

# KANIŠŠUWAR

A TRIBUTE TO  
HANS G. GÜTERBOCK

ON HIS  
SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY

May 27, 1983

*Edited by*

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

*and*

GARY M. BECKMAN



THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*ASSYRIOLOGICAL STUDIES · No. 23*

CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

# INHERITANCE AND ROYAL SUCCESSION AMONG THE HITTITES\*

GARY BECKMAN

*Yale University*

Let only a prince of the first rank, a son, become king! If there is no first-rank prince, then whoever is a son of the second rank—let this one become king! If there is no prince, no (male) heir, then whoever is a first-rank daughter—let them take a husband for her, and let him become king!<sup>1</sup>

While this, our only general statement of the principles of royal succession in Ḫatti, is straightforward, it is contained in the late Old Kingdom Proclamation of Telepinu (CTH 19), and it is presented there as a reform. Consequently there has been ample room for scholarly debate concerning the character of the rules of succession to the Hittite throne in force before Telepinu's edict. Two of the most influential interpretations of the relevant Old Hittite material have been that suggesting an elective kingship, a position which I have discussed and dismissed elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> and that supporting a matrilineal succession.<sup>3</sup>

\*In the preparation of this study I have made use of the lexical files of the Hittite Dictionary Project of the Oriental Institute, access to which was generously granted by the co-editors of the Project, Professor Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., and the *Jubilar*. I am honored to contribute this piece to a volume in celebration of Professor Güterbock, who has taught me much—through his writings, through conversations concerning my research, and through his example.

1. KBo 3.1 ii 36–39 (with restorations from KBo 7.15 + KBo 12.4 ii 11ff.):

36. LUGAL-uš-ša-an ḫa-an-te-ez-zi-ya-aš-pát DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-RU ki-ik-k[(i-iš-)]ta-ru ták-ku DUMU.LU[GAL]

37. ḫa-an-te-ez-zi-iš NU.GÁL nu ku<sup>1</sup>-iš ta-a-an pé-e-da-aš DUMU-RU nu LUGAL-uš a-pa-a-aš

38. ki-ša-ru ma-a-an DUMU.LUGAL-ma DUMU.NITA NU.GÁL nu ku-iš DUMU.SAL ḫa-an-te-ez-zi-iš

39. nu-uš-ši-iš-ša-an LÚan-ti-ya-an-ta-an ap-pa-a-an-du nu LUGAL-uš a-pa-a-aš ki-š[(a-ru)]

2. JAOS 102 (1982) 435–42.

3. This position is set forth most fully by K. K. Riemschneider in H. Klengel, ed., *Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des Alten Vorderasien* (1971) 79–102 (hereafter BSS), based largely on

In addition to analysis of the events narrated by the historical sources of the Old Kingdom, evidence adduced for this latter view includes the independent position within Hittite society of the woman bearing the title Tawananna,<sup>4</sup> the enigmatic self-reference of Ḫattušili I in his annals (CTH 4) as “the brother’s son of Tawananna” (ŠA <sup>t</sup>*Ta-wa-an-na-an-na* DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU),<sup>5</sup> and the important role played by goddesses in the Hittite pantheon. I will offer my own interpretation of most of these questions in the course of this paper, but I must remark here that the position of female deities within a religious system is hardly a direct reflection of the power or influence enjoyed by human females within that society.<sup>6</sup>

Matrilineality within a social group in which political power is hereditary and exercised by males entails the succession to a man’s property and/or office by the son of his sister.<sup>7</sup> I do not believe that such a system obtained in Ḫatti in any period. Indeed, the very vocabulary employed in connection with royalty in Hittite texts indicates a patrilineal succession. Note first of all the New Hittite royal genealogies which stress direct descent in the male line. For example, Ḫattušili III identifies himself at the beginning of his “Apology” (CTH 81) as:

---

studies of the Soviet scholar Dovgjalov (cited p. 80, n. 5) inaccessible to me. Many writers have imputed some degree of matriarchy and/or matrilineality to Old Hittite society—see, for example, A. Goetze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer* (1936) 63, KI 92ff.; G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Atti-AccTosc* 23 (1958/59) 116; J. G. Macqueen, *AnSt* 9 (1959) 171–88; F. Cornelius, *XIX<sup>e</sup> CRRAI* 325; R. Lebrun, *Hethitica* 3 (1979) 112; and V. Haas, *KN* 315–18, *WZKM* 69 (1977) 150–56, *Hethitische Berggötter und hurritische Steindämonen* (1982) 12, 43f., 63ff. As M. Liverani, *OA* 16 (1977) 118f. with n. 48, points out, discussion of this problem has been carried out largely within the context of modern racialist mythology. For a particularly striking formulation, see F. Hančar, *AfO* 13 (1939/41) 289.

4. This point is stressed particularly by Macqueen, *AnSt* 9 (1959) 184ff. On this office for females, see S. R. Bin-Nun, *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom*, *THeth* 5 (1975) esp. pp. 11–29, but note my comments, *JAOS* 98 (1978) 513–14.

5. Preserved fully only in KBo 10.2 i 3. The duplicate KBo 10.3:2 has [DUMU ŠE]Š-ŠU, while the Akkadian KBo 10.1 obv. 1 preserves only *ša<sup>t</sup>Ta-w[a- . . .]*.

6. A “forerunner” to the alleged Hittite matriarchy is not to be found in the occasional rule of native princesses (*rubātum*)—among a great majority of princes—in the Anatolian towns of Ankuwa, Kaneš, Luḫušaddiya, and Waḫšušana during the Old Assyrian period. No historian would see matriarchy or a matrilineal rule of succession in sixteenth-century England, based on the reign of Elizabeth I. See M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies, Mesopotamia* 4 (1976) 121, n. 44, who suggests that the attested princesses were the widowed surviving members of original ruling pairs. Cf. also Bin-Nun, *THeth* 5:11–14.

7. On matrilineality see J. Gould and W. L. Kalb, eds., *Dictionary of the Social Sciences* (1964) 416–17.

**Ḫattušili**, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḫatti; son of **Muršili**, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḫatti; grandson of **Šuppiluliuma**, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḫatti; descendant<sup>8</sup> of **Ḫattušili**, King of **Kuššar**.<sup>9</sup>

Such genealogies could, of course, be adduced in great numbers.<sup>10</sup>

Secondly, in the description of the actual assumption of royal office, the most frequently employed terminology—after such obvious and unhelpful locutions as “be or become king”—is:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ INA \} \\ \{ ANA \} \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ \text{GI}^{\text{S}}\text{GU.ZA} \} \\ \{ \text{GI}^{\text{S}}\text{ŠÚ.A} \} \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ \text{ABĪYA/ŠU} \} \\ \{ \text{LUGAL-UTTI} \} \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ eš-/WAŠĀBŪ \} \\ \{ ELŪ \} \end{array} \right\}$$

LUGAL-uizni

“to sit on<sup>11</sup>/go up to the throne of the father/of kingship.” That is, “throne of the father” and “throne of kingship” are interchangeable terms. There is no apparent development through time in the use of this vocabulary.<sup>12</sup>

I proceed to a closer examination of the Hittite sources:

If within a particular society tenure of a political office is hereditary, its transmission from generation to generation ought to follow for the most part the rules in force for other types of property. Of course, the office of king is special in at least two respects—it is non-divisible, unlike most other forms of property, and its “ownership” is of great interest to many members of the society beyond those individuals who actually transfer it. Therefore some special rules may govern its inheritance, but the general principles applicable within a society—e.g., patrilineality or matrilineality, strict primogeniture or parental choice—will be in force here also.<sup>13</sup>

Despite the small amount of material available for the study of Hittite inheritance practice, we may be certain that it was patrilineal. While no para-

8. On ŠĀ.BAL.BAL see StBoT 24 (tr. Nachfahre on p. 3, Nachkomme on pp. 31, 111):34. [Ed.—Note that in Ḫatt iv 86–7 the ŠĀ.BAL.BAL must be of *both* Ḫattušili and Puduḫepa.]

9. KUB 1.1 + 19.62 i 1–4 and dupls. (Ḫatt)—see StBoT 24:4f.

10. Similarly, scribes often employ patronymics in colophons—see E. Laroche, ArOr 19 (1949) 10ff.—as do other individuals on occasion, e.g., KUB 26.58 obv. 6 (cf. rev. 4a): <sup>m</sup>GAL-<sup>d</sup>IM-aš-ma DUMU <sup>m</sup>Kán-t[u-uz-zi-li].

11. (*haššuiznani*) *ašatar*, “seating (in kingship),” seems to have been the general Hittite expression for the installation of the monarch. Note the oracles carried out concerning LUGAL-iz-na-ni a-ša-a-tar (KUB 23.13), and the EZEN a-ša-an-na-aš (KUB 18.36:19f.). See A. Ünal, THeth 6:15, for a complete list of relevant oracles. For *ašatar/ašanna* in the meaning “to seat” cf. Hoffner, JAOS 103 (1983) 192.

12. See Appendix.

13. See J. Goody in id., ed., *Succession to High Office* (1966) 1ff., and cf. Liverani, OA 16 (1977) 118.

graph of the Hittite Laws focuses on inheritance, there are several sections dealing with the closely related problem of marriage. §27 reads:

If a man takes a wife and carries her [to his house], he takes her dowry along. If the woman [should die] t[here], then he, the man, will bur[n] her (personal) goods, (but) her dowry he shall take for himself. If she should die in (her) paternal household [. . . ?] (and) she has a male child, the man shall no[t take] her dowry.<sup>14</sup>

Whatever the significance of the incineration of the personal effects, it is clear from this law that normal marriage was virilocal, with the dowry of a deceased wife devolving upon her husband or upon her children,<sup>15</sup> if she had remained in her paternal household. This is in keeping with patrilineality, as is §46 of the Laws, which stipulates that a man who has received the lesser portion of a piece of landed property as an inheritance (*iwaru*<sup>16</sup>) should not be responsible for the services due to the state, but that these should be rendered “from his paternal household” (*IŠTU É ABIŠU*—KBo 6.2 ii 40 and dupls.).<sup>17</sup> Note here also the levirate marriage set forth in §193:

If a man has a woman (as his wife), and (that) man dies, his brother will take his wife. Then his father will take her. When secondly his father also dies, the son of his brother will take the wife whom he had. It is not an offense.<sup>18</sup>

A final law concerned with marriage is §36:

14. KBo 6.5 ii and dupls.:

4. *ták-ku LÚ-aš DAM-ŠU da-a-i na-a[n pá-r-na-aš-ša]*
5. *pé-e-ḫu-te-ez-zi i-wa-ru-uš-ši-[(it-az)]*
6. *an-da pé-e-da-a-i ták-ku SAL-za [(a-)pí-ya a-ki]*
7. *na-aš LÚ-aš a-aš-šu-še-et BIL-n[u-zi<sup>?</sup> (i-wa-ru-še-ta-áz)]*
8. *LÚ-aš da-a-i ták-ku [a]d-da-aš É-[(ri a-ki)]*
9. *DUMU.NITA-ši i-wa-ru-ši-it LÚ-aš Ú-U[L da-a-i]*

On the interpretation of this paragraph, see Hoffner, *AlHeth* 33.

15. Probably not only a male heir as in the text quoted—the older dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 3 has *DUMU.MEŠ-Š[U]* in place of *DUMU.NITA* here.

16. As Goetze, K1 105 and 113 recognized, an *iwaru* could be bestowed by a father upon either a son or a daughter. In fact, the *iwaru* seems to have constituted the share of the family estate due to a child leaving the paternal household before his father has died (so Hoffner, *Hittite Laws* [1964] 301f.). In the case of a woman this would be her dowry.

17. Cf. F. Imparati, *JESHO* 25 (1982) 233.

18. KBo 6.26 iii:

40. *ták-ku LÚ-iš SAL-an ḫar-zi ta LÚ-iš a-ki DAM-SÚ*
41. *ŠEŠ-ŠU da-a-i ta-an A-BU-ŠU da-a-i*
42. *ma-a-an ta-a-an A-BU-ŠU-ya a-ki SAL-na-an-na ku-in ḫar-ta*
43. *(DUMU) ŠEŠ-ŠU da-a-i Ú-UL ḫa-ra-tar*

If a slave pays the "bride-price"<sup>19</sup> for a free young man and takes him as an *antiyant*-husband (for his daughter), no one shall alienate him (i.e., the young man) (from the household of the slave).<sup>20</sup>

As several scholars have already noted,<sup>21</sup> reflected here is a practice similar to the Mesopotamian *erēbu*-marriage<sup>22</sup> by which the father of the bride pays, rather than receives, the "bride-price," and the bride-groom therefore becomes a member of the wife's family in inversion of the usual custom. Thus when Queen Ašmunikal endows a mausoleum estate with what she intends as a permanent population of workers, she forbids to this group any alienation of its younger members through "bridship or *antiyant*-ship."<sup>23</sup>

*antiyant*-marriage is otherwise known in Hatti from one of the versions of the Illuyanka myth<sup>24</sup> and from the Old Hittite Inandik tablet.<sup>25</sup> In this latter legal document, an important person by the name of Tuttulla, whose own son has been dedicated to the priesthood of a deity and thus removed from normal societal relationships, gives his daughter in marriage to the man Zidi. At the same time Tuttulla adopts Zidi as his son. Any future legal challenge by the physical son of Tuttulla and his descendants to the ownership of Tuttulla's property by Zidi and his offspring is forbidden.

19. On *kušata* see most recently J. J. S. Weitenberg, IF 80 (1975) 67f.

20. KBo 6.3 ii:

27. *ták-ku* IR-iš A-NA DUMU.NITA EL-LIM ku-ú-ša-ta pí-d[a-iz-:]zi

28. *na-an* LÚan-ti-ya-an-ta-an e-ep-zi na-an-kán pa-ra-a [Ú-]UL ku-iš-ki tar-na-i

21. See K. Balkan, Dergi 6 (1948) 147–52; Güterbock, Cor.Ling. 64, MAW 152; Hoffner, Or 35 (1966) 393f.

22. See most recently C. H. Gordon, FsLacheman 155–60. Despite Kammenhuber's objections—HW<sup>2</sup> 108f.—LÚ*antiyant*- must be understood as a participle of *anda(n) iya-*, i.e., "the one entering." Even if Kammenhuber is correct in her view that *anda(n)* is not attested with certainty as a preverb with *iya-*, the Hittite term is probably a calque on Akkadian *erēbu* and thus may not reflect correct Hittite usage. For an example of an *erēbu*-marriage at Kaneš, see K. Veenhof, CRRAI 25 (1978) = BBVO 1 (1982) 151.

23. KUB 13.8 i:

13. A-NA LÚ.MEŠ É.NA<sub>4</sub>-ya-kán AŠ-ŠUM É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A-TIM an-da-an pé-eš-kán-du

14. pa-ra-a-ma-kán DUMU.NITA DUMU.SAL AŠ-ŠUM É.GI<sub>4</sub>.A-TIM LÚan-da-i-ya-an-da-an-ni-ya le-e

15. ku-iš-ki pa-a-i

Let them give (their daughters) for the purpose of bridship internally, to the men of the mausoleum (estate)! Let no one give out(side of the estate) a male or female youth for bridship or *antiyant*-ship!

24. See Hoffner in H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts, eds., *Unity and Diversity* (1975) 137f., and, in general, BiOr 37 (1980) 200.

25. K. Balkan, *Inandik* (1973). The text is transliterated and translated into German on pp. 41–44.

Inheritance of property in the male line is clear, but what of a situation in which there were several children? The royal documents conferring land upon an individual speak only of its devolution upon posterity in general,<sup>26</sup> but the Šahurunuwa text (CTH 225)<sup>27</sup> of the Empire period records the *ante mortem* gift by this high courtier of many scattered properties to the sons of his daughter (obv. 8ff.). Also mentioned in passing is a previous donation to his own sons of much land (obv. 4–7). This tablet reveals the possibility of choice by a man in the disposition of his property among his heirs, and it possibly also indicates that a daughter could not inherit land in her own right.<sup>28</sup>

Turning to the inheritance of the office of King of Ḫatti, a subject most easily studied through injunctions to vassals in treaties, we see again that most texts speak only generally of the posterity of the overlord. Thus Muršili II informs Duppi-Tešub of Amurru:

I have hereby caused you to swear an oath in regard to the King of Ḫatti, to the Land of Ḫatti, and to my sons, (and) my grandsons . . . You, Duppi-Tešub, must protect the King of Ḫatti, the Land of Ḫatti, my sons, (and) my grandsons in the future!<sup>29</sup>

Other treaties, however, indicate that the incumbent King of Ḫatti might exercise a choice. Šuppiluliuma I enjoins one vassal:

Now you, Ḫuqqana, recognize only My Majesty in regard to lordship! My son of whom I, My Majesty, say: "Let everyone recognize this one," and whom I thereby distinguish among (his brothers)—you, Ḫuqqana, recognize him!<sup>30</sup>

26. E.g., KBo 5.7 (= LS 1) rev. 48: *UR-RA-AM ŠE-E-RA-AM ŠA* <sup>4</sup>*Ku-wa-at-ta-al-la A-NA DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU MA-AM-MA-A-AN LA-A I-RA-AG-GUM*, "In the future no one shall contest (the property) with the sons or grandsons (or, 'children or grandchildren') of Kuwattalla." On these clauses in the royal land donations, see Riemschneider, MIO 6 (1958) 332ff.

27. KUB 26.43 + KBo 22.56 and dupl., edited by Imparati, RHA XXXII (1974).

28. See Imparati, op. cit. 16. That a woman could *hold* property, however, is clear from KBo 5.7, cited above in n. 26, a royal grant in favor of the "maid" (SAL.SUḪUR.LAL) Kuwattalla. Cf. also Law §171, where a (widowed?) mother seemingly disinherits her son—see H. C. Melchert, JCS 31 (1979) 62–64, and R. Haase, RIDA 17 (1970) 63f.

29. KBo 5.9 i:

21. *nu-ut-ta ka-a-aš-ma A-NA LUGAL KUR* <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-at-ti KUR* <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-a[t-ti]*

22. *Ḫ A-NA DUMU.MEŠ-YA DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-YA* *še-er li-in-ga-nu-nu-un*

27. . . . *zi-ik-ma* <sup>m</sup>*Dup-pi-ḪU-aš*<sup>1</sup>(Text: -AN) LUGAL KUR <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-at-ti*

28. *KUR* <sup>URU</sup>*Ḫa-at-ti DUMU.MEŠ-YA DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-YA* *zi-la-du-wa pa-aḫ-ši*

See J. Friedrich, SV 1:12f.

30. KBo 5.3 i:

8. *nu-za zi-ik* <sup>m</sup>*Ḫu-uq-qa-na-a-aš* <sup>d</sup>*UTU-ŠI-pát AŠ-ŠUM BE-LU-TIM* *ša-a-ḫk*

and the same ruler informs another subordinate king:

Whichever son of his My Majesty speaks of to Šunaššura for kingship, Šunaššura will guard that one.<sup>31</sup>

Therefore inheritance of the office of king, as well as of other property, was in the male line and was subject to the will of the previous holder as to its disposition within the group of eligibles.<sup>32</sup> The texts just quoted date from the Empire period, well after the promulgation of the Telepinu Proclamation.<sup>33</sup>

9. DUMU-YA-ya ku-in <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI te-mi ku-u-un-wa-za hu-u-ma-an-za ša-a-ak-du  
 10. na-an-kán iš-tar-na te-ek-ku-uš-ša-mi nu-za zi-iq-qa <sup>m</sup>Hu-uq-qa-na-a-š  
 11. a-pu-u-un ša-a-a[k]

See Friedrich, SV 2:106f.

31. KBo 1.5 i:

57. . . . a-i-ú-me-e  
 58. <sup>d</sup>UTU-ši DUMU.NITA-šu a-na LUGAL-ru-tim ša a-na <sup>m</sup>Šu-na-aš-šu-ra  
 59. i-qa-ab-bi <sup>m</sup>Šu-na-aš-šu-ra šu-ú-tam a-na LUGAL-ru-tim i-na-aš-ar-šu

See E. Weidner, PD 94f.

32. See already Otten, MIO 5 (1957) 27, n. 5, and below, n. 59.

33. Not surprisingly, rules of succession in the appanage kingdoms of Ḫatti were similar to practices involving the Great Kingship. The treaty between Tuthaliya IV and Ulmi-Tešub of Tarḫuntašša (CTH 106) well demonstrates that the kingship was hereditary, and that the male line had precedence. KBo 4.10 obv.:

9. ma-a-an DUMU-KA DUMU.DU[MU-KA kat<sup>?</sup>-t]a wa-aš-ta-i ku-iš-ki na-an  
 LUGAL KUR <sup>URU</sup>Ḫat-ti pu-nu-uš-du nu-uš-ši-kán ma-a-an wa-aš-túl a-aš-zi  
 10. nu GIM-an A-NA LUGAL [KU]R <sup>URU</sup>Ḫat-ti ZI-an-za na-an QA-TAM-MA  
 i-ya-ad-du ma-a-na-aš ḫar-kán-na-aš-ma na-aš ḫar-ak-du É-TUM-ma-aš-ši-  
 kán  
 11. KUR-TUM-ya le-e [d]a-an-zi na-at da-me-e-el NUMUN-aš le-e pí-ya-an-zi  
 ŠA <sup>m</sup>Ul-mi-<sup>d</sup>U-ub-pát NUMUN-aš da-ad-du  
 12. da-ad-du-ma-at ŠA DUMU.NITA ŠA DUMU.SAL-ma le-e da-an-zi ma-a-an  
 NUMUN DUMU.NITA-ma Ú-UL e-eš-zi EGIR-an-at-kán tar-na-at-ta-ri  
 13. nu NUMUN ŠA DUMU.SAL ŠA <sup>m</sup>Ul-mi-<sup>d</sup>U-ub-pát EGIR-an ša-an-ḫa-an-du  
 ma-a-na-aš a-ra-ab-zi-na-ya KUR-e na-an a-pí-iz-zi-ya  
 14. EGIR-pa ú-wa-d[a]-an-du nu I-NA KUR <sup>URU</sup><sup>d</sup>U-ta-aš-ša AŠ-ŠUM EN-UT-TI  
 a-pu-u-un ti-it-ta-nu-wa-an-du

(The Great King assures his junior colleague: Your descendants shall possess the kingship, but) if any son or grandson of yours should commit an offense, then let the King of Ḫatti question him. And if an offense is proven against him (lit. "remains for him"), then let the King of Ḫatti treat him as he pleases: If he is deserving of death, let him perish! But his household and country will not be taken and given to (someone) of another family. Let only (someone) of the descent of Ulmi-Tešub take (them)! Let (someone) of the male line take them—(those) of the



How does this Hittite theory of succession compare to the practice actually attested in historical documents? Aside from the Proclamation of Telepinu, our most important source for the Old Kingdom period is the Bilingual Edict of Ḫattušili I (CTH 6), drawn up when the king was quite ill and possibly on his death bed.<sup>34</sup> The ruler addresses the assembly:

I spoke to you of the young Labarna (saying:) "Let him sit securely (upon the throne)." I, the King, had named him as my son; I continually instructed him and constantly looked after him. But he showed himself a youth not fit to be seen . . . No one will ever again raise the son of his sister! . . . But enough! He is no (longer) my son! . . . Muršili<sup>35</sup> is now my son! H[im you must acknowledge!] Him you must enthrone!<sup>36</sup>

The text continues with advice and commands for both the new heir<sup>37</sup> and the assembly, frequently buttressing these instructions with admonitory tales drawn from recent history. Most importantly for the present topic we learn in ii 63ff. that a son Ḫuzziya had led an unsuccessful revolt against Ḫattušili in a provincial town, and that afterward a daughter of Ḫattušili had been brought to rebellion by plotters who incited her:

female line shall not take (them). But if there is no male line of descent, (and) it is extinguished [Ed.—Cf. Otten, StBoT 24.29 tr. "einziehen." ]—then let (someone of) the female line of Ulmi-Tešub alone be sought out! Even if he is in a foreign country, let him be brought back from there! And let him be installed for lordship in the land of Tarḫuntašša!

See Imparati, RHA XXXII (1974) 98, n. 153 and H. Winkels, Diss. Hamburg (n.d.) 64f. As opposed to E. Neu, StBoT 5:168, and Götze, KIF 1 (1927–30) 229f., I understand the second occurrence of the pronoun *-at* in line 12 as referring to NUMUN (always a neuter noun—see Otten, ZA 61 [1971] 236 with n. 7) and not to *per* and/or *utne*. It is clear that *tarnattari*, in the indicative, forms part of the description of the situation, rather than of its consequences, which are all expressed in the imperative or the prohibitive.

34. Note the colophon (KUB 1.16 iv):

73. *tup-pí Tà-ba-ar-na* LUGAL.GAL *i-nu-ma*

74. LUGAL.GAL *Ta-ba-ar-na i-na* URU*Ku-uš-šar*<sup>KI</sup> *im-ra-aš-šú-ma* TUR-am  
<sup>m</sup>*Mu-u[r-ši-li]*

75. *a-na* LUGAL-*ru-tim ú-wa-a-ru*

For *wārum* D as "einsetzen, abordnen," see W. von Soden, AHw 1472b, citing BoSt 8:36 *ana šarrūti . . . limeršu*.

35. Muršili was probably the physical grandson of Ḫattušili—see KBo 1.6 obv. 13: <sup>m</sup>*Mu-ur-ši-li* LUGAL.GAL DUMU.DUMU-*šú ša* <sup>m</sup>*Ḫa-at-tu-ši-li* LUGAL.GAL.

36. KUB 1.16 i–ii 1ff., 9, 14, 37f.—see F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB 2–7 for transliteration, but in i 4 read *ú-ú-ri-šu* with E. Forrer, BoTU p. 10, and AHw 1472a. This was called to my attention by Professor Hoffner.

37. This aspect of the text renders unlikely the suggestion of Liverani, OA 16 (1977) 115 with n. 35, that the "true author" of the Bilingual Edict was Muršili himself.

[For] your father's [throne there is no heir. A se]rvant will sit (upon it)!<sup>38</sup>

It is obvious that the naming of the young men as "son," i.e., their adoption, is equivalent to their proclamation as heir to the throne, and that Labarna's dismissal as son cannot be divorced from his removal as heir. The successive adoptions of these two were necessitated by the prior revolt of Ḫuzziya, which apparently left the old king without an eligible physical son. There can be no doubt as to either the patrilineal character of this succession, or as to the freedom of the ruler to choose among the eligibles, shown by the Bilingual Edict to include in practice most male members of the younger generation of the royal family.<sup>39</sup>

As for Ḫattušili's reference to himself in his Annals as "the brother's son of Tawananna," I can only suggest that this phrase expresses Ḫattušili's own biological relationship to the previous generation,<sup>40</sup> for it is likely that he was not the physical son of his predecessor,<sup>41</sup> but was probably himself adopted by King Labarna.<sup>42</sup> Even if we grant that this singular filiation might invoke legitimation according to matrilineal principles, it remains the sole possible piece of evidence for the existence of such a system in Ḫatti. No other king in all of Hittite history was followed in rule by his nephew, and the murders and usurpations by brothers-in-law attested by the Telepinu Proclamation may be better explained as examples of the exercise of *antiyant*-claims to the throne than as preemptive revolts on behalf of the claims of children of the next generation.<sup>43</sup>

It is important to note that many of the (male) victims chronicled in the Telepinu Proclamation perished along with their children (*QADU DUMU*<sup>MES</sup>.

38. KUB 1.16 ii 70f.: *at-ta-aš-ta-aš-wa* [<sup>GIŠŠU</sup>.A-ši DUMU.NITA NU.GÁL ]R-iš-wa-aš-ša-an e-ša-ri.

39. Uncertainty persists only as to whether a king could pass over an otherwise eligible physical son of the first rank and adopt a more distant relative as son and heir to the throne.

40. Cf. Hoffner, OrNS 49 (1980) 297. T. R. Bryce, AnSt 31 (1981) 13, hypothesizes that Ḫattušili suppressed mention of his father because he had been among the rebels against the "grandfather" mentioned in KUB 1.16 iii 41ff. (HAB 12ff.).

41. Note KUB 1.16 iii 41f.: *ḫu-uh-ḫa-aš-mi-iš* [*La-ba-a*]r-na-an DUMU-ša-an URUŠa-na-ḫu-it-ti iš-ku-na-aḫ-ḫi-iš, "my grandfather i.-ed [Laba]rna his son in Šanaḫuitta." If, as I believe, the Labarna treated here is the same person as the predecessor of Ḫattušili, then he cannot have been his father, for the younger man would certainly have referred to the older as "my father."

42. Bryce, AnSt 31 (1981) 12, believes that Labarna, too, may have been adopted, but since his view hinges upon interpretation of the passage quoted in n. 41, and therefore upon the meaning of the obscure verb *iškunahḫ-* (on which see J. Puhvel, IF 83 [1978] 141-43) we cannot be certain.

43. This latter opinion, of course, is that of proponents of the matrilineal analysis—see Riemschneider, BSS 84ff., 94. Cf. also Bin-Nun, THeth 5:213-17.

ŠU).<sup>44</sup> Since these grisly actions were only necessary—or at least were only mentioned in the context of the Proclamation—because they represented the extinction of a line and a claim to the throne, they serve as additional evidence for patrilineal succession.<sup>45</sup> It may well be that in those instances when a reigning king (Muršili I, Zidanta I) himself was murdered, the crime was committed before he had made known his choice of successor. We must remember that while the Proclamation informs us of the identity of the murderers, this information may not have been widely available at the time of succession.

It is also useful to bear in mind that Telepinu was himself the son-in-law of his penultimate predecessor, Ammuna, and brother-in-law of the ruler whom he deposed, Ḫuzziya (see §22). Since this Ḫuzziya had come to power as the result of a bloodbath which eradicated the lines of Tittiya and Ḫantili, and since he had in addition threatened the lives of Telepinu and his wife Išta-pariya, the sections of the Proclamation providing for the punishment of a murderous monarch by the assembly (§§27, 29ff.) were certainly directed against him. Thus the goals of the Proclamation may be seen not only as the elimination of bloodshed within the royal family and the concomitant rise in the fortunes of Ḫatti, but also the justification of the very career, accession, and policies of Telepinu.<sup>46</sup> The centerpiece of the entire text, of course, is the rule of succession with which we began.

However, it seems that the will of Telepinu was thwarted soon after his own death, for his immediate successor was apparently not his son-in-law Alluwamna, as he had undoubtedly intended,<sup>47</sup> but rather the poorly attested Taḫurwaili, in all probability a brother of Ḫuzziya.<sup>48</sup> Early in the following “Middle Hittite” period there was also a struggle for the throne—apparently between two rival lines—again in clear contravention of the Telepinu Proc-

44. Kaššeni (§18), Tittiya (§21), Ḫantili (§22).

45. See Riemschneider, BSS 92. On p. 84, with n. 27, he quite rightly dismisses the idea of Døvgjalo that DUMU might indicate both “son” and “nephew” (i.e., “matrilineal successor”) in Hittite texts.

46. Cf. Hoffner in *Unity and Diversity* (1975), pp. 51–56, esp. bottom of p. 51 (“The defense of both usurpers had to rest upon grounds other than descent.”) and OrNS 49 (1977, pub. 1980) 307f., followed by Liverani, OA 16 (1977) 118ff., esp. n. 45, where he remarks that the purpose of the Proclamation was more to justify the present than to regulate the future.

47. Cf. Goetze, JCS 11 (1957) 57, and Gurney, CAH 3 II/1, 669. Note that Alluwamna is given the title DUMU.LUGAL in KUB 11.3:6. Does this perhaps indicate that he, like Arnuwanda later, was adopted by his father-in-law?

48. On this recently re-discovered Hittite king, see O. Carruba in K. Bittel et al., eds., *Anatolian Studies presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (1974) 73–93, esp. 91. Cf. also Otten, *Hist. Quellen* 115, and Liverani, OA 16 (1977) 113f.

lamation. These troubles were seemingly resolved by an agreement reached by the two parties, as recorded in the fragmentary “Protocoles de succession dynastique” (CTH 271).<sup>49</sup>

Later in the “Middle Hittite” period a vexing problem is posed by Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal, whom the sources refer to both as brother and sister and as a married couple, in seeming violation of Hittite concepts of incest.<sup>50</sup> We may resolve this difficulty by understanding Arnuwanda as the son-in-law and adopted son of his predecessor Tutḫaliya.<sup>51</sup> This would thus be a situation similar to that of Tuttulla and Zidi adduced earlier. Note that Tutḫaliya further strengthened the claim of Arnuwanda to the throne by instituting the only known coregency in Hittite history.<sup>52</sup>

Under the Empire, succession was most often from father to first-rank son,<sup>53</sup> but on two occasions to the brother of the deceased ruler (Muršili II, Šuppiluliuma II). Whereas it is said of Šuppiluliuma II that his brother had not left even a pregnant woman behind,<sup>54</sup> we have no such statement of the lack of issue of Arnuwanda II, succeeded by his brother Muršili II.<sup>55</sup> There were two celebrated usurpers in the Empire period: The army seems to have been instrumental in the installation of Šuppiluliuma I in place of Tutḫaliya the Younger,<sup>56</sup> who may well have been his brother,<sup>57</sup> and Ḫattušili III re-

49. On these and related documents, see Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977) 175–95, and Košak, *Tel Aviv* 7 (1980) 163–68. See also Košak, *AnSt* 30 (1980) 37f. I cannot, however, accept Košak’s view of the role of the *panku-* in this period—see my study cited in n. 2.

50. See Gurney, *CAH* 3 II/1, 671f., and Otten, *Hist. Quellen* 105f.

51. This interpretation is presented by Beal, *JCS* 35 (1983) 115–119. I am grateful to Mr. Beal for allowing me to read a preliminary version of his study. Cf. also C. Kühne, *CRRAI* 25 (1978) = *BBVO* 1 (1982) 254, n. 139, and 261, n. 215.

52. See Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 58, n. 2.

53. See below, n. 59. Other than for Muwatalli—see Ḫatt i 9–11 (*StBoT* 24, 4f.)—we cannot be reasonably sure that any succeeding son was actually the eldest of the first rank.

54. In KUB 26.33 ii an unnamed official reports of Arnuwanda III:

7. *nu-uš-ši* NUMUN NU.GÁL *e-eš-ta ar-m[a-aḫ-ḫu-wa-an-ta-an]*

8. *SAL-an pu-nu-uš-šu-un nu ar-ma-aḫ-[ḫu-wa-an-za]*

9. *SAL-aš Ú-UL e-eš-ta*

Cf. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977) 151–53.

55. See the description given by Muršili II in his annals of his becoming king—Götze, *AM* 15–21.

56. Muršili II relates in his “First Plague Prayer” (CTH 378.I), KUB 14.14++ and dupl. obv. 13–19:

Because Tut[ḫaliya] the Younger was Lord of the lands of Ḫatti, the princes, the nobles, the commanders of the thousands, the officers (LÚ.MEŠ DUGUD), [the subalterns(?) (LÚ.MEŠ SIG<sub>2</sub>)], and all [the infantry] (and) chariotry of Ḫattuša swore an oath to him. My father also swo[re] an oath to him. [But when m]y

volted successfully against his nephew Muršili III/Urḫi-Tešub.<sup>58</sup> Whatever the ultimate glories of the reigns of these two usurpers, their initial claims to kingship must have rested on some basis within the acknowledged system of succession.<sup>59</sup>

It seems that the choice of successor within the male line remained somewhat free down to the end of Hittite history. That is, the old king chose the best candidate among his first-rank sons,<sup>60</sup> born to his sole legitimate queen.<sup>61</sup> In the absence or disqualification of such *šaḫuiḫu(i)ššuwali*-sons,<sup>62</sup>

---

[father] mistreated Tuḫaliya, al[l the princes, the noble]s, the commander(s) of the thousands (and) the officers of Ḫattuša [went] over to my father. And the oath (deities) [seized Tuḫaliya. Then they killed] [Tuḫaliya,] (and) furthermore, such of his brothers as [stood with him?] they killed.

For transliteration, see Lebrun, *Hymnes* (1980) 194, and cf. Götze, KIF 1 (1927–30) 166. For the military connotation of LÚ DUGUD and LÚ SIG<sub>5</sub>, see E. von Schuler, OrNS 25 (1956) 209–13.

57. See Götze, KIF 1 (1927–30) 181–82, and Laroche, NH no. 1389.5. With the newly discovered seal impression from Mašat (S. Alp, *Belleten* XLIV/173 [1980] 57) proving that Tuḫaliya (II) was the father of Šuppiluliuma, we see that the function of the epithet DUMU-RU in the case of Tuḫaliya “the Younger” was precisely to distinguish father from son in the historical records.

58. See Ḫatt, esp. iii 63–iv 37 (StBoT 24:20–25).

59. Riemschneider’s suggestion—BSS 96, n. 89—that the provisions of the Telepinu Proclamation had been forgotten over time is made unlikely by the fact that all known copies of this text may be dated by their script to the Empire period.

60. As Sturtevant, *Chrest.* (1935) 189 and 198 and Liverani, OA 16 (1977) 118, n. 44 have shown, *ḫantezziyaš* DUMU.LUGAL and DUMU.LUGAL *ḫantezziš* in the Telepinu Proclamation—see n. 1 here—must refer to a rank, even though *ḫantezzi(ya)š* DUMU in other contexts may mean “firstborn.” Of the two variant expressions, the first probably involves an ellipsis, i.e., *ḫantezziyaš (pedaš)* DUMU.LUGAL—cf. *tān pedaš* DUMU-RU in the same context and DUMU-aš SAG.DU-aš (nom.) in KUB 26.33 ii 15—while the second features an attributive. Cf. also Götze, ArOr 2 (1930) 158, n. 2. It seems reasonable that a rank might be occupied by more than one person; if so, even the Telepinu Proclamation leaves the king some degree of choice as to his successor, and the plans of Šuppiluliuma I to pick a successor mentioned earlier would not necessarily involve a violation of this edict.

61. So Sturtevant, *Chrest.* 189 “of the first (wife),” sometimes referred to as *šakuwaššaraš* SAL.LUGAL, “legitimate queen,” e.g., KUB 21.42 iv 16. Note that in the greeting formulae of the letter of Ḫattušili III to Kadašman-Enlil II of Babylon (KBo 1.10—CTH 172), the Hittite ruler mentions only one wife (DAM) of his own (obv. 3), while attributing several to the addressee (obv. 5). Likewise, Šattiwazza of Mitanni, when given a Hittite princess in marriage, is told by his overlord/father-in-law Šuppiluliuma I that while he may make no other woman equal in rank to his new queen, he might enjoy SAL.MEŠ *EŠ-RI-TU*<sub>4</sub> (KBo 1.1 obv. 59ff.—see Weidner, PD 18f.). [Ed.—Cf. also the class/rank of DAM.MEŠ *pahḫuwaršeš* KUB 29.1 iii 42 and Güterbock apud Kellerman Diss. 65–6 (all the wives of the king but the queen).]

62. See Götze, NBr 24f.

the purple might fall on a son-in-law espoused to a first-rank daughter,<sup>63</sup> or on a son of the second rank, offspring of a secondary wife (*ESERTU* or *NAPTARTU*).<sup>64</sup> Such was the position of Muršili III/Urḫi-Tešub,<sup>65</sup> who in the eyes of some, however, was not well-enough-born to sit upon the throne.<sup>66</sup> Unfortunately the sources yield no information as to how or when a ruler made known his choice of successor.<sup>67</sup> In normal cases this would probably not have occurred until the king had ruled for at least a few years. When on two occasions under the Empire a monarch died early in his reign, he was succeeded by a brother, rather than by a minor son, illustrating the priority of competence over a strict rule of succession.<sup>68</sup> That is, the claims of an entire generation of eligibles were not always in practice vacated by the accession of one of their number.

This system had as an advantage the securing of the most able of several young males for the demanding position of king, but it carried within itself the seeds of intradynastic struggle and bloodshed, as exhibited in both the Telepinu Proclamation and the “Apology” of Ḫattušili III. It is the large number of persons with some—perhaps remote—claim to consideration for the highest office to whom Tutḫaliya IV refers in his Instructions to the Eunuchs (CTH 255.2):

63. See the passage of the Telepinu Proclamation quoted in n. 1, and note that Ištapariya, wife of Telepinu, is called the “first-rank sister” (*ha-an-te-er-zi-ya-an NIN*) of Ḫuzziya (KBo 3.1 ii 10). Cf. Pugliese Carratelli, *AttiAccTosc* 23 (1958/59) 105, n. 1.

64. Despite the work of Götze—see esp. *ArOr* 2 (1930) 153–63, and K1 87 and 94f.—many details of the organization of the Hittite royal family and harem remain obscure.

65. *Hatt* iii 41 (StBoT 24:20) refers to Urḫi-Tešub as *DUMU EŠERTI*.

66. In his treaty with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru (CTH 105), Tutḫaliya IV recounts the objectionable behavior of a previous ruler of that kingdom, Mašturi (KUB 23.1++ ii 20–29):

When Muwatalli “became a god,” then Urḫi-Tešub, son of Muwatalli, became king. [My father, however,] wrested the kingship away from Urḫi-Tešub. [Maš]turi committed treachery—(Although) it was Muwatalli who had taken him up and had made him his son-in-law, afterwards he (Mašturi) did not protect his son, Urḫi-Tešub, but went over to my father, (thinking:) “Will I protect even a ‘bastard’ (*LÚpaḫḫurši*-)?”

For transliteration see StBoT 16:10, and see pp. 37f., on *LÚpaḫḫurši*-.

67. The Hittites were not alone in the ancient Near East in allowing their king to choose, within limits, his own successor. Note the comments of Liverani, *CRAI* 19 (1971, publ. 1974) 336, on Late Bronze Age Syria, and R. N. Frye, *Acta Antiqua* 25 (1977) 81, on ancient Persia. On this latter culture cf. also G. Widengren, *Commemoration Cyrus—Congrès de Shiraz 1971* (1974) 84ff.

68. These are the sole instances of succession by a brother attested in Hittite history, and although I cannot give a detailed rebuttal here, I believe that there is no evidence to support the thesis of Bin-Nun, set forth in *RHA XXXI* (1973) 5–25, and *THeth* 5, *passim*, that brother-succession was the rule in ancient Anatolia.

My Majesty has many brothers and many [co]usins (lit. [sons of] his "fathers"). The Land of Ḫatti is full of the seed of kingship. The seed of Šuppiluliuma, the seed of Muṣšili, the seed of Muwatalli, (and) the seed of Ḫattušili, is numerous. You must not recognize any other man in regard to lordship! In regard to lordship, down to the second and third generations, protect the seed of Tuḫaliya!<sup>69</sup>

## APPENDIX

### The Terminology of Succession and Rule<sup>70</sup>

I have included the approximate date of the tablets on which each Old and Middle Hittite attestation is inscribed. For the system of dating and abbreviations employed, see CHD III/1 xiv–xv. When more than one occurrence of a single expression are attested for a particular ruler, in most cases only the oldest example is cited. I have also omitted duplicate texts. Citations in brackets are those involving substantial restorations.

#### OLD KINGDOM

Labarna		
active <sup>71</sup>	LUGAL.GAL <i>eš-</i>	KBo 3.67 i 2 (OH/NS)
passive <sup>71</sup>	PN <i>iškunahḫ-</i>	KUB 1.16 iii 41f. (OH/NS)
Ḫattušili I		
active	<i>ḫaššuwai-</i>	[KBo 10.2 i 3] (OH/NS); KBo 3.1 i 12 (OH/NS)
	LUGAL- <i>utta epēšu</i> <sup>72</sup>	KBo 10.1 obv. 1 (OH/NS)

69. KUB 26.1 i 9–16—for transliteration see von Schuler, *Dienstanw.* 9, and cf. Laroche, *RA* 47 (1953) 76f. On the restoration [DUMU] 'A<sup>1</sup>.BI<sup>MES</sup>.ŠU cf. Goetze, *JCS* 13:66 (space is adequate). A similar passage is found in KUB 23.1++ ii 8ff. (*StBoT* 16:8–11). On the difficult successions in the last era of Hittite history, see Otten, *Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt a.M.* (1976) 30f.

70. On the related question of Hittite royal titulary, see H. Gonnet, *Hethitica* 3 (1979) 3–107.

71. Seen from the point of view of the king. In instances where the action is thus "passive," the actor may be either a powerful human being or a deity.

72. For this expression, see *CAD* E 219f.

<b>Muršili I</b>		
active	LUGAL <i>eš-</i>	KBo 3.57 ii 5 (OH/NS)
	<i>ḥaššuwai-</i>	KBo 3.1 i 23 (OH/NS); KBo 3.57 ii 4 (OH/NS)
	GIŠŠÚ.A <i>ABĪŠU da-</i>	KBo 3.27 obv. 14 (OH/NS)
passive	PN <i>ašeš-</i>	KUB 1.16 ii 38 (OH/NS)
<b>Zidanta I</b>		
active	<i>ḥaššuwai-</i>	KBo 3.1 i 65? (OH/NS) [KBo 3.67 ii 11] (OH/NS)
<b>Ammuna</b>		
active	<i>ḥaššuwai-</i>	KUB 11.1 ii 4 (OH/NS)
	INA GIŠGU.ZA	
	<i>ABĪYA eš-</i>	[KUB 26.71 i 8] (OH/NS)
	<i>utne maniyahḥ-</i>	[KUB 26.71 i 8] (OH/NS)
<b>Ḫuzziya I</b>		
active	<i>ḥaššuwai-</i>	KBo 3.1 ii 9 (OH/NS)
<b>Telepinu</b>		
active	INA GIŠGU.ZA	
	<i>ABĪYA eš-</i>	KBo 3.1 ii 16 (OH/NS)
<b>miscellaneous (pretenders, general statements, uncertain)</b>		
active	LUGAL- <i>uš kiš-</i>	KBo 3.22 obv. 22, rev. 49 (OS); KUB 21.48 obv. 7(?)
	INA GIŠŠÚ.A <i>eš-</i>	[KUB 1.16 ii 71] (OH/NS)
	INA GIŠGU.ZA.GAL	
	<i>eš-</i>	KUB 11.3:2(?)
	<i>wašābu</i> <sup>73</sup>	KUB 1.16 i 3 (OH/NS) (of the Young Labarna)
passive	LUGAL- <i>un iya-</i>	[KBo 3.38 rev. 6] (?) (OH/NS)
	PN <i>ašeš-</i>	KUB 1.16 iii 44 (OH/NS) (of Papatḫdilmah)
	PN GIŠŠÚ.A- <i>mi ašeš-</i>	KBo 3.28 ii 24 (OH/NS)
	PN <i>te-lqabû</i>	KUB 1.16 i-ii 3 (OH/NS) (of the Young Labarna)

73. For the use of *wašābu* with *kussû*, "throne," see AHW 515 and 1481. In the present context *ina kussî* has been ellipsed.



## "MIDDLE HITTITE" PERIOD

Tuthaliya I  
active

*ana* <sup>GI</sup>ŠGU.ZA  
LUGAL-utti elû KBo 1.6 obv. 15 (NH)

Tuthaliya II *tuhkanti*  
active

ANA <sup>GI</sup>ŠGU.ZA  
ABĪŠU eš- KBo 10.34 iv 12 (MH/NS)  
LUGAL-uizni eš- KBo 10.34 i 1 (MH/NS)

miscellaneous  
passive

LUGAL-uizni  
*lamnai-* KUB 36.109:6 (MH/MS)  
LUGAL-uizni  
*tittanu-* KUB 36.114:22 (MH/MS)  
LUGAL-uizni *iškiya-* KUB 36.119:5 (MH/MS?)  
ANA LUGAL-TIM  
*iškiya-* KBo 16.24 (+) 25 i 66 (MH/MS)

## EMPIRE PERIOD

Šuppiluliuma I  
active

LUGAL.GAL *kiš-* KBo 22.10 iii 10f.<sup>74</sup>  
ANA <sup>GI</sup>ŠŠÚ.A  
LUGAL-UTTI eš- KBo 6.28 obv. 16f.  
*ana* <sup>GI</sup>ŠGU.ZA  
LUGAL-utti  
*wašābu* [KBo 1.6 obv. 33]  
LUGAL-uizni eš- KUB 23.124 i 36

Arnuwanda II  
active

ANA <sup>GI</sup>ŠGU.ZA  
ABĪŠU eš- KBo 3.4 i 5

74. Košak, Tel Aviv 7 (1980) 164f., suggests that this passage was spoken by Muršili II in reference to Šuppiluliuma I.

## Muršili II

active

<i>ḥaššuwai-</i>	KUB 19.8 i 19
ANA DINGIR <sup>MES</sup>	
LÚSANGA <i>kiš-</i>	KUB 14.12 obv. 4
ANA G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA	
ABĪYA <i>eš-</i>	KBo 3.4 i 3
ANA G <sup>IS</sup> ŠÚ.A	
LUGAL-UTTI <i>eš-</i>	KUB 26.43 obv. 13
ana G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA <i>abīya</i>	
<i>wašābu</i>	[KUB 3.14 obv. 12]
ana G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA	
LUGAL-utti	
<i>wašābu</i>	KBo 1.8 obv. 8

## Muwatalli

active

LUGAL-izziya-	KUB 23.1 i 29
ANA G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA	
ABĪŠU <i>eš-</i>	KBo 6.29 i 23
LUGAL-iznanni <i>eš-</i>	KBo 4.12 obv. 14
ana G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA	
LUGAL-utti	
<i>šabātu</i> <sup>75</sup>	KBo 1.8 obv. 11

passive

ANA DN LÚSANGA	
<i>iya-</i>	KUB 6.45 iii 29f.
LUGAL-iznanni <i>dai-</i>	KUB 6.45 iii 31

## Muršili III = Urḫi-Tešub

active

LUGAL.GAL <i>eš-</i>	[Ḥatt (StBoT 24) iii 44]
LUGAL-izziya-	KUB 23.1++ ii 21
ANA G <sup>IS</sup> GU.ZA	
ABĪŠU <i>eš-</i>	[KUB 21.17 ii 17]

passive

LUGAL-iznanni	
<i>tittanu-</i>	KBo 4.12 obv. 21
AŠŠUM LUGAL-	
UTTI <i>tittanu-</i>	KUB 21.37 rev. 18f.
AŠŠUM LUGAL-	
UTTI <i>dai-</i>	KBo 6.29 i 38
EN-anni <i>dai-</i>	[Ḥatt (StBoT 24) iii 43]

75. Muwatalli uses this expression to describe his own legitimate accession. Šabātu is not solely employed to describe accession in a critical or hostile manner—cf. A. Archi, SMEA 14 (1971) 200, n. 64.

## Hattušili III

active

LUGAL.GAL <i>kiš-</i>	Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iii 43
LUGAL- <i>izziya-</i>	KBo 4.12 obv. 31
LUGAL- <i>anni eš-</i>	KUB 26.43 rev. 9–11
<i>ana</i> <sup>GIŠ</sup> GU.ZA <i>abiya</i>	
<i>wašābu</i>	KBo 1.8 obv. 16
<i>ina ašri ša abi abika</i>	
<i>wašābu</i>	NBC 3934 obv. 15 (JCS 1, 241)
<i>šarrūta šabātu</i>	KBo 1.14 rev. 5, 7
ANA PN LUGAL-	
<i>iznatar arḫa da-</i>	KUB 23.1 ii 22

passive

LUGAL- <i>UTTA</i>	
<i>mema-</i>	Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iv 7f.
LUGAL- <i>iznanni</i>	
<i>tittanu-</i>	Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iv 65f.

## Arnuwanda III

active

LUGAL- <i>uš eš-</i>	KUB 26.32 i 9
----------------------	---------------

## Šuppiluliamia II

active

LUGAL- <i>uš kiš-</i>	[KUB 26.33 ii 23]
-----------------------	-------------------

passive

EN- <i>an iya-</i>	KUB 26.33 ii 13
--------------------	-----------------

## miscellaneous

active

LUGAL <i>eš-</i>	KUB 31.66 + IBoT III 122 ii 5
LUGAL- <i>uš kiš-</i>	KBo 6.28 rev. 19
PN <i>lū inneppuš</i>	
LUGAL- <i>utti</i>	[KBo 1.7:40]
LUGAL <i>išpart-</i>	KUB 31.66 + IBoT III 122 ii 7
ANA <sup>GIŠ</sup> ŠÚ.A	
LUGAL- <i>UTTI eš-</i>	KUB 10.45 rev. rt. 25–27
ANA LUGAL- <i>UTTI</i>	
<i>eš-</i>	KUB 9.10 rt. 17f.
LUGAL- <i>iznanni eš-</i>	KBo 18.179 rt. 8
<sup>GIŠ</sup> GU.ZA <i>ABĪŠU</i>	
<i>ep-</i>	KUB 8.1 ii 8 (oracle trans.)
INA <sup>GIŠ</sup> GU.ZA	
<i>ABĪŠU para nai-</i>	KUB 8.1 ii 10 (oracle trans.)

passive

*ana šarrūti qabû*

KBo 1.5 i 46f.

*te-*

KBo 5.3 i 9

*IŠTU Ì DÙG.GA*

*LUGAL-UTTI*

*iškiya- . . . ŠUM*

*LUGAL-UTTI*

*dai- . . . TÚG*

*LUGAL-UTTI*

*waššiya- . . .*

*TÚG* *lupannin šiya-*

KUB 24.5+ obv. 19ff.