

A Critical Evaluation of Moshe Weinfeld's Approach to the Davidic Covenant in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants: What Did He Get Right & What Did He Get Wrong?

Gordon Johnston, Professor of Old Testament Studies
Old Testament Department, Dallas Theological Seminary

Presented to The Old Testament and Ancient Near East Study Group
2011 National Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society (San Francisco)

1.0 Introduction

In several influential studies in the 1970's, Moshe Weinfeld distinguished the royal grant from suzerain-vassal treaty in ancient Near Eastern literature.¹ Making a rigid dichotomy between the two, he characterized the grant as promissory and unconditional, but the treaty as obligatory and conditional. Weinfeld viewed the Mosaic covenant as a suzerain-vassal treaty, characterizing it as a conditional obligatory covenant. He classified God's covenant with Abraham in Genesis 15 and God's promises to David in 2 Samuel 7 as royal grants, characterizing them as unconditional promissory covenants.² Over the past forty years, many scholars have adopted Weinfeld's approach as evidence that Genesis 15 and 2 Samuel 7 present the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants as unconditional.³ Indeed, his model represents something of a popular consensus and the generally recognized starting point of any discussion of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants. However, a growing number of recent studies have raised serious questions about its validity.⁴

The purpose of this paper is to ask and answer the question, "What did Weinfeld get right and what did he get wrong?" Let me suggest what he got right: Weinfeld correctly identified (1) the Abrahamic covenant as an example of a royal land grant; (2) the Davidic covenant as an example of a royal throne grant; and (3) the Mosaic covenant as an example of a vassal treaty. However, this paper posits that he likely got it wrong when he suggested that royal grants bestowed on loyal servants--whether land grants or throne grants--were *unconditional*. Due to the limits of time, this paper will limit its focus to Weinfeld's claim that royal throne grants given to loyal servants were unconditional. Discussion of his analysis of royal land grants must--sadly--wait another time and place.

2.0 What Do Many Readers of Weinfeld Get Wrong?

Before asking, "What did he get wrong?" we must first disabuse ourselves of a popular level misunderstanding. Many assume that Weinfeld argued that *all* ancient Near Eastern royal grants were *unconditional*. In fact, he did *not* argue that *all* grants were unconditional; he acknowledged that *most* were *conditional*--the unconditional grant was the *exception*. Weinfeld noted:

"In most cases, rebelliousness brought about the dissolution of sonship, be it a real son or an adopted (son) ... We find that the Hittite suzerain did not always grant land unconditionally. In a land grant of Muršiliš II to Abiraddaš, the Hittite suzerain guarantees the rights of DU-Tešup, Abimardaš' son, to throne, house and land, only on the condition that DU-Tešup will not sin (*waštai-*) against his father. The unconditional promise is therefore a special privilege and apparently given for extraordinary loyal service."⁵

¹ Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970) 184-203; "Addenda," 92 (1972) 468-69; idem, "The Davidic Covenant," in Keith Crim, ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplement* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976) 189-194; idem, *The Promise of the Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) 222-264.

² Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant," 184.

³ For example, Samuel Loewenstamm, "The Divine Grants of Land to the Patriarchs," *Journal of the Ancient Oriental Society* 91 (1971) 509-10; John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975) 100-03; David Petersen, "Covenant Ritual: A Traditio-Historical Perspective," *Papers of the Chicago Society of Biblical Literature* 22 (1977) 9; Jon Levenson, "On the Promise to the Rechabites," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976) 508-14; idem, "The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979) 205-19; Shalom Paul, "Adoption Formulae: A Study of Cuneiform and Biblical Legal Clauses," *MAARAV* 2 (1979-80) 176-78; E. Theodore Mullen, Jr., "The Divine Witness and the Davidic Royal Grant: Ps 89:37-38," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983) 207-18; idem, "The Royal Dynastic Grant to Jehu and the Structure of the Book of Kings," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 193-206; Z. Ben-Barak, "Meribaa and the System of Land Grants in Ancient Israel," *Biblica* 62 (1981) 73-91; P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel*, Anchor Bible 9 (New York: Doubleday, 1984) 207-08; Bruce Waltke, "The Phenomenon of Conditionality within Unconditional Covenants," in Avraham Gileadi, ed., *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988) 123-39; Avraham Gileadi, "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection," in Gileadi, ed., *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*, 157-163; Tim Hegg, "The Covenant of Grant and the Abrahamic Covenant," paper read at the Regional Evangelical Theological Society, 1989; George Mendenhall, "Covenant," in David Noel Freedman, ed. et al, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 1:1179-1202; Michael Grisanti, "The Davidic Covenant," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 10:2 (1999) 233-250; Darrell Bock, "The Covenants in Progressive Dispensationalism," in Herb Bateman, ed., *Three Central Issues for Today's Dispensationalist* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2000) 159-207; René Lopez, "Israelite Covenants in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Covenants (Part 2 of 2)," *CTS Journal* 10 (Spring 2004) 72-106; Walter Brueggemann, "Israel's Covenant Obligation," *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005) 417-20; Scott Hahn, "Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994-2004)," *Currents in Biblical Research* 3:2 (2005) 263-292; Eugene Merrill, "The Davidic Covenant," *Everlasting Dominion: A Theology of the Old Testament* (B&H Publishing Group, 2006) 434-442; Tikva Frymer-Kensky, "Covenant: A Jewish Biblical Concept," *Studies in Bible and Feminist Criticism* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2006) 141-42 [133-156]; Thomas Blanton IV, "The Covenant According to the Damascus Document," *Constructing a New Covenant: Discursive Strategies in the Damascus Document and Second Corinthians* (Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 24-25 [17-70].

⁴ See especially, Gary Knoppers, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996) 670-97; Richard S. Hess, "The Book of Joshua as a Land Grant," *Biblica* 83 (2002) 493-506; Steven McKenzie, "The Typology of the Davidic Covenant," in James Maxwell Miller, ed. et al, *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honor of J. Maxwell Miller* (Continuum: 2001) 154-55 [152-178]; J.J.N. Roberts, "Davidic Covenant," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Historical Books*, eds., Bill T. Arnold and H.G.M. Williamson (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005) 206-211.

⁵ Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant," 189-193.

This qualification is important, since it means mere classification of a covenant as a royal grant does not automatically imply it is unconditional. Since most grants were conditional, classification of a covenant as unconditional cannot be determined simply by identification of its form as a grant. Its classification as an unconditional rather than conditional grant must be based upon actual content. Too often, scholars have prematurely classified the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants as unconditional simply on the basis of their form as grants—with the faulty assumption that all grants are necessarily unconditional. As a result, discussion of the nature of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants all too often begins and ends with Genesis 15 and 2 Samuel 7; the conditional passages are often relegated to secondary status or simply ignored. Form criticism should not trump actual biblical content.

3.0 What Did Weinfeld Get Wrong?

Although Weinfeld acknowledged that the typical royal throne grant was conditional, he also argued for the existence of unconditional grants. However, the only examples he offered as evidence of unconditionality were limited to isolated excerpts from two (!) Hittite texts dating to the 2nd millennium BC: (1) the grant of Mursili II of Hatti with Kupanta-KAL of Mira-Kuwaliya (CTH 68); and (2) the grant of Hattusili III of Hatti with Kuruntiya (aka Ulmi-Teshub) of Tarhuntassa (CTH 106).⁶ In each case, the Hittite king granted the security of the dynastic throne of his servant, even if he or any of his descendants might sin. Weinfeld suggested similar imagery in 2 Sam 7:14-16 (cf. Ps 89:28-37 [29-38]) implied Nathan's oracle also presented the Davidic covenant as unconditional.

"Although the grant to Abraham and David is close in its formulation to the neo-Assyrian grants and therefore might be late, the promises themselves are much older and reflect the Hittite pattern of the grant. 'Land' and 'house' (=dynasty), the objects of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants respectively, are indeed the most prominent gifts of the suzerain in the Hittite and Syro-Palestinian political reality, and like the Hittite grants so also the grant of land to Abraham and the grant of 'house' to David are unconditional. Thus we read in the treaty of Hattusilis III (or Tudhaliyas IV) with Ulmi-Tesup of Dattasa: 'After you, your son and grandson will possess it, nobody will take it away from them. If one of your descendants sins (*waštai*-) the king will prosecute him at his court. Then when he is found guilty ... if he deserves death he will die. But nobody will take away from the descendant of Ulmi-Tesup either his house or his land in order to give it to a descendant of somebody else.' In a similar manner, Mursilis II reinforces the right of Kupanta-Kal to the 'house and the land in spite of his father's sins' ... The same conception lies behind the promise of the house to David and his descendants in II Sam. VII, 8-16 where we read: 'I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever, I will be his father and he shall be my son, when he sins I will chastise him with the rod of men and with human afflictions but my grace will not be removed ... your house and your kingdom will be steadfast before me forever, your throne shall be established forever'.""⁷

Yet a careful reading of these two documents reveals that Weinfeld mishandled these isolated quotations. He simply excavated each citation without consideration of how either must be nuanced by the context of the text as a whole. He also failed to consider the rhetorical function that each text played in its political/social setting. When each document is examined holistically, it is patently clear that neither of these two isolated statements actually convey the concept of absolute unconditionality. Due to the limits of time, this paper will focus on the grant bestowed by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya of Tarhuntassa (CTH 106b.2), which we will examine in a holistic manner. For a brief overview of the grant issued by Mursili II with Kupanta-KAL of Mira-Kuwaliya (CTH 67), see Appendix 1.

4.0 The Royal Grant of Hattusili III to Kuruntiya of Tarhuntassa

Weinfeld's excerpt of selected lines from this document hardly provides his reader with an accurate understanding of the nature of this grant. The next several pages will summarize the historical background and political function of this tablet. Then follows a translation of the entire tablet which allows the reader to place Weinfeld's isolated quotation within its proper context.

4.1 Royal Grant of Hattusili III to Kuruntiya: Contextual Considerations

4.1.1 Social Background/Political Context

CTH 106 concerned the royal grant of the rule of Tarhuntassa, a major cultic center and the second most important city in the Hittite Empire, subordinate only to Hattusa the capital, and equal in rank to Carchemish. So important was Tarhuntassa that the Hittite capital, which had been located at Hattusa since antiquity, was moved to Tarhuntassa during the reign of Muwattalli II (ca. 1295-1272 BC).⁸ When his successor Urhi-Teshub (ca. 1272-1268 BC) returned the capital to Hattusa,⁹ Tarhuntassa continued to function as a cult center. During the reign of Hattusili III (ca. 1268-1246 BCE), rulership of Tarhuntassa was assigned to Kuruntiya.¹⁰

⁶ Weinfeld also drew upon two other Hittite tablets featuring royal adoption language, which he compared to Yahweh's adoption of the Davidic king as his "son" (e.g., 2 Sam 7:13-14; Pss. 2:7; 89:89:26-27 [27-28]): (1) the royal edict/political testament of Hattusili I concerning Mursili I (CTH 6); and (2) the grant treaty of Suppiluliuma I of Hatti with Mattiwaza (aka Sattiwaza) of Mittani (CTH 51, 52). However, since Weinfeld did not claim that royal adoption imagery was a marker of unconditionality, discussion of this motif is beyond the scope of this paper.

⁷ Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant," 189-190.

⁸ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 108.

⁹ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 115-116.

¹⁰ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 116, 121.

According to the royal archives, the ruler of Tarhuntassa was second in rank in the Hittite Empire, subordinate only to the Hittite king, and equal in rank to the ruler of Carchemish. However, neither the ruler of Tarhuntassa nor of Carchemish should be confused as the crown prince (heir apparent) to the throne of Hattusa. Hittite kings often designated rulership of Tarhuntassa and Carchemish to potential rivals to their throne as a way to satisfy their thirst for power. They kept them far enough away from causing problems in Hattusa but close enough within the Empire to keep an eye on them. Although the rhetoric of any particular grant might describe the recipient as a loyal servant, the actual function of the grant in many cases was not to reward past loyalty, as much as to secure future loyalty and to stave off any attempt to usurp the king's own throne in Hattusa.

4.1.2 Rhetorical Situation/Political Context

It is impossible to fully appreciate the original function of CTH 106 without understanding the political intrigue that generated its issue. Hattusili III was the younger brother of Muwattalli II, both of whom were sons of king Mursili II (ca. 1321-1295 BC).¹¹ When Mursili II died, he was succeeded by his oldest son Muwattalli II (ca. 1295-1272 BC). When Muwattalli II died without leaving an heir of the first rank, his younger brother Hattusili III believed that he was entitled to the throne. Before he died, however, Muwattalli II designated Urhi-Teshub (ca. 1272-1268 BC), the son of his concubine or secondary wife, as his successor.¹² Since Urhi-Teshub was not an heir of the first rank, Hattusili III believed that he had a more legitimate claim to the throne than his nephew. Furthermore, he protested that Urhi-Teshub was a mere lad at the time of his ascension to the throne and less qualified to rule as king than Hattusili III himself who had proven himself as a capable military leader during the reign of his older brother Muwattalli II. Hattusili III stewed for several years until Urhi-Teshub attempted to demote him from his position as commander of the Hittite army. In response, Hattusili III rallied the army and usurped the throne of Urhi-Teshub, claiming he had a more legitimate right to the throne than his second rate nephew.¹³ Hattusili III deposed Urhi-Teshub, who fled to Egypt where he found refuge under Ramesses II.

Once on the throne, Hattusili III (ca. 1267-1237 BC) appointed Kuruntiya as ruler of Tarhuntassa. Kuruntiya was a member of the royal family: he was one of the sons of Muwattalli II (the now deceased, older brother of Hattusili III) and therefore a nephew of Hattusili III, as well as a half-brother of Urhi-Teshub (whom Hattusili III had deposed). While Kuruntiya was young, his elderly father Muwattalli had entrusted him to his uncle Hattusili III for safekeeping and upbringing. So when Hattusili III later rebelled against Urhi-Teshub to seize the throne of the Empire (as recounted above), Kuruntiya sided with him. In reward, Hattusili III appointed Kuruntiya as king over Tarhuntassa, the chief center of one of the two most important provinces--the other being Carchemish.¹⁴ It is also likely that Hattusili III granted Kuruntiya the rule over Tarhuntassa to head off any aspirations the latter might have had to the throne. After all, being one of the sons of the former king Muwattalli II and young brother of the recently deposed Urhi-Teshub, Kuruntiya had a more direct claim to the throne of the Hittite Empire than his uncle Hattusili III. As a result, Hattusili III drew up a series of three interstate documents to govern his relationship with Kuruntiya: (1) an original grant that was purely promissory in tone: CTH 106a; (2) a subsequent edict making explicit certain treaty obligations: CTH 106b.1; and (3) a final official version of the grant treaty governing their relationship, which consisted of a redaction of the original grant and the subsequent edict of treaty obligations: CTH 106b.2.

Hattusili III was succeeded by his son Tudhaliya IV (ca. 1237-1209 BC). Originally, Hattusili III had designated his oldest son as his heir; but when he proved himself unworthy, Hattusili III repudiated him. In his place, Hattusili III designated Tudhaliya IV as his successor, since the king deemed him most worthy despite being one of his youngest sons. Since his older brothers (Nerikkaili and Huzziya) coveted his kingship, the reign of Tudhaliya IV was under constant threat by numerous members of the royal family who were potential claimants to the Hittite throne.¹⁵ In addition to imposing loyalty oaths on royal officials and military forces, Tudhaliya IV took special measures to win the goodwill and support of various members of the royal family by conferring on them all kinds of favors. These politically motivated acts included an edict issued to Sahurunuwa, son of Sarri-Kusuh king of Carchemish, granting him a large estate, conferred in seemingly unconditional language, which masked its real purpose to secure his loyalty (CTH 225).¹⁶

Tudhaliya IV also had to deal with the potential threat to his throne posed by Kuruntiya, the son of Muwattalli II whom Hattusili III had previously granted the kingship over Tarhuntassa to secure his submission.¹⁷ Upon taking the throne, Tudhaliya IV drew up a new treaty with Kuruntiya for the political purpose of ensuring his continued loyalty: CTH 106b.3. Altman notes: "It is in this light that one has to regard the treaty drawn up by Tudhaliya IV for his cousin Kuruntiya, king of Tarhuntassa and a son of Muwattalli II (StBoT 1). This treaty is not merely a follow-up treaty of the one

¹¹ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 107-108.

¹² Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 115.

¹³ The main source of information comes from the so-called "Apology of Hattusili III" (CTH 81; edited by Otten 1981).

¹⁴ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 121.

¹⁵ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 124.

¹⁶ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 126. Note that Weinfeld also counted the royal land grant of Tudhaliya to Sahurunuwa as an example of an unconditional royal land grant. Weinfeld failed to understand the rhetorical function of this politically motivated act which was designed to ensure the loyalty of Sahurunuwa who was heir to the throne of Carchemish and a potential threat to the security of the throne of Tudhaliya IV.

¹⁷ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 126. See Imparati 1992: 319, pointing to KUB 16.18 = CTH 275 (ii 9'-10', 16').

drawn up for Kuruntiya by Hattusili III. In order to win the goodwill of Kuruntiya, Tudhaliya (IV) went a long way toward granting Kuruntiya various important concessions beyond those that had already been conferred on him by Hattusili (III)."¹⁸

As the historical prologue of this treaty reveals, Tudhaliya IV and Kuruntiya had a long history of interpersonal loyalty with one another. It will be remembered (see above) that Hattusili III had watched over Kuruntiya in his youth. Under these circumstances, Tudhaliya and Kuruntiya had become loyal friends during their youth in a way somewhat reminiscent of the friendship that arose between David and Jonathan the son of king Saul. In section §5 of the Bronze Tablet, Tudhaliya IV recalls:

Now, I Tudhaliya the Great King, before I had became king, the god already had brought together Kuruntiya and me in friendship. Already we were kind and good to each other. We were [men] of an oath: "The one must be loyal to the other!" At that time my father had put an older brother into position as crown prince. At that time he had not yet decided that I should become king. But even at that time Kuruntiya was loyal to me. And he swore to me as follows: "Even if your father does not install you in kingship, in whatever place your father puts you, I will be loyal to you only. I (will be) your servant." I (also) swore to Kuruntiya: "I will be loyal to you." But when my brother whom my father had (previously) placed in <the rank of> crown-prince, (when) he (=my father) deposed him (=my brother), he installed me in kingship. When my father saw the kindness and goodwill between Kuruntiya and me, my father brought us together and made us swear, "The one must be loyal to the other!" My father made us swear and we became individual parties to a mutual oath. Kuruntiya was loyal to me; the oaths, which before me he had sworn, he never broke. I, My Majesty, likewise swore/promised to him: "If the gods recognize/choose me, and (as a result) I become king, there will go good for you on account of me." But when my father at that time died, and when (other) lands "adopted a wait-and-see policy," Kuruntiya at that time risked his life for me for me. He was loyal to me; the oaths, which he had sworn he never broke. When the deity took me, and I became king, I made the treaty (*išhiul*) with Kuruntiya as follows: I give those cities which do not lie (i.e., are not specified in writing) on the treaty tablet of my father together with field, fallow and citizens, everything to Kuruntiya king of the land of Tarhuntassa as (his) servant(s) ...

This treaty was so important to Tudhaliya IV that it was not inscribed on a stone tablet, but on a beautiful bronze tablet which was placed in prominent display in the royal archives. However, as the historical evidence shows, the grant treaty inscribed upon the Bronze Tablet failed to secure the loyalty of Kuruntiya. Sometime after the new treaty went into effect, Kuruntiya attempted to seize the Hittite throne when Tudhaliya IV was away on a military campaign. Kuruntiya even succeeded in ruling over Hattusa the capital of the Empire for a short period. However, he was eventually defeated by Tudhaliya IV who retook Hattusa and then deposed Kuruntiya from the kingship of Tarhuntassa.¹⁹ Tudhaliya IV placed the rule of Tarhuntassa in the hands of an altogether different dynasty, effectively negating his earlier promise that he would never do such a thing--a promise which must be understood as having been made in good faith but with the understanding that it would be honored only as long as Kuruntiya himself remained loyal to Tudhaliya IV. Since Kuruntiya violated the terms of the treaty with Tudhaliya IV, the latter was free from his obligation to uphold his promise to ensure the perpetuity of the dynasty of Kuruntiya. The terms of the treaty having been violated by Kuruntiya, Tudhaliya IV removed the Bronze Tablet from the royal archives and subjected the treaty tablet to a desacralizing interment under the pavement of the main street of Hattusa.²⁰

4.1.3 Literary Context: the Series of Four Interstate Documents

The grant that Weinfeld identified as the prime example of unconditionality--CTH 106b.2--is the second in this series of four interstate documents issued by the Hittite king Hattusili III (ca. 1268-1246 BCE) and his successor Tudhaliya IV (ca. 1246-1218 BC),²¹ granting kingship of Tarhuntassa to their vassal Kuruntiya the son of Muwattalli II.²² The political purpose of this mixed genre of texts was to secure the loyalty of Kuruntiya the son of Muwattalli II to the Hittite king Hattusili III and his successor Tudhaliya IV. Since Kuruntiya was a member of the royal family with a legitimate claim to the Hittite throne, Hattusili III viewed him as a potential threat to his rule. Consequently, Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV both granted him kingship of Tarhuntassa in return for an oath of loyalty.

This series of four documents represents a mixed genre consisting of (1) the original promissory grant issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya (CTH 106a); (2) a subsequent edict issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya, making explicit certain treaty obligations that were not articulated in the original grant (CTH 106b.1); (3) the final official version of the grant treaty issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya, which combined the original promissory grant and the subsequent edict along with further treaty obligations (CTH 106b.2); and (4) a later renewal of the grant treaty by Tudhaliya IV (the successor of Hattusili III) to Kuruntiya, which also featured both promissory and obligatory features.²³ For the sake of convenience, this series of four documents is listed in order below:

¹⁸ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 126.

¹⁹ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 127.

²⁰ Altman, *Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 127; P.J. Neve, cited by Hoffner 1989b: 47-48.

²¹ These dates follow the so-called short chronology. The dates that follow the alternate long chronology are: Hattusili III (ca. 1265-1237 BC) and Tudhaliya IV (ca. 1237-1209 BC). For discussion of the short chronology, see Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford University Press, 1998); G. McMahon, "Hittite History," *Biblical Archaeologist* 52 (1989) 62-77.

²² Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995) XXX-XXX; Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series, Volume 7, edited by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 102-117; Amnon Altman, *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties: An Inquiry into the Concepts of Hittite Interstate Law* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2004) 49-51.

²³ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 107.

1. original grant of Tarhuntassa issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya (CTH 106a)
2. subsequent edict issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya, making explicit certain treaty obligations that were not articulated in the original grant, as well as providing exemptions from other obligations (CTH 106b.1 = ABoT 57)
3. final official version of the grant treaty issued by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya (aka Ulmi-Teshub), which combined the original promissory grant (#1 above) with the subsequent edict articulating treaty obligations (#2 above) (CTH 106b.2 = KBo 4.10)
4. later treaty renewal issued by Tudhaliya IV reaffirming original grant of kingship of Tarhuntassa to Kuruntiya, but with modifications of the original treaty in the form of several concessions (CTH 106b.3 = Bo 86/299) (aka "the Bronze Tablet")

CTH 106a. The original draft of the vassal treaty Hattusili III drew up granting kingship of Tarhuntassa to Kuruntiya was a short tablet consisting of four sections: (1) preamble and historical prologue; (2) provision for royal succession; (3) royal grant of succession for perpetuity [from which Weinfeld excerpted isolated lines]; and (4) land boundaries. This short treaty did not contain any explicit stipulations or conditions, but its political function is clear to Hittitologists. While seemingly unconditional in nature and exclusively promissory in tone, its original intent was to secure the loyalty of Kuruntiya to Hattusili III. In fact, it is clear from statements in the second follow-up grant treaty (CTH 106b.2 = KBo 4.10) that the Hittite king was imposing rather demanding obligations upon Kuruntiya (e.g., provisions of a large quota of military personnel).

CTH 106b.1. Sometime after the original draft of the vassal treaty (CTH 106a) was drawn up, it became apparent that the failure of the original draft to stipulate specific obligations upon Kuruntiya created an uncomfortable ambiguity in the nature of their mutual responsibilities to one another. Kuruntiya could balk at any demands Hattusili III wanted to make upon him, the latter claiming they were implicit in their original agreement, but the former claiming he was free from any obligations that had not been made explicit in the original treaty tablet. Furthermore, Kuruntiya claimed he was unable to fulfill certain service obligations imposed on Tarhuntassa during the days of Muwattalli II, when the city temporarily functioned as the capital of the Empire. Ever since Urhi-Teshub returned the royal seat to Hattusa, the fortunes of Tarhuntassa had been diminished, making it difficult for Kuruntiya to bear this old burden. Consequently, Hattusili III drew up an edict making explicit certain treaty obligations and providing exemption from those which Kuruntiya was unable to meet (CTH 106b.1 = ABoT 57).

CTH 106b.2. Sometime later, Hattusili III had a final official version of his grant treaty with Kuruntiya (CTH 106b.2 = KBo 4.10). This third text represents a mixed genre, combining the promissory features of the original grant (CTH 106a) and obligatory features of the subsequent edict (CTH 106b.1). This tablet consisted of three main sections: (1) a copy of the original short treaty which had been entirely promissory in content; (2) an editorial transition which explained the function of the following addendum; and (3) a lengthy stipulation section, clarifying the treaty obligations that Hattusili III had imposed on Kuruntiya. In this tablet, Hattusili III reiterated the original promise to ensure the perpetuity of the dynasty of Kuruntiya (§3), but qualified this by warning that unfaithfulness to the Hittite king would invite the swift destruction of Kuruntiya along with his dynasty (§§8-9). This final official version makes clear that the original grant had imposed implicit treaty obligations which were officially made explicit in this tablet.

CTH 106b.3. When Hattusili III died, his son Tudhaliya IV reaffirmed the original grant but lessening the demand of several stipulations to secure the goodwill and cooperation of Kuruntiya. This text reiterates many features of the previous grant treaty drawn up by Hattusili III (CTH 106b.2), including the guarantee of the succession of Kuruntiya's dynasty to the throne, but qualified this by warning that defection from the Hittite king would result in the destruction of his dynasty. Thus, the seemingly unconditional promise to never remove the throne from the line of Kuruntiya was dramatically nuanced by the subsequent warning against blatant treason. And as history shows, when Kuruntiya did, in fact, attempt to usurp the throne of Tudhaliya IV, his act of treason resulted in the termination of his dynasty and his deportation into exile. Tudhaliya IV replaced Kuruntiya's dynasty with another line of kings.

4.2 The Actual Contents of the Four Grant Treaties

4.2.1 Original Promissory Grant: CTH 106a

The original grant of Tarhuntassa by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya is preserved in KBo 4.10 obverse 1-37 (= CTH 106a).²⁴ This tablet refers to Kuruntiya by his Luwian throne name Ulmi-Teshub (cf. his older brother's name Urhi-Teshub). Since it is composed in a promissory tone, the casual reader might misinterpret the lack of explicit obligations as conveying an unconditional covenant. From a speech-act perspective, however, the locutionary tone should not be confused with its illocutionary function. The political function of this royal grant was to secure the loyalty of Kuruntiya and to prevent

²⁴ Although the original draft of this grant has not yet been recovered, the wording of this original draft is preserved in KBo 4.10 obverse lines 1-37. The latter represents a second edition of the original draft which was supplemented by KBo 4.10 obverse lines 38-56 + reverse lines 1-32. For discussion and translation, see Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995) 11-20; Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 109-113 (= §18B).

him from contending for the Hittite throne by granting him the throne of Tarhuntassa. This short document was composed of four sections listed below.²⁵

- §1. Preamble and Historical Prologue
- §2. Provision for Royal Succession
- §3. Royal Grant of Succession for Perpetuity
- §4. Land Boundaries and Grazing Rights

Translation²⁶

1. Preamble and Historical Prologue: obverse 1-3

[The first thirty lines have been lost. The initial preserved lines are too fragmentary for connected translation.]

2. Royal Succession: obverse 4-7a

[...] your wife [...] but I ... and you shall take her son. On the royal [throne you shall install] him ... for you are mortal, and your death will come to you, and your sons [... my son will recognize your son] ... they shall take and shall put him on your throne.

*3. Royal Grant of Succession for Perpetuity: obverse 7b-14

Your son they shall [...] him. I My Majesty will not reject your son. I will accept neither your brother nor anyone else. The land of Tarhuntassa that I have given that to you, later your son (and) your grandson will hold it. They shall not take it away from them. If any son of yours (or) grandson of yours later commits an offence (*waštai*-), the King of Hatti must question him! If an offence is proven (lit. "it sticks) against him, the King of Hatti shall do with him according to his soul (i.e., shall treat him as he pleases). If he should perish (i.e., deserves death), he should perish (i.e., must be put to death)! But they shall not take his house and his land from him. They shall not give it to the line of another. Only someone of the line of Ulmi-Teshub shall take (them). Someone of the male line shall take them; someone of the female line shall not take (them). **But if there is not a male line (of descent), then it [= property/throne] will be held back/kept in reserve.** They must seek someone of the female line of Ulmi-Teshub alone! If he is in a foreign land, they shall bring him back from there, they shall install this one in lordship in the land of Tarhuntassa.

4. Land Boundaries: obverse 15-37

Protect the land which I have given to you, Ulmi-Teshub, and the frontiers which I have established for you. Do not violate them. Your frontiers are established as follows: In the direction of the land of Pitassa, your frontier is Mount Hawa, the *kantanna* of the city of Zarniya, and the city of Sanantarwa, but the *kantanna* of Zarniya belongs to the land of the Hulaya River, while Sanantarwa belongs to the land of Pitassa. In the direction of the border district of the land of Pitassa, his frontier is the sinkhole of the city of Arimmatta, but Arimmatta belongs to the land of Pitassa. In the direction of Mount Huwatnuwanta, his frontier is the *hallapuwanza*, but the *hallapuwanza* belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. Up behind the city of Kursawanta, his frontier is the Stone Monument of the Dog. In the direction of the city of Ussa, his frontier is the city of Zarata, but Zarata belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Wanzataruwa, his frontier is the city of Harazuwa, but Harazuwa belongs to the land of Ussa. On the first treaty tablets his frontier in the direction of Mount Kuwakuwalyatta was the city of Suttasna, but now I, the Great King, have made the city of Santimma his frontier. But Santimma belongs to the land of Hulaya River. In the direction of the cities of Wanzataruwa and Kunzinasa, his frontier is Mount Arlanta and the city of Alana. Alana belongs to the land of the Hulaya River, but the water which is upon Mount Arlanta belongs jointly to Hatti and to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Sinnuwanta, his frontier is Mount Lula, but the city of Ninainta belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. However, the service estate of the golden charioteer, which is behind the city, belongs to My Majesty. In the direction of the city of Zarnusassa, his frontier is the *harmima*, but the *harmima* belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Zarwisa, his frontier is Mount Sarlaimmi and the sinkhole of water [...]. In the direction of the mountain heights, his frontier is the city of Saliya, but Saliya belongs to Hatti. In the direction of foreign territory, his frontier is the city of Walwara and various dependencies of Walwara—Mata, Sanhata, Surimma, Saranduwa, and Tattasi. In the direction of the city of Saranduwa, to whatever locality his armed force should reach—that belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Walma, his frontier is the cities of Alluprata and Huhhura, but these cities belong to the land of the Hulaya River.

In §3, Hattusili III ensured the security of the dynasty of Kuruntiya. In the case if one of his descendants might sin (*waštai*-), the Hittite king reserved the right to punish the offender as he saw fit, but promised to never remove the throne from his line and transfer it to another dynasty. At first blush, this sounds unconditional, but CTH 106b.2 nuances this (see below).

4.2.2 Subsequent Explicit Articulation of Obligatory Treaty Stipulations: CTH 106b.1

Although the original grant (CTH 106a) was framed in purely promissory terms, it is clear that Hattusili III required Kuruntiya to demonstrate loyalty to the Hittite king and to fulfill certain stipulations, which were originally articulated orally. The first documentation of some of these stipulations appears in an edict of Hattusili III concerning certain military and temple obligations (CTH 106b.1).²⁷ This edict articulates certain obligations Hattusili III imposed on Kuruntiya when he installed him on the throne, but which had not been made explicit in the original grant tablet.²⁸

²⁵ Emmanuel Laroche, "Un point d'histoire: Ulmi-Teshub," *Revue hittite et asiatique* 48 (1947-48) 40-48; Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995) 19-20; Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, *Analecta Biblica* 21A (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981) 72-73.

²⁶ This translation follows Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995) 11-20; Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 109-113 (= §18B §§1-4).

²⁷ The conventional identification of this tablet follows: originally CTH 97 = now CTH 106b.1 = ABoT 1.57 = HDT 18A. For the *editio princeps* of CTH 106.B.1 (classification; formerly CTH 97) = ABoT 1.57 (line drawings) = AnAr 9132 (find number), see Kernal Balkan, *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri* [= Bogazköy-Tafeln im Archäologischen Museum zu Ankara] (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1948), pp. vii (introduction), ix-x (identification) and 31-32 (line drawing of the obverse and reverse). For the critical edition of ABoT 1.57 = CTH 97 (now CTH 106.B.1), see Emmaneul Laroche, *RHA* 48 (1948) 40-48.

²⁸ Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7, edited by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 103.

It also represents a gracious response by Hattusili III to the complaint of Kuruntiya that some of the treaty obligations originally imposed upon him were too heavy.²⁹

Translation³⁰

[Thus says Hattusili], the Great King, King of Hatti, and the Queen: The King and the Queen made Kuruntiya king in the land of Tarhuntassa. When the King and the Queen examined the treaty obligations, they realized that the divine (= temple) obligations had become too heavy for him to manage. Formerly, when Muwattalli resided in Tarhuntassa (i.e., when his royal seat was located there) and worshipped the gods of Tarhuntassa, all the land of Hatti supported them. But now the King and Queen have made Kuruntiya king in Tarhuntassa, and he has not been able to manage the divine obligations from his land alone. So the King and the Queen have revised the divine obligation within your treaty obligation as follows: His Majesty has remitted the chariotry and infantry of the land of the Hulaya River for which the armory in Hatti holds claim, and in the future only 200 of his men shall go on a Hittite military expedition. Additional troops shall not be sought from him for the armory. These troops have been remitted to him for the corvée and dues obligations. Some personnel the King remitted to him for custodial duties in the temple, some he remitted to him for cultivation, and some he remitted to him for guarding the salt lick. In the future, no one shall contest this decision. But if some king should rise up against His Majesty, then the king of the land of Tarhuntassa himself shall come to his assistance, but absolutely no infantry shall be sought from him. And if some equal should arise against the King, then the king of the land of Tarhuntassa himself shall come to his assistance, but absolutely no infantry or chariotry shall be sought from him.

Comment

This edict indicates that original written grants did not always articulate the treaty obligations which the Hittite king had originally imposed upon the recipient, perhaps in oral fashion. It demonstrates that the appearance of subsequent obligations in a later tablet may represent a continuity rather than a discontinuity with the original grant tablet. The initial grant (CTH 106a) and the subsequent edict clarifying the treaty obligations (CTH 106b.1) were originally composed as separate tablets. However, we will discover in our next example that the original grant and the subsequent articulation of treaty obligations were combined in the third (CTH 106b.2 = HDT 18B §6) and fourth (CTH 106b.3 = HDT 18C §22) texts in this series.³¹

4.2.3 Eventual Composition of the Final Official Version of the Grant Treaty: CTH 106b.2

CTH 106b.2 is the third document drawn up by Hattusili III,³² governing his relationship with Kuruntiya, who in this tablet is identified by his Luwian name Ulmi-Teshub (cf. his brother's name Urhi-Teshub).³³ This document represents the official version of the great treaty,³⁴ the previous two (CTH 106a and CTH 106b.1) being regarded as preliminary drafts.³⁵ Its literary structure consists of three basic parts: (1) a copy of the original grant tablet, (2) a transitional editorial comment explaining the following addendum, and (3) an addendum formally articulating treaty obligations Hattusili III had placed on Kuruntiya which were not articulated in the original grant tablet.³⁶ Thus, part 1 represents a copy of the original grant (CTH 106a); part 2 is an explanation of the literary composition of the tablet; and part 3 is a copy of the subsequent edict making explicit certain treaty obligations (CTH 106b.1) along with additional obligations as well as blessings and curses.³⁷

²⁹ Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 103.

³⁰ This translation follows Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995) 11-14; Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 103

³¹ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 102-103, notes: "When the scribes adapted these earlier records, they did not always exercise sufficient care in harmonizing their source material with the later contexts. This accounts for the confusion of grammatical person particularly evident in No. 18B."

³² Since the opening lines of the cuneiform tablet have been lost, the identity of the Hittite king who issued KBo 4.10 (=CTH 106b) is uncertain; however, the evidence points to Hattusili III rather than Tudhaliya IV. David Hawkins has recently presented compelling evidence in private conversation with Theo van den Hout that the Hittite king who drew up CTH 106 should be identified as Hattusili III, since Tudhaliya IV is listed as one of the human witnesses at the end of CTH 106, where he is called Prince Tashmi-Sharrumma, a title that Hawkins has shown is equated with Tudhaliya IV in another tablet. I am indebted to Professor van den Hout for this crucial information, and wait in anticipation for Hawkins' forthcoming publication on this important discovery. In the meantime, the identification of the Hittite king who drew up CTH 106 as Hattusili III is supported by de Monte (1991-92: 141f), Klengel (1992: 231f), Sürenhagen (1992: 350-358), Gurney (1993: 14-22), Beal (1993: 31f note 10), Alp (1998). The identify of the king of CTH 106 as Tudhaliya IV is supported by Otten (1988: 6), van den Hout (1989; 1995: 11-19), Houwink ten Cate (1994: 233). For discussion, see Heinhold-Krahmer (1991/92: 146-147), Altman (121).

³³ It is important to note that the identification of Ulmi-Teshub is a matter of debate. See Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 107-108. Most Hittite scholars identify Ulmi-Teshub as the Luwian name of Kuruntiya, e.g., Horst Klengel, "Tuthaliya IV. von Hatti: Prolegomena zu einer Biographie," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18 (1991) 224-38; Dietrich Sürenhagen, "Untersuchungen zur Bronzetafel und weiteren Verträgen mit der Sekundogenitur in Tarhuntassa," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 87 (1992) 350-58 [341-71]; O.R. Gurney, "The Treaty with Ulmi-Teshub," *Anatolian Studies* 43 (1993) 19-22 [13-28]. However, others distinguish Ulmi-Teshub and Kuruntiya, e.g., Theo P.J. van den Hout, "A Chronology of the Tarhuntassa-Treaties," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 41 (1989) 100-14; Fiorella Imparati, "Le relazioni politiche fra Hatti e Tarhuntassa all'epoca di Hattusili III e Tuthaliya IV," in F. Imparati, ed., *Quattro studi ittiti* (Florence: Elite, 1991) 61-62 [23-68]. However, CTH 106 obverse line 41' refers to Kuruntiya in such a way that supports the view that he should be identified with Ulmi-Teshub. The identification of Ulmi-Teshub with Kuruntiya is supported by de Monte (1991-92: 141f), Klengel (1992: 231f), Sürenhagen (1992: 350-358), Gurney (1993: 14-22), Beal (1993: 31f note 10), Alp (1998). On the other hand, van den Hout (1989; 1995: 11-19) distinguishes Ulmi-Teshub from Kuruntiya. Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 103 (?), writes: "Since the upper portion of No. 18B [= KBo 4.10] containing the preamble and historical introduction has been lost, it has long been uncertain whether this treaty was issued by Hattusili III or by his son and successor Tudhaliya IV. With the discovery in 1986 of No. 18C [= Bo 86/299], which is certainly the work of Tudhaliya [IV], new light has been cast on the problem. In particular, it may now be seen that the boundary adjustment carried out by the father of the Hittite rule of No. 18C (§5) is the same action as that described in the first person by the author of No. 18B (§3). Thus the latter text must be attributed to Hattusili. This being so, Kurunta and Ulmi-Teshub must simply be two different names, Luwian and Hurrian respectively, for the same individual. For this interpretation, see Klengel 1991:231-32; Sürenhagen 1992: 350-58; Gurney 1993: 19-22; but cf. van den Hout 1989; Imparati 1991: 61-62."

³⁴ The conventional nomenclature of this tablet is: CTH 106b.2 (classification) = KBo 4.10 (line drawings) = StBoT 38 (critical edition) = HDT 18B (Beckman's translation) = 1548/u + Bo 7794 + VAT 7457 (archaeological find numbers). For the critical edition of KBo 4.10, see Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995). For a convenient translation, see Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 109-113 (= §18B). For discussion, see D.J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 1, 52-53, 55, 59-60, 63-65, 69-73, 80, 114, 128, 144, 184.

³⁵ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 102-103.

³⁶ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 102-03; Theo van den Hout, "A Chronology of the Tarhuntassa-Treaties," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 41 (1989) 100-14.

³⁷ For discussion of the complex structure and compositional history of this grant text, see D.J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 1, 52-53, 55, 59-60, 63-65, 69-73, 80, 114, 128, 144, 184. McCarthy, *ibid.*, 72-73, notes that the current document represents a revision of a previous grant: "This looks quite complex; yet it can be explained logically in terms of the function of the treaty and the techniques for meeting them. Here the problem is to include a mass of material already covered by oath (treaty), then add new material. This is done by a

Translation⁴³

1. Preamble and Historical Prologue: obverse 1-3

[The first thirty lines have been lost. The initial preserved lines are too fragmentary for connected translation.]

2. Royal Succession: obverse 4-7a

[...] your wife [...] but I ... and you shall take her son. And on the royal [throne you shall install] him ... for you are mortal, and your death will come to you, and your sons [... my son will recognize your son] ... they shall take and shall put him on your throne.

*3. Royal Grant of Succession for Perpetuity: obverse 7b-14

Your son [...] they shall ... him. I My Majesty will not reject your son. I will accept neither your brother nor anyone else. The land of Tarhuntassa that I have given that to you, later your son and your grandson will hold it. They shall not take it away from them. If any son of yours or grandson of yours later commits an offence (*waštai*), the King of Hatti must question him! If an offence is proven against him, the King of Hatti shall do with him as he pleases. If he deserves death, he should be put to death! But they shall not take his house and his land from him. They shall not give it to the line of another. Only someone of the line of Ulmi-Teshub shall take (them). Someone of the male line shall take them; someone of the female line shall not take them. But if there is not a male line (of descent), then it [= property/throne] will be held back/kept in reserve. They must seek someone of the female line of Ulmi-Teshub alone! If he is in a foreign land, they shall bring him back from there, they shall install this one in lordship in the land of Tarhuntassa.

4. Land Boundaries: obverse 15-37

Protect the land which I have given to you, Ulmi-Teshub, and the frontiers which I have established for you. Do not violate them. Your frontiers are established as follows: In the direction of the land of Pitassa, your frontier is Mount Hawa, the *kantanna* of the city of Zarniya, and the city of Sanantarwa, but the *kantanna* of Zarniya belongs to the land of the Hulaya River, while Sanantarwa belongs to the land of Pitassa. In the direction of the border district of the land of Pitassa, his frontier is the sinkhole of the city of Arimmatta, but Arimmatta belongs to the land of Pitassa. In the direction of Mount Huwatnuwanta, his frontier is the *hallapuwanza*, but the *hallapuwanza* belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. Up behind the city of Kursawanta, his frontier is the Stone Monument of the Dog. In the direction of the city of Ussa, his frontier is the city of Zarata, but Zarata belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Wanzataruwa, his frontier is the city of Harazuwa, but Harazuwa belongs to the land of Ussa. On the first treaty tablets his frontier in the direction of Mount Kuwakuwalyatta was the city of Suttasna, but now I, the Great King, have made the city of Santimma his frontier. But Santimma belongs to the land of Hulaya River. In the direction of the cities of Wanzataruwa and Kunzinasa, his frontier is Mount Arlanta and the city of Alana. Alana belongs to the land of the Hulaya River, but the water which is upon Mount Arlanta belongs jointly to Hatti and to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Sinnuwanta, his frontier is Mount Lula, but the city of Ninainta belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. However, the service estate of the golden charioteer, which is behind the city, belongs to My Majesty. In the direction of the city of Zarnusassa, his frontier is the *harmima*, but the *harmima* belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Zarwisa, his frontier is Mount Sarlaimmi and the sinkhole of water [...]. In the direction of the mountain heights, his frontier is the city of Saliya, but Saliya belongs to Hatti. In the direction of foreign territory, his frontier is the city of Walwara and various dependencies of Walwara—Mata, Sanhata, Surimma, Saranduwa, and Tattasi. In the direction of the city of Saranduwa, to whatever locality his armed force should reach—that belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Walma, his frontier is the cities of Alluprata and Huhhura, but these cities belong to the land of the Hulaya River.

*5. Deposition of Treaty and Introduction to Addendum: obverse 38-39

This treaty tablet has already been made, and it shall be placed in Arinna in the presence of the Sun-goddess of Arinna. But his military obligation was not treated on this tablet, so My Majesty subsequently made a tablet of his military obligations as follows.

6. Treaty Obligations and Exceptions: obverse 40-47

[Thus says Hattusili], the Great King, King of Hatti, and the Queen: The King and the Queen made Kuruntiya king in the land of Tarhuntassa. When the King and the Queen examined the treaty obligations, they realized that the divine (= temple) obligations had become too heavy for him to manage. Formerly, when Muwattalli resided in Tarhuntassa (i.e., when his royal seat was located there) and worshipped the gods of Tarhuntassa, all the land of Hatti supported them. But now the King and Queen have made Kuruntiya king in Tarhuntassa, and he has not been able to manage the divine obligations from his land alone. So the King and the Queen have revised the divine obligation within your treaty obligation as follows: His Majesty has remitted the chariotry and infantry of the land of the Hulaya River for which the armory in Hatti holds claim, and in the future only 200 of his men shall go on a Hittite military expedition. Additional troops shall not be sought from him for the armory. These troops have been remitted to him for the corvée and dues obligations. Some personnel the King remitted to him for custodial duties in the temple, some he remitted to him for cultivation, and some he remitted to him for guarding the salt lick. In the future, no one shall contest this decision. But if some king should rise up against His Majesty, then the king of the land of Tarhuntassa himself shall come to his assistance, but absolutely no infantry shall be sought from him. And if some equal should arise against the King, then the king of the land of Tarhuntassa himself shall come to his assistance, but absolutely no infantry or chariotry shall be sought from him.

7. Divine Witnesses: obverse 48-56 + reverse 1-4

7A. In this matter, the Storm-god of Lightning, the Sun-god of Arinna, the Storm-god of Hatti, the Storm-god of Nerik, Ishtar of Samuha, Ishtar of Lawazantiya, and the Thousand Gods of Hatti shall be witnesses.

7B. Since I have made this treaty tablet for you, the Thousand Gods are now summoned to assembly. They shall observe and listen and be witnesses: The Sun-god of Heaven, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, the Storm-god of Heaven, the Storm-god of Hatti, the Storm-god of the Army, the Storm-god of Hisashapa, the Storm-god of Zippalanda, the Storm-god of Nerik, the Storm-god of Aleppo, the Storm-god of Uda, the Storm-god of Sapinuwa, the Powerful Storm-god, the pihaimmi Storm-god, the Storm-god of Lightning, Lulutassi, the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity of Hatti, Ayala, Karzi, Hapantaliya, Sharrumma, Zithariya, Hebat, Queen of Heaven, Ishtar, Ishtar of Nineveh, Ishtar of Hattarina, Ninatta, Kulitta, Nikkal, Ishhara, the Moon-god Lord of the Oaths, the Deity of Arusna, the War-god, the War-god of Hatti, the War-god of Illaya, the War-god of Arziya, Yarri, Zappana, Abara of Samuha, Hantitassu of Hurma, Katahha of Ankuwa, the Queen of Katapa, Ammamma of Tahurpa, Hallara of Dunna, Huwassanna of Hupisna, Lelwani, the mountain-dweller gods, the mercenary gods, the male deities, the female deities, the great sea, the mountains, rivers, and springs of Hatti and of the land of Tarhuntassa.

⁴³ This translation follows Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchungen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995) XX-XXX; Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series, Vol. 7, ed., Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 104-108 (No. 18B).

***8. Curses and Blessings: reverse 5-15**

***8A. And if you, Ulmi-Teshub, do not observe these words of the tablet, or do not protect My Majesty, the Queen, and later the son of My Majesty as overlords, or should alter the words of this tablet, then these Thousand Gods shall eradicate your person, together with your wife, your sons, your land, your house, your threshing floor, your orchards, your fields, your oxen, your sheep, and all your possessions.**

8B. But if you observe the words of this tablet and protect My Majesty, the Queen, and later the son of My Majesty as overlords, and desire only My Majesty, the Queen, and later the son of My Majesty as overlords, then these oath gods shall benevolently protect your person, together with your wife, your son, your land, your house, your threshing floor, your orchard, your fields, your oxen, your sheep, and all your possessions. And you shall live to a good old age in the land of My Majesty.

8C. These oath gods shall eradicate from the Dark Earth, together with his progeny, whoever in this land brings difficulties upon Ulmi-Teshub and takes it away from him (!), or later takes it away from the son or grandson of Ulmi-Teshub, or diminishes his territory, or alters the words of this tablet.

***9. Further Stipulations and Curses: reverse 16-20**

9A. If My Majesty requests a city or some locality from Ulmi-Teshub, he must give it to him with good grace. It is not a matter for coercion. This shall be exempted from the oath. Or if Ulmi-Teshub requests something from My Majesty, My Majesty will give it to him. This shall also be exempted from the oath.

***9B. If he (My Majesty) does not wish to give some city or locality to Ulmi-Teshub, and the Ulmi-Teshub exerts himself and takes it by force, these oath god shall eradicate him from the Dark Earth, together with his progeny.**

10. Document Clause: Reverse 21-22

I have engraved on a tablet of iron that which I, My Majesty, have given to Ulmi-Teshub, king of the land of Tarhuntassa, the frontiers I have established for him, as well as that which I gave to him afterward.

11. Reiteration of Royal Succession: Reverse 23-27

In the future, no one shall take them away from the descendant of Ulmi-Teshub, nor contest them with him at law. The King (of Hatti) shall not take them for himself. He shall not give them to his own son. Nor shall they be given to another descendant (of the Hittite royal family). In the future, only a descendant of Ulmi-Teshub shall hold the kingship of the land of Tarhuntassa. The Storm-god, King of Heaven; the Sun-goddess of Arinna, Lady of the Lands of Hatti; Sharrumma, son of the Storm-god; Ishtar; and the Thousand Gods of this tablet shall eradicate from Hatti—together with his progeny—whoever brings difficulties upon him and takes the land away from him, or alters a single word of this tablet.

12. Human Witnesses: Reverse 28-32

This tablet <was written> in the city of Urikina in the presence of Crown Prince Nerikkaili; Prince Tashmi-Sharrumma; Prince Hannutti; Prince Huzziya; Ini-Teshshup, king of the land of Carcheshmish; Ari-Sharrumma, king of the land of Isuwa; AMAR.MUSHEN, uriyanni, Halpa-ziti, commander of the troops of the right; Prince Heshni; Prince Tattamaru; Prince Uppara-muwa, overseer of the golden grooms; Prince Uhhaziti; Prince Tarhunta-piya; LUGAL.^dLAMMA, commander of the troops of the left; Ali-ziti, chief of the palace servants; Tuttu, chief of the storehouse; Palla, lord of the city of Hurma; Walwa-ziti, chief of the scribes; Alalimi, chief of the cupbearers; Kammaliya, chief of the cooks; and Mahhuzzi, chief of the offering officials.

Comment

The reader's attention is called to §3 (Grant of Royal Succession), from which Weinfeld excerpted an isolated promise which he characterized as an unconditional. Attention is also called to §8 (Curses and Blessings) and §9 (Further Stipulations and Curses), which qualify the promissory language of §3, making clear that the latter was not unconditional. In §3, to be sure, Hattusili promised in seemingly unconditional terms that the throne would never be removed from Kuruntiya's house even if a future descendant might sin (*waštai-*). While the Hittite king might punish the offender, he would never remove the throne from Kuruntiya's line and transfer it to another line. Admittedly, this promise of dynastic succession seems to convey unconditionality. Yet when read in the light of the tablet as a whole, it is difficult to interpret these lines in an unconditional sense.

As following sections make clear, Kuruntiya/Ulmi-Teshub and his dynasty were not entirely free from obligation.⁴⁴ In fact, §8-9 make clear that political defection from the Hittite king would result in destruction of the dynasty.⁴⁵ Following the articulation of various treaty stipulations, Hattusilis warned: “If you, Ulmi-Teshub, do not observe these words of the tablet, or do not protect My Majesty, the Queen, and later the son of My Majesty as overlords, or should alter the words of this tablet, then these Thousand Gods shall eradicate your person, together with your wife, your sons, your land, your house, your threshing floor, your orchards, your fields, your oxen, your sheep, and all your possessions!” (§8, rev. 5-7).⁴⁶ Following the articulation of further stipulations, Hattusili again warned: “If he (My Majesty) does not wish to give some city or some locality to Ulmi-Teshub, and the latter (Ulmi-Teshub) exerts himself and takes it by force, then these oath god shall eradicate him from the Dark Earth, together with his progeny!” (§9, rev. 18-20).⁴⁷ Clearly, the perpetuity of the dynasty was not unconditional, but explicitly contingent on ongoing loyalty. How does one reconcile the seemingly unconditional language of §3 with the explicitly conditional language of §§8-9? By careful attention to the not so subtle distinction in the kinds of infractions being addressed. According to §3, *banal transgression* (*waštai-*) would be punished, but it would not result in forfeiture of the

⁴⁴ See Beckman, "Inheritance and Royal Succession Among the Hittites" in *Kanisṣuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock*, Assyriological Studies 23 (Chicago: Oriental Institute/University of Chicago Press, 1986) 19-20 [13-31]; D.J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, Analecta Biblica 21A (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981) 302-304; E. Cavaignac, "Dadasa-Dattasa," *Revue hittite et asiatique* 10 (1933) 65-76; E. Laroche, "Un point d'histoire: Ulmi-Teshub," *Revue hittite et asiatique* 48 (1947-48) 40-48; T. R. Bryce, "The Boundaries of Hatti and Hittite Border Policy," *Tel Aviv* 13 (1986): 99-101; Theo van den Hout, *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchungen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 34, 48; idem, "A Chronology of the Tarhuntassa-Treaties," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 41:1 (1989) 100-114; O.R. Gurney, "The Treaty with Ulmi-Tesup," *Anatolian Studies* 43 (1993) 13-28; D. Sürenhagen, "Untersuchungen zur Bronzetafel und weitem Verträgen mit Sekundogenitur in Tarhuntassa," *OLZ* 87 (1992) 342-71; Noel Weeks, *Admonition and Curse: The Ancient Near Eastern Treaty/Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relationships*, JSOT Supplement Series, 407 (Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004) 75-78.

⁴⁵ Knoppers, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants," 683; Jon Levenson, "The Davidic Covenant," 211-12.

⁴⁶ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 112.

⁴⁷ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 113.

throne. According to §§8-9, however, *blatant defection* from or *blatant treason* against the Hittite king would result in evacuation of the throne and its transfer to another more worthy dynasty.⁴⁸

Parallels with Davidic Covenant Language

As Weinfeld noted, the language of §3 (Grant of Royal Succession) is strikingly similar to 2 Samuel 7:14-16. However, his characterization of this promise as unconditional was flawed. To be sure, the promise of perpetual dynastic succession (§3) was not explicitly conditioned. However, since explicit conditions (§§8-9) do appear in the final official version of the document, it is not valid to claim that this was unconditional. The final version of this treaty made explicit what was only implicit in the original grant tablet.

It is important to note that the language of §8-9 (Curses for Defection) is similar to 2 Samuel 13:13-15, in which God rejected Saul and his dynasty as punishment for his blatant rejection of Yahweh, replacing him with David--a man after God's own heart. It is also striking similar to 1 Kings 9:4-9, in which God warned Solomon that if he or his sons would defect from Yahweh to worship other gods, He would evacuate the dynastic throne and send the nation into exile.

It is also important to note that--in the face of the evacuation of the dynastic throne due to wickedness--Hattusili III promised to reserve the throne for a worthy heir of Kuruntiya, even if it meant searching for such a one from one end of the earth to the other: "If any son of yours (or) grandson of yours later commits an offence (*waštai-*), the King of Hatti must question him! If an offence is proven (lit. 'it sticks') against him, the King of Hatti shall do with him according to his soul (i.e., shall treat him as he pleases). If he should perish (i.e., deserves death), he should perish (i.e., must be put to death)! But they shall not take his house and his land from him. They shall not give it (= throne) to the line of another. Only someone of the line of Ulmi-Teshub shall take (it) ... But if there is not a male descendant, then it (= throne) will be held back/kept in reserve ... Even if he is in a foreign land, they shall bring him back from there, they shall install this one in lordship in the land of Tarhuntassa" (obverse 9-14). I would like to suggest that this language is strikingly similar to God's promise--in the face of dynastic wickedness and the evacuation of the throne in the Babylonian exile--to reserve the throne of David for a worthy heir, that is, the second David, whom we know as the Messiah (e.g., Isa 11:1, 10; Jer 23:5-6).

4.2.4 Later Treaty of Tudhaliya IV Reaffirming Original Grant of Tarhuntassa to Kuruntiya: CTH 106b.3

When Hattusili died, his son Tudhaliya IV honored the previous grant treaty that his father bestowed on Kuruntiya and issued a renewal of this arrangement.⁴⁹ It constitutes a reaffirmation by Tudhaliya IV of the grant treaty that Hattusili III had originally bestowed upon Kuruntiya.⁵⁰ As a demonstration of the importance of this political arrangement, Tudhaliya IV had his scribes draw up this treaty renewal on a magnificent bronze tablet, which was stored in a prominent location in the royal archives. Known today as the Bronze Tablet, the beauty of this display document attests to its original importance and intent to stand for perpetuity.

This document features the following sections.⁵¹

§1	Preamble
§2	Historical Prologue: rehearsal of original grant treaty
§3	Boundaries of land granted
§4	Stipulations: provisions for temples
§5	Stipulations: mutual loyalty
§6	Relative status of subordinate rulers
§7	Promise of Future Succession
§8	Stipulations: military obligations
§9	Stipulations: remissions of dues
§10	Divine witnesses
§11	Stipulation (loyalty) with Curses and Blessings
§12	Validation Clause: Curses Against Others
§13	Human Witnesses
§14	Deposit of Treaty Tablets

Following the introduction (§1: Preamble), Tudhaliya IV recalled the loyalty Kuruntiya had shown to his father Hattusili III (§2A: Historical Prologue), then reaffirmed the ongoing validity of the original grant treaty (§2B: Grant Treaty Renewal). Tudhaliya also reaffirmed the original boundaries of land that Hattusili III had granted to Kuruntiya in the past (§3: Boundaries). Thereupon, the Hittite king articulated various treaty stipulations (§4-5) and clarified the status of the king of Tarhuntassa relative to the king of Carchemish (§6). After ensuring the succession of future descendants of Kuruntiya to the throne of Tarhuntassa (§7), the Hittite king articulated further treaty stipulations which Kuruntiya and his dynasty

⁴⁸ For example, see Michael Avioz, "Could Saul Rule Forever? A New Look at 1 Samuel 13:13-14," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5 () Article 16.
⁴⁹ The conventional nomenclature of this tablet is: CTH 106B.C = Bo 86/299 = HDT 18c. For discussion, see Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 114-123 (= HDT 18c).
⁵⁰ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 107.
⁵¹ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 114-123.

were obligated to fulfill (§8-9). After calling upon the divine witnesses (§10), Tudhaliya threatened Kuruntiya and his dynasty with curses for disloyalty but blessings for loyalty (§11), at the same time threatening divine curses against any who might curse Kuruntiya and his progeny (§12). Following the list of human witnesses (§13), the treaty closed with a clause concerning the deposit of the tablet in the temple before the goddess of Arinna (§14).

Translation⁵²

§1. Preamble

The words of the Tabarna, Tudhaliya (IV), Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, Hero; son of Hattusili (III), Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, Hero; grandson of Mursuili (II), Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, Hero; great-grandson of Suppiluliuma (I), Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, Hero, ultimate seed and namesake of Tudhaliya (I), Great King, King of the Land of Hatti, Hero.

§2. Historical Prologue

When my father Hattusili (III) became hostile against Urhi-Teshup son of Muwatalli, he removed him from kingship. But no sin struck to Kuruntiya. In whatever way the men of Hatti sinned, Kuruntiya never was involved. Formerly, King Muwatalli had entrusted him to my father Hatusili to raise him. So formerly, my father started raising him. But when my father deposed Urhi-Teshup from kingship, my father took Kuruntiya and installed him in kingship the land of Tarhuntassa. What treaty my father made with him, how he set boundaries for him, my father made treaty tablets for him, Kuruntiya has it (=the treaty tablet).

§3. Land Boundaries

¶A. His boundaries (lit. frontiers) were/are established for him as follows: In the direction of the land of Pitassa, his frontier is Mount Hawa, the kantanna of the city of Zarniya, and the city of Sanantarwa, but the kantanna of Zarniya belongs to the land of the Hulaya River, while Sanantarwa belongs to the land of Pitassa.

¶B. Previously, in the direction of the land of Pitassa, his frontier was the city of Nahhanta. My father pushed back his frontier, and on my father's treaty tablet the sinkholes of the city of Arimmatta are made the frontier. Now I, My Majesty, have reestablished the earlier frontier for him.

¶C. In the direction of the land of Pitassa, in the direction of the border district of the city of Arimmatta, his frontier is the cities of Nahhanta and Hauttassa, but Nahhanta and Hautassa belong to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of Mount Huwatnuwanta, his frontier is the hallapuwanza, but the happapuwanza belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. Up behind the city of Kusawanta, his frontier is the Stone Monument of the Dog.

¶D. In the direction of the city of Ussa, his frontier is the city of Zarata, but Zarata belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the city of Wanzataruwa, his frontier is the city of Harazuwa, but Harazuwa belongs to the land of Ussa. In the direction of Mount Kuwakuwalyatta, the city of Suttasna was made his frontier on my father's first treaty tablets, but it happened that later my father himself made the city Santimma the frontier. But Santimma belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. In the direction of the cities of Wanzataruwa and Kunzinasa, his frontier is Mount Arlanta and the city of Alana. But Alana belongs to the land of the Hulaya river, but the water which is upon Mount Arlanta belongs jointly to the land of the Hulaya River and Hatti.

¶E. In the direction of the city of Sinnuwanta, his frontier is Mount Lula and the Sphinx Mountains, but the city of Ninainta belongs to the land of the Hulaya River. However, the service estate of the golden charioteer, which is behind the city, belongs to My Majesty. In the direction of the city of Zarnusassa, his frontier was the harmima, but I, My Majesty, have made the city of Uppassana his frontier. But Uppassana belongs to the land of the Hulaya River.

¶F. In the direction of the city of Zarwisa, his frontier is Mount Sarlaimmi and the sinkhole of water. In the direction of the mountain heights, his frontier is the cities of Hassuwanta, Mila, Palmata, Hashasa, Sura, and Simmuwanta, but these cities belong to the land of the Hulaya River.

¶G. In the direction of the border district of the city of Hawaliya, his frontier ...

§5A. Stipulations: Obligation of Mutual Loyalty

Now, I Tudhaliya the Great King, before I had became king, the god already had brought together Kuruntiya and me in friendship. Already we were kind and good to each other. We were [men] of an oath: "The one must be loyal to the other!" At that time my father had put an older brother into position as crown prince. At that time he had not yet decided that I should become king. But even at that time Kuruntiya was loyal to me. And he swore to me as follows: "Even if your father does not install you in kingship, in whatever place your father puts you, I will be loyal to you only. I (will be) your servant." I (also) swore to Kuruntiya: "I will be loyal to you." But when my brother whom my father had (previously) placed in <the rank of> crown-prince, (when) he (=my father) deposed him (=my brother), he installed me in kingship. When my father saw the kindness and goodwill between Kuruntiya and me, my father brought us together and made us swear, "The one must be loyal to the other!" My father made us swear and we became individual parties to a mutual oath. Kuruntiya was loyal to me; the oaths, which before me he had sworn, he never broke. I, My Majesty, likewise swore/promised to him: "If the gods recognize/choose me, and (as a result) I become king, there will go good for you on account of me." But when my father at that time died, and when (other) lands "adopted a wait-and-see policy," Kuruntiya at that time risked his life for me for me. He was loyal to me; the oaths, which he had sworn he never broke. When the deity took me, and I became king, I made the treaty (*išḫiul*) with Kuruntiya as follows: I give those cities which do not lie (i.e., are not specified in writing) on the treaty tablet of my father together with field, fallow and citizens, everything to Kuruntiya king of the land of Tarhuntassa as (his) servant(s) ... (lines 62-66)

§5B. Stipulations: Obligation of Mutual Loyalty

For all time, let this treaty exist/be valid for Kuruntiya, king of the land of Tarhuntassa, while Tudhaliya (king) of the land of Hatti will protect the kingship (of Kuruntiya). Let the seed of Tudhaliya protect the seed of Kuruntiya in Tarhuntassa in kingship in the same way. He must not allow him to be killed or demoted. Just as I, Tudhaliya, Great King, am loyal to Kuruntiya, so also must my son and my grandson be loyal to the seed of Kuruntiya. Just as I am loyal to Kuruntiya—if he lacks something, I will compensate him. If something befalls the seed of Kuruntiya, let my son or my grandson compensate him in the same way. He must not allow him to be killed or demoted.

§6. Stipulations: Relative Status to the King of Carchemish

Let there be a treaty for the king of the land of Carchemish with respect to the Great Throne. Let only the crown prince (of Hatti) be greater than the king of the land of Tarhuntassa; but let no one else be greater than him! Whatever (royal insignia or protocol) is allowed to the king of the land of Carchemish, let it be allowed also to the king of the land of Tarhuntassa!

⁵² This translation follows Otten's critical edition. For another convenient translation follows Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series, Volume 7, edited by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 104-108 (No. 18C), 108-117.

§7A. Stipulations: Tudhaliya's Line Must Ensure the Succession/Permanence of Kuruntiya's Descendants

¶A. Concerning what is written on the treaty tablet of my father (=Hattusili III): “The woman whom the (Hittite) queen gives you as a wife, put that son of him in the kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa!” When they made the treaty tablet, that woman, O Kuruntiya, during the time of my father (i.e., during my father's reign), you had not taken (her). Whether now Kuruntiya takes that woman or does not take her, that word (i.e., the aforementioned treaty requirement) will not be enforced. Whatever son Kuruntiya prefers, whether the son of his wife or the son of some other woman, whatever son is the choice of Kuruntiya, whatever son Kuruntiya prefers, let him place him (=the son whom Kuruntiya prefers) in (the position of) kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa. No one may overrule (= determine) this matter for Kuruntiya!

¶B. Let this treaty (*išhiul*) be valid (lit. exist) for Kuruntiya, his son and his grandson. I, My Majesty, will not depose (i.e., throw out) your son. I will never accept your brother or anyone else. The land of Tarhuntassa, which I gave to you, the seed of you alone will possess it. They will not take it away from him.

***¶C. If some son or grandson of yours commits some sin (*waštaiya*), the king of the land of Hatti must examine him, and if an offence is proven (lit. "sticks") against him, then let the king of the land of Hatti do according to his soul. But they may not take from him his household (lit. "house," i.e., his dynasty[?]) and land, nor may he (=the king of Hatti) give it to another descendant/line (i.e., some other descendant of Muwatalli II, such as brother or cousin).**

¶D. Now, concerning the matter of the land of Tarhuntassa which was subsequently formulated as follows: “In the future let no one take away the kingship of the land of Tarhuntassa from the descendants (lit. seed) of Muwatalli.” (If) someone does this (i.e., the following): he gives it (=the land) to another line of Muwatalli, (and) takes it away from the descendant (lit., seed) of Kuruntiya, whoever does that thing, may the storm-god of Hatti and the sun-goddess of Arinna destroy him! In the future, the descendant (lit. seed) of Kuruntiya alone must hold kingship over the land of Tarhuntassa. But let only a descendant on the male side may take it; they must not accept (lit. take) the descendant of a daughter. And if some son or grand-son of Kuruntiya exercises kingship over the land of Tarhuntassa and a misfortune befalls him (lit. “someone”) because of the word of a god (i.e., a god’s decision), and (as a result) he relinquishes the kingship of Tarhuntassa, let them take only a descendant of Kuruntiya, and let them install him in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa. They must not give it to any other descendant! If he has no descendant in the male line, they must search for a descendant of the daughter of Kuruntiya. Even if he (i.e., the male descendant) is in a foreign country, they must bring him back even from there, they must then install him in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa.

§7B. Stipulations: Kuruntiya's Line Must Ensure the Succession/Permanence of Tudhaliya's Descendants

If some seed of Tudhaliya exercises kingship in the land of Hatti, and something befalls him, whatever seed of Kuruntiya exercises kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa he must (be ready/willing to) die for him. Just as Kuruntiya was loyal to Tudhaliya, so also the seed of Kuruntiya likewise must be loyal to the seed of Tudhaliya. The seed of Kuruntiya should also be loyal to the seed of Tudhaliya. He must not allow him to die or be demoted. If something befalls the seed of Tudhaliya, and he must step down from the kingship of the land of Hatti, whatever descendant of Kuruntiya exercises in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa he must make war on the (new) king of Hatti; he must not serve (him).

§8. Stipulations: Kuruntiya Must Provide Troops to Tudhaliya

As the (obligation of the provision of) chariotry and infantry of the Hulaya River Land which the administration holds for you (=Kuruntiya) in Hatti, my father, Hattusili (III), abolished for him (Kuruntiya), and also I, My Majesty, the Great King, abolished it for him. In the future, a troop of 100 foot soldiers supplied by him shall march on a campaign of the land of Hatti. The administration may not seek/demand further troops from him. Whenever they require/requisition a contingent of troops from him, they shall require/requisition (a maximum of) 100 foot soldiers, and there shall not be (any) chariots (required). But if a king of equal power arises against the Hittite king, or if I, My Majesty, launch a campaign from the Lower Land, he may require/requisition a contingent of 200 foot soldiers from him, but they may not serve as garrison troops.

§9. Stipulations: Temple Taxes and Exemptions

Concerning this which my father (=Hattusili III) gave to Kuruntiya and concerning what I, My majesty, gave to him, namely, the treaty (*išhiul*) which we made for him: In the future, let no one change it! When I, My Majesty, reviewed the tax corvée (*šahḫan luzzi*) of the gods of the king of Tarhuntassa (=Kuruntiya): it was too heavy for him; he could not manage it. What divine obligation the king of Tarhuntassa supports in the land of Tarhuntassa, it corresponds to the obligation of Hattusa, of Arinna and of Zippalanda. What my father gave (i.e., imposed upon) to Kuruntiya, and what I imposed, because the support of the ceremonies and provisions for the gods was too burdensome for him, what I, My Majesty, imposed on him (=Kuruntiya), for the sake of the Storm-god, Sarruma son of Tessub, and all the gods of Tarhuntassa, I exempted him from it. Let no one take anything away from him! Let no one subject him to tax (*šahḫan*) and corvée (*luzzi*)! Whoever might take away the kingship of the land of Tarhuntassa from a descendant (lit. seed) of Kuruntiya, or (whoever) might reduce it, or (whoever) might command to abolish it, or what my father and I had given to him (whoever) might take it away from him or (whoever) might change/alter one word of this tablet, from that very same person may the sun-goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Hatti take away the kingship of the land of Hatti!

§10. Divine Witnesses

¶A. In this matter, the Storm-god of Lightning, the Sun-god of Arinna, the Storm-god of Hatti, the Storm-god of Nerik, Ishtar of Samuha, Ishtar of Lawazantiya, and the Thousand Gods of Hatti shall be witnesses. Since I have made this treaty tablet for you, the Thousand Gods are now summoned to assembly.

¶B. They shall observe and listen and be witnesses: The Sun-god of Heaven, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, the Storm-god of Heaven, the Storm-god of Hatti, the Storm-god of the Army, the Storm-god of Hisashapa, the Storm-god of Zippalanda, the Storm-god of Nerik, the Storm-god of Aleppo, the Storm-god of Uda, the Storm-god of Sapinuwa, the Powerful Storm-god, the pihaimmi Storm-god, the Storm-god of Lightning, Lulutassi, the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity of Hatti, Ayala, Karzi, Hapantaliya, Sharrumma, Zithariya, Hebat, Queen of Heaven, Ishtar, Ishtar of Nineveh, Ishtar of Hattarina, Ninatta, Kulitta, Nikkal, Ishhara, the Moon-god Lord of the Oaths, the Deity of Arusna, the War-god, the War-god of Hatti, the War-god of Illaya, the War-god of Arziya, Yarri, Zappana, Abara of Samuha, Hantitassu of Hurma, Katahha of Ankuwa, the Queen of Katapa, Ammamma of Tahurpa, Hallara of Dunna, Huwassanna of Hupisna, Lelwani, the mountain-dweller gods, the mercenary gods, the male deities, the female deities, the great sea, the mountains, rivers, and springs of Hatti and of the land of Tarhuntassa.

***§11. Curses and Blessings**

***¶A. If you, Kuruntiya, do not keep these words of the treaty, and you do not remain loyal to My Majesty or the future descendants (lit. seed) of My Majesty as regards kingship, or if you might desire for yourself the kingship of the land of Hatti, or if someone causes trouble for My Majesty or for the descendants (lit. seed) of My Majesty, and you show favor to him, and you do not make war (lit. do not become hostile) against him, then may these oath-deities destroy you together with your progeny (lit. 'his seed' = his dynasty)!**

¶B. But if you, Kuruntiya, take to heart the words of this tablet, and you desire My Majesty and the future descendants (lit. seed) of My Majesty as regards kingship/lordship, and you are loyal to them, then may these (oath)deities take good care of you, and may you grow old in the benevolent hand of My Majesty.

§12. Validation Clause: Curses Against Anyone Who Curse Kuruntiya

But whoever causes trouble for Kuruntiya in this land, and takes it (=this land) away from him and either later takes it away from the line/descendant of Kuruntiya, or reduces his territory, or what I have given to him, he takes anything from him, or alters even one word of this tablet, may these oath-deities destroy him! Whatever I, My Majesty, have given to Kuruntiya king of the land of Tarhuntassa, and whatever borders I have set for him, no one must ever take these away from the descendants of Kuruntiya. Even the king (of Hatti) must not take it away, and he must not give it/them to his son! He must never give them to another descendant. Let no one contest his right to it! Let only the (direct) line of Kuruntiya's descendants (lit. seed) possess the kingship of the land of Tarhuntassa forever. But if someone causes trouble for him, and takes anything away from him, may these oath-deities destroy him together with his line/descendants/progeny (lit. seed)!

§13. Human Witnesses

Halwa-ziti, the scribe, the son of Lupakki of Ukkiya, inscribed this tablet in the city of Tawa in the presence of the following witnesses: Prince Nerikkaili, Huzziya the chief of the palace guards, Prince Kurakura, Ini-Tesub king of Carchemish, Masturi king of the Seha River Land, Sauska-muwa the king's son-in-law, Uppara-muwa the *anduwassalli*, Tattamaru the chief of the guard of the left side, Prince Ehli-Sarruma, Aba-muwa chief of the chariot drivers, Prince Hesmi-Sarruma, Prince Taki-Sarruma, Prince En-Sarruma, Alalimi chief of the military tribunes, Alantalli king of the land of Mera, Bentesina king of the land of Amurru, Sahurunuwa chief of the wood scribes, Hattusa-LAMMA the field marshal, GAL-dU chief of the chariot drivers, Hursaniya the field marshal, Zuzuhha chief of the chariot warriors, Salikka chief of the guards of the right side, Tapa-ziti the decurio, Tuttu commander of the storehouses, Walwa-ziti chief of the scribes, Kammaliya chief scribe of the kitchen staff, Nana-zi chief of the scribes and overseer of the food-servers — and all sorts of military commanders, magistrates and all the royal family.

§14. Deposit of Treaty Tablets

These tablets were made as seven copies and sealed/impressed with the seals of the sun-goddess of Arinna and the storm-god of Hatti: (1) one tablet was placed before the sun-goddess of Arinna, (2) one before the storm-god of Hatti, (3) one before Lelwani, (4) one before Hebat of Kizzuwatna, (5) one before the storm-god of lightning, (6) one in the king's house before Zithariya, and (7) Kurunta king of Tarhuntassa keeps one in his house.

Comment

The reader's attention is called to §7 (Grant of Royal Succession), in which Tudhaliya reaffirmed the promise of Hattusili III that Kuruntiya's dynasty would endure from one generation to another. In typical fashion, the Hittite king promised in seemingly unconditional terms that his descendants would sit upon his throne in unbroken succession. Like Hattusili III, Tudhaliya promised his loyal servant to never remove the throne his line even if one of his descendants one day might be found guilty of a civil crime. Although the offender would be executed, the dynastic throne would pass to another legitimate descendant of Kuruntiya. Like the parallel passage in the original grant of Hattusili III (CTH 106b.3, obverse 7b-14), this language is striking similar to 2 Samuel 7:14-16. Nevertheless, §11 (Stipulations of Loyalty and Curses for Defection) makes clear that the promise of the perpetuity of Kuruntiya's dynastic throne was not unconditional: "If you, Kurunta, do not observe these words of the tablet, and do not protect My Majesty and later the progeny of My Majesty concerning overlordship, or if you even desire the kingship of Hatti yourself, or if someone brings difficulties upon My Majesty or upon the progeny of My Majesty concerning the kingship of Hatti, and you show him favor and do not combat them, then these oath gods shall eradicate you together with your progeny." How do we reconcile the seemingly unconditional promise of §7 (Grant of Succession) with the explicitly conditional threat of §11 (Curses for Defection)? Quite simply. It was one thing to violate civil law, it was another matter altogether to commit treason against the Hittite king. Obedience to the obligations would guarantee the perpetuity of Kuruntiya's dynasty; defection could bring about the end of his dynasty. And as the course of historical events actually unfolded, when Kuruntiya did attempt to usurp the throne, he was deposed and sent into exile. Tudhaliya brought a swift end to his dynasty and Kuruntiya spent his last days in exile. The grant was hardly unconditional!

5.0 Conclusion

It should be clear by now that Weinfeld dramatically overstated matters when suggesting the royal throne grant bestowed by Hattusili III to Kuruntiya was a parade example of an unconditional covenant. I agree with the assessment of Gary Knoppers: "Close study of the historical and literary setting of royal grants indicates most are actually conditional ... Royal grants are not predominantly unconditional."⁵³ Richard Hess also put it well: "Such grants are found throughout the ancient Near East in Hittite, Ugaritic, and Akkadian. Although they have been used as sources for comparisons with biblical covenants of Abraham and David, their form is not fixed (unlike the suzerain-vassal treaties) nor can they be described as unconditional."⁵⁴ In a recent essay on the Davidic Covenant, J.J.M. Roberts similarly concluded: "the unconditionality of the land grants has been vastly overstated ... and it is clear that in most cases, whether explicitly stated or not, the crown reserved the right to redistribute the land, depending on the continuing loyalty of the vassal and his descendants. In contrast to the suzerainty treaty model, which does help explain numerous features in

⁵³ Gary Knoppers, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996) 670 [670-697].

⁵⁴ Richard S. Hess, "The Book of Joshua as a Land Grant," *Biblica* 83 (2002) 493-506.

the Mosaic covenant, the land grant model simply highlights elements already obvious in the promises to David without explaining them, and given the weaknesses, pointed out by Knoppers, the model probably should be abandoned."⁵⁵

What does this say about whether the Davidic covenant is conditional or unconditional? This paper has not actually addressed that issue directly. It simply suggests that identifying 2 Samuel 7:8-16 in general and 7:14-16 in particular as an unconditional covenant cannot be made simply on the basis of its classification as a biblical example of a royal throne grant. Since Weinfeld's failed to demonstrate that ancient Near Eastern royal throne grants were unconditional, mere identification of the literary form of the Davidic covenant as a royal throne grant cannot be the determinative factor whether it is unconditional. Determination of whether any biblical covenant is unconditional or conditional must be based upon careful examination of the actual biblical contents in the light of their literary context. Form criticism should not trump biblical content. While the comparative method can be extremely helpful to exegesis when used in a disciplined manner, its undisciplined use can be dangerous. Weinfeld's mishandling of ancient Near Eastern royal grants is perhaps one of the most egregious examples of how an undisciplined use of ancient Near Eastern literature can create widespread misunderstanding of biblical texts, such as God's covenant promise to David.

⁵⁵ J.J.N. Roberts, "Davidic Covenant," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Historical Books*, eds., Bill T. Arnold and H.G.M. Williamson (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005) 209 [206-211].

Appendix 1:
Grant Treaty of Murshilish II of Hatti with Kupanta-Kurunta of Tarhuntassa
(CTH 68 = HDT 11)

Weinfeld cites this Hittite royal throne grant as a prime example of a promissory covenant that shares terminology with Nathan’s dynastic oracle to David (2 Sam. 7:13-14).⁵⁶ Yet careful inspection of this royal throne grant document reveals that it is not merely promissory in nature, but also obligatory. Although Murshilish of Hatti places Kupanta-Kurunta (aka Kupanta-KAL) on the throne of Mira in typical royal grant fashion, he makes clear that the ongoing perpetuity of this grant would be contingent on his compliance with numerous obligations. The literary structure of this royal grant document follows: (1) preamble, §1; (2) historical prologue, §2-8; (3) land boundaries, §9-10; (4) stipulations: loyalty to king of Hatti, §11-27; (5) document clause/reading, §28; (6) divine witnesses, §29-31.⁵⁷ The lengthiest portion of this text is the stipulation section, where we find ten sets of obligations that Kupanta-Kurunta must fulfill. Each concludes with the stereotypical formula, “If you [do not observe such-and-such an obligation], you will have offended before the gods and you will have transgressed the oath; the oath gods shall pursue you unrelentingly.”⁵⁸ Murshilish also warns Kupanta not to defect from his rule by declaring independence, since Murshilish then would be released from his self-oath and free to attack Kupanta. So while Murshilish placed Kupanta on the throne of Mira as reward for past loyalty, the stipulations demanded continued loyalty and his threats were designed to elicit this. In fact, Murshilish explicitly states that this royal grant arrangement did not merely reward Kupanta for past loyalty, but obligated him to demonstrate continued loyalty: “As you have stood on the side of My Majesty, you must continue to stand only on the side of My Majesty.”⁵⁹

Weinfeld also suggested that the royal throne grant given by Murshilush II to Kupanta-Kurunta was a prime example of unconditionality.⁶⁰ In this grant document Murshilish II reaffirmed the right of Kupanta-Kurunta to inherit the throne in spite of the sins of his father Mashuiluwa. As Weinfeld saw it, this reaffirmation indicates that this grant was unconditional. Unfortunately, this is an oversimplification. Let us briefly summarize the contents of this grant document, which, technically speaking is a second generation “grant reaffirmation” text.

According to the historical prologue, Murshilish conquered the entire land of Arzawa and bestowed a royal grant of kingship on his loyal servant Mashuiluwa over the territory of Mira. Since Mashuiluwa did not have a son of his own, Murshilish allowed him to appoint Kupanta-Kurunta his nephew as heir to his throne. Later, Mashuiluwa rebelled against Murshilish in an act of treason, but Murshilish captured him and removed him from the throne (Murshilish explains that he had the right to kill Mashuiluwa, but simply removed him from the throne. Murshilish explains that he showed mercy to him because Mashuiluwa was married to his sister, that is, Mashuiluwa was the brother-in-law of Murshilish). Murshilish also explains that he had every right to disinherit Kupanta-Kurunta his heir from the throne as punishment for his father’s act of treason. Nevertheless, Murshilish showed mercy by placing Kupanta-Kurunta on his father’s throne (since he was a member of the Hittite royal family as adopted son of the sister of Murshilish).⁶¹

Because Mashuiluwa had no son, and took you, Kupanta-Kurunta, the son of his brother, as his son—Are you, Kupanta-Kurunta, not aware that if in Hatti someone commits the offense of revolt, the son of whatever father commits the offense is an offender too? And that they take the house of his father away from him and give it to someone else or take it for the palace? Now, because your father, Mashuiluwa, committed an offense, and because you, Kupanta-Kurunta, were Mashuiluwa's son, even if you were in no way an offender, could they not have taken the house of your father and your land away from you and given it to someone else? I could have made someone else lord in the land.⁶²

In the next section, Murshilish graciously reaffirmed the original royal grant by allowing Kupanta-Kurunta to inherit his father’s throne. Yet Murshilish called Kupanta-Kurunta to be loyal to him, warning him to not rebel as Mashuiluwa had done.⁶³

Now I, My Majesty, have not mistreated you, Kupanta-Kurunta, in any way. I have not turned you out. I have not taken the house of your father or the land away from you. I have given the house of your father and your land back to you, and I have installed you in lordship for the land. I have given you the land of Mira and the land of Kuwaliya. The borders shall be the same for you as they were in the time of Mashuiluwa.⁶⁴

In the next section of this grant reaffirmation tablet, Murshilish stressed that he had been gracious to Kupanta-Kurunta to place him on the throne, but that he reserved the right to destroy Kupanta-Kurunta (and probably transfer the throne to a loyal servant from another family altogether) if he rebelled in the future. Murshilish issued a series of stipulations along with blessings for loyalty but curses for rebellion. Murshilish repeatedly warns Kupanta-Kurunta: “If you offend the gods and transgress the oath, the oath gods shall pursue you unrelentingly” (eight times). The concluding

⁵⁶ Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant,” 189.

⁵⁷ Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series, 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 74-82 (HDT No. 11).

⁵⁸ CTH 68 A i 34; C ii 25’; C iii 21; B iii 30’; A iii 12; D iv 18’; E iv 33’; G ii 8’. See Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 76-81 (§12-27).

⁵⁹ CTH 68 E iv 26-27. For a convenient translation, see Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 79 (§21 lines 10-11).

⁶⁰ Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant,” 189.

⁶¹ Amnon Altman, *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*, 147-48.

⁶² Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 69-77 (No. 11).

⁶³ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 69.

⁶⁴ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 69-77 (No. 11).

curse section twice warns that if Kupanta-Kurunta joins an enemy coalition (as Mashuiluwa had), Murshilish will be free from this oath of benevolence and will become his enemy:

But if you, Kupanta-Kurunta, defect from My Majesty [] as overlord, offend against My Majesty in some way, and defect from him []. Then I, My Majesty, will not back you in this matter. It (this scenario) shall be exempted from the oath []. But if you, Kupanta-Kurunta, offend My Majesty in some way, and attempt to harm My Majesty, you will forfeit my support. How did Mashuiluwa act? He offended My Majesty and then defected from him. But his own subjects took the side of My Majesty, saying as follows, "You have offended His Majesty, but we are the subjects of His Majesty alone." And if you, Kupanta-Kurunta, act like this, your subjects will defect from you and take the side of My Majesty. I will not back you in this matter. It (this scenario) shall be exempted from the oath ... I shall be your enemy.⁶⁵

When the document is read as a whole, it is clear that this royal grant was not unconditional. Murshilish honored his original covenant promise to Mashuiluwa to place his son Kupanta-Kurunta on the throne—in spite of the defection of Mashuiluwa. As Murshilish emphasized, he had every right to kill Mashuiluwa for defecting and to abolish his dynasty. Yet he graciously chose to show mercy because Mashuiluwa repented, and more importantly, because he was a member of the royal family—the husband of Murshilish's own sister. As a sheer expression of mercy, he allowed Kupanta-Kurunta to take the throne of his father. Yet Murshilish warned that if Kupanta-Kurunta defected like his father had done, the great king would be free from his covenant oath and become his enemy. Free to treat him like any other recalcitrant vassal, we are justified in understanding that Murshilish would depose/kill Kupanta-Kurunta and terminate his dynasty.

⁶⁵ Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 69-77 (No. 11).

Appendix 2: On the Comparative Method

In recent years, biblical scholars have become more acutely aware of both the promises and the pitfalls of the comparative method.⁶⁶ Used in a disciplined manner, the comparative method can help the modern reader become more sensitive to the basic form and features of a particular genre that the Hebrew Scriptures share with ancient Near Eastern literature. But it can be abused when the undisciplined interpreter superimposes a concept derived from an ancient Near Eastern text that is foreign to the intended meaning of the biblical text.⁶⁷ Recognizing the need for a balanced approach, John Walton recently published a helpful set of criteria for using the comparative approach in a disciplined manner.⁶⁸ One of his criteria is that any particular ancient Near Eastern text must be correctly understood on its own terms before any attempt is made to use it for comparative purposes in the exegesis of any particular biblical Hebrew text. After all, if the ancient Near Eastern parallel is not correctly understood on its own terms, its comparative use will likely lead to faulty interpretation of the parallel biblical Hebrew text. Walton's ten principles are as follows:

1. Both similarities and differences must be considered
2. Similarities may suggest a common cultural heritage or cognitive environment rather than borrowing
3. It is not uncommon to find similarities at the surface but differences at the conceptual level and vice versa
4. All elements must be understood in their own context as accurately as possible before cross-cultural comparisons are made (i.e., careful background study must precede comparative study)
5. Proximity in time, geography, and spheres of cultural contact all increase the possibility of interaction leading to influence
6. A case for literary borrowing requires identification of likely channels of transmission
7. The significance of differences between two pieces of literature is minimized if the works are not the same genre
8. Similar functions may be performed by different genres in different cultures
9. When literary or cultural elements are borrowed, they may in turn be transformed into something quite different by those who borrowed them
10. A single culture will rarely be monolithic, either in a contemporary cross-section or in consideration of a passage in time

⁶⁶ For example, see Helmer Ringgren, "Remarks on the Method of Comparative Methodology," in Hans Goedicke, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971) 407-411; Shemaryahu Talmon, "The 'Comparative Method' in Biblical Interpretation: Principles and Problems," in F.E. Greenspahn, ed., *Essential Papers on Israel and the Ancient Near East* (New York: New York University Press, 1991) 402 ff; John Tigay, "On Evaluating Claims of Literary Borrowing," in M. Cohen, ed. et al., *The Tablet and the Scroll* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993) 250-55; William W. Hallo, "Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Their Relevance for Biblical Exegesis," in William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr., eds., *The Context of Scripture, Volume 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2003) xxiii-xxviii; John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006) 15-42.

⁶⁷ Admittedly, this raises the question of what constitutes "the intended meaning" of the biblical text. However, what I have in mind is the situation in which the modern reader superimposes an erroneous interpretation on the biblical text due to an overzealous use of the comparative method.

⁶⁸ John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006) 26-27; idem, "Cultural Background of the Old Testament," in David Dockery, K. Matthews and R. Sloan, eds., *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Broadman/Holman, 1994) 256.