

^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni*: AN OLD HITTITE OFFICE

Matteo Vigo* - Freie Universität Berlin

*This article explores the role played by a Hittite official during the Old Hittite Period. We also evaluate an old hypothesis according to which the term ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* could match the Akkadogram ^{LÚ}*ABUBĪTUM*, a term employed in Hittite sources to indicate a similar office.*

Keywords: Hittite administration; Hittite officials; social profiles; power structures; Old Hittite Kingdom

1. ORTHOGRAPHY, WRITING VARIATIONS, AND ETYMOLOGY

One of the oldest official profiles in Hittite sources is the ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni*. None of the previous identifications with other offices documented via Akkadograms or Sumerograms holds (e.g., ^{LÚ}*HAL* “Augur; exorcist”; ^{LÚ}*KARTAPPU* “Chariot-driver”; ^{LÚ}*SAGI.(A)* “Cup-bearer”).¹ F. Pecchioli Daddi collected the attestations of this office,² and recently Tayfun Bilgin devoted a full prosopographic study to it.³

The title is predominantly attested in those land donations that span between the time of Telipinu and Muwatalli I (ca. 1525-1440 BC). The title is mostly uninflected (*urianni*), but most of the inflected forms appear in the oldest texts.⁴ The attestations in the *Landschenkungsurkunde* may be interpreted as an Akkadinized loanword (^{LÚ}*URIANNI*).⁵ Most of the Old Hittite texts (and later copies) displays the form *urianni-* that we take as the primary one. The first attestation with glide (^{LÚ}*uriyanni-*) appears in LSU 47 ([Muwatalli I

* This study was presented at the *Kolloquium* for the KFG-Project (24.05.2022) of the Freie Universität of Berlin (DFG Kolleg - Forschungsgruppe 2615 “Rethinking Governance in the Ancient Near East” <https://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/rod/index.html>) that hosted me as a Research Fellow (April - July 2022). The material of investigation has been collected during my research at the *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz* for the DFG Project no. 394841501 “Akteure und Machtstrukturen in der hethitischen Gesellschaft” (<https://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/projekt/394841501>). As such, it represents an important outcome of the research carried out for the DFG Project. The present research is also part of the PRIN 2020 “Networks of Power: Institutional Hierarchies and State Management in Late Bronze Age Western Asia (NePo)” CUPB87G22000280001. The abbreviations are those of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* (Güterbock *et al.* 1989–). The term ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni-* is typeset in this article according to the Hittitological conventions: italic and lowercase whenever is perceived as a Hittite word; italic and small capitals when is attested as an alleged Akkadographic form; capital as an alleged foreign word in texts from Ugarit. I thank the two anonymous reviewers for their remarks and corrections.

¹ Cf. Weeden 2011, 257-258.

² Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 266-268.

³ Bilgin 2018, 176-190. See the prosopography of the Old Hittite Kingdom *uri(y)anni-s* in Bilgin (2018, 177-182). The list in Bilgin (2018, 186, table 10) must be emended with the name of Ḫišaili, ^{LÚ}*urianni* under Muwatalli I (LSU 47: KBo 32.185, obv. 22-23). KBo 18.66, rev. 15: *[u-ri-an-ni]Ku-wa-y[a-*: the identification is too tentative. Cf. Marizza 2009, 38.

⁴ Inflected NH forms also exist: e.g., KUB 23.87: 4: ^{LÚ}*u-ri-ya-an-ni-in*; KUB 58.112 + Bo 3010, obv. 9: [^{LÚ}*u-(ri-ya-an-n)]i-ya-aš*.

⁵ van den Hout 2020, 113: «...entirely understandable, as this may have been a typical Anatolian office with no Syro-Mesopotamian counterpart». Cf. HEG, IV/15 U: 98. I am still dubious whether in the LSU it has to be interpreted as a real Akkadogram. See, for instance, the form ^É*LÚURIYANNI* vs. ^É*LÚABUBĪTI* (attestations in Bilgin 2018, 400f.). But see also the strange form ^{ŠA}*LÚURIANNŪTIM*.

(end of 15th century BC): Bo 90/671, rev. 28). No *uriyanni*-women ever existed. The alleged attestation ^{MUNUS}*úr-ri-ya-x*[in KUB 7.61, obv. 2 (NH/NS) is not compelling: 1. The word *uriyanni*- is never attested with initial *úr*-; 2. The word in the break is *urri*- (*úr-ri*-), not *uri*-. 3. The broken sign after syllable IA can hardly be AN.⁶

All *urayanni* spellings with the *-a*- vocalization in the second syllable occur in late Empire period texts.⁷ In the Old Hittite Palace Anecdotes, the word occurs declined, for instance, as a Hittite *i*-stem noun, whereas in most of the land grants, we find an alleged frozen Akkadographic writing. The attestation in an Akkadian text from Ugarit (^{LU}*ú-ri-ya-an-nu*: RS 17.368, rev. 5' = PRU IV, 77) would speak in favour of a foreign word, but it cannot be ascertained.⁸ Two points must be stressed: 1) It also appears in a cuneiform Luwian text as *u-ra-ya-an-ni*' (KBo 29.43, 6'); 2) It is always spelled in Hittite texts with the initial *u*-, not with *ú*-. The relation between *uriyanni* and *urayanni* may be suggested by KUB 31.61 ii 9 (NH/NS): ^mAMAR.MUŠEN-iš ^{LU}*u-ra-y[a-an-ni-iš]*⁹. If so, they must be interpreted as parallel formations but probably not derived from the same *ablauting* stem. The meaning of the word remains ultimately unclear. Still, a Luwian etymology cannot be completely ruled out (*ura/i*- "great" + *-anni*), whereas an *interpretatio hurrica* cannot be sustained (*uriyanni* = *ura/i*- [foreign word] + *-nni* adjectival suffix; similar to *mariyanni* = *mariya*+*nni*: a social class). There is no such attestation in Mittanian contexts, and the words borrowed from Hurrian are usually later than the Old Hittite period. One would even think of a Hurrian form **urianni*- ← *ur* (verb) =*i* (derivational suffix in deverbal noun) =(a)*nni* (suffix for professional designations derived from the verb, like *am=om=i=nni*: "supervisor"): "the one who performs a service". However, the word is never attested in Hurrian, and this case is morphologically hard to explain.

2. THE OFFICE IN THE OLD HITTITE PERIOD

The (^{LU})*urianni* appears already in a passage of the Palace Anecdotes (KBo 3.34 i 5-10, OH/NS), an Old Hittite composition - Muršili I at the latest - copied during the Empire period. In this text, Pappa, the *urianni* (KBo 3.34 i 5: ^{LU}*u-ri-an-ni-iš*; i 7: ^{LU}*u-ri-an-ni-in*), abused his power by fraudulently distributing supplies (^{NINDA}ÉRIN.MEŠ), and *marnuwa*-beer in the town of Tarukka (probably west of the Zalpuwa Land, in the modern district of Boyabat - Province of Sinop). Yet, he did the same in Ḫattuša (KBo 3.34 i 9-10 [with KUB 36.104 i 6'-7']: ^{URU}Ḫattuši=*ma* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*aš walḫi marakta*). Following the narrative path and the final goal of the entire composition, the episodes of deplorable behaviours and unprofessional actions of royal administrators are counterbalanced by the allegoric image of the royal banquet set by the king to celebrate the faultless and trustful king's brothers and the relative of the father of the king, an unfortunately anonymous lord of Ušša (KBo 3.34 iii 20': DUMU ^{URU}*Ušša gaenaš=šiš*).¹⁰ In the thematically related OH/OS fragment of the Palace Anecdotes

⁶ Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 417.1 (TRit 24.06.2011), *translatio*, note 1. *Contra* Pecchioli Daddi 1982, 400; Trémouille 2004, 162, note 24.

⁷ Bilgin 2018, 176, with attestations at note 397.

⁸ Cf. EDHIL, 926. Certainly to be distinguished from Akkadian *urānu* (*urannu*, *uriānu*) "anice". For the attestations, see AHW III, 1430; CAD U/W, 206ff.

⁹ Cf. duplicate text VBoT 71, 10 (NH/NS): ^{LU}*u-ra-ya-[an-ni-iš]*.

¹⁰ For this passage, see already de Martino 2018, 322. Since the so-named Palace Anecdotes should refer to facts happened in a lost past, I am not persuaded that this character can be identified with the ^{LU} ^{URU}*Ušša* of LSU 5:

(CTH 8.D: KUB 36.104 iv 8'), the *urianni* takes one sheep from the palace on the third day of this royal banquet. So far, these can be considered the earliest attestations of this office in the Hittite documentation.

The importance and the prestige of the office in the early Hittite kingdom is testified by the presence of the title in the list of partakers in the royal banquet, namely the king's family members, officers (LÚ.MEŠ DUGUD), and the bronze-spearmen (LÚ.MEŠ ŠUKUR ZABAR). Moreover, as already mentioned, the LÚ_{uri(y)anni} appears in the witness lists of the royal grants of real estates among the highest-level officials. Of 91 royal grants discovered and published so far,¹¹ 38 preserve the witness lists at the bottom of the tablets; 27 encompass the LÚ_{uri(y)anni} in the witness lists. The title appears in the second position after the GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL ("Great (among) the palace attendants") in at least eleven cases. He held the first position in two cases (LSU 22, 23 [Aluwamna?]). From the LSU of Ḫantili II's reign on, the title appears in the third or lower position.¹² Whenever there is the lowest number of witnesses (e.g., LSU 5), we find the GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL and the LÚ_{uri(y)anni}, except for LSU 6 (*Grabungsnummer*: 162/k+38/1), where the GAL LÚ.MEŠ GIŠ GIDRU ("Great (among) the sceptre-bearers") took the place of the LÚ_{uri(y)anni} (rev. 12'). Another Pappa appears in a royal validation of a private transaction (LSU 1 [so-named İnanlık Tablet]: İK 174-66, obv. 10, 16) dated to the time of king Telipinu, or Ammuna at the earliest. In this text, the office of *urianni* is, however, held by a certain Tiwazidi, as stated in the colophon (İK 174-66, rev. 25: ANA PANI mTi-wa-zi-di LÚ U-RI-AN-NI). According to the lists of witnesses of the *Landeschenkungs-surkunde*, during the Old Hittite kingdom, only one person held the office of *uri(y)anni*, but from the reign of Ḫantili II on, we find two *uri(y)anni* at work at any one time, indicated either as LÚ.MEŠ URIANNI (e.g., LSU 29: Bo 90/568++ rev. 24-25: mIlaliuma, mZi?-1x-x; LSU 41: VAT 7436, rev. 11: mZuzzu, mMarasšā), or listed one after the other (e.g., LSU 45: KBo 32.187, rev. 4'-5': mMarasšā, mZuzzu). As pointed out by several scholars,¹³ the presence of two *uri(y)anni* could reflect the expression LÚ_{uri(y)anni} ZAG-aš/GÜB-laš ("uri(y)anni official of the right/left") - unattested within the LSU until now - since we have at least one case of an "estate in the village of Uḫḫi(u)wa of the 'urianni-ship' from the right" (LSU 30: Bo 90/758, obv. 7'-9': É URU Uḫḫiwa ŠA LÚ URIANNŪTIM kunnaz), which I interpret, following Pecchioli Daddi,¹⁴ as an abstract noun referring to the office, just like *šāpiūtum* (governorship).¹⁵ Pecchioli Daddi¹⁶ and Bilgin¹⁷ correctly stated that such a form in the *Landeschenkungs-surkunde* of the time of Ḫantili II appears to be the earliest usage of "the right/left" designation for an office in Hittite sources. It must be stressed that the designation refers predominantly to an estate (É) of the *uri(y)anni*.¹⁸ From the festival texts, we know that supplies and sacrificial animals were taken

VAT 7463 (CTH 222.5), obv. 17.

¹¹ Rüter - Wilhelm 2012. KBo 54.278 is not included in StBoT, Beiheft 4 (CTH-Bestimmung: 26.3.2019), but it does not preserve the colophon. Cf. Groddek 2010, 173f.

¹² Except for LSU 38, where he seems to hold the second position (Bo 91/2067, rev. 2':]LÚru[-ri-an-ni]. Cf. Rüter - Wilhelm 2012, pl. LXVII. Note that the dating of LSU 38 to the time of Ḫantili II is not secured though.

¹³ See especially McMahon 1991, 262; Bilgin 2018, 185.

¹⁴ Pecchioli Daddi 2010, 235, nt. 31.

¹⁵ Rüter (1994, 68f.) took it as an adjectival plural form.

¹⁶ Pecchioli Daddi 2010, 235.

¹⁷ Bilgin 2018, 185.

¹⁸ Extant attestations of the É (LÚ) *uri(y)anni* ZAG-aš: Bo 5447, left. col. 5'; Bo 4922, rev. 3-4; KUB 55.43 iii 24',

from the estate of the *uri(y)anni* “of the right” and “of the left”. The ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* estates may have also comprised personnel, as indicated in some texts. In a fragmentary passage of the *Festritual* for the Palaic god Ziparva (Ziparwa_a) (CTH 750), the ^{LÚ}1.MEŠ É ^{LÚ}*uriyanni* (KBo 59.176 v 6’) are mentioned in a context where barley beer is consumed (KBo 59.176 v 7’).¹⁹ Specifically, his personnel could encompass shepherds (^{LÚ}SIPA.UDU.ḪI.A), according to the LSU 30 mentioned above: Bo 90/758, obv. 6’-9’. The estate of the ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* can sometimes be interpreted as a “house”²⁰ which may have been located in settlements close to the capital, visited by the king on particular occasions, together with other storehouses (e.g., Arinna: KBo 16.82 + KBo 23.91 + KBo 34.15 iv 17; Ḫanḫana: KUB 53.3 i 21’-22’). The “houses” of the ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* could have also been located in Ḫattuša, not far from the temples district (or shrines) of the Hattian deities, as indicated, for instance, in a very fragmentary passage of Bo 3689, left col. 12’-13’, or in the far north, as inferable from festival fragments of Nerik (CTH 678).²¹ There is no doubt that, as Bilgin affirms,²² the house of the *uri(y)anni*: «was some kind of governmental supply house» since in there were collected the provisions (*ḫalkueššar*^{HL.A}) to be offered to the gods during state festivals and cult ceremonies. In at least one text (KUB 53.3 i 21’-22’), it is stated that two draft oxen were taken off by the lord of the settlement of Ḫanḫana (^{LÚ} BĒL ^{URU}Ḫanḫana) from the “house of the *uriyanni*” for the festival of Telipinu. The fact that the ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* is attested predominantly in cultic texts does not necessarily mean we are dealing with a social profile related to the religious sphere only but rather demonstrates once more how religion and economic administration were bound in Hittite Anatolia.²³ Most of the cult texts in which the ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* is mentioned belong to festivals of old tradition; as such, they are NH/NS copies of old compositions, otherwise re-arranged festival settings over time. Noteworthy, in all these occurrences, the locations of the festivals are either central Hittite territories - gravitating around the former Ḫattuš - or northern Hittite places of the Hattian milieu.

The ^{LÚ}*uri(y)anni* tenured considerable royal land that the king and (or) the queen could split off or reassign as long as they wished: e.g., LSU 91: KBo 5.7, rev. 22: 28 IKU Ú.SAL ^{LUM} RĪT GU₄.ḪI.†A¹ [IŠTU] †É¹ ^{LÚ}URIANNI=*kan ZAG-az šarran*: “ca. 15,12 ha. of pasture split off from the estate of the *urianni* from the right”. Of 91 donation texts, only one (LSU 87) seems to ratify the ^{LÚ}*uriyanni* as beneficiary.²⁴ Sometimes, the personnel therein could also be reassigned to other officials, as testified by LSU 30: Bo 90/758, obv. 14-16: ANA

36’??; É (^{LÚ})*uri(y)anni* ZAG-az: KBo 5.7, rev. 22; É (^{LÚ})*uri(y)anni* GÜB-laš: KUB 53.13 iv 16; IBoT 2.9 + KUB 52.102 i 6; KUB 53.49, rev. 2’; KBo 47.92 iii 7’-8’; KBo 40.339, rev. 7’?

¹⁹ *Contra* Bilgin 2018, 190: «One other distinction between these two offices is that on quite a few occasions there is mention of the “men of the palace” (^{LÚ}.MEŠ É.GAL) or just the “palace” (É.GAL) of the (^{LÚ}.MEŠ) *ABUBĪTU* office, whereas no “men” or “palace” have been attested in connection with the *uriyanni* office.»

²⁰ See the clearest example in KUB 53.12 iv 1-2: *para=ma KÁ É (^{LÚ})uriyanni 1 UDU appanzi n=an éḫilammaš* ^{DU}UTU-i [ḫuk]anzi: «Further, they seize one sheep (at) the door of the house of the *uriyanni* and [sacr]ifice it to the Sungod of the gatehouse.»

²¹ Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 2010, 237.

²² Bilgin 2018, 187.

²³ Cf. Vigo 2019. Bilgin (2018, 186) stated that: «the office had both administrative and cult responsibilities». But then he specified that: «...there are no texts that indicate a direct involvement of this officer in cultic functions» (Bilgin 2018, 188).

²⁴ Cf. Rüster - Wilhelm 2012, 229.

^mHaššuli, GAL LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI.²⁵ The uri(y)anni-household comprised not only pasture but also a vineyard (KBo 32.185, obv. 22: ^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN) and threshing floor (*Ibidem*: É^{TUM} Û KISLAḪ).²⁶ In a fragmentary text related to the complex series of the ritual of Allaituraḫi of Mukiš - a texts group probably copied from Ḫattušili III's reign on, but to be dated to the time of Tudḫaliya III at the earliest - we find the following twosome of officials: [LÚu]riyanniyaš=wa=z [(maniyahḫiyaš EN-aš peran)] [išḫa]šarwatar daškimi: "At the presence of both the LÚuriyanni and of the lord of administration, I take for me the lordship"²⁷ (CTH 781: KBo 12.118, rev.⁷ 9'-10' with duplicate KUB 58.112 + Bo 3010, obv. 20'-21'). To our knowledge, there are no other attestations of LÚuriyanni together with the LÚmaniyahḫatalla- (or maniyahḫiyaš išḫa-). However, the duties of both officials seem to encompass the provision of livestock and procurement of supplies. The interpretation of the passage of the Palace Anecdotes (§2) in which Pappa, the LÚurianni distributed (marakta) supplies allotted to the workforce of townships (vel. local recruitable population),²⁸ gives us glimpses about his duties. The combined analysis of festival texts and *Landschenkungsurkunde* shows that the LÚuri(y)anni held royal estates with cattle, cultivable lands, and workers that were meant to provide rations at given times, especially during festivals that were also conceived as specific occasions for redistributive operations throughout the history of the Hittite kingdom. Therefore, the passage of the Palace Anecdotes must be interpreted accordingly: Pappa was probably not accused of embezzlement but of having distributed supplies out of the schedule. However, given the high authority of the office and its leeway, it is not surprising to find similar episodes in other sources dated to the Old Hittite kingdom. In a possible Middle Hittite *Gerichtsprotokoll* (KBo 16.61),²⁹ a certain Maraššā is denounced to the king by another functionary (Šamuḫa-ziti) of having requested bribes (obv. 5: 2000 PARĪSU ŠE.ḪI.A [i.e., ḫalkieš]; obv. 8: 2700³ PARĪSU ŠE.ḪI.A).³⁰ He confessed that he subtracted five² minas of silver to the "royal pocket", but he had to pay compensation after the royal verdict (obv. 9-12). The text also records that Maraššā was in charge of supervising the distribution of cattle and wild goats (šāša-: *Capra aegagrus*) that deported prisoners (LÚ.MEŠ)NAM.RA) bred for their pelt (^{KUŠ}ḫap(p)utri-), but some of them got probably missed, or their number - as admitted by Maraššā himself in the trial report - did not somehow correspond to what was registered on the royal bookkeeping boards (rev. 2'-17'). Although the Maraššā of the *Gerichtsprotokoll* seemed committed to similar tasks

²⁵ We do not agree with Bilgin (2018, 187, note 446) who stated that the property was shared by the uriyanni and the GAL LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI.

²⁶ Pecchioli Daddi 2010, 236.

²⁷ CHD M, 168 translates "district lord". For the occurrences maniyahḫiyaš/maniyahḫayaš išḫaš in OH/MH texts see CHD M, 167.

²⁸ For the present interpretation of ^{NINDA}ÉRIN.MEŠ, see Hoffner 1974, 194.

²⁹ In the Konkordanz (S. Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.992) s.v. CTH 295.9) is indicated as mh.? and it is so reported in other studies (e.g., EDHIL, 196 s.v. ār-ⁱ/ar-). But it is often labelled NH (e.g., CHD Š/2, 302 s.v. šāša-). The tablet surface is damaged; therefore, any palaeographic dating is approximate. For the alleged MS dating, see for instance signs E (rev. 17'), LI (obv. 13, rev. 3'), ḪA (obv. 4), EN (obv. 6, rev. 9'), DA (rev. 17'). The signs AḪ (obv. 4, rev. 11') are almost illegible from the pictures, but the one in rev. 2' looks MS. Note also the ligature in A-NA (rev. 15') which is absent in the following line (rev. 16'), and especially the aspect of the tablet (e.g., the density of the signs and the writing running almost all over the tablet surface).

³⁰ These are obviously enormous quantities of barley (more than 100.000 liters. Cf. van den Hout 1987-1990, 524; Müller-Karpe 2015, 150). The odd numbers must therefore be explained as scribal mistakes. Otherwise, they can be ascribed to our incapacity to grasp the logic of the calculation.

as the other “Middle Hittite” ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni-s, we do not find plausible the identification with the namesake, ^{LÚ}urianni, mentioned in LSU 41 (rev. 11), and possibly LSU 45 (rev. 4’), both dated to the time of Ḫuzziya III.³¹

As stated by Bilgin,³² there is no firm evidence that the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni ever held military roles.

In sum, the information about the duties of the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni, albeit quite meager, tells us that in the formative stages of the Hittite kingdom, the king entrusted a high-ranking official to manage the royal “houses” together with cultivable lands and cattle in different locations of the realm. Despite the difficulties in grasping his exact social rank, a festival text (CTH 670.1329?: KBo 30.73 iii 12’-18’) informs us that the ^{LÚ}uriyanni was summoned in particular ceremonies together with other “greats” (GAL.MEŠ) and “lords” (*BELŪ*^{MEŠ} *ḫūmandaš*).³³ It seems to be not accidental (see *ultra*).

3. ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni- AND ^{LÚ}ABUBĪTUM

This office is still attested in the late Empire sources outside the archives of the Hittite capital. The late Empire period references to the activities of the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni outside the borders of Ḫatti respond to the imperialistic policies of the Hittite kings in that period, demonstrating that the official retained his role, supervising the delivery of grain supplies or troops and animals from the lands under the Hittite jurisdiction back to Ḫattuša, as one would expect in an empire-size kingdom. The ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni is mentioned in several texts from Ugarit.³⁴ In an Akkadian letter sent by ʾUzzīnu to the king of Ugarit, the royal servant reports that when he arrived at Qadeš, the *uriyanni* (‘URYN) had already left to ʾUpaha (RS 94.2391, upper edge 18’). In another letter, the high Hittite official Kulanamuwa complains to the king of Ugarit because supplies that the *uriyanni*-s (RS 94.2585, obv. 10: ^{LÚ}.MEŠ *ú-ra-a-an-ni*; lower edge [^{LÚ}.MEŠ?] *ḫū-ra-ya-an-ni*) have set in the name of the king of Ḫatti had not been sent yet. The king of Ugarit must supply 3,000 (unspecified) units of grain staples (*ma-na-ḫa-ti*). The unit implied probably the *sūtu*, given the high number. The weight of the *mānaḫātu* then would have been a staggering 18.6 tons.³⁵

In the letter issued by the ^{LÚ}uriyanni (RS 94.2578, obv. 1: ^mú-ri-ya-an-ni) to Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit, the Hittite official exhorts the king of Ugarit himself, the king of Kargamiš, and the king of Qadeš to meet in Halab, after having recruited troops for Alalah.³⁶

Pecchioli Daddi tentatively proposed identifying the ^{LÚ}ABUBĪTUM with the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni³⁷. Both the offices were active since the Old Hittite Kingdom, both of them belonged to the upper levels of the Hittite administration, and they were distinguished with an additional “right” (*kunna*-/ZAG-na) or “left” (*ipala*?-/GÜB-la-) designation at the end of their title. It must be stressed that such a designation is typical of other Hittite offices, like

³¹ Cf. Bilgin 2018, 181f.

³² Bilgin 2018, 188-189.

³³ Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 2010, 235-236.

³⁴ For further references of ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni in Ugarit, see Lackenbacher 2002, 139, note 427.

³⁵ This information is reported literally from an online lecture by Yoram Cohen (17.11.2021) who recently collected and studied the relevant epigraphic material. See now Cohen - Torrecilla 2023.

³⁶ Cf. the contents of RS 94.2509: another letter sent by the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni to Niqmaddu.

³⁷ Pecchioli Daddi 2010.

the GAL KUŠ₇, GAL SIPA, GAL NA.GAD, and GAL UKU.UŠ.³⁸ Most importantly, the two offices seem to share the same duties: They managed royal households, supplying victuals on the occasion of state festivals. Moreover, both officials took part in the offerings during festivals. Although it seems odd that the same office would have been indicated with two different terms, this is not surprising, as testified, for instance, by another title of the Old Hittite period: LÚAGRIG, storehouse administrator, also indicated in the texts with its original Hittite title (LÚmaniyahatalla-). The LÚABUBĪTUM does not appear in the important corpus of the Hittite land donations, and the two titles are never indicated next to each other among the “Greats”.³⁹ This research question exceeds the limits of my contribution. Still, it is worth mentioning that the *Landschenkungsurkunde* for Ura-Tarḫunda mentioned above (obv. 5, *passim*) displays the only name of a LÚABUBĪTUM we have so far, Kantuzzili (^mKán-tu-uz-zi-li-iš), who was the father of Ura-Tarḫunda. Soysal⁴⁰ suggested that it may have been a close royal family member.⁴¹ It is interesting to note that a partially preserved personal name of a LÚuriyanni ends in [...]li (KBo 1.6 [CTH 75], rev. 19).⁴² It cannot be completely excluded that this LÚuriyanni is the same as the one mentioned in the Edict of Muršili II (RS 17.457, rev. 5’), as well as the military officer sent by Muršili II to Kargemiš in support of the king’s brother, Šarri-kušuḫ, against the Egyptians (KUB 14.17 ii 20’-23’. Cf. KBo 8.34+ ii 8).

There are other interesting occurrences to postulate the equivalence between LÚuri(y)anni- and LÚABUBĪTUM: in the NS copy of the Old Hittite KILAM-festival KUB 10.13 (CTH 627.3.b.B) the LÚABUBĪTUM (iv 24’: LÚA-BU-U-BI-TUM [Cf. dupl. KBo 25.176 (NS), i.e. 2: LÚA-BU-BI-TI]) is mentioned together with other officials (GAL MEŠEDI, GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL, GAL GEŠTIN, GAL LÚ.MEŠKUŠ₇, LÚ.MEŠDUGUD, LÚ.MEŠŠUKUR). In another festival fragment (CTH 670: KBo 3.73 (NS) iii’ 12’-17’), we find almost the same sequence,⁴³ apart from LÚu-ri-ya-an-ni (iii’ 13’) where we expect LÚABUBĪTUM. Here, the king and the palace attendances offer drinks (iii’ 17’: akuwanna pianzi) to all the lords (iii’ 15’: ANA BELU^{MEŠ} hūmandaš). The same list of “Greats” is listed in a passage of the Edict of Telipinu (CTH 19.II.G: KBo 7.15 + KBo 12.4 ii 8’: [(LUGAL-aš p]arni kueš šallae[š]). Here we find the LÚABUBĪTUM (Cf. Vigo 2023, 104). In the Old Hittite manuscript of the Palace Chronicle, the LÚ.MEŠDUGUD and LÚ.MEŠŠUKUR (KUB 10.13 iv)⁴⁴ partake in the royal banquet, bringing victuals together with the LÚurianni.

The LÚABUBĪTUM and the LÚuri(y)anni are not only never attested in the Hittite documentation one next to the other so far, but it seems that they are also synchronically and mutually exclusive: there are no clear OS/MS attestations of the LÚABUBĪTUM, whereas the LÚuri(y)anni is mostly attested in OS/MS texts.⁴⁵ The NS evidence of LÚuri(y)anni comes

³⁸ Bilgin 2018, 400.

³⁹ Cf. Bilgin 2018, 189-190.

⁴⁰ Soysal 2012, 314f.

⁴¹ Cf. Marizza 2010, 92: a case of papponymy? See now Bilgin 2018, 190.

⁴² Treaty of Muwatalli II with Talmi-Šaruma of Aleppo, reporting a preceding treaty of his father Muršili II. Cf. Devecchi 2015, 237.

⁴³ Cf. Groddek 2002, 103.

⁴⁴ Dardano 1997, 176.

⁴⁵ See chart in Vigo 2023, 104; Cf. Bilgin 2018, 411. I assume that Bilgin (2018, 411) refers to KBo 12.4+ as a MS attestation of LÚABUBĪTUM. If this is the case, we stress that this is not clearly a MS copy of the Edict of Telipinu. The validity of the assumptions expressed here cannot be corroborated because the NS copies of the

from texts of foreign affairs (Kargemiš, Aleppo, and Ugarit). Incidental or not, I think it was worth reporting it in evaluating the possible equivalence between ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni and ^{LÚ}ABUBĪTUM.

REFERENCES

- BILGIN, T.
2018 *Officials and Administration in the Hittite World* (Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 21), Boston - Berlin 2018.
- COHEN, Y. - TORRECILLA, E.
2023 Grain Tribute in Hittite Syria and the Fall of Ugarit: *Bulletin of the American Society of Overseas Research* 389 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1086/724269>.
- DARDANO, P.
1997 *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: la cosiddetta "Cronaca di Palazzo"*, Roma 1997.
- DE MARTINO, S.
2018 Sitting at the Table of the Hittite King: *Die Welt des Orients* 48/2 (2018), pp. 319-329.
- DEVECCHI, E.
2015 *Trattati internazionali ittiti*, Brescia 2015.
- GRODDEK, D.
2002 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KBo 30* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 2), Dresden 2002.
2010 *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KBo 54* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 31), Wiesbaden 2010.
- GÜTERBOCK, H.G. - HOFFNER, H.A.JR. - VAN DEN HOUT, TH. - GOEDEGEBUURE, P.M. (eds.)
1989– *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, Winona Lake - Chicago 1989–.
- HOFFNER, H.A.JR.
1974 *Alimenta Hethaeorum. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor* (American Oriental Studies 55), New Haven 1974.
- VAN DEN HOUT, TH.P.J.
1987-1990 Maße und Gewichte. Bei den Hethitern: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7 (1987-1990), pp. 517-527.
2020 *A History of Hittite Literacy. Writing and Reading in Late Bronze Age Anatolia (1650-1200 BC)*, Cambridge 2020.
- LACKENBACHER, S.
2002 *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit: Textes provenant des vingt-cinq premières campagnes* (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 20), Paris 2002.
- MARIZZA, M.
2009 *Lettere ittite di re e dignitari*, Brescia 2009.
2010 La papponimia nel mondo ittita. Casi accertati e casi presunti: *KASKAL* 4 (2010), pp. 153-180.
- MCMAHON, G.
1991 *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities* (Assyriological Studies 25), Chicago 1991.

KILAM-festivals clearly refer to OH texts, as it does manuscript G of CTH 19. We cannot, therefore, venture to claim that the scribes of the 13th century BC adopted the Akkadogram ^{LÚ}ABUBĪTUM to render the Old Hittite office of the ^{LÚ}uri(y)anni.

MÜLLER-KARPE, A.

2015 Archäologische Beiträge zur Kenntnis hethitischer Maße und Gewichte: A. MÜLLER-KARPE - E. RIEKEN - W. SOMMERFELD (hrsg.), *Saeculum - Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags* (Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 58), Wiesbaden 2015, pp. 147-160.

PECCHIOLI DADDI, F.

1982 *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita* (Incunabula Graeca 79), Roma 1982.

2010 LÚuri(y)anni: una nuova ipotesi di identificazione: *Orientalia NS 79/2* (2010), pp. 232-241.

RÜSTER, CH.

1994 Eine Urkunde Ḫantilis II.: *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43 (1994), pp. 63-70.

RÜSTER, CH. - WILHELM, G.

2012 *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige* (Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten, Beiheft 4), Wiesbaden 2012.

SOYSAL, O.

2012 Kantuzzili: 'Genç' Tuthaliya İçin Kral Naibi?: *Colloquium Anatolicum* 11, pp. 309-346.

TRÉMOUILLE, M.-C.

2004 I rituali magici ittiti: *Res Antiquae* 1 (2004), pp. 157-203.

VIGO, M.

2019 Staple and Wealth Finance and the Administration of the Hittite Economy: M. HUTTER - S. HUTTER-BRAUNSAAR (eds.), *Economy of Religions in Anatolia: From the Early Second to the Middle of the First Millennium BCE. Proceedings of an International Conference in Bonn (23rd to 25th May 2018)* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 467), Münster 2019, pp. 141-151.

2023 Power and Economic Administration at the Dawn of the Hittite Kingdom: A close look at LÚABUBŪTUM from a broad perspective: *Aula Orientalis* 41/1 (2023), pp. 97-108.

WEEDEN, M.

2011 *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, (Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 54), Wiesbaden 2011.

WEBSITES

Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (2.plus): https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrage.php?c=417.1 (ultima consultazione: 27 giugno 2023).

Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (2.plus): https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrage.php?c=295.9 (ultima consultazione: 1 settembre 2023).