

## KURUNTA & TUTHALIJA (IV): A 'GREEK' PRACTICE AMONG THE HITTITES?

Daan W. Smit

When most recent historical studies on the reign of Tuthaliya IV assume a clash of interests between the two branches of the Hittite royal family, and suggest a revolt by Kurunta in Tuthaliya's later years, the present study will, instead, emphasize the good relations between the two cousins, now well-established for Tuthaliya's earlier years and before, since the discovery of the Bronze Tablet.<sup>1</sup>

Little is known about Kurunta before he was appointed vice-king of Tarhuntassa. He was raised by his uncle Hattusili III,<sup>2</sup> but the earliest useful reference to his age is when he consented to Hattusili's coup d'état in 1265. We may assume that Kurunta was an adult by then and consequently he was born in 1283 or earlier. He had not been installed as vice-king by his father Muwatalli,<sup>3</sup> so his vice-kingship can be interpreted either as a political concession by Hattusili to the Muwatalli-branch, or as an example of the normal Hittite practice of securing important posts for well-trusted relatives. In view of Muwatalli's date of birth in c.1318, as I have argued elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> Kurunta may have been born in c.1298 at the earliest.

When comparing the offices held by Tuthaliya and Hattusili before each of them became Greatking, it can be argued that Hattusili 'planned' his son's career by letting him follow into his footsteps. In this regard,

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcription Otten 1988. When earlier suggestions about Kurunta's revolt can be rejected by the evidence of this text, the case now rests on the discovery of two seals that call him Greatking, cf. P. Neve, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1987, 401f, Abb. 20 & 21; Otten 1988: 4. But other explanations for these seals remain possible, e.g. a short intermediate reign after Tuthaliya's death.

<sup>2</sup> Hattusili's Apology IV 62-4; transcription Otten 1981.

<sup>3</sup> KBo IV 29\* says that Urhi-Tesub started his reign in Tarhuntassa.

<sup>4</sup> D.W. Smit, *Talanta* XXII/XXIII (1990-1) 82, n. 29.

Tuthaliya's earliest function was that of "priest of Ishtar of Samuha"<sup>5</sup> as Hattusili had also been "priest of Ishtar of Samuha" as a boy.<sup>6</sup>

Next, the fragment KUB XIX 8 III 20-40<sup>7</sup> tells that Tuthaliya was sent out by Hattusili on a campaign against Hatenzuwa, which he defeated. His title was *GAL ME.SE.DI*, as Hattusili had been *GAL ME.SE.DI* before he was appointed *TAR.TE.NU* after Mursili's death.<sup>8</sup> Therefore it is likely that at this time the function of *GAL ME.SE.DI* was a stepping-stone towards that of *tuhkanti*. The campaign is dated in III 34-36; Hatenzuwa was brought back into the Empire *de facto* 15 years after Hattusili had started ruling over it *de jure* only, i.e. in c.1250.

III 27 states that Tuthaliya was merely 12 years old at that time,<sup>9</sup> since, if *SA MUD.12.KAM* ("of 12 years") were to be interpreted as a duration (as *INA MUD.x.KAM*), implying that he had been, e.g., a general for 12 years, he would have been appointed as such when even younger than 12. No son of Hattusili and Puduhepa could have been born before c.1272, their marriage having taken place after the Kadesh-battle of 1274.<sup>10</sup> When Tuthaliya's campaign took place, as has been argued above, in c.1250, the resulting year for his birth, c.1262, very well fits with KUB XXV 21 Obv.13-17, where his coming of age is immediately followed by Hattusili's death,<sup>11</sup> which is firmly dated in c.1240 or a little earlier.<sup>12</sup>

III 30-33 tells that Tuthaliya not only subdued Hatenzuwa, but also pacified the area and built or reconstructed several cities. So far, one may conclude that the boy acted in name only and was advised in all of this by experienced men, but inviting his parents after the pacification (III 34) may have been his own idea.

After a lacuna, IV 5-15 relates how Tuthaliya showed his personal braveness. His title was still *GAL ME.SE.DI*, so the lacuna will not have covered a lengthy period. Three variants are also dedicated to the event, which was not quite something a *man* could boast about, being little more than a succesful flight after a lost battle with the comfortable divine intervenience of Ishtar of Samuha, "who held a shield above him". But even when the boy's efforts may have been insignificant, it can be held that this story was used by Hattusili to prove Tuthaliya's excellence in

<sup>5</sup> Hattusili's Apology IV 76-8.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I 13-8.

<sup>7</sup> Riemschneider 1962: 117.

<sup>8</sup> Hattusili's Apology I 25.

<sup>9</sup> Riemschneider 1962: 118-9 and Delmonte, *RGTC* 6 (1978) 102-3.

<sup>10</sup> Hattusili's Apology III 1-8.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. von Schuler 1965: 186-7.

<sup>12</sup> The latest independent reference to Hattusili is year 34 of Ramesses II of Egypt (= 1245); there is no correspondence between Hattusili and Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assur (1243-1207), cf. Hagenbuchner 1989: 246 f.

a difficult situation and to show him worthy of his future Greatkingship.<sup>13</sup>

Hattusili, who was between 63 and 66 in c.1250, will not have waited very long to make Tuthaliya his new *tuhkanti* after the boy had proven himself as *GAL ME.SE.DI*. A very young crown-prince is by no means an absurdity, as we have an earlier example of an ageing king who, unsatisfied with his intended successor, selected a child instead. The later Mursili I, when appointed by his grandfather Hattusili I, was considered too young to lead troops by himself and the boy was to be accompanied and protected for the next three years.<sup>14</sup> His name-sake Mursili II was so young at the start of his reign that his enemies could call him “a boy, with no military experience at all”.<sup>15</sup>

The Bronze Tablet attests very cordial relations between the two cousins just before Tuthaliya was appointed crown-prince :

- II 31 “I, Tuthaliya, the Greatking, before I ruled as a king,  
32 the Goddess brought Kurunta and me together in friendship  
33 and then already we were the best of friends.<sup>16</sup>  
34 And we made a mutual oath<sup>17</sup> “One will support the other!”  
35 At that time my father had made my older brother crown-prince  
36 He had not yet made me crown-prince by then  
37 But then Kurunta showed his loyalty to me  
38 and made the following oath to me personally: “When your father  
39 does not make you king, wherever  
40 your father may send you, I will be loyal to you *only*  
41 and (be) your servant”.”

The goddess (32) is Ishtar of Samuha, so Tuthaliya was either still priest in her honour when Kurunta and he were “brought together”, or he had just become famous, with her support, as *GAL ME.SE.DI*. In any case, the meeting is more likely situated in Hattusa than in Tarhuntassa; the vice-king need not have remained there continuously.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup>Riemschneider 1962: 111-6 (texts), 120-1 (conclusion).

<sup>14</sup>Hattusili's bilingue II 37-47, cf. F. Sommer & A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I (Labarna II)*, Hildesheim 1974 (reprint of 1938).

<sup>15</sup>Mursili's Annals: KBo III 4 Obv.I 10-15; II 12; KUB XIX 29 Rev.IV 16-21.

<sup>16</sup>*nu-un-na-as an-ni-sa-an-pát na-ak-ki-e-es a-as-sa-u-e-es e-su-u-en*; Otten: “und wir waren uns schon damals lieb und wert”. On account of *nakkiatar* in II 45 (cf. below, “respect”) a more formal translation “we valued each other highly and were well-disposed towards each other” is also possible.

<sup>17</sup>*nu-un-na-as le-en-ki-ia-as e-su-u-en*; lit. “and we were of the oath”. Otten: “Und wir waren einander (Männer) des Eides”.

<sup>18</sup>In Mursili's Annals the king twice met his brother Sarri-Kusuh outside of the

Kurunta's oath, and especially his words *you only*, might be interpreted as a proof of his unreliability as a vassal. When it was his first duty to protect the interests of his overlord Hattusili, he thus opposed the Hittite king's succession-arrangement by expressing his loyalty to someone other than the *tuhkanti*. But a disloyalty towards Hattusili would not have been presented favourably by Tuthaliya, even if he had profited from it himself.<sup>19</sup> On the contrary, good relations between Hattusili and Kurunta are attested by the Bronze Tablet<sup>20</sup> and no friction needs to be assumed when Tuthaliya's age is considered at the time when Hattusili changed his mind about his successor.

Even in a society that highly valued contracts and oaths, very few adults would have taken a mutual oath of eternal loyalty with a 12-year-old boy, unless having a special reason to do so. When possibly interpreting Hattusili's intentions in regard of his young son correctly, at the time of the oath Kurunta unlikely anticipated his overlord. In other words, he might have hoped for the boy to become his future king, but he could not actually have relied on it. The vice-king of Tarhuntassa ranked third in Hittite hierarchy, immediately after the Greatking and the *tuhkanti*, sharing his position with the vice-king of Karkemish only. So why *did* he call himself the servant of the boy Tuthaliya, who, among many brothers, was still likely after having reached maturity to obtain a social position less exalted than his own?

The Bronze Tablet may provide an answer by recalling how Hattusili, after he had appointed his young son as the new crown-prince, reacted quite benevolently upon the friendship between his nephew and his son and even made it official:

- II 45 "At that time my father saw respect and *love* for each other  
 46 in Kurunta and me. And my father brought us together  
 47 and made us swear "One will support the other!" So my father  
 48 made us swear this oath mutually."

The word for love (*assiyatar*, 45) is the normal word for any love between two human beings. It is used, e.g., by Hattusili to describe the love between husband and wife as a gift of Ishtar of Samuha.<sup>21</sup> I therefore suggest that Kurunta was much more fond of his young cousin than

latter's residential city of Karkemish, cf. KUB XIV 15 Obv.II 8-10; Rev.III 35 (3rd year) & KUB XIV 29 Obv.I 28-31 +KBo IV 4 Obv.I 6-8 (9th year).

<sup>19</sup> In the Sausgamuwa-treaty Obv.II 15-30 (transcription Kühne & Otten 1971) Tuthaliya presents Masturi's support of Hattusili (and disloyalty towards Urhitesub) as an offense.

<sup>20</sup> BT I 6-13.

<sup>21</sup> Hattusili's Apology III 3: SA L<sup>U</sup>MU.DI D[A]M *assiyatar*.

considered fashionable by modern standards and that his attitude is compatible to that of an *erastes* in Classical Greece.

Fundamentally opposing those holding that such a practice should not be studied at all, since a scholar may unexpectedly encounter it even when observing baboons,<sup>22</sup> I make use of Greek terminology because *paidierastic* relationships in Greece have been studied in a scholarly way since E. Bethe's article of 1907.<sup>23</sup> But although a multitude of Greek sources presents intriguing possibilities towards understanding e.g. the social consequences of the suggested Hittite relationship, cautiousness in the study of these phenomena is required before an historical analogy between Hittites and Greeks can be attempted. Recently, abundant Greek material has been offered, with excellent linguistic comment, by K.J. Dover,<sup>24</sup> who makes a case for the predominance of a 'homosexual ethos' in the early Classical period. However, treating *paidierastic* relationships as a sub-category of androphile homosexual behaviour leads, in my view, to an unacceptable mixture of two separate sets of socio-cultural phenomena because of the prominent heterosexual preferences of most *erastai* and *eromenoi* in other circumstances. I had originally intended to summarize the Greek source-material in this article; instead, a separate study on Classical Greece is included in this volume.<sup>25</sup>

In this it is concluded, so far as taken to be relevant to Hittite history, that in its original form the social function of these relationships was to guide the *eromenos* in the transitory stage between childhood and manhood (from about 12 to somewhere between 16 and 20) and to make full use of the fighting-power of the *erastes* by encouraging him, when training a successor, to postpone a marriage until he was about 30. The majority of the *erastai* married indeed; especially in Sparta the unmarried were regarded with contempt.

The above may be regarded as an 'ideal' representation of the practice, but I see little need in giving attention to later developments in Greece, especially in Athens, that have been judged as a 'degeneration' of this ideal. A purely military need, not always in desperate circumstances, may result in the enlistment of 12-year olds in any society, including our own not so long ago,<sup>26</sup> and this is why the existence of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. S. Zuckermann, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes* (London 1932) ch. 15-17.

<sup>23</sup> Bethe 1907 has recently been reprinted (Berlin 1988).

<sup>24</sup> Dover 1989. To describe the older and the younger partner in a *paidierastic* relationship, I follow his ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος (both from ἐρα-).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. D.W. Smit, *Paidierastia, A Greek practice reconsidered* (elsewhere in this volume).

<sup>26</sup> In 1914 a great number of 12-year olds still served in the British Navy, and in Eastern Prussia a corps of bicycle-scouts was created who were aged 12-14.

practice among the Hittites, with the same background as in Classical Greece, is at least a possibility. The principal Hittite weapon was the chariot, not the line of hoplite infantry. Hittite chariots had a crew of three instead of two as in contemporaneous armies, the third having little to do but enabling the other two to move freely in a fight. A boy, receiving training to become either driver or fighter, could do this, adding less weight than a third adult.<sup>27</sup>

Continuous success in warfare was a pre-condition of survival to Hittite society and Tuthaliya's military valour at the age of 12 was stressed accordingly, as shown above. But how could Hattusili consent to the role of *eromenos* for young Tuthaliya, of whom he had such high hopes? So far, I have argued from analogies and possibilities only, but the suggested relationship between the crown-prince and his adult cousin would need an attested wider form of social acceptance, even if the father did not object personally, since otherwise Tuthaliya would have experienced some difficulties at least in getting accepted as the best candidate to succeed him as Greatking.<sup>28</sup>

Such a general social acceptance can only be found in the much debated §36 of the Hittite Laws (KBo VI 3, "when a slave pays the bride-price for a free boy"), which, in its translation accepted before 1940,<sup>29</sup> would show a very remarkable tolerance of the practice indeed. Using Greek terminology once more, it would show regulation of the 'vulgar' *eros* rather than a philosophically defensible elitarian 'good' *eros* for court-circles or even a 'useful' *eros* acceptable among soldiers.

Admittedly, some scholars denied any relation to it whatsoever, assuming that the slave wanted a free son-in-law for his daughter.<sup>30</sup> This interpretation will be called the 'son in law' – or 'içgüvey' – view after K. Balkan (1948), who, arguing from a Turkish marriage-custom, was first to analyse *antiyant* as a contraction of *anda* "in" and *iya-* "to go". He was rapidly followed by many others,<sup>31</sup> and few have defended the *paidierastia*-view since.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>27</sup> On the Hittite army see now Beal 1992; training of charioteers cf. 127-9; 168 f. On account of Hatt. Apology I.1.12 he suggests the possibility that (some) chariot-drivers were in their early teens (p. 155).

<sup>28</sup> E.g. the triumphing Julius Caesar was mocked for having been the *eromenos* of the king of Bithynia in his youth, cf. Suetonius I.2 & I.49.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. V. Korosec, *Studi in onore di S. Riccobone I* (Palermo 1932) 559 n. 39; Goetze 1933: 105, n. 6; Friedrich 1939: 4-5, with literature.

<sup>30</sup> Hrozný in his text-edition (1922: 29); for others cf. Friedrich 1939: 4-5.

<sup>31</sup> E.g. Goetze 1950, Neufeld 1951; Güterbock 1955: 64; Hoffner 1963; Beckman 1986.

<sup>32</sup> Riemschneider 1954: 55. Friedrich 1959: 96 recalled his original view, following Balkan, in his text-edition of the Laws.



As for the first sentence, it was held in defense of the 'son-in-law'-view that the slave of §36 'advanced' a bride-price for a marriage-candidate too poor to pay by himself, the youngster having to work for his father-in-law in repayment.<sup>38</sup> This can be excluded after Güterbock,<sup>39</sup> the sum was paid in both cases to the parents of the desired person.<sup>40</sup> The real obstacle in this line to accepting the 'son-in-law' - or 'içgüvey' -view is the word DUMU.NITA, which involves an age-problem. Elsewhere in the laws, this word must be translated "son", "male child" or simply "boy".<sup>41</sup> In §36 DUMU.NITA cannot be translated as "son" without any reference to a father,<sup>42</sup> so the alleged marriage-candidate appears to be a boy under 16.<sup>43</sup> Should one conclude that §36 deals with a child-marriage, it is to be wondered why the more general case of in-marrying adults is not at all represented, as adults would have been marriage-candidates more often than boys would have been.<sup>44</sup>

The middle part of §36 is commonly translated as "and takes him as husband" with the addition "(sc. for his daughter)", but the taking itself is otherwise regarded as an action without which any marriage was incomplete;<sup>45</sup> one would expect the slave's alleged daughter to participate in it more actively. Comparing the middle sentences of §34 and §36

<sup>38</sup> E.g. Neufeld 1951: 152, Hoffner 1963: 292-3, but see Grothus 1973: 44.

<sup>39</sup> ZA NF 8 (1935) 225 f.; JCS 27 (1975) 177 (contra Grothus).

<sup>40</sup> This does not imply that Güterbock criticised the 'son-in-law'-view; according to him the slave could pay for a husband (for his daughter) just as he could pay for a wife.

<sup>41</sup> DUMU(.NITA): §§44a,171,189 (son), §§27,31 (child), §200a (apprentice).

<sup>42</sup> Both Hrozný's "FILS LIBRE" and Goetze's "son (of a) free (man)" (ANET) should be rejected because of this.

<sup>43</sup> Although DUMU has a wider range, DUMU.NITA has not, which is why Hoffner's "young man" for §36 is unwarranted. The only parallel is the compromise suggested by Sommer (AU 113-6) for KUB XIV 3 II 30. Normally, DUMU.NITA is used with DUMU.SAL to distinguish boys from girls, e.g. KUB XIII 8 14 (cf. below), KBo XXV 31 12-15 (with duplicates, E. Neu, *StBoT* 25 (1980) 78-85); a DUMU.NITA and a DUMU.SAL performing in an Inaras-ritual, and KBo XXII 2. This text has DUMU for the sons of the queen of Kanesh in 1,3,4,11 and 18, but DUMU.NITA in 6,13 and 17, where the daughters are also mentioned; transcription cf. Otten 1973.

In texts that mention no family-relation DUMU.NITA should be translated as "boy":

KUB IX 31 II 9-11 (cf. Sommer, AU 116): "Then they take 8 DUMU.NITA, who do not yet see women. One of them is dressed with (the skin of) a he-goat and he sacr[ifies....]"

KBo XII 3 I 2-11 (E. Neu, *StBoT* 5 50 n.1): "A DUMU.NITA, born from the union with a slave-girl, was brought to a meadow near a pure (holy) spot..."

<sup>44</sup> One might expect <sup>L0</sup>KAL-ant or perhaps <sup>L0</sup>AMA.A.TU instead of DUMU.NITA if an adult had been intended.

<sup>45</sup> When the 'seizure' had not yet happened an engagement could be broken off, the party doing so forfeiting the bride-price (§§29 & 30).



in their own right, since a formal 'seizure' is a requirement in both cases<sup>46</sup> it can be observed that the DUMU.NITA was supposed to become the slave's *antiyant* in the very same way as the woman became his wife.<sup>47</sup> A sexual implication of this 'seizure' is commonly supposed in §34 and other paragraphs in which a woman is concerned;<sup>48</sup> one may also think of a public ritual,<sup>49</sup> but I find it hard to imagine a slave performing such a ritual with his son-in-law, handing him over to his daughter afterwards.

So far, it seems that the social consequences of the 'içgüvey'-view are no less odd than those of the '*paiderastia*'-view. The balance is only in favour of the 'içgüvey'-view if *antiyant* should be translated as "(in-marrying) bridegroom" in its two other attestations.

Of these, KUB XIII 8 14-5 offers a second example of a boy turning into an *antiyant*. This royal decree rules that adult men and women attached to a certain estate should marry internally, so that marriages would not decrease their number. It continues:

"No one will give away (from the estate) a boy or a girl for the purpose of (becoming) a bride or an *antiyant*." <sup>50</sup>

This parallel case should warn against translating (boy-) *antiyant* as "(in-marrying) bridegroom" automatically, the more so because adult bridegrooms-to-be have been dealt with before. Moreover, none of the three examples in Hittite texts of in-marrying males actually has the word.<sup>51</sup> Naturally, any *antiyant* might eventually become a bridegroom indeed, as in the famous case of Telipinu's Law of Succession:

"When there is no prince, no son (at all), but (there is) a daughter of the first rank, they must take up an *antiyant* for her and he will become king."<sup>52</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *nan-(za) .. da-i* and *nan .. ep-zi* both mean "he takes". The latter is even more direct, tending to "to grab"; the former to "to choose". The reflexive *-za* is not essential; §31 also has *-za*, but §§27 & 30 are without it.

<sup>47</sup> Friedrich 1939: 5.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. Friedrich 1959: 27 "(geschlechtlich) genommen"; Goetze 1957: 112; Gurney 1990: 84 "consummation of the marriage".

<sup>49</sup> E.g. the western custom of carrying the bride over the door-step?

<sup>50</sup> Lit. "as regards brideship and *antiyant*-ship":

(14) *para-ma-kán* DUMU.NITA DUMU.SAL AS.SUM E.GI<sub>4</sub>.A-TIM  
LU<sub>4</sub> *andayandanni-ya le* (15) *kuiski pai*.

Cf. Friedrich 1939: 4 n. 20; Beckman 1986: 17, n. 23.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. HW 1:A, 109. This kind of marriage is commonly styled Errebu-marriage as in Akkadian texts, cf. P. Koschaker, *JCS* 5 (1951), 109, n.16, but there is no Hittite word for it. Examples: § 27b of the Laws, the son of the weathergod in the Ilyuankasmyth and the Inandik-tablet described by Balkan 1973; his more recent view on *antiyant* cf. p. 46.

<sup>52</sup> 2BoTU 23A II 38-9 (duplicate XXII 4 Obv.II 8):

A translation “bridegroom” for *antiyant* seems to be logical here, but for the particle *-san*, which, expressing a movement, shows that not the future status of the candidate was concerned, but rather his present social upgrading. As has been noted,<sup>53</sup> this *antiyant* married above his social standing, whereas the *antiyant* of §36 (allegedly) married below it, so it can be held that not a marriage, but a change of status caused one to be called an *antiyant*. Therefore “outsider” or “newcomer” is a more cautious translation than “husband” or “bridegroom” for the word in Telepinu’s Law and more in line with what Telepinu was trying to settle. The kingship was not to be given to an existing son-in-law of the deceased king, but to a new one. Obviously, Telepinu intended to avoid rivalry within the royal family by obliging the candidates to agree on an outsider, as he himself had been. Finally, if the *antiyant* of this text married ‘into’ anything, it was into the royal family as a whole, for the king was already dead before a ‘son-in-law’ came into consideration.

There are no examples of Hittites who became the relative of a dead person, but there are many others who ‘moved into another family’ without a marriage. Goetze argued that the inalienability of land was bypassed by a construction: the seller of the land formally adopted the buyer as his son, granting him the land in return as an advance-payment of his heritage-portion.<sup>54</sup> Although not yet attested, such a buyer may have been called an *antiyant*.

One may conclude that the ‘içgüvey’-interpretation of §36, although in line with generally accepted moral standards, is much in need of further proof before it can out-balance the similarities between §34 and §36. Apart from the juridical difficulties it presents,<sup>55</sup> it goes with more linguistic problems than would be acceptable in most other hypotheses. The view glosses over the ‘seizure’ of the slave’s direct object, supposes a semantic development for *antiyant* towards “husband” or “bridegroom” on account of but one uncertain example, and either widens the meaning of DUMU.NITA without proper attestation or limits the intention of the legislator to the regulation of a very specific case that hardly ever would have occurred in practice.

---

(38) *ma-an DUMU.LUGAL ma DUMU.NITANU.GÁL nu kuis DUMU.SAL hantezzis*

(39) *nu-us-si-san* <sup>L0</sup>*antiyanttan appandu nu LUGAL-us apa-as kisaru.*

Alternative translations: Goetze 1957: 87; Beckman 1986: 13; Gurney 1990: 52.

<sup>53</sup> HW I:A, 109.

<sup>54</sup> Goetze 1957: 105.

<sup>55</sup> Grothus 1973: 44; Neufeld 1951: 152-3, accepting the ‘içgüvey’-view, rightly wonders what the status of the slave’s grand-children will be. Indeed, nothing is said in §34 about the status of any such off-spring.

The '*paiderastia*'-interpretation, on the other hand, when not in accordance with what in western society is considered proper, offers no such linguistic problems at all. I have translated *antiyant* in §36 as "intimate" to express the inward movement into the slave's family. The twice attested change from boy to man merely implies that the boy, whatever his age, was thought to hold the rights of an adult after the 'seizure'. Comparing his legal position to that of the slave's wife of §34, it can be held that he was entitled to some part of the slave's property, although this would have been less than half (as in a normal marriage) on account of the inevitable shortness of the duration of such relationships. The *erastes* himself, whether slave or free, suffered no legal impediments<sup>56</sup> provided that he did what was held proper in Hittite society, i.e. obtain the consent of his *eromenos*' parents by paying an acceptable *kusata* and perhaps swear an appropriate mutual oath with the boy. Apparently, for reasons unknown, the Hittites were even more tolerant towards the practice than the Greeks of the early Classical period, as the legislator Solon prohibited a slave to do what he encouraged in free men.<sup>57</sup>

It therefore can be concluded that Hattusili, in demanding Kurunta and Tuthaliya to confirm their mutual oath in public, did not worry about negative reactions at the time or about a possible stain on his son's reputation once he had become an adult. The benefit of this 'officialised' relationship, as he may have calculated, was the consent to his succession-arrangement of a man who could have claimed the kingship for himself, had he been ambitious to do so. But as Jonathan voluntarily gave up his rights for David, whom he judged a better man-to-be and even more fitted for the kingship than he was himself,<sup>58</sup> so apparently did Kurunta.

Once a Greatking, Tuthaliya's benevolence towards Kurunta is attested by his concern for the health of the older man,<sup>59</sup> there are no texts that suggest a contrary attitude.<sup>60</sup> Lastly, I may point to the king's choice

<sup>56</sup> §189, dealing with incest, prohibits intercourse between father and son. No general law against "indecent with minors" has found its way into the comparatively elaborate moral section, cf. Hoffner 1963: 118; Grothus 1973: 36. Friedrich 1939: 6 concluded that the legislator saw no need to spend a paragraph to a free *erastes*.

<sup>57</sup> Literature cf. Bethe 1907: 458.

<sup>58</sup> 1 Samuel 18:1ff. Note the unusual frankness about the physical aspect (2 Sam. 1:26) and especially the mutual oath sworn by adult and boy (*na'ar*), calling God as a witness and obliging their future offspring as well (1 Sam. 18:3; described in 1 Sam. 20:42). On David's age at their first meeting, see e.g. Budde 1902: 127.

<sup>59</sup> Edel 1976: 47-50, 88-90.

<sup>60</sup> Kurunta is warned not to strive for the kingship in BT IV 7, but this warning figures in the list of forbidden acts which is added in every treaty. A few years later

of his personal protective deity, the boy-god Sarruma. This choice is easily explained when the circumstances of his being appointed crown-prince and his valiant deeds (as *GAL ME.SE.DI*) are recalled. On the double procession of Yazilikaya, Tuthaliya's grave-monument, the boy Sarruma appears second in the 'row of women', but his presence in this row as single male deity should offer no greater surprise than the presence of two goddesses of war in the opposite 'row of men'.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balkan, K.  
 1948 *Eti Hukukunda İçgüveylik. Dergi* 6. Ankara.  
 1973 *Eine Schenkungs-urkunde aus der althethitische Zeit gefunden in Inandik* 1966. Ankara: Turk Tarih.
- Beal, R.H.  
 1992 *The Organisation of the Hittite Military. TdH* 20. Heidelberg.
- Beckman, G.M.  
 1986 *Inheritance and royal succession among the Hittites. In: Kanissuwar, Tribute to H.G. Güterbock*. Pp. 13-31. University of Chicago.
- Bethe, E.  
 1907 *Die Dorische Knabenliebe, Ihre Ethik und Ihre Idee. Rheinisches Museum für Klassische Philologie* XXVII. Pp. 438-75.
- Budde, K.  
 1902 *Kürzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament, Abteilung VIII, Die Bücher Samuel. Tübingen/Leipzig*.
- Dover, K.  
 1989 *Greek Homosexuality. Harvard* (2nd ed.).
- Edel, E.  
 1976 *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof. Göttingen*.
- Friedrich, J.  
 1939 *Zu einigen umstrittenen Paragraphen der hethitischen Gesetze. In: Symbolae Ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentes P. Koschaker Dedicatae*. Pp. 1-10. Leiden.  
 1959 *Die hethitischen Gesetze. Leiden*.
- Friedrich, J. & Kammenhuber, A.  
 1975-84 *Hethitisches Wörterbuch I:A. Heidelberg (= HW)*.
- Goetze, A.  
 1933 *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens. Munich* (1st ed.).  
 1957 *Ibid.* (2nd revised ed.).  
 1950 *The Hittite Laws. In: J.B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts in Relation to the Old Testament (= ANET)*. Princeton.
- Grothus, J.  
 1973 *Die Rechtsordnung der Hethiter. Wiesbaden*.
- Gurney, O.R.  
 1990 *The Hittites (revised Penguin-edition)*. London.

---

in the Sausgamuwa-treaty Tuthaliya explicitly forbade Sausgamuwa to support any other of Hattusili's sons (Obv.II 8-14; Rev.III 8-18), but did not mention Kurunta among these potential usurpers; cf. Kühne & Otten 1971.

- Güterbock, H.G.  
 1955 Zu einigen hethitischen Komposita. In: *Corolla Linguistica*, Festschrift Sommer. Pp. 63-8. Wiesbaden.
- Hagenbuchner, A.  
 1989 *Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (2. Teil). *TdH* 16. Heidelberg.
- Hoffner, H.A.  
 1963 *The Laws of the Hittites* (thesis Brandeis University). Chicago.
- Hrozny, B.  
 1922 *Code Hittite*. Paris.
- Kühne, C. & Otten, H.  
 1971 *Der Sausgamuwavertrag*. *StBoT* 16.
- Neufeld, E.  
 1951 *The Hittite Laws*. London.
- Otten, H.  
 1973 Eine Althethische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa. *StBoT* 17.  
 1981 Die Apologie Hattusilis III. *StBoT* 24.  
 1988 Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. *StBoT* Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden.
- Riemschneider, K.K.  
 1962 Hethitische Fragmente historischen Inhalts aus der Zeit Hattusilis III. *JCS* 16. Pp. 110-21.
- Riemschneider, M.  
 1954 *Die Welt der Hethiter*. Stuttgart.
- Schuler, E. von  
 1965 *Die Kaškäer*. Berlin.