference between its style and that of the autobiography: «I, Pudu-Ḫepa, am your old servant, lamb of your stable, stone of your foundation; you raised me, my lady, and Ḥattušiliš, your servant, to whom you joined me, was closely (?) connected with the Weather-god of Nerik, your beloved son; and the place in which you have established us, Sun-goddess of Arinna, my

13 KUB XXIV 3 I 47 and 40, Cat. 283: see O. R. Gurney, AAA 27, 1940, p. 24. For parā ḫandātar cf. again KUB XXI 27 IV 3, Cat. 287 (fragmentary) and the second prayer for the plague, KUB XIV 8 and duplicates, Cat. 279, see A. Goetze, KIF I, p. 218 l. 4.

14 See the lexical study of E. Laroche, RHA 68, 1961, pp. 27-29.
lady, was the dwelling of your beloved son, of the Weather-god of Nerik.»

And this is typical of Ḫattušiliš: to transfer to the religious plane events which had formed the substance of political struggle, and of which the time must have been fully conscious. In another prayer, Ḫattušiliš, together with Pudu-Ḫepa, examines in a dialogue with the Sun-goddess of Arinna the three great dynastic problems from the time of Muršiliš, in order to demonstrate his own innocence: as far as the queens Tawanannaš, wife of Suppiluliumaš I, and Danu-Ḫepa are concerned, he declares himself to be innocent, for at that time he would not even have been capable of doing harm; but he describes the third case, the dispute with Urḫi-Tešup, as if Urḫi-Tešup had wished not so much to harm Ḫattušiliš, but rather the city-sanctuary of Nerik, seat of the great sanctuary of the Weather-god of the city (and son of the Sun-goddess of Arinna), when it was isolated from Ḫattušaš «like a sea-shell in the water». He tells of the great care with which he had reconstructed it, whereas the preceding kings had neglected it, and then proceeds thus: «When Urḫi-Tešup, who [became angered] with me because of my lordship, became wicked with me over the town of Nerik, my friends (and) companions abandoned me (saying): «for Nerik you will ruin yourself »; I however did not listen to the anger [of] my [lord] and the wicked[ness] of my companions... and thus I spoke «why leave Nerik to others? [For Ner]ik I wish to die! ».

In the prayers which he composed for the plague, Muršiliš investigates whether his work or that of his father had not in some way violated the sacred code; here the situation is exaggerated to make it assume almost the aspect of a religious war. Again, Pudu-Ḫepa, in the above mentioned prayer (KUB XXI 27) says:

I [nu-za A-N]A KUR URUN[e-r]i-i[k] Ḫa-ak-piš

34 [a-pi-e-]el SAG.DU-an a-pi-e-cl-la [ZI-an]
36 [me-na-a]b-ḫa-an-da KASKAL-an i-ja-at
38 ma-ab-ḫa-an-ma-za ¹Mu-u-wa-la-al-li-iš [a-pi-e-]e[I SES-SU]
DINGIR ²IM-iš ki-ša-at Ur-ḫi-IM-up-an [DUM]U S[ES-SU]
40 [d]a-at-la na-an LUGAL-u-iz-na-an-ni ti-i[t-ta-nu-ut]

---

15 KUB XXI 27 I 7-15, Cat. 287; cf. the transl. by A. Goetze in ANET, p. 393f.
16 KUB XXI 19 (+) XIV 7, Cat. 286. Other unpublished fragments are used for some passages by V. Haas, Der Kult von Nerik, Roma 1970 (see the index at p. 339f.).
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1. Ha-at-tu-ši-li-in IR-KA
2. A-NA uršu-rim-qa ma-ab-ḫa-an an-da [ši-ja-il?]
3. na-at ḫuršu- ĕn-NA ḫi-ak-ti [ma-ab-ḫa-an-ma]
4. UN-šu-an pār-ḫi-iš-ki-it DUMUL-du-šum-[šu]-ra-in DUR-ka-an [ma-ab-ḫa-an]
5. [u-]-ši-šš-ši-[š]-ka A-NA LUGAL-ra-an [ma-at GASPAN-JA]
6. [ša-a]-k-ti a-pa-aš-ma a-pi-e-el ṣar-ga-[a-n]
7. [a-p]-i-e-el-la ḫi-in-ḵān U-UL kap-p[u-ša-a-it]
8. [nu-wa A-]-NA uršu-ne-ri-šu-qa še-ir ag-ga-ši-[e]-š-du]
   a) or [-q]-a

I [And for the country of Nerik and the country of Ḫ[akpiš]
34 he [engaged] [his] own body and his own [soul,]
36 while he made war [again]
38 [the Kaška people (?)].]

38 But when Muwatalliiš, [his own brother,]
became god (i.e. died), he took Urḫi-Tešup, [the son of his
brother,]
40 and esta[blished] him in the kingship.
42 Ḫatušiliš, your servant, towards Nerik,
that you know, Son-goddess of Arinna, my lady; [and how]
44 his lord incited him, [how] the princes
urged him: « to Nerik! », [that, my lady,]
46 you [know]. And he didn’t con[sider]
his ruin and his death,

Now, at that time, what did these two represent — Ištar of Šamuḫa, and
the Weather-god of Nerik? For what reasons did Ḫatušiliš base his propa­
ganda on these two divinities, and in so doing, to whom in particular did
he address it?

Ištar, who arrived in Anatolia via the Hurrians, has the same terrifying
powers as those attributed to her in Mesopotamia: to dispose of living beings
at her pleasure. « For men, turn to dust (their) masculinity, (their) virility,
(their) health!; take spears, bows, arrows, swords, and bring them to Ḫattušaš;
place in (their) hand(s) the spindle and the mirror of a woman,
dress them as women and put a veil on them!; deprive them of your favour!
From women, take away (their) maternity, love..., and bring them to the

19 The translation differs from that of A. Goetze, _ANET_, p. 393f. For lines 43-48
cf. V. Haas, _op. cit._, p. 13 and note 1.
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midst of the Ḫatti country! »20. Istar of the fields is one of the principal goddesses who protect Muršiliš II 21, and it is one of her hypostases which is honoured at Samuḫa 22. This city became a notable cult center when a predecessor of Muršiliš II, Tuthaliyaš, transferred to it the divinities of Kizzuwatna 23. This would make one suppose that it was located in a safe zone 24, but it was more or less at the same time that it was exposed to enemies 25. Suppiluliumaš I made use of it as a base against the Kaška people 26, and it is perhaps to this king that we should attribute the construction of that «house of the grandfather of the king» in which a ritual for Istar of Tami-

20 (KUB XI 35) (+) KBo II 9 I 25-32, Cat. 406 (see F. Sommer, ZA 33, 1921, p. 98f.; J Friedrich, AO 25, 2, 1925, p. 21f.). And the divinities associated with the goddess could also be held accountable for such subversions: see KUB XXIV 7 I-II 27, transl. in part by A. Goetze, AM, p. 262f. For the influence that the Mesopotamian conception must have exercised in Anatolia, cf. the Accadian prayer to Istar, with Hittite translation, KUB XXXVII 36 (+) 37 and KUB XXXI 141, Cat. 529 and 273; studied by E. Reiner and H. G. Güterbock, JCS XXI, 1967, p. 255-266.

21 The canonical list in the annals is DU NIR.GAL EN-JA DU URRU Arinna GASAN-JA DU URRU Hatti DU KARAS DISTAR IS.II DU jrariš, see A. Goetze, AM, p. 322 s. v. DISTAR. The same divinities, leaving aside the first, the last and DU KAL, recur also in the narration of the deeds of Suppiluliumaš I, still compiled by Mursiliš (see H. G. Güterbock, DŠ, JCS X, 1956, p. 41ff., 75ff., 107ff., fragments 10 1. 7f.; 14 1. 44; 15 1. 8f., etc.

In the annals of Tuthaliyaš, Cat. 85 (on the attribution of which see now Ph. Howink ten Cate, The Records of the early Hittite Empire, Istanbul 1970, p. 71f. and 80), the list includes, among other the divinities, DUPABA, BA DISTAR DŠIN DLEWANIS: KUB XXIII 11 II 25, III 20.

22 DISTAR SERI URRUSAMUHA: Istar of the fields of Samuḫa, KUB XXXII 130 r 1: J. Danmanville, RHA 59, 1956, p. 39ff.; cf. E. Laroche, RHA 46, 1946-47, p. 95. With Ḫattušiliš and Tuthaliyaš, Istar of Samuḫa is sometimes inserted in lists of divinities along side of DU URRUNERIK, cf. KBo IV 10 r 48; IBoT II 20 (+) (Cat. 518,1) 6ff., forming also discrepant lists as in Bo 3136 (see Haas, op. cit., p. 309), where at line 6ff. there occurs DU URRU NEPER DISTAR USAMUHA URR.SAGḪABURWA.

23 KUB XXXII 133, see A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna, p. 24f., and H. Kronasser, Schu. G., p. 58.

24 On the geographical position of the city of Samuḫa, see J. Garstang · O. R. Gurney, Geography, p. 32ff.; A. Goetze, JCS XIV, 1960, p. 46f.; E. von Schuler, Kaskaer, p. 35 note 188. The city is the cult center of diverse divinities who are mentioned with some frequency from the epoch of Suppiluliumaš I: DU, see E. Laroche, RHA 46, 1946-47, p. 114; Ḫepat, cf. KUB VI 45 I 40 = 46 II 6; Lelwanis, see especially KBo IV 6 r 21, Cat. 280, and cf. E. Laroche, op. cit., p. 75ff.; Ḫabarš, ibid., p. 79; Zappanaš, KBo IV 10 v 1; DMI, KUB VIII 71 r 9; KUB XXXII 133 1 8; KBo XVI 97 r 13, v 15, 18; BELAT AJAKKI, E. Laroche, op. cit., p. 104. For the cult of Istar of the city of Tamininga at Samuḫa, see J. Danmanville, RHA 70, 1962, p. 51ff. For DUUTU cf. KUB XXV 32 + XXVII 70 + 1628/u II 45 and 54: A. M. Dinçol · M. Darga, Anatolica III, 1969-70, p. 106f.).

25 KBo VI 28 r 11f., Cat. 58, see A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna, p. 21f.

ninga was celebrated. At any rate, we know with certainty that Muršiliš was concerned with the cult of Ištar of Šamuḫa: in a ritual for the goddess, Ḥattušiliš, to whom the text has to be attributed, decides to restore some of the cult practices, and therefore states: «If in relation to the past years / they revive the ancient ritual for Ištar primigenia, for Ištar / the powerful (??) they do not revive the ancient / ritual of Muršiliš! To Ištar of Šamuḫa, / for (her) festival, she (is) appropriately invited. Muršiliš, / the father of His Majesty, has celebrated it thus... » 28. And if Muršiliš had not been particularly devoted to the goddess, certainly he would not have dedicated Ḥattušiliš to her.

The conquest of Nerik and its reconstruction is the culmination of the reorganization of the entire Upper Region. To have taken it from the Kaška people and given it security constitutes one of the greatest achievements of Ḥattušiliš. The sequence of events can be reconstructed thus 29: Ḥattušiliš, after a series of actions, reconquors large territories in the north; Muwatalliš helps him, and then transfers the capital to Dattašša, leaving all of the Upper Region to his brother, and installing him as king at Ḥakpiš. Nevertheless, Ḥattušiliš does not at first succeed in establishing a lasting order: because he participates in the battle of Qadeš, the capital rebels. Later, at Ḥakpiš, according to the version of it which Ḥattušiliš gives in a text dealing with the restoration of the cult of Nerik, the Weather-god of Nerik appears to him in a dream, and probably invites him to liberate the city. This he will finally succeed in doing only during the reign of Urḫi-Tešup (autob. III 45ff.), reconquoring at last for the Hittites the great city-sanctuary which Muršiliš and Muwatalliš had reached, but had been forced to abandon again to the enemy 30.

From the military point of view, then, the enterprise is quite remarkable,

27 KUB XII 5, Cat. 412; see J. Danmanville, op. cit., p. 51ff. The ritual is celebrated by a queen, probably Pudu-Ḫepa; if at that period she exercised the office of tawanannaš beside her son Tutḫališa IV, then the building was constructed by Muršiliš.


30 KUB XX 8 II 1ff., Cat. 75,3; but the text is rather fragmentary: see V. Haas, op. cit., p. 9f. and p. 15. Also Tutḫališa IV recognizes that Muršiliš has pushed on up to Nerik: KUB XXXI 14 6ff., Cat. 126: V. Haas, op. cit., p. 8 and note 5.
and has the greatest religious echoes, since Nerik had been one of the most important sanctuaries ever since the time of the Old Kingdom, the loss of which was also very painful to Arnuwandaš and Ašmunikal. If then, during the first period of the New Kingdom the cult of the Weather-god of Nerik, which was transferred to Ḫakpiš, underwent a decline for obvious reasons in favor of the Weather-god of Zippalanda, nonetheless Ḫattušiliš had in hand an element of the first order to use when he had to present a version of the coup d'état which should justify him and turn the opinion of various sectors in his favor. Simplifying the terms of the struggle, as is done in the prayers, he contrasts the man who restored the glory of an ancient cult-seat to that other who did not hesitate to undo the work. But beyond this immediate contrast, the propaganda makes use of more complex elements, even if they are not always openly stated. The Hittite kingship is bound up with the Weather-god of Nerik (or better, was so in origin), and the text Bo 3138 addresses to him the famous invocation which in IBoT I 30 is addressed to the Weather-god of Ḫatti: «The country belongs to the Weather-god... he has made the labarnaš, the King, (his) governor; to him he has given the whole country of Ḫattušaš...»; see again a passage such as: «the [labarn]aš, the king, the tawanannaš, [the queen, and the princes] do you guide (Weather-god of Nerik)»; or even the bonds between the divinity and the important festival of purulli. Beyond being protected by Ištar, Ḫattušiliš, in becoming priest of the Weather-god of Nerik (autob. III 60f.), guarantees the original values of the Hittite religion, bound up with the Hattian culture, and does so in a moment when the transference of the capital, with the gods and sacred images (autob. II 52f.), desired by Muwatallis, would have provoked noticeable difficulties. Certain statements must be seen in the light of the character of the document and the purpose for which it was written. Thus, in the autobiography, Ištar becomes queen of Ḫakpiš, and promises the priesthood of the Sun-goddess of Arinna (that is, the kingship of Ḫatti; III 12f.; IV 14f.); but in the prayers which he addresses to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, Ḫattušiliš, keeping in mind that Nerik is the city sacred to her son, and wishing to justify the coup d'état,

31 In § 50 of the Laws Nerik is beside Arinna and Zippalanda.
32 KUB XVII 21, duplicates in Cat. 277; see above all IV 5ff.; transcribed and transl. in E. von Schuler, op. cit., p. 152ff.
33 See V. Haas, op. cit., p. 107ff.; for the texts regarding the cult at Ḫakpiš, ibid., p. 7 n. 3.
34 The new text is cited by V. Haas, op. cit., p. 97ff. and note 4, where there is also a translation of the well-known IBoT I 30, Cat. 537,1.
35 KUB XXXI 136 III 2f., Cat. 290,2; transcribed and transl. in V. Haas, op. cit., p. 196ff.; there too at p. 156 see KUB XXXVI 89 v 49, Cat. 553: “before the countries of the [go]ds he made (his) governor the labarnaš, the king”, where again the functions of the Weather-god of Ḫatti are attributed to the God of Nerik.
36 V. Haas, op. cit., pp. 43-50, with bibl.
prefers to conduct the discourse on other religious lines, recalling how much he has done for the city, and that he marched against Urḫi-Tēšūp only when it ran the risk of being attacked. Thus, in establishing the regulations for various festivals at Nerik, Ḫattušiliš presents himself as «the favorite» of the divinity (NARÂM D[U 人民服务], who «[has made] me [king,] and Pudu-Ḫepa queen»38, but in the decree regarding the foundation NAKšekur, he calls himself, with a redundant title, «favorite of the Sun-goddess of Arinna, of the Weather-god of Nerik, of Ištar of Samuha» 39.

It is true that he is eager to demonstrate his capacity for governing, and the ability with which he reconquered the Upper Region, and then how, as king in Ḫattušaš, was able to guarantee a period of relative peace and prosperity. Unique among the kings of the New Kingdom, and in order to underline the legitimacy of his position, he relates himself directly to Ḫattušiliš I, king of Kuššara, in the titles of his rank 40. Nevertheless, since, as has been said, his propaganda makes use above all of religious elements, almost as if to institutionalize the moments which carried him to the throne, he makes his son, Tūthaliyaš, who was designated heir, the anointed priest of the God of Nerik 41, as well as dedicating him to Ištar of Samuha 42.

37 See KUB XIV 7 (+) IV 11ff.; “If a man for the father (and) the mother raises a son, does not the father (or) the mother give him (the recompense) for the nurse? And does he not take joy in him? I concerned myself with the city of the Weather-god of Nerik, your beloved son; thus, oh Sun-goddess of Arinna...”, cf. L. Rost, MIO 4, 1956, p. 332.

38 KUB XXI 11 r 1, v 5f., Cat. 75.2.

39 KBo VI 28 (+) r 2, Cat. 58.

40 “... the tabarnāš Ḫattušiliš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, son of Muršiliš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, grandson of Suppiluliumāš, great king, king of the country of Ḫatti, descendant of Ḫattušiliš, king of Kuššara”, thus the titulature in the autobiography, and cf. again those of KBo IV 12; KBo VI 29 (+); KBo 28 (+), Cat. 58; KUB XXI 29, Cat. 62; KUB XXVI 58, Cat. 65 (sometimes “Ḫattušiliš, man of Kuššara”; but in KUB XI 35, Cat. 480,1, he remembers only Tūthaliyaš III). Muwatalliš is neglected since, according to custom, the relation of descendants which is considered, is that from father to son. Tūthaliyaš IV limits himself to going back to Tūthaliyaš III, skipping over Suppiluliumāš in addition to Muwatalliš; cf. KBo XI 43 restored with IBoT III 39; KUB XX 63 (+), Cat. 495. Suppilulijamaš II stops at Muršiliš II cf. KBo XII 38 and 41, but in the “oath of the scribe”, KUB XXVI 32 (+) III 10ff., Cat. 91, the lineage of Suppiluliumāš I is recorded as present in Ḫattušaš; cf. E. Laroche, RA 47, 1953, p. 72ff.

41 KUB XXV 21 III 13ff., Cat. 504.4; cf. most recently E. von Schuler, op. cit., p. 186ff.; KUB XXXVI 90 r 15ff.; see V. Haas, op. cit., p. 176ff.

42 Autob. IV 76ff. In the “minor text”, KBo VI 29 (+), there does not however occur the name of the son of Ḫattušiliš, destined to rule the foundation of Ištar. One would be tempted to think that originally Tūthaliyaš was destined for this and that then, when he was ousted to Nerik, it had been left deliberately undetermined which of the other sons of Ḫattušiliš should become the one destined to receive the benefits. But in U. III 1ff. of the “minor text”, in the edition reconstructed in A. Goetze, NBr, p. 48ff., the son destined to the foundation of Ištar seems to administer also the Upper Region, thus
There is no doubt that Ḥakpiš remains the principal centre of the Upper Region until the coup d'état 41, and that the exaltation of Nerik, restored to its ancient importance 44, occurred in large part later; but that Ḫattušiliš' great endeavors could not be interpreted simply as a justification a posteriori of the version of the events which he had imposed, but that instead the cult of Nerik was sincerely felt, seems indubitably proved from the assiduity with which Tuthālijas continued the work of his father 45 (Ḫattušiliš had given also one of his sons, later son-in-law of Bentešina, and tuḫkantis, the name of Nerikkalis, literally "he of Nerik.") 46 There can also arise an impression of artfulness when we consider that the great number of texts dealing with Nerik all belong, with rare exceptions, to Ḫattušiliš or Tuthālijas, and that this abundance of sources stands in contrast to the very rare mentions of the divinity in the other religious and historical documents which are so numerous in connection with his counterpart, the Weather-god of Zippalanda. Nevertheless, a valid justification can be given from the sequence of the events themselves, which made necessary a great work of reorganization for such regions. On the other hand, certain mythological references which recur in the cult of the divinity, even though guaranteed for authenticity by their Hattian origin, could also be a work of the antiquarian at the service of politics 47.

It would be a mistake, however, to think of Ḫattušiliš only as a restorer of ancient cults, whose interests were limited to the central region of Anatolia, where, for accidental reasons, he had accomplish his first enterprises. If his policy contrasts with that of Muwatallis, which was decidedly oriented toward Syria 48, he made use precisely of the military successes of his brother to resolve through diplomatic means alone relations with Egypt, to which he also gave much importance 48bis. And for maintaining the equilibrium in Syria,

creating the possibility for Tuthālijas to reunite the two benefits. Was KBo VI 29 (+) then composed when Ḫattušiliš did not have sons of age? The so-called "minor text", having, to be sure, the same propagandistic elements as that of the autobiography, is nevertheless compiled in a rather condensed form and with a rather extensive regulation regarding the norms and privileges of the foundation in honor of Istar. Thus, as Furlani notes, op. cit., p. 153f., it is probably the true document of the constitution, while the autobiographical text has an eminently apologetic character. For the task of exaltation which Ḫattušiliš undertook in favor of his son, Tuthālijas, for the purpose of assuring his succession, see the narration in heroic style of KUB XIX 8, 9; KBo XII 44, Cat. 73; see K. K. Riemschneider, JCS XVI, 1962, pp. 110-121.

41 Cf. autob. III 59ff., IV 42f.; in Ḥakpiš he became priest of the Weather-god of Nerik: autob. III 60ff.; KBo VI 29 (+) I 25f.
44 On the "country of Nerik" cf. V. Haas, op. cit., p. 6f.
45 See the texts cited in V. Haas, op. cit., in the indices at p. 337, s. v. Tuthālijas IV.
46 See E. Laroche, Noms, p. 130.
47 See p. 225 in this volume of SMEA.
48 Cf. V. Haas, op. cit., p. 19f.
48bis On the political situation in Syria, see now H. Klengel, Gesch. Syriens III, p. 229f.
it was certainly a help that he had restored Bentešina to the throne of Amurru, since he was linked in so many ways to Ḫattušiliš. And also, as far as the cults are concerned, in addition to his loyalty to Ištar, one should remember also his interest in Kummanni, the city of the Hurrian Ḫepat, as testified by the rock reliefs of Tašçi and Fraktin, and by the introduction by Pudu-Ḫepa of festivals from the region of Kizzuwatna 49.

The religious dimension of the propaganda of Ḫattušiliš is not confined to the confrontation with Urḫi-Tešup, which assumes the character of a veritable divine judgment (ḫanneššar) in that concise document which is the « minor text » 50. It involves also the important conflict with Arma-Dattaš. The latter, deprived of the rule of the Upper Region by Muwatalliš, who wished to entrust it to Ḫattušiliš, launched a series of accusations of which Ḫattušiliš was judged to be innocent in a trial presided over by the same Muwatalliš (autob. I 25-65). Such, then, were the origins of the conflict, as is confirmed by another document: « His Majesty and Arma-Dattaš came into conflict and became estranged for this reason, that the Upper Region was given for administration to Arma-Dattaš, but when Muwatalliš, my brother, gave me the Upper Region to administer, Arma-Dattaš began to betray my brother and did harm to me. » 51 And Arma-Dattaš, in his hostility, and profiting from the fact that both Muwatalliš and Ḫattušiliš were engaged against the Egyptians, had recourse to magic, not hesitating even to go so far as to contaminate the city sacred to Ištar: « and filled with incantations Šamuḫa, the city of the Goddess » (autob. II 78f.; compare III 19) 52. Finding him guilty in a second judiciary trial, Muwatalliš consigned Arma-Dattaš, together with his family, to Ḫattušiliš, who spared their lives, contenting himself with sending them into exile (autob. III 14-30). But Urḫi-Tešup will later take advantage of the hostilities between the two families when, preparing himself to attack Ḫattušiliš, he sends against him in the Upper Region the son of Arma-Dattaš, Sippazitiš, who had been recalled from his exile in Alasija (autob. IV 3-6).

49 Cf. the colophones of the ituwał festival (Cat. 433): KBo XV 52; 60; KUB XL 102; and H. Otten, BiOr 8, 1951, p. 225. Pudu-Ḫepa is given the epithets “great queen, queen of the country of Ḥatti, daughter of the city of Kummanni”: KUB XV (+) I 1, transcribed and transl. in SiBoT I, p. 16.

50 KBo VI 29 II 1ff.

51 KUB XXI 17 I 3-9, Cat. 63: ḪUTU slu ⊕ XXX.xu-ša ta ša-an-ni-ta-l-wa-eš-šir / ḪUL-(m)šš-šir ma-at kie-da-ni me-mi-jani / KUR UGU/TM ku-ii A-NA ⊕ XXX.xu AS-SUM MU-IR-DU-UT-TIM pi-eš-ta GIM-an-ma-mu / NIR.GAL SES-JA KUR UGU/TI AS-SUM MU-IR-DU-UT-TI «-IS » / pi-eš-ta ⊕ XXX.xu-as-ma-mu-za A-NA SES-JA GAM-an / pi-eš-ku-wa-aš da-a-š / nam-ma-mu-kān ḫa-wa-ap-pš-is-kš-šit. KUB XXXI 26, Cat. 64 also would have formed a part of this text, according to P. Meriggi, WZKM 58, 1962, p. 90f.

52 KUB XXI 17 I 10f., Cat. 63, more moderately: “He put enchantresses behind me, and they bewitched me”, cf. A. Goetze, NBr, p. 14.
Hattušiliš had given to Ištar first half of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš, who had been found guilty of magic (alwanzatar) ⁵²₄, and later the other part, when Sippazitiš was definitively defeated ⁵³. Nonetheless, in composing the document for the foundation, notwithstanding the fact that he had once again shown clemency towards Sippazitiš by pardoning him (autob. IV 36f.) ⁵⁴, Hattušiliš feels the need to appeal to the Goddess, making it seem that she herself was responsible for the idea of depriving Arma-Dattaš of part of his patrimony, and calling on Muwatallis as witness and guarantor of his actions: «I did not take [all of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš], I took half, and half I restored to Arma-Dattaš; then, before my brother I took possession of Ištar of Šamūa, and in Urikina I constructed temples to her, and to her I gave this patrimony of Arma-Dattaš; and as for the question of the patrimony of Arma-Dattaš, the Goddess with a dream established the half, and I did not change it. »⁵⁵ Now we can be certain that Hattušiliš acted legally from the first phase, since for example in the « instructions for priests » the co-responsibility of the family is mentioned several times ⁵⁶; and although the edict of Telepinuš ( §§ 31 and 32) specifically exempts the entire family from paying with his patrimony in a case in which a prince of the royal family is found guilty in the course of penal proceedings, yet in the autobiography it is specified that at the trial the wife and sons of Arma-Dattaš were also found guilty (II 77 and III 17) ⁵⁷.

In fact, the foundation in honor of Ištar permitted the dynasty to bind to itself certain groups, offered a position of prestige to the one in charge (so much so that for a certain period the crown prince himself was delegated to the foundation), and through its constitution (with its effective assignment of the patrimony to the Goddess) it gave to Hattušiliš the means of establishing the official version of a conflict which for long years had placed him in opposition to one of the most important families of Hatti. In sub-

⁵²₄ On the crime of magic see the §§ 44 b and 111 of the Laws.
⁵³ Cf. autob. III 29f. and IV 66, in addition to KUB XXI 17 II 1ff., which though fragmentary in its last part, seems to show that there were two different moments in the constitution of the foundation, the first of which was already at the epoch of Muwatallis.
⁵⁴ The fragment 579/d (quoted by H. G. Güterbock, ZA NF IX, 1936, p. 321ff.) seems to refer a flight of Urqi-Tešup with Sippazitiš.
⁵⁵ KUB XXI 17 II 1-10: U-UL da-ab-hu-un [na-]at-za ták-ša-[an] / šar-ra-an-za da-ab­
hu-un / ták-ša-an šar-ra-an-ma A-NA I DXXX.DU / EGIR-pa pi-ib-hu-un / nam-ma-zá-kán
DILIS URŠu-mu-bi / A-[N]A PA-AN SES-JA šar-ra-ab-hu-un / nu-uši: EMES DINGIRMES
I-NA URšu-ki-nu / i-ja-[ni-un [nu ki-ši E I DXXX.DU a-pie-da-ni AD-DIN / nu 1NIM E
I DXXX.DU DINGIRUM ták-ša-an U-za IQ-BI / na-an-kán U-UL-pá ša-ab-nu-nu-un. Lines 5f. are translated according to A. Goetze, Tunnaui, p. 45.
⁵⁶ KUB XIII 4, Cat. 166, where see the duplicates and bibl.; transcription and transl.
by E. Sturtevant, Chrest., p. 148 ff.
⁵⁷ Idem, op. cit., p. 190ff.
stituing himself for this family in the government of the Upper Region, he was able to create the premises for his accession. Nonetheless, to wish to see behind the continual appeals to Ištar and in the constitution itself, merely political and propagandistic ends would be to impose an anachronistic point of view upon a very different historical situation, since for the mentality of the time, religious fact was inseparable from practical experience. Thus we should not be shocked to learn, when reading the decree for Mittannamuwaš, in which the context is totally human, that it was Mittannamuwaš himself who cured Ḫattušiliš of his youthful illness; while in the autobiography one reads of Ištar announcing to Muršiliš: «Brief are the years for Ḫattušiliš. He does not belong to life. Consign him to me and make him my priest: he will be sound».

The two documents, in such different tones, present two aspects of the same mentality, according to which, if man is free to act and to influence reality, divine favor will assist him, if he is worthy, with constant support.

The decree for Mittannamuwaš already « great scribe » at the time of Muršiliš, for whose family Ḫattušiliš succeeded in retaining office even under Uṛḫi-Tešup, or the document in favor of Ura-Dattaš, whose services Ḫattušiliš rewarded with a gift of landed property, are styled in the form of political treaties, in accordance with which the most important clause consists of the support and reciprocal protection between the sovereign and the « noble », and their respective legitimate descendents (these texts shed particular light on what an important part personal ties played in the structure of the Hittite state). Now the theme which makes up the political part of these, as of other political-administrative documents, is again, almost invariably, the conflict with Uṛḫi-Tešup, but this time without recourse to motifs of a religious character. The image which Ḫattušiliš tends to favor is that of Uṛḫi-Tešup, legally placed by Ḫattušiliš upon the throne of Ḫatti, but acting, then, either from foolishness or incapacity, in contrast to the lines laid down by Muwatalliš (when possible he refers back even to Muršiliš), lines of which he presents himself, instead, as the perpetuator, emphasizing at every opportunity the relationship which binds him to his brother.

---

58 KBo IV 12, A. Goetze, Ḥatt., p. 41ff.
59 Autob. I 14-17. The contrast between the two versions is such that G. Furlani, op. cit., p. 153ff., prefers to think of two different illnesses.
60 For this view, cf. A. Archi, Studi in onore di P. Meriggi, Athenaeum LVII, 1969, p. 17ff.
61 KBo IV 12 I 29f., A. Goetze, Ḥati., p. 42f.
62 KUB XXVI 58, duplicate in Cat. 65.
63 There are numerous occasions when Ḫattušiliš makes mention of this legalistic act of his.
64 Br. Meissner, ZDMG 72, 1918, p. 43, and E. Weidner, Pol. Dok., p. 126 n. 2 see in
logical consequence could not be other than that « those lords whom Urbi-Teşup sooner or later had chased out » (as will be stated in autob. IV 19f.) finally switch to Ḫattušiliš' side. This motif of the bonds and continuity with his brother is one of the most frequent in the apology itself: it is directly to Muwatalliš that Ištar appears in a dream to instruct Muršiliš to consign to her the ailing Ḫattušiliš (autob. I 13f.). In contrast, Urbi-Teşup recalls from Cyprus Sippazitiš, who had been exiled under Muwatalliš; and Mittanamnuwas, to whom Muwatalliš had consigned Ḫattušiliš itself (KBo IV 12 r 17; when the capital was transferred to Dattasša?) can transfer the office to his son only by the intervention of Ḫattušiliš 65. And into this prospective fits well the fragment KUB XXI 33 (Cat. 113) in the interpretation given by P. Meriggi: it is a memorandum of an high official who had served as early as the time of Muwatalliš, enumerating the initiatives taken by Urbi-Teşup in opposition to the directives of his father 66.

We cannot know, in reality, how much truth there is in Ḫattušiliš' the phrase arki ̣abi'ya Muwatallis abi'ya ana kussi šarrutti išabat (“after my father, Muwatalliš, my brother, took the throne of the kingship”) of the treaty of Bentešina (KBo I 8 r 11), a hostile expression of Ḫattušiliš with regard to his brother's accession to the throne: the classic expression, in fact, uses wasiibu (cf. line 16 ana kussi abi'ya atata ́b) but Ḫattušiliš himself employs also sabatu to indicate his own accession to the throne: KBo I 14 v 5, Cat. 66, cf. A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna, p. 28. One should remember, however, that Urbi-Teşup was the one to bring the capital back to Ḫattušaš, while the decision of Muwatalliš was at variance with this.

One can of course also maintain that Urbi-Teşup, not feeling himself supported, sought to surround himself with men faithful to him.

65 The treatment of P. Meriggi is in WZKM 58, 1962, pp. 70-76; I cannot accept the interpretation of R. Stefanini, JAOS 84, 1964, pp. 22-30, since I consider the insertion of EN-JA “my lord” not addressed to a divinity (cf. line 9). The objections of H. Klengel, Gesch Syriens II, p. 215f. and 241f. (note 123) are naturally the same as arise in anyone who interprets the fragment in question. On the other hand, the restoration of Ḫattušiliš at the beginning of line 16 is not probable since the whole fragment tests on a contrast between a Muršiliš and the sovereign called EN-JA; however, if one cannot help remaining perplexed in reading that there was a “Manapa-Dattas affair” also at the time of Muwatalliš — Urbi-Teşup, it would be still stranger that a Sapiliš — Bentešina episode were already verified at the time of Muršiliš II. One can, however, understand, that here Urbi-Teşup, contrary to custom, is called with the name of Muršiliš, with whom he ascended the throne, when one thinks that the document could go back to the period immediately subsequent to the coup d’état. And so one could explain that here the responsibility for restoring Bentešina to the throne of Amurruru is given to Urbi-Teşup, if one hypothesizes that he, at the beginning of his reign, had in effect established Bentešina in Amurruru again on the suggestion of Ḫattušiliš (as he had also intervened for the family of Mittanamnuwa). So Ḫattušiliš could rightly boast later of having restored the throne to him (E. Weidner, Pol. Dok., p. 126 line 17). The functionary who compiled the document would have held to the formal datum.

The history of the reign of Amurruru for this period is set forth in its particulars by H. Klengel, op. cit., pp. 307-319.
accusations, but it is certain that he acted loyally towards Muwatallis, who protected him from his rivals and entrusted to him tasks of great importance. If he were already then planning the coup d'état, he would certainly have tried it at the moment of his succession, all the more since Urhi-Tešup was not the son of the first wife of Muwatallis, but of a concubine.

In general it is considered a proof of Ḫattušiliš's conspiracy — truly long-range planning! — that he arranged to receive from his brother the king of Amurru, Bentešina, who had betrayed the alliance with the Hittites by changing to the side of the Egyptians, in order to restore him to the throne after the coup d'état. It seems strange though that Ḫattušiliš could have had this kind of plan so soon after the battle of Qadeš, when Muwatallis' prestige must have been at its height. Moreover, what possible action could Ḫattušiliš have been planning in conjunction with an exile of a country so far from Ḫattušaš (if an exile succeeded in winning back the throne it was almost always by the direct intervention of an external force, given the difficulties at that time, and with such governmental structures, of maintaining and guiding the opposition from a distance), and above all, what help could he expect at the decisive moment of the coup d'état?

The activity of Ḫattušiliš to bind to himself the nobles of the realm with a view to taking over power seems to begin later. In his prayers Ḫattušiliš affirms that he felt isolated: « and (they) abandoned me, my friends (and) my companions », whereas Urhi-Tešup would have been able to count on a large support: « [and how] his lord incited him (Ḥattušiliš), [how] the princes urged him... ». But when he no longer wishes to use a dramatic tone, while demonstrating that he who is on the side of justice affirms himself among men with the favor of the gods, then it is that the story assumes a different aspect: « Ištar, of Šamuha, [my lady,] came to my side, and the [countr]ies to which I wrote: « follow me », all followed me, and the countries to which I did not write, all came to my side » (among these there figure also the Kaška people, who were in almost perpetual struggle with the Hittites: autob. IV 26-29f.). Ištar had already appeared in a dream to Pudu-Hepea to announce to her: « All of Ḫattušaš will pass to your husband’s side », and again to the nobles to inform them that: « I have directed all of the countries of Hatti to the side of Ḫattušiliš » (autob. IV 10f. and 21ff.). Now we know how Ḫattušiliš advanced various people, so that these forecasts would be fulfilled: « That Kantuzziliš who was an administrator, he [threatened (me) wickedly] and I fought him; Ura-Dattaš, son of Kan[tuzziliš] changed to the side of His Majesty, and I honored him »: and to comprehend the background of the story, this passage is sufficient, even

67 Respectively KUB XXI 19 (+) II 28f. and KUB XXI 27 I 43 ff.
68 It is the "minor text", KBo VI 29 (+) II 13-17.
if fragmentary: «But Ura-Dattaš was Kantuzziliš’ son, [and ...] when Uṛḥi-Tešup, my brother’s son, came to the struggle [...].» Also Ulmi-Tešup, made king at a later time at Dattašša, found himself at the crucial moment at Ḥattušaš, and must have chosen at the right moment the winning party; of LAMA, the sources say only that he was named by Ḥattušiliš first king of Dattašša, but we know with what prudence Ḥattušiliš chose the men in whom he would place trust. Also Maštriš, king of the country of the river Šeṣa from the time of Muwatalliš, to one of whose daughters he was married, «went over to the side» of Ḥattušiliš (EGIR-an [tijat]). But to this push to join with his father’s troops, Tuthalijaš IV gave a judgment which was not at all positive, and without mincing terms, declared that Maštriš promoted a conspiracy (kupijatin kupta), making use of the same expression which Ḥattušiliš attributes to the exiled Uṛḥi-Tešup (autob. IV 34).

But we can well believe that at least Ḥattušaš, where Uṛḥi-Tešup resided, would have offered resistance at the moment of the coup d’état: we are partially informed of it by a decree promulgated by Ḥattušiliš for the population of the city, KUB XXI 37 (Cat. 71), presenting, for their information, the official interpretation of the events, and binding them by means of an oath to the new sovereign and his descendants.


70 KUB XXI 37 r 37, cf. infra, p. 205. The treaty which regulates the granting of the province of Dattašša for Ulmi-Tešup is KBo IV 10, Cat. 68, where see bibl.; but the text is translated almost completely by J. Garstang - O. R. Gurney, Geography, p. 66ff.

71 LAMA is installed at Dattašša according to autob. IV 62ff., in which A. Goetzke, NBr p. 34, following E. Forrer, Forschungen I, p. 100, restores at line 62: [nu DUMU SE]S-JA, that is “[and the son of] my [brother]” (contra F. Sommer, AU, p. 35 n. 3). The restoration, according to which LAMA would be the son of Muwatalliš, seems to be confirmed by 544/f, studied by H. G. Güterbock, SBo II, p. 106 (SBo II text 1).

On the other hand, the hypothesis of Güterbock, JNES XX, 1961, p. 86 n. 3 that LAMA is the second name assumed by the same personage at the moment of his installation does not seem to me probable. The treaty of Ḥattušiliš with LAMA is preserved in ABoT 57 (Cat. 69) = KBo IV 10 I 40ff. (Cat. 68).

72 KUB XXIII 1 (+) II 15-28, Cat. 80; transcr. and transl. by O. Szemerényi, Orients Antiquus 9, 1945, p. 113ff.

73 See P. Meriggi, WZKM 58, 1962, pp. 66-68. I have also had the opportunity of discussing with prof. P. Meriggi my interpretation of the text.

For the course of the events cf. also KBo XIV 45 (a partial translation in H. Otten, MDOG 93, 1962, p. 75): 1. 3 n/mu-kan manijaḫḫāšiš daš[a]nd he took (away) my possessions; 1. 5 nu-ši kururijah[bun “and [I] fought against him”]; 1. 6 n-an-zan tarabḫašu “I conquered him”; 1. 7 arḫa titti annunun ku-enu-ma-kan ŬL “I [depo]sed [him]” but I did not kill (him)”.
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8 LÜMES URI Ha-at-ti [pa-an-qa-u-e-e] DUMU MES LUGAL BE-LU MES

10 kat-ta-ma DUMU.NITA MES [D]UTU DUMU.NAM

12 A-NA DUTU DUMU MES SAL LUGAL ku-i-eš nu DUMU SAL


16 am-me-da-za ti-ja-at ku-iš-ma IŠ.TU 'Ur-bi DUTU DUMU sa-ab-ba-as-ši DUMU.JA

18 'Ur-bi DUTU DUMU sa-ab-ba-as-ši DUMU.JA DUGAL

20 a[p-a-a-aš-ma m-m]u uk te-ip nu-um ma-an-zi š[e-i]r lu-ur-i-ja[št̂iš] bi-ki-it...


24 E-ir-ma-wa-tak-kam A-NA É'[a] an-da pi-ib-bi nu ki-e-da[...nu...

26 [a-tak-kam x ku-it-ki nu-wa[...]

[... I-NA URI Ha-at-ti AS-SUM] LUGAL-UT-TIM x[...]

DUMU.NAM.ULU DU-za nu k[u-it 'U]r-bi DUTU DUMU.NAM.ULU DU-za na-as-li...

SUM-an te-eš-bi ma-an-ma-kam A-NA DUMU JAMA ku-e-da-ni...

A-NA DUTU DUMU MES SAL LUGAL ku-i-eš nu DUMU SAL

DUMAL AS-SUM EN-UT-TI [pa-ab-ba-as-ši]

DUMU.NAM.ULU DU-za na-as-li...

SUM-an te-eš-bi ma-an-ma-kam A-NA DUMU JAMA ku-e-da-ni...
Yo[ur (?)] lord [...]
and him x[...]
that which x[...]
but you [...]
extactly the question to him [...]
before away [....]x[ ...]x [ ...]
People! [since] Urhi-Tešup [was guilty] before the king [...]
8 men of Ḥatti [all(?)], princes, lords, [...]
no-one shall se[ar]ch for! And after him no-[one shall search] for
(his) so[ns!]

But in the future defend the sons of the king. People!
I then [for a son, who shall be king,]
will establish the name; but if to my son, to whom [...]
to His Majesty the sons of the queen who (remain), then [protect]
a son of the queen with regard to the kingship!
But do not ta[ke] anyone of another line! [A son of Urhi-Tešup]
no-one shall search for! Urhi-Tešup did me harm, [and you]
did me harm, you humiliated me, and [I] fought you. [Who]
sided with me, and who sid[ed] with Urhi-Tešup; [I defeated him]
and then I reunified the population: I did [not(?)] do harm
[to anyone(?).]

Urhi-Tešup was son of m[y bro]ther and when my brother died,
and installed him with regard to the kingship, and I [was loyal] to him,

but he under[took] to humiliate me in order to diminish me. [And he even swore to me:]


I will not take (from it) one man! Before my father to you [was conceded . . .

and that I will reconsign to him. [I will make] you administrator in [the Upper Region,]

house after house I will give to you ». And to th[is promise . . .
And he made an oath to the Moon-god, and before the Moon-god of the throne, [raising] his eyes [he said:]

[« . . . . . ] to you . . . everything, and [. .
[. . . . . . . . . . in] H[atti with regard (?) to the(?)]

kingship x[. . .

[. . . . . . . . . . ] x x x [. .
[. . . . . . . . . . ] but [I]

to you do not

[. . . . . . . . . . ] I will change the [wo]rd

and will do you harm

[. . . . . . . . . . ]x before the divine oath let it be left,

[. . . . . . . . . . ] was, and as he did me harm,

[. . . . . . . . . . ] I fought against him,

[. . . . . . . . . . ] those gods of the judgement

[will make him succumb(?).]

[. . . . . . . . . . ] all of [Hā]ttušaš (acc.) to Ulmi-Tešup

[I entrusted, . . . . . . . and against me . . .]x x he came, and

he himself

[. . . . . . . . . . but I] conquered [him] with [ar]ms.

him] I made (my) son, but you, all men of Hatti,

[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . put yourselves,

but His Majesty you

Urhi-Tešup I dep]osed, but you, men of Hatti,
[... you do not give it back to him!]

44 [... you do not take it back to him!]

[If someone] hears from [someone bad things regarding His Majesty,]

46 [or even someone hears, and him, loyal to His Majesty]

[...] hostile someone does harm [... one does not hide that from [His Majesty!]]

50 [... and it (to one) of another line you do not give, ...] in future all the descendants

52 [... with regard to the lordship protect conscientiously.

[With respect to this question may the thousand gods be witness: the Sun-god of the sky, the Sun-goddess of Arinna,]

54 [the Weather-god of the sky, the Weather-god of Ḫatti, ... Namnīš, Ḥazziš, [the Weather-god of Ne[r]īk,]

56 [the Weather-god of Sapinuwa, ... the Weather-god of [ ... mountains, rivers, springs of the country of Ḫatti]

The coup d'État at Ḥattuṣaš created certain perplexities in the foreign courts, and Ḥattušiliš, not hiding his irritation, expressed himself thus in a letter probably directed to a king of Assyria: "Did not [my father] send you fine gifts? When I assumed kingship, you did not send me an ambassador. And it is the custom that kings assume the [king]ship, and (other) kings and their nobles send to him fine gifts, a royal mantle, and pure [oil] forunction. But up (unul) now, you have not done this"; and soon after, disassociating himself from Urḫi-Tešup: «The ambassadors whom you sent at the time of the king Urḫi-Tešup had bad experiences. Now...» 24

24 KBo I 14 v 4-10 and 15f., Cat. 66; studied by A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna, p. 27ff.
Ramesses II also preferred to wait until the situation clarified itself, but under pressure from Ḫattušiliš III he hastened to recognize that «[Certainly the great king] of the countries of Ḫatti [are you. The Sun-god has granted to you, and the Weather-god has granted to you [to sit in] the country of Ḫatti, in the place of the father of your father.» 75. Really, Ramesses would have felt himself obliged to support Urhi-Tešup, being bound to Muwatalliš by a treaty, and to use the words which Ḫattušiliš in a similar case would have addressed to the Babylonians: «I[f you] do not protect in (his) rulership [the descendant] of my brother (the king of Babylonia), I shall be your enemy: I shall come (?) and conquer Babylonia.» 76. And in fact the loyal king of Mira, bound feudally to Ḫatti, turned to the Egyptian king to learn what attitude he would take. Ramesses responds: «Mind, too, that the question of Urbi-Tešup of which [you have written] me, the great king, the king of Ḫatti, has resolved according to [my (??) wishes (?)]» 77. Any intervention from the outside would have been unrealizable, and it was too important to the Egyptians to preserve the order established in Syria. When Ḫattušiliš showed himself capable of handling the situation, there remained no other course but to maintain the peace, and of this peace the queen of Egypt, Nofretari, writes to Pudu-Ḫepa, recalling the latter's own words: «...the relationship of beautiful peace,... the relationship of beautiful brotherhood in which the great king, the king of Egypt (finds himself) with his brother, the great king, the king of Ḫatti »; and she proceeds, auguring: «(the Sun-god) will grant for eternity the beautiful brotherhood of the great king, the king of Egypt, with his brother, the great king, the king of Ḫatti » 78.

But if Ḫattušiliš could be proud of his loyalty towards Muwatalliš, and if his personal successes and his piety towards the gods supported his belief that he had acted justly, and enjoyed the favor of the gods, nevertheless, in substituting himself by force for the legitimate king, and interrupting the succession from father to son, he had violated a norm of the Hittite social order upon which the kingship was based 79. Therefore not even his son,

75 NBC 3934 r 13-15, Cat. 567; studied, together with KUB III 22, concerning the same problems, by A. Goetze, JCS I, 1947, pp. 241-251.
76 Letter to Kadašman-Enlil II: KBo I 10 r 14ff., Cat. 55; transl. by J. Friedrich, AO 24,3, 1925, p. 24ff.
77 KBo I 24 r 12ff., Cat. 56; transcr. and transl. by Br. Meissner, ZDMG 72, 1918, p. 43f.
78 KBo I 29 r 8-11, 14-17, Cat. 577; transl. by Br. Meissner, op. cit., p. 59f., and J. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 23f. Cf. again KUB XXI 38 v 13ff., Cat. 57: "...the country of Egypt and the country of Ḫatti will become a single country..."
79 The succession from father to son constitutes the rule, so much so that, for example, Muršiliš II, succeeding to his brother Arnuwandaš II, expresses himself thus: "but when His Majesty sat on the throne of my father..." A. Goetze, AM, p. 20 line 19; this is the
Tuthaliyaš IV, who succeeds him, will consider his father’s actions justified, precisely because this principle had to be respected in every case, and, together with the obligation of mutual protection, constituted the very reason for every treaty and pledge sworn to with the king. Speaking in defense of this, Tuthaliyaš did not hesitate to say: «... and besides (Mašturiš) did not protect [his son (of Muwatallis)], Urbi-Tešup, and prepared a plot, and came to side with my father. You will say: because his son (was) a bastard! You will protect even a bastard! »³⁸.

And in a world such as that of the Hittites, where each man took such care to examine his own actions and those of his relatives in order to avoid any disfavor from the gods or the dead, and gave such scrupulous attention to the omens, it is very natural to find in mantic literature traces of reappraisals and more cautious attitudes taken in the period after Hattušiliš.

Even while he was still living, Pudu-Heqa, knowing how the troubled events of the past could expose him to the disfavor of the gods, supplicated the Goddess of Arinna to take no account of such calumny. KUB XXI 27 III 14-20:

usual expression, which Hattušiliš also uses (cf. the treaty of Benešina, E. Weiland, Pol. Dok., p. 126 line 16). The succession passed to the brother only when there were no sons, whether of the wife or of a concubine. So the same Hattušiliš prescribes: “If there is a son or a descendant of him (Ura-Dataš), then the patrimony has to remain for the son or for the grandson of Ura-Dattas; but if there is not a son or a grandson of him, but there is a brother of him, then to him shall [they give it.]” (21) ma-a-an-SI DUMU-SU DUMU-DUMU-SU e-e-i-zí na-aš-te E-ir (22) A-NA DUMU-SU DUMU-SU ŠA GAL-ŠI-IM a-aš-du (23) ma-a-an-ŠI DUMU-SU-ma DUMU-DUMU-SU ŠU-UL e-e-i-zí (24) ŠES-SU-ma-aš-ŠI e-e-i-zí na-[a-]ŠI [i pi-an-zí] (KUB XXVI 58 r 21-24, Cat. 65).

Tuthaliyaš IV, taught by the example given by his father, placed on guard against the brothers of the sovereign the nobles who took the oath of loyalty with him: cf. KUB XXIII 1 (+) III 9, Cat. 80 and especially the instructions to E-ŠEŠ-SIAG: “His Majesty has many brothers and many ancestors. The country of H(atti) is full of the royal line: in H(atti the line) of Suppiluliumaš, the line of Mušiliš, the line of Muwatallis, the line of Hattušiliš is numerous. With regard to the lord[ship] you will not recognize any other man, with regard to the lordship protect in the future the grandchildren, the great-grandchildren, the line of Tuthaliyaš!” (KUB XXVI 1 (+) I 9-16, Cat. 173.2; see E. von Schuler, Dienstanw. p. 9).

³⁸ KUB XXIII 1 (+) II 26-29, Cat. 80: O. Szemerenyi, op. cit., p. 118f. Surely the episode of Urbi-Tešup is mentioned again as a warning in the extremely badly damaged 1st col. l. 54 of KBo IV 14 53, Cat. 92: R. Stefanini, Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Serie ottava, Rendiconti, vol. XX, 1965, p. 49f. and 75.
The propaganda of Ḫattušiliš III

na-aš-ma-aš-ši-kān DINGIRMES UGU [DINGIRMES ŠA]P-LI-TI ku-iš-ki

20 ḪUL-u-wa-an-ni EGIR-an ša-[r(a-a t)]i-ja-an ṣar-zi [aš ma pi-ja-an ku-iš-ki ŠA [t'Ha-a]t-tuši-li ḪUL-u-an-ni še-[i(r]

22 A-NA DINGIRMES pi-ja-an ṣar-zi...

14 Your servant, Ḫattušiliš, who [ ...] people have spoken about him before Ur[ḫi-Tešup: ]

16 For(?) short [years may he live!]

Now, if Ḫattušiliš, [your servant,]

18 before you, oh gods, (has) come [through the work of a human]

being, or even one of the superior gods [(or) of the gods of the under-]

world for him

20 has made denunciation(?) for evil, or someone (has) given: has given to the gods

22 for the evil of Ḫa]ttušiliš ...

And Tuthaliyaš, who evidently did not consider resolved the important differences which his father had had with his political adversaries, but feared their unfavorable consequences on the religious level, often concerned himself with them in order to neutralize any danger. KUB XVI 32 (Cat. 222):

II 14 A-NA ḪUTUš ku-it A-NA DUMIMES P-UP : SISKUR ma-an-ta[l-li]

IGI-an-da ar-ša BAL-u-an-zi UL SIxSA-AT UL-aš ku-it [ḪUL-ab-ḫu-un]

16 ḪUL-ab-ta-ši ku-iš UKU-aš na-aš nu-u-wa ku-it TI-za nu [a-pi-el ku-it]

ZI-za UL wa-ar-ši-ja-an-za nu SISKUR ma-an-ta-li ar-ša B[AL-u-an-zi]

18 a-pi-iz UL SIxSA-at

A-NA ḪUTUš ku-it A-NA DUMIMES 1 DXXX 3 DU SISKUR ma-an-ta[l-li]

20 IGI-an-da ar-ša BAL-u-an-zi UL SIxSA-AT UL-aš ku-it

ḪUL-ab-ḫu-un ḪUL-ab-ta-ši ku-iš UKU-aš na-aš nu-u-w[a ku-it]

22 TI-za nu a-pi-el ku-it ZI UL wa-ar-ši-ja-ša[n-za

[n ]a SISKUR ma-an-ta-li-j a ar-ša KIN-an-zi a-pi-iz U[ L SIxSA-AT]


26 [a]ta-n a-ha a-an-za nu GIDIM a-pa-aš : ar-su-l[a(-) ...]

MA-ME-TUM ŠA A-BI ḪUTUš ku-it A-NA INIM ḪU-bi-[P-U-up]

As is was not established (with oracles) for His Majesty to make offering according to the *mantalli* ritual in favour of the sons of Urḫi-Tešup, as [I did no harm] to them;

(but) the man who did do harm to them, as he (is) still living, and [as his] soul (is) not placated, then (it is) through his (fault) (that) it was not established to offer

the *mantalli* ritual.

As it was not established (with oracles) for His Majesty to make offering according to the *mantalli* ritual in favour of the sons of Arma-Dattaš, [as] I did not harm to them; (but) the man who did do harm to them, [as he] (is) still living, as his soul (is) not placated, then (it is) through his (fault) (that) it was not established to make the *mantalli* ritual.

Kiuṭa, a locality, for GAL-U [they will take (?)] away [and] will give it to the spirit, Katapaili [(...)]

(for it is) responsible, and that one the spirit :aršul[a...

As it was established (with oracles) the (unfulfilled) oath of the father of the king regarding the question of Urḫi[-Tešup], the mother of the god will resolve (!) the oath, and to the [sons(?)]

[of Urḫi]Tešup, in Neja 80, a locality [(...)]

they will [con]sign.

Here are brought together, side by side, the case of Urḫi-Tešup and of Arma-Dattaš (although we do not know with certainty who this U₆GAL was) 81, and line 1 also brings up the case of queen Danu-Ḫepa, which therefore could not have been considered resolved even at that time (an investigation on Danu-Ḫepa and Urḫi-Tešup occurs also in another mantic text, KUB XVI 16 v 1, and 23, Cat. 214,6). It is clear, then, that at the court of Ḥattušaš watch was kept with continual mantic observations to ensure, by means of the correct ritual performances, that the descendants of those political adversaries could have no unfavorable influence. And if in

---

80 For Neja see H. Klengel, *Gesch. Syrions II*, p. 58f.
81 Cf. *infra*, note 84.
line 28 DUMU\textsuperscript{mes} should really be restored, then one must recognize that a solution was also sought by means of the gift of benefits. In KUB XXII 35 III 6ff., Cat. 222, is mentioned again the father of the king, that is, Ḫattušiliš, and this time in relation to Ḫalpazitiš, the son of Arma-Dattaš, and the question here too regards the mantalli ritual, which was reserved for the dead.

These fears are expressed still more clearly in a more detailed text, KBo II 6 (+), Cat. 221,2:

1 EME \textsuperscript{1}DXXX.p\textsuperscript{U} ku-iš SIxŠA-at nu kiš-an DŪ-an-zi

32 EME \textsuperscript{1}DXXX.p\textsuperscript{U} A-NA DINGIR\textsuperscript{mes} LUGAL-UT-TI pi-an ar-ḫa a-ni-ja-an-zi

AŠ-RJ\textsuperscript{H1.a} LUGAL-UT-TJ G\textsuperscript{GI5}DAG\textsuperscript{H1.a}.ja pār-ku-nu-wa-an-zi

34 DUTC\textsuperscript{ST} ja-az pār-ku-nu-uz-zī šar-ni-ik-zī-el-ša

ŠA ĖTI ME-an-zi nu ku-it dam-me-li pī-di ti-an-zi

36 ku-it-ma A-NA GIDIM SUM-an-zi DĪMU.DĪMU-ŠU-ja ta-me-da-za ka-ni-ša-an-zi ma-a-an-ma-za DINGIR\textsuperscript{Esqu} QA-TAM-MA ma-la-a-an Ḫar-ter-ni

38 INIM \textsuperscript{1}DXXX.p\textsuperscript{U} kān ki-e-iz INIM-za DU₇-ta-ri

That slander of Arma-Dattaš which was proved (with oracles,) — can they then act thus?

32 Will they treat (by means of the cult) the slander of Arma-Dattaš before the gods of kingship, will they purify the places of kingship and the thrones (of the cult),

34 will His Majesty purify himself, will they make reparation for the house (patrimony?) — by putting this in an untouched place,

36 by giving that to the spirit —, will they honour his grandchildren with (something) else? If the god (is) thus kept pacified,

38 the question of Arma-Dattaš will be resolved with this question?

This text, according to the colophon, constitutes the fifth tablet of an investigation into the case of Arma-Dattaš and a woman, Šaušgattiš, not further identifiable for us. A divinity has been provoked by an « (evil) tongue », that is, by an act of magic, effected in connection with the dead Arma-Dattaš. The evil effects are directed against the king and his surroundings, and to neutralize them, the ritual practices must also repacify a spirit (GIDIM). Those responsible are certainly the sons of Arma-Dattaš, with whom, it seems, it is hoped a reconciliation may reached: for initiatives of a magical character undertaken by these descendants see for example in the same text at line I 11f. « if the spirit (is) irritated for some reason, as ...
and the grandchildren of Arma-Dattaš do slander ... » ma-a-an GIDIM-pál ku-it-ki TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za ... ku-it ... DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA Š XXX. DU-ja EME e-ešša-an-zi.

That which leads to such careful examination is the case with which the spirits can come provoked, and in consequence the vulnerability of the human world, which finds itself exposed to the vendettas of those who are interested in keeping alive the ancient conflicts. The same problems existed also in the case of Urḫi-Tešup, KUB XVI 41 (+), (Cat. 222).

III


III because of the slander of Urḫi-[Tešup ... .

4 [will they purify] the royal places [and] the (cult) thrones will His Majesty purify himself [ ... ]

If for us the evil of Urḫi-[Tešup through [that]

14 thing shall be resolved, will evil for us be excluded from (our) house? ... .

82 Cf. for Šaušgattiš in II 55: "will her sons make slander and disturb the spirit?" nu DUMUM-ŠU-ša EME e-ešša-an-zi nu GIDIM ni-ni-in-kiš-kán-zi.

83 Line 14 is completed with 7/u, which is here joined to KUB XVI 41 according to E. Neu, StBoT 5, p. 171, who reproduces the phrase.

84 Some cases of homonymy have led to maintaining that certain judiciary procedures of which we have mention were set into motion to destroy politically hostile persons.

It is clearly observed currently that an Ura-Dattaš (GAL-DU), who appears in a mantic text cited above (KUB XVI 32) in which are treated also Urḫi-Tešup and Arma-Dattaš, could be implicated in the struggle for the domination of Ḫatuššil, but only with hesitation can one think that it is the same person as that GAL-DU, son of Ukkušil, who underwent a trial for the withdrawal of fabrics or some work animals (KUB XIII 35 (+), studied by R. Werner, StBoT 4, p. 36f., cf. p. 79f.); H. Otten, Tot., p. 136, was the first to place this trial in connection with KUB XVI 32 II 24, though with much prudence. With now such caution one must proceed in such cases as that fact which almost in the same period in which such a trial is attested, there was another Ura-Dattaš (son of Kantuzziliš) and from the beginning on the side of Ḫatuššilšiš (cf. supra, p. 202f.), who remained faithful to him through the whole period of his reign, if it is he whom we must posit as witness in the edict of Sahurunuwaš: KUB XXVI 43 v 31.

And again, note the Alihešniš of the trial KUB XXI 76 (+), and on the other hand the Alihešniš, son of Mittannamuwaš, who is perhaps the same one cited in Sahurunuwaš
v 22. It is nevertheless singular to find in a trial a Ḫešniš and a Ḥalpazitiš (KUB XIII 33 II 5, 13 and IV 1, see R. Werner, op. cit., p. 34), and again a Ḥalpazitiš with a Alalimis (KUB XIII 34 (+) IV 3, 6, ibid., p. 40), all names which recur, one next to the other, in the narration of the conspiracy against Tuthaliyaš IV (?) organized by a certain Ḫešniš (KUB XXXI 68, treated by R. Stefanini, Athenaeum XL, 1962, pp. 22-36; for the persons above cited cf. also O. Carruba, OrAn IX, 1970, p. 84). Now, if on the one side the Ḫešniš of the conspiracy will probably be the same one who appears as witness, with the title of prince, in the treaty of Dattašša (KBo IV 10 v 30), and for whom one can only hypothesize an identification with the Ḫešniš of the trial who is described as LUGA.TAM “treasurer”, then, on the other side, Alalimis in the trial is a cup-bearer, LUGU.SILA.DU₂.A, and therefore probably the same person as the head of the cup-bearers, GAL LUGU.SILA.DU₂.A, who appears beside the prince Ḫešniš in KBo IV 10 v 32 (cf. KUB XXI 38 r 32). Since this last is with excellent reason identified with the Alalimis of the conspiracy (also a Ḥalpazitiš appears beside them with the title of “head of the hoplites”, GAL LUGU.MESÙ.UKU.US, KBo IV 10 v 29), it will then be necessary to deduce that the trial of which KUB XIII 34 (+) informs us, which is surely anterior to the conspiracy, did not impede the career of Alalimis.