KANĪŠŠUWAR

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.1

While this, our only general statement of the principles of royal succession in Hatti, 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,2 and that supporting a matrilineal succession.3

*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-ša-an ha-an-te-ez-zi-iš-páš DUMU.LUGAL DUMU.RU ki-ik-ā[(i-iš)]ta-rū tāk-ki DUMU.LUGAL
37. ha-an-te-ez-zi-iš NU.GAL nu ku-iš ta-a-an pé-e-dā-aš DUMU.RU nu LUGAL-ša a-pa-a-aš
38. ki-sa-nu ma-a-an DUMU.LUGAL-ma DUMU.NITA NU.GÁL nu ku-iš DUMU.SAL ha-an-te-ez-zi-iš
39. ra-us-si-is-ša-an LUNNI-tu-an-ta-an ap-pa-a-an-du nu LUGAL-ša a-pa-a-aš ki-[la-nu]

3. This position is set forth most fully by K. K. Riemenschneider in H. Klengel, ed., Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des Alten Vorderasiens (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, the enigmatic self-reference of Ḫattušili I in his annals (CTH 4) as "the brother's son of Tawananna" (מנה יִתְנַנְא נַתְנַנָּא דּוּמּו שִׁישׁ שָׁעַו), 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.

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. 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:

---


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 ʾTa-윙[...].

6. A "forerunner" to the alleged Hittite matriarchy is not to be found in the occasional rule of native princesses (regnum)—among a great majority of princes—in the Anatolian towns of Ankuwa, Kaneš, Lulḫaddiya, and Waḫššana 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, TThet 5:11–14.

Hattušili, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḥatti; son of Muršili, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḥatti; grandson of Šuppiluliuma, the Great King, King of the Land of Ḥatti; descendant of Hattušili, King of Kušar. 9

Such genealogies could, of course, be adduced in great numbers. 10

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INA} & \quad \text{GANUZA} \quad \text{ABIVASU} \quad \text{EŠ-IWAŠABU} \\
\text{ANA} & \quad \text{GSU} \quad \text{LUGAL-UTTI} \quad \text{ELÜ} \\
\text{LUGAL-uzni} & \quad \end{align*}
\]

“to sit on/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. 12

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. 13

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 ŠA.BAL.BAL. see StBoT 24 (tr. Nachfahre on p. 3. Nachkomm. on pp. 31, 111:34. [Ed.—Note that in Ḥatt iv 86-7 the ŠA.BAL.BAL must be of both Hattushili and Puduhepa.] 9 KUB 1.1 + 19.62 i 1-4 and duphs. (Ḫatt) see StBoT 24:4f.

10. Similarly, scribes often employ patronyms 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): 4IM-\text{aš-ša} DUMU 6\text{KIN-šu-zi-il}.

11. (haššuwašan) \text{aštar}, “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 aštar (KUB 23.13), and the EZEN aštar-\text{aššu} (KUB 18.36.19f.). See A. Ünal, THeth 6:15, for a complete list of relevant oracles. For \text{aššu-šašna} in the meaning “to seat” cf. Hoffner, IAOS 103 (1983) 192.

12. See Appendix.

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] there, then he, the man, will burn 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 not take her dowry. 14

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, 15 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 16) should not be responsible for the services due to the state, but that these should be rendered “from his paternal household” (ISTU È ABÎSU—KBo 6.2 ii 40 and dupls.). 17 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. 18

A final law concerned with marriage is §36:

14. KBo 6.5 ii and dupls.:

4. tâk-ku LÛ-as DAM-ŠU da-a-i nu-a[n pâr-na-as-ša]
5. pê-e-hu-te-e-zî i-wa-ru-as-šî[[(ir-aż)]
6. an-da pê-e-da-a-i tâk-ku SAL-zu [(a]-pi-ya a-ki]
7. na-as LÛ-as a-as-su-se-et BIL-n[u-zi] (i-wa-ru-se-ta-aż]
8. LÛ-as da-a-i tâk-ku [a]-dâ-as E[(tri a-ki)]
9. DUMU.NITA-sî i-wa-su-šî-i LÛ-as U-U[L da-a-i]

On the interpretation of this paragraph, see Hoffner, AltHeth 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, KI 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] 301ff.). In the case of a woman this would be her dowry.


18. KBo 6.26 iii:

40. tâk-ku LÛ-ilš SAL-an hâr-zî ta LÛ-ilš a-ki DAM-SÛ
41. SEŠ-SU da-a-i ta-an A-BU-ŠU da-a-i
42. ma-a-an ta-a-an A-BU-ŠU-ja a-ki SAL-na-an-na ku-in hâr-ta
43. (DUMU) SEŠ-SU da-a-i U-UL ha-ra-tar
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If a slave pays the "bride-price" 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.20

As several scholars have already noted,21 reflected here is a practice similar to the Mesopotamian erēbu-marriage22 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 Ašmunika 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 "brideship or antiyant-ship."23

antiyant-marriage is otherwise known in Ḥatti from one of the versions of the Illuyanka myth24 and from the Old Hittite Inandik tablet.25 In this latter legal document, an important person by the name of Tutulla, 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 Tutulla adopts Zidi as his son. Any future legal challenge by the physical son of Tutulla and his descendants to the ownership of Tutulla's property by Zidi and his offspring is forbidden.

20. KBo 6.3 ii:
27. tāk-ku ƗR-iš A-NA DUMU. NITA EL-LIM ku-dá-ša-ta pid-di-zi-[zi]
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, FsLachman, 155–60. Despite Kammenhuber's objections—HW: 108f.—LUnantiyant—must be understood as a participle of andan(i) iya-, i.e., "the one entering." Even if Kammenhuber is correct in her view that andan(i) 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 Kanesh, see K. Veenhof, CRRAI 25 (1978) = BBVO 1 (1982) 151.
23. KUB 13.8 i:
14. pa-ra-a-ma-ka-n DUMU.NITA DUMU.SAL AŠ-ŠUM É.GI A-TIM LUN-an-
15. du-i-ya-an-da-an-ni-ya le-e
16. ku-iš-ki pa-a-i

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

25. K. Balkan, Inandik (1973). The text is transcribed 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, but the Šaḫurunuwa text (CTH 225) 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.28

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.29

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!30

26. E.g., KBo 5.7 (= LS 1) rev. 48: UR-RÁ-AM ŠE-E-RA-AM ŠA (Ku-wa-at-ta-al-la A-NA DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU MÁ-AM.MA-AN LÁ-A 1-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.SUHUR.LAL) Kuwattalla. Cf. also Law §171, where a (widowed?) mother seemingly disinherits her soa—see H. C. Melchert, JCS 31 (1979) 62–64, and R. Hase, RIDA 17 (1970) 63ff.

29. KBo 5.9 i:

21. nu-ut-ka a-a-aš-ma A-NA LUGAL KUR URUḪa-at-ti KUR URUḪa-a-l-[i-]l
22. U-NA DUMU.DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-YA DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-YA še-er li-in-qa-nu-na-an
27. . . . zi-ik ma Dup-pi-DU-aḫ-[Text: -AN] LUGAL KUR URUḪa-at-ti
28. KUR URUḪa-at-ti DUMU.MEŠ-YA DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-YA zi-la-du-wa pa-aḫ-si

See J. Friedrich, SV 1:12f.

30. KBo 5.3 i:

8. nu-aš zi-ik Ḫu-qq-a-na-a-aš ḪU-DU-ŠI-p₂₂₂ AŠ-SUM BE-LU-TIM ša-a-qaq
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.31

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.32 The texts just quoted date from the Empire period, well after the promulgation of the Telepinu Proclamation.33

10. na-an-šan is-tar-na te-ek ku-ul-ša-mi nu-zu zi-qi-qa 5Bu-ul-qa-na-aš
11. a-pu-un ša-a-a[š]

See Friedrich, SV 2:106f.

31. KBo 1:5 i:

57. ... a-i-š-e
58. 4UTU-ši DUMU.NITA-šu a-na LUGAL-ru-tim ša a-na 5Šu-na-as-šu-ra
59. i-qa-ab-bi 5Šu-na-as-šu-ra šu-it-tam a-na LUGAL-ru-tim i-ne-as-ar-šu

See E. Weidner, PD 94f.

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

33. Not surprisingly, rules of succession in the appanae kingdoms of Ḫatti were similar to practices involving the Great Kingdom. 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.:
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 Hattušili I (CTH 6), drawn up when the king was quite ill and possibly on his deathbed. 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!... Muršili35 is now my son! Him you must acknowledge! Him you must enthrone!16

The text continues with advice and commands for both the new heir37 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 Huzziya had led an unsuccessful revolt against Hattušili in a provincial town, and that afterward a daughter of Ḥattušili 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-Tesub 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 Ṭarḫuntašša!

See Imparati, RHA XXXII (1974) 98, n. 153 and H. Winkels, Diss. Hamburg (n.d.) 64ff. As opposed to E. Neu, StBoT 5:168, and Götze, KIF I (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 a. 7) and not to per and/or one. It is clear that tarnlitti, 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-pi Ta-ba-ar-na 1.LUGAL.GAL i-nu-ma
74. LUGAL.GAL Ta-ba-ar-na i-na URU.Ku-us-sar.KI im-ra-as-šu-ma TUR-am
    "Mu-ur-[s]-ši-ši"
75. a-na 1.LUGAL-ra-tim ū-ša-wa-a-ra

For ṭärurum D as "einzettzen, abordnen," see W. von Soden, AHw 1472b, citing BoSt 8:36 ana šarru... šiseru.

35. Muršili was probably the physical grandson of Ḥattušili—see KBo 1.6 obv. 13: "Mu-ur-si-ši-ši LUGAL.GAL DUMU.DUMU-ša sa Ḥa-at-su-ti-li LUGAL.GAL.

36. KUB 1.16—ii 1ff., 9, 14, 37f.—see F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB 2–7 for transliteration, but in i 4 read ū-ši-ti-su 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 servant will sit (upon it)] 38

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 Huzziya, 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. 39

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, 40 for it is likely that he was not the physical son of his predecessor, 41 but was probably himself adopted by King Labarna. 42 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 antient-claims to the throne than as preemptive revolts on behalf of the claims of children of the next generation. 43

It is important to note that many of the (male) victims chronicled in the Telepinu Proclamation perished along with their children (QADU DUMU) 44

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 (1985) 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 41ff.: hu-ah-ša-ši-iš [La-ba-a]-ra-an DUMU-ša-an ušša-na-hu-ir-ti iš-ša-ša-nah-bi-iš, “my grandfather i.-ed [Labarna his son in Šanquipat.]” 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 isšu-nab-bi- (on which see J. Puhvel, 1F 83 [1978] 141–43) we cannot be certain.
43. This latter opinion, of course, is that of proponents of the matrilineal analysis—see Riemchenheider, BSS #4ff., 94. Cf. also Bin-Nun, THeth 5:213–17.
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. It may well be that in those instances when a reigning king (Mursili 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, Ḫuzziyā (see §22). Since this Ḫuzziyā had come to power as the result of a bloodbath which eradicated the lines of Tittiya and Ḥantili, and since he had in addition threatened the lives of Telepinu and his wife Ištapaši, 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 Ḥatti, but also the justification of the very career, accession, and policies of Telepinu. 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 Alluwamma, as he had undoubtedly intended, but rather the poorly attested Taḫurwaili, in all probability a brother of Ḫuzziyā. 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), Ḥantili (§22).
45. See Riemschneider, BSS 92. On p. 84, with n. 27, he quite rightly dismisses the idea of Dowigalo 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) 307ff., 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. Goette, ICS 11 (1957) 57, and Gurney, CAH 3 11/1, 569. Note that Alluwanna 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?
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).49

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.50 We may resolve this difficulty by understanding Arnuwanda as the son-in-law and adopted son of his predecessor Tuthaliya.51 This would thus be a situation similar to that of Tuttuala and Zidi adduced earlier. Note that Tuthaliya further strengthened the claim of Arnuwanda to the throne by instituting the only known coregency in Hittite history.52

Under the Empire, succession was most often from father to first-rank son,53 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,54 we have no such statement of the lack of issue of Arnuwanda II, succeeded by his brother Muršili II.55 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 Tuthaliya the Younger,56 who may well have been his brother,57 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—this period—see my study cited in n. 2.
50. See Gurney, CAH 3 II 1, 67f., 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 Muwattali—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-ši NUMUNNU.GAL e-eš-ta ar-m[a-al-ḫu-wa-an-ta-an]
8. SAL-an pu-nu-šu-un nu ar-ḫa-ḫa-[ḫu-wa-an-ca]
9. SAL-ša U-UL e-eš-ta

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 378.1), KUB 14.14 ++ and dupl. obv. 13–19:

Because Tuthaliya the Younger was Lord of the lands of Ḫatti, the princes, the nobles, the commanders of the thousands, the officers (LÜ.MEŠ DUGU/DI), [the subalterns (?)] (LÜ.MEŠ SİG), and all [the infantry] (and) chariots of Ḫattuša swore an oath to him. My father also swore an oath to him. [But when my}
volted successfully against his nephew Muršili III/Urḫi-Tešub. 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. 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, born to his sole legitimate queen. In the absence or disqualification of such šahuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuḫuğu
the purple might fall on a son-in-law espoused to a first-rank daughter, or on a son of the second rank, offspring of a secondary wife (ESERTU or NAP'ARTU). Such was the position of Muršili III/Urḫi-Tešub, who in the eyes of some, however, was not well-enough-born to sit upon the throne. Unfortunately the sources yield no information as to how or when a ruler made known his choice of successor. 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. 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 Tūḫaliya 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 Ḫtāparyā, wife of Telepinu, is called the "first-rank sister" (Ka-an-te-ez-zi-ya-an Nin) of Huzziya (KBo 3.1 ii 10). Cf. Pugliese Carratelli, AttiAccTosc 23 (1958) 99. n. 1.
64. Despite the work of Götz—see esp. ArOr 2 (1930) 153-63, and Ki 87 and 94f.—many details of the organization of the Hittite royal family and harem remain obscure.
65. Ḫattušili 41 (StBoT 24:20) refers to Urḫi-Tešub as DUMU ESERTI.
66. In his treaty with Šaššamunu of Amurru (CTH 105), Tūḫaliya IV recounts the objectionable behavior of a previous ruler of that kingdom, Mašturi (KUB 23.1+11 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. [Mašturi 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" (I-puhurusidd)?"

For transliteration see StBoT 16:10, and see pp. 37f., on I-puhurusidd.


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-sucdension 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 Suppiluliuma, the seed of Muršili, 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 Tutḫaliya.\textsuperscript{69}

APPENDIX
The Terminology of Succession and Rule\textsuperscript{70}

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labarna</th>
<th>active\textsuperscript{71}</th>
<th>LUGAL.GAL $eš$-</th>
<th>KBo 3.67 i 2 (OH/NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passive\textsuperscript{71}</td>
<td>PN $iškunab\dot{h}$-</td>
<td>KUB 1.16 iii 41f. (OH/NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫattušili I</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>$ḥaššuwa\dot{i}$-</td>
<td>[KBo 10.2 i 3] (OH/NS); KBo 3.1 i 12 (OH/NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LUGAL-$utta epēšu$\textsuperscript{72}</td>
<td>KBo 10.1 obv. 1 (OH/NS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{69} KUB 26.1 i 9–16—for transliteration see von Schuler, Dienstanw. 9, and cf. Larocie, RA 47 (1953) 76f. On the restoration [DUMU] $\textup{A}\cdot\textup{Bi}$\textsuperscript{MES-SU} 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) 30ff.

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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{72} For this expression, see CAD E 219f.
INHERITANCE AND ROYAL SUCCESSION

Muršili I
active
LUGAL eš-
ḫaššuwai-
 GISŪ.A ABĪŠU da-
passive
PN ašeš-

KBo 3.57 ii 5 (OH/NS)
KBo 3.1 i 23 (OH/NS); KBo 3.57 ii 4 (OH/NS)
KBo 3.27 obv. 14 (OH/NS)
KUB 1.16 ii 38 (OH/NS)

Zidanta I
active
ḫaššuwai-
KBo 3.1 i 65 (OH/NS)
[KBo 3.67 ii 11] (OH/NS)

Amumuna
active
ḫaššuwai-
INA GISGU.ZA
ABIYA eš-
utne maniyahḫ-

KUB 11.1 ii 4 (OH/NS)
[KUB 26.71 i 8] (OH/NS)
[KUB 26.71 i 8] (OH/NS)

Ḫuzziyia I
active
ḫaššuwai-
KBo 3.1 ii 9 (OH/NS)

Telepinu
active
INA GISGU.ZA
ABIYA eš-
KBo 3.1 ii 16 (OH/NS)

miscellaneous (pretenders, general statements, uncertain)
active
LUGAL-uš kiš-
INA GISŠU.A eš-
INA GISGU.ZA.GAL
eš-
wašābu?1
KBo 3.22 obv. 22, rev. 49 (OS); KUB 21.48 obv. 7(?)
[KUB 1.16 ii 71] (OH/NS)
KUB 11.3:2(?)
KUB 1.16 i 3 (OH/NS) (of the Young Labarna)
passive
LUGAL-un iya-
PN ašeš-
PN GISŠU.A-mi ašeš-
PN te-šqabā
[KBo 3.38 rev. 6] (?) (OH/NS)
KUB 1.16 iii 44 (OH/NS) (of Papḫudīmlaḫ)
KBo 3.28 ii 24 (OH/NS)
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 kussû has been ellipsed.
"MIDDLE HITTITE" PERIOD

Tutḫaliya I
active

_ana_ GİŚGÜ.ZA
LUGAL-tti elû

KBo 1.6 obv. 15 (NH)

Tutḫaliya II tuḫkantı
active

ANA GİŚGÜ.ZA
ABIŠU eš-
LUGAL-üzni eš-

KBo 10.34 iv l2 (MH/NS)
KBo 10.34 i i (MH/NS)

miscellaneous

passive

LUGAL-üzni
lannai-
LUGAL-üzni
titau-
LUGAL-üzni ıškiya-
ANA LUGAL-TIM
ıškiya-

KUB 36.109:6 (MH/MS)
KUB 36.114:22 (MH/MS)
KUB 36.119:5 (MH/MS²)
KBo 16.24 (+) 25 i 66 (MH/MS)

EMPIRE PERIOD

Šuppiluliuma I
active

LUGAL.GAL kiš-
ANA GİŚŠÚ.A
LUGAL-UTTI eš-
_ana_ GİŚGÜ.ZA
LUGAL-tti
wašaabu
LUGAL-üzni eš-

KBo 22.10 iii 10f.⁷⁴
KBo 6.28 obv. 16f.
[KBo 1.6 obv. 33]
KUB 23.124 i 36

Arnuwanda II
active

ANA GİŚGÜ.ZA
ABIŠU 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.
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Mursili II
active
haṣṣuwai-
ANA DINGIRMES
LUGAL-UTTI eš-
ANA GISGU.ZA
ABIYA eš-
ANA GISŠU.A

KUB 19.8 i 19
KUB 14.12 obv. 4
KBo 3.4 i 3
KUB 26.43 obv. 13
[KUB 3.14 obv. 12]
KBo 1.8 obv. 8

Muwatalli
active
LUGAL-izziya-
ANA GISGU.ZA
ABIŠU eš-
LUGAL-izzanni eš-
ANA GISGU.ZA
LUGAL-utti
šabatu75

KUB 23.1 i 29
KBo 6.29 i 23
KBo 4.12 obv. 14
KBo 1.8 obv. 11

passive
ANA DN LUGAL-
iphy-
LUGAL-izzanni dai-

KUB 6.45 iii 29f.
KUB 6.45 iii 31

Mursili III = Urḫi-Tešub
active
LUGAL.GAL eš-
LUGAL-izziya-
ANA GISGU.ZA
ABIŠU eš-

[Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iii 44]
KUB 23.1+ + ii 21
[KUB 21.17 ii 17]

passive
LUGAL-izzanni
tittunu-
AŠŠUM LUGAL-
UTTI tittunu-
AŠŠUM LUGAL-
UTTI dai-
EN-anni dai-

KBo 4.12 obv. 21
KUB 21.37 rev. 18f.
KBo 6.29 i 38
[Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iii 43]

75. Muwatalli uses this expression to describe his own legitimate accession. Šabatu is not solely employed to describe accession in a critical or hostile manner—cf. A. Archi. SMEA 14 (1971) 200, n. 64.
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Ḫattušili III
active
LUGAL.GAL kiš- Ḫatt (SiBoT 24) iiii 43
LUGAL-izziyā- KBo 4.12 obv. 31
LUGAL-anni eš- KUB 26.43 rev. 9–11
ana GISGU.ZA abiya wašábu KBo 1.8 obv. 16
ina ašri ša abi abiška wašábu NBC 3934 obv. 15 (JCS 1, 241)
šarruša šabatu KBo 1.14 rev. 5, 7
ANA PN LUGAL- KUB 23.1 ii 22
iznatar arḫa da-
passive
LUGAL-UTTA Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iv 7f.
memka-
LUGAL-izzannī Ḫatt (StBoT 24) iv 65f.
tittanu-
Arnuwanda III
active
LUGAL-uš eš- KUB 26.32 i 9
Šuppiluliam II
active
LUGAL-uš kiš- [KUB 26.33 ii 23]
passive
EN-an iya- KUB 26.33 ii 13
miscellaneous
active
LUGAL eš- KUB 31.66 + IBoT III 122 ii 5
LUGAL-uš kiš- KBo 6.28 rev. 19
PN lū innepuš [KBo 1.7:40]
LUGAL-uttī KUB 31.66 + IBoT III 122 ii 7
LUGAL išpat- ANA GISȘU.A
ANA LUGAL-UTTI eš-
KUB 10.45 rev. rt. 25–27
KUB 9.10 rt. 17f.
LUGAL-izzanni eš- KBo 18.179 rt. 8
GISGU.ZA ABĪŠU ep-
ANA GISGU.ZA KUB 8.1 ii 8 (oracle trans.)
ABĪŠU para nai-
KUB 8.1 ii 10 (oracle trans.)
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passive

asa šarrûti qabû te-
IŠTU l DUG.GA
LUGAL-UTTI
šikira- . . . ŠUM
LUGAL-UTTI
dai- . . . TUG
LUGAL-UTTI
waššiya- . . .
toolapannin šiya- KUB 24.5+ ebv. 19ff.

KBo 1.5 i 46f.
KBo 5.3 i 9