

Altorientalische Forschungen	25	1998	2	269–290
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

VICTOR PARKER

Reflexions on the Career of Hattušiliš III until the Time of this Coup d'État*

The hymn of praise which Hattušiliš III composed to his patron goddess Ištar of Šamuḫa is one of the most fascinating documents that has come down to us from the cuneiform Near East. More so than Darius' inscription at Behistun this text of Hattušiliš' is almost purely autobiographical in inspiration. Ostensibly, it is, of course, a hymn to Ištar, whom Hattušiliš credits with his attainment of fortune and glory; ironically, it is his successes which prove Ištar's greatness. Hattušiliš' greatest success undoubtedly came with the deposition of his nephew, Muršiliš III, whom he then succeeded on the throne. Ünal in his

* I would like to thank Fritz Gschnitzer and Cord Kühne for kindly reading a draft version of this paper; they are in no way to be held accountable for its errors and deficiencies of judgement. – The major biography of Hattušiliš is that of A. Ünal, *Hattušili III. Part 1, Volumes 1–2*, Heidelberg 1974 (= *Texte der Hethiter* 3–4) – no additional volumes published. The first edition of the major texts involved was that of A. Götze, *Hattušiliš, Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten*, Leipzig 1925 (MVAeG 29/3 = *Hethitische Texte* 1) with Reprint (Darmstadt 1967). Six years later Götze published additional fragments: *Neue Bruchstücke zum Großen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten*, Leipzig 1930 (MVAeG 34/2 = *Hethitische Texte* 5). H. Otten has incorporated farther fragments in his now standard Edition of the main text, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*, Wiesbaden 1981 (*Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 24). Additional texts of relevance are printed in the second volume of Ünal's opus. The Prayers of Hattušiliš and his wife Puduḫepaš have now been edited by D. Sürenhagen, *Zwei Gebete Hattušilis und der Puduḫepa*, AoF 8 [1981] 83–168. There has been much debate as to whether the main text should be termed an autobiography, an apology, a hymn to Ištar of Šamuḫa, a religious foundation decree, an historical text related to the well-known annals of other Hittite kings, etc. For convenience' sake I use the term "autobiography," with which I intend no judgement as to genre or ultimate purpose of this document. When quoting from this document I give a composite text. On the other two Hittite Kings involved Urḫi-Tešub/Muršiliš III and Tudḫalijaš IV – I should like to refer to the following two studies: P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Urhi-Tessub revisited*, BiOr 51 [1994] 233–259, and H. Klengel, *Tudḫalija IV. von Hatti: Prolegomena zu einer Biographie*, AoF 18 [1991] 224–238.

near exhaustive discussion of Hattušiliš' rise to power has cast that Hittite monarch in the rôle of the wicked uncle (the Richard III theory) who schemes to rule through his nephew and, when that fails, in his stead.¹ This interpretation seems to me wrong, at least in its extreme form. Of course, the prejudices of our sources complicate discussion of the question: we have little evidence other than what Hattušiliš III tells us in the very documents in which he justifies his usurpation!² We do have, however, the odd snatch of information to supplement and to offset what Hattušiliš recounted in his version of events. This taken with a critical reading of Hattušiliš' official documents suggests, as I shall argue, that Hattušiliš did not try inordinately to impose his will on his nephew; nor was his usurpation entirely unjustified.

We shall begin with Hattušiliš' rôle in the administration of the realm during the reign of his brother Muwatalliš II, to whose intervention with their father Muršiliš II Hattušiliš owed his installation as a priest of Ištar of Samuḫa.³ Muwatalliš II was the second of Muršiliš II's three sons, the eldest, Ḫalpašulupiš, having died before his father.⁴ Interestingly enough, all of Muršiliš II's sons seem to have been sickly: Ḫalpašulupiš died as a young man; Muwatalliš II expired after a relatively brief reign with an heir perhaps still in his minority⁵; Hattušiliš' sickness resulted in his being given to Ištar as a priest: he was, in his father's opinion, apparently not fit for advancement in a military or administrative capacity. We may perhaps imagine that Muršiliš II welcomed Muwatalliš II's suggestion to send his ailing youngest son away to the goddess, for it may have seemed the only honourable way of setting up the seeming invalid in life in a comfortable fashion.

Muwatalliš II had, however, an appreciation of his brother's abilities that ran counter to his father's, for after Muwatalliš II had ascended the throne, he appointed Hattušiliš to high military rank, making him an EN KARAŠ ("lord of

¹ Ünal, Hattušili (first note). The standard summaries of Hittite history differ on whether to view Hattušiliš as a scheming Machiavel with designs on the throne from the very beginning (H. Otten, *Hethiter, Hurriter und Mitanni*, Fischer Weltgeschichte 3, Frankfurt 1966, 156–158) or as a sound administrator who was justified in seizing power (O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, Harmondsworth 1993, 28).

² See on this e.g. A. Archi, *The Propaganda of Hattušiliš III*, *SMEA* 14 [1971] 185–215.

³ *Autobiography*, I 13–18 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 4). According to Otten's interpretation of the passage it was in a dream that Muwatalliš II spoke with Muršiliš II. Even so, discussions in this regard between Muršiliš II and Muwatalliš II can easily have taken place on a corporeal plane also.

⁴ Hattušiliš places this sibling's name before that of Muwatalliš II and his own (*Autobiography*, I 9–10, [Otten, *Apologie* (first note), 6]), so Ḫalpašulupiš was in all likelihood the eldest son. As he never played any rôle in the succession and since we never again hear of him, it is probable that he died at an early age.

⁵ KBo VI 24, I 34–35 (Götze, *MVAeG* 29/3 [first note], 47). Much depends on the exact interpretation of the word *šahuiḫuššuuḫališ*, whether it mean "of age" or "of legitimate birth."

the host”) and a GAL *ME-ŠE-DI* (“captain of the guard”)⁶. This surprises all the more as it would not seem that Hattušiliš had acquired any military experience as a priest of Ištar. Muwatalliš II farther made Hattušiliš administrator of the Upper Land⁷, one of the two main territories into which the Hittite Kingdom proper was divided. Again, any special competence of Hattušiliš in such a high capacity does not emerge from his experience as priest of Ištar. Yet nothing during the reign of Muwatalliš II occurred that gave the lie to Muwatalliš II’s confidence in his brother’s capability to function in these positions.

On the contrary, Hattušiliš seems to have been an exemplary administrator and soldier, one whom Muwatalliš II implicitly trusted. Hattušiliš admits to one trial before his brother in which he was apparently at some risk⁸: Muwatalliš II, however, found no wrongdoing on the part of Hattušiliš and continued to maintain him in high office. After the trial, in fact, Muwatalliš II entrusted Hattušiliš with the administration of the entire Hittite army and began to send him out on campaign.⁹ No mistrust of his brother dissuaded Muwatalliš II from taking the unparalleled step of moving the capital to Tarḫundašša in the South, in the Lower Land, while leaving Hattuša and the Upper Land in the hands of Hattušiliš.¹⁰ Nothing entitles us to suspect that Muwatalliš II was splitting the kingdom into two parts: the kingdom had long been divided into two districts. Radical in Muwatalliš II’s procedure was only the transference of the centre of power away from the lands within the bend of the River Halys. We may presume that Kaškaean pressure played a rôle in this decision.

We shall see that an analysis of the two passages relating to Muwatalliš II’s moving of the capital supports this conclusion. Let us look at the second of these:

52. *nam-ma-kân* DINGIR.MEŠ ^{URU}*ba-at-ti* GIDIM.HI.A-*ia pí-di ni-ni-ik-ta*

53. *na-aš I-NA* ^{URU}*dU-aš-ša kat-ta pí-e-da-aš nu* ^{URU}*dU-aš-ša-an e-ep-ta*¹¹

“Moreover he took up at (their) place the gods and *manes* of the city of Hattuša and brought them down into the city of Tarḫundašša and took the city of Tarḫundašša (for his dwelling-place).”

⁶ Autobiography, I 24–25 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 6). On the terms EN KARAŠ and GAL *ME-ŠE-DI* see now R. H. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, Heidelberg 1992 (Texte der Hethiter 20), 417–426 and 327–342 respectively.

⁷ Autobiography, I 27 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 6).

⁸ Autobiography, I 33–62 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 6–18).

⁹ Autobiography, I 63–66 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 8).

¹⁰ The relevant texts are cited below.

¹¹ Autobiography, II 52–53 (Otten, Apologie [first note] 14). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1; B = KBo III 6. Ms. B. (II 34) writes *ú-e-te-it* “he built” instead of the *e-ep-ta* “he took” of Ms. A (I 53).

The phraseology duplicates exactly an earlier passage:

75. GIM-*an-ma* ŠEŠ-*IA* ¹NIR.GÁL IŠ-TU A-MA-AT DINGIR^{LIM}-ŠÚ
76. I-NA KUR ŠAP-LI-TI *kat-ta pa-it* ^{URU}*ḫa-at-tu-ša-an-ma ar-ḫa tar-na-aš*
- II.1 nu[. . . DINGIR.MEŠ] ^{URU}KÙ.BABBAR-ti GIDIM.ḪI.A-*ia* *ša-ra-a da-a-aš*
2. *na-aš* I-NA KUR ^{URU}[. . . *pí*]-*e-da-aš* EGER-^[az-ma]
3. KUR *ga-aš-ga*.ḪI.A *ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš* KUR [^{URU}]*pí-iš-ḫu-ru* KUR
^{URU}*da-iš-ti-pa-aš-ša*
4. BAL *i-ia-at* nu KUR ^{URU}*iš-ḫu*-[*pí*]-*il-ta* K]UR ^{URU}*ma-ri-iš-ta*
5. URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A BÀD-*ia-ar-ḫa ḫar-ga*[-*nu-i*]^{r12}

“When my brother, Muwatalliš at the behest of his deity went down into the Lower Land, leaving, however, the city of Hattuša, then *he took up the [gods] and manes of the city of Hattuša and [b]rought them into the land of the city of . . .* (emphasis mine). Thereupon, however, the lands of the Kaškaeans – the land of Pišḫuru and the land of Daištipa – all made rebellion. So they destr[oy]ed the land of Išḫupī[ta], the land of Marišta, and the fortified cities.”

That these passages could be taken as doublets has always occurred to scholars,¹³ though the gap in the earlier precludes any direct proof. Farther references to the campaign referred to do, however, constitute in my opinion a strong hint that the accounts of the removal of the gods and *manes* do recall the same event. Now the passage just cited quite remarkably does not include an account of which steps the Hittites took against the Kaškaeans: we learn of the enemy's advances and successes and then hear:

15. . . .]^[TIM] *iš-tap-pa-an e-eš-ta nu-uš-ma-aš* I-NA MU.X.KAM
16. NUMUN Ū-UL *an-ni-eš-ki-ir pa-ra-a-ma* MU.KAM.ḪI.A-*aš ku-e-da-aš*
17. ŠEŠ-*IA* ¹NIR.GÁL-*iš* I-NA KUR ^{URU}*ḫa-at-ti e-eš-ta*
18. *nu* KUR ^{URU}*ga-aš-ga*.ḪI.A *ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš ku-ru-ri-ia-aḫ-ḫi-ir*¹⁴

¹² Autobiography, I 75 – II 5 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 10). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1 + XIX 62; B = KBo III 6; D = KUB I 5 + II 11 + Bo 69/363. There are three inconsequential textual variants: A I 75 ¹NIR.GÁL vs. B I 64 ¹NIR.GÁL-*iš*; A I 76 KUR ŠAP-LI-TI vs. D I 47 KUR ^{URU}ŠAP-LI-^[TIM]; A I 76 *kat-ta* vs. B I 65 GAM.

¹³ Ünal, Hattušili 1 (first note), 51, rejects the idea; H. Otten, Historische Konsequenzen aus der Neubearbeitung des großen Thronbesteigungsberichts Hattušilis III., in: Türk Tarih Kongressi 9/1, Ankara 1986, 215–216, argues for a doublet. I am in substantial agreement with the arguments of Otten, though I would like perhaps to go a bit farther in the discussion than he.

¹⁴ Autobiography, II 15–18 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 10). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1; B = KBo III 6; E = KUB I 6. Instead of *kuedaš* (A II 16) Ms. B II 2 and E II 10 write *kuitman*. The sense is unaltered.

“[*But since the land* (vel sim.)] was oppressed, among them one did not sow grain for ten years. But even during the years when my brother Muuatalliš was in the Land of Hatti the lands of the Kaškaeans all made war.”

The text has told us that Muuatalliš II left Hattuša and took the household gods with him. Thereupon the Kaškaeans made war upon Hatti. Suddenly, however, the account of this war meanders off into a generalisation on how no grain was sown for ten years in the lands affected by this invasion (clearly an exaggeration). Then the text speaks of the time when Muuatalliš II was still in Hattuša; on my interpretation this must introduce a flashback, an account of events which in a strict chronological order of events would have belonged before the account of Muuatalliš II's departure.¹⁵ At all events the account of the Kaškaean invasion breaks off without any conclusion, a sure indication that what immediately follows (an account of a Kaškaean invasion which affected the towns of Dankuua and Pattiariga i.e. a geographically different region – and of which we know the conclusion: according to the text itself it was beaten back by Hattušiliš¹⁶) indeed is interjected. For it is a later passage which takes up the events in Pišhuru and Marišta:

II.31 *ú-it-ma* ^{LÚ}KÚR ^{URU}*pí-iš-ḫu-ru-uš an-da a-ar-aš* ^{URU}*ka-ra-aḫ-n[a-aš]-ša*
32. ^{URU}*ma-ri-iš-ta-aš ŠA* ^{LÚ}KÚR ...¹⁷

“It came to pass, however, that the enemy, (namely) the city of Pišhuru, came in. And the city of Karaḫn[a] (and) the city of Marišta in the midst of the enemy ...”

Although several signs after ^{LÚ}KÚR have been lost, thus obscuring the exact meaning of the passage, the general sense seems to be clear enough: the enemy is operating from Pišhuru and about Marišta.¹⁸ Little stands in the way of assuming that Hattušiliš means the same Kaškaean campaign to which he has referred earlier without recounting its conclusion, especially since we learn this time how the campaign ended:

37. ...*nu-mu a-pí-ia-ia*
38. ^dIŠTAR GAŠAN-IA *pí-ra-an ḫu-u-ua-a-iš nu-za a-pí-ia-ia* ^{LÚ}KÚR
39. *IŠ-TU NÍ-TE-IA tar-aḫ-ḫu-un* ^{LÚ}^{LUM}*-ma ku-iš pí-ra-an ḫu-u-i-ia-an-za*

¹⁵ So also Otten, *Konsequenzen* (note 13), 216.

¹⁶ *Autobiography*, II 19–30 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 10–12).

¹⁷ *Autobiography*, II 31–32 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 12). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1; B = KBo III 6; C = KUB I 2. Ms. B (II 16) here twice sets crossed wedges to indicate an illegible portion of the tablet which was being copied. The other Mss. either seem to have skipped this portion without indication or are missing for this passage.

¹⁸ Thus also Otten, *Apologie* (first note), 13, note to line 31.

40. *e-eš-ta* [nu] *an-da pí-en-nu*[- . . .] *na-an-kán* GIM-*an ku-e-nu-un*
 41. ^{LÚ}KÚR-*ma-za pí-d-da*-[a]¹-iš URU.DIDLI.HI.A-*ma ku-i-e-eš ŠA KUR* ^{URU} *ḫa-at-ti*
 42. *iš-tap-pa-an-te-eš e-šir nu-kán* [GUL]¹-*ḫi-eš-ki-ir*
 43. *nu* ^{LÚ}KÚR *ḫu-ul-li-iš-ki-u-ua-an ti-i-e-ir*
 44. ŠU.AN-*ma I-NA* ^{URU} *ú-i-iš-ta-ua-an-da ú*-[e]¹-*da-aḫ-ḫu-un*
 45. *nu-mu a-pí-ia-ia ŠA* ^dIŠTAR GAŠAN-*IA ka-ni-eš-šu-u-ua-ar e-eš-ta*
 46. ^{GİŠ}TUKUL-*ma ku-in a-pí-ia ḫar-ku-un na-an ḫa-li-iš*-[ši]¹-*ia-nu-un*
 47. *na-an A-NA DINGIR* ^{LIM} GAŠAN-*IA pí-ra-an te-eḫ-ḫu-un*¹⁹

“Even there did Ištar, my mistress, hasten before me, and even there did I smite the enemy of mine own strength. He, however, who was (their) leader . . . ; and as soon as I had slain him, the enemy did flee. But the cities, which in the land of Ḫatti had been shut up, again and again struck blows and began the one after the other to fight against the enemy. The host, however, I brought to the city of Uištatauanda. And even there was the favour of Ištar, my mistress, mine. But the weapon, which I there did wield, I framed in metal and laid it before the goddess, my mistress.”

Immediately after this account of the end of the campaign we receive confirmation of our suggestion that Muwatalliš II had left Ḫattuša before this incursion of the Kaškaeans:

48. *nu-mu ŠEŠ-IA* ¹NIR.GÁL EGER-*an-da ú-it nu* ^{URU} *an-zi-li-ia-an*
 49. ^{URU} *ta-pí-iq-qa-an-na ú-e-te-it na-aš ar-ḫa-pát pa-it*
 50. *ma-ni-in-ki-ua-an-na-aš-mu Ú-UL-pát ú-it ERÉN.MEŠ-ia-za*
 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
 51. ŠA KUR ^{URU} *ḫa-at-ti pí-ra-an ḫu-u-i-nu-ut na-an ar-ḫa pí-e-ḫu-te-it*²⁰

¹⁹ Autobiography, II 37–47 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 12). Composite text; Mss. : A = KUB I 1 + KUB XIX 61; B = KBo III 6; C = KUB I 2 + KUB XIX 59. Textual variants are mostly inconsequential: A II 41 [pí-d-da]-[a]¹-iš vs. B II 24 pí-d-da-[a]¹-it; A II 42 e-šir vs. II 25 e-še-ir; A II 44 ú-i-iš-ta-ua-a[n-da] vs. B II 26 ú-i-iš-ta-u-ua-a-an-da; A II 47 te-eḫ-ḫu-un (pret. “I laid”) vs. B II 28 te-eḫ-ḫi (pres. “I lay”). However, B does omit the clause in A II 40: [nu] an-da pí-en-nu. It has been left untranslated above; perhaps “and led them on”?

We possess a badly preserved account of a campaign against the Kaškaeans which came to a conclusion near the town of Uištatauanda: KUB XIX 9, II. It could well be a campaign of Ḫattušiliš’ (II 34: ¹ḫa-at-ti-u-ši-li-iš?), and has therefore rightly been connected by Ünal (Ḫattušiliš 1 [first note], 68) with the campaign under discussion in the text.

²⁰ Autobiography, II 48–51 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 14). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1 + KUB XIX 6; B = KBo III 6. Variants are mostly inconsequential: A II 48 ¹NIR.GÁL vs. B II 29 ¹NIR.GÁL-iš; A II 48 nu vs. B II 29 nu-mu (adds sense of “built cities for me”); A II 50 ma-ni-in-ku-ua-an-na-aš-mu vs. B II 31 ma-ni-in-ku-ua-na-aš-mu; A II 51 ḫa-at-ti vs. B II 31 KÙ.BABBAR-ti. In B II 32 the word [ḫu-u-m]a-an is added after ḫa-at-ti in A II 51: “All the troops and chariot-fighters of Ḫatti.”

“So my brother, Muuatalliš, *came back* (emphasis mine); and he built the city of Anziliia and the city of Tapiqqa. Then he went even away. Yet he drew not nigh unto me; and he made the troops (and) chariot-fighters of the land of Ḫatti to go before him and led them away.”

Muuatalliš II returns on what we may call a tour of inspection. He approves of what Ḫattušiliš has done or, rather, undertakes nothing against him – that it would seem is the import of the phrase “he did not come close to me.”²¹ But as so many commanders-in-chief have done, he requisitions the troops, which, of course, his subordinate needs as sorely, for his own purposes elsewhere. The very next lines in our text refer to Muuatalliš II's moving of the capital, which I should in the light of the above discussion now prefer to translate with pluperfective force: “For he had taken up the gods and *manes* of the city of Ḫatti at (their) place and had brought them to the city of Tarḫundašša and had taken the city of Tarḫundašša (for his dwelling-place).”

To recapitulate: Ll. I 75 – II 2 mention the transfer of the capital, whereupon, Ll. II 2–16, the Kaškaean revolt and campaign in the area about Pišḫuru and Marišta. These attacks are left hanging in the air without their outcome's being mentioned. There follows a flashback, Ll. II 16–30, which deals with the time when Muuatalliš II was still in Ḫattuša and Ḫattušiliš beat back a Kaškaean invasion geographically distinct from the one described in Ll. II 2–16. Then, Ll. 31–47, we hear of the conclusion of the Kaškaean invasion near Pišḫuru und Marišta. Ll. 48–51 tell of Muuatalliš II's return to inspect what Ḫattušiliš has done and to requisition troops. Ll. 52–53 take up Ll. I 75 – II 2 and briefly restate the information given there.

We now see clearly that the events recounted in the Autobiography, II 16–30, take place before the moving of the capital, when Ḫattušiliš, justifying the faith reposed in him by his brother, beat back a Kaškaean invasion from the North. The successful conclusion of this defensive campaign was the first deed of Ḫattušiliš' manhood, about which, we may venture to guess, Ḫattušiliš intended to write a separate account.²² Muuatalliš II's decision to move the capital farther away towards the South was doubtlessly influenced by the Kaškaean attacks which took place, as we now see, immediately *before* the taking of this decision.

This moving of the capital led to a series of administrative alterations. Muuatalliš II upgraded Ḫattušiliš' status by transferring numerous lands in the North

²¹ One may compare the German phrase “er trat mir nicht zu nahe”: “he intruded not upon me, encroached not upon my prerogatives.”

²² Autobiography, I 73–74 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 8).

to Hattušiliš' portfolio²³, as it were, and by making Hattušiliš the king of the land of Ḫakpiša.²⁴ Hattušiliš was by no means an independent king: he had become the king of a land in fealty to the Hittite kingdom, i.e. he had become the vassal of Muwatalliš II. The legal position in which Hattušiliš now found himself was twofold: as administrator of the Upper Land including the other regions given into his hand he was directly and absolutely responsible to Muwatalliš II as his King; as King of Ḫakpiša on the other hand he had entered into a different relationship with Muwatalliš II by which he was indeed bound to render certain services to Muwatalliš II as his liege-lord, but by which Muwatalliš II himself was inversely bound to render certain services to Hattušiliš as his vassal. Violation of the treaty – for there certainly was a treaty of vassalage²⁵ – would, of course, have constituted grounds for an intervention on the part of the Hittite King as liege-lord, but so long as Hattušiliš as vassal fulfilled his obligations to his liege-lord, that personage had no legal justification for action against him as Vassal King. We shall see the relevance of these observations momentarily.

For now we note that Hattušiliš retained the trust of his brother, who saw nothing dangerous in granting Hattušiliš ever wider powers in regions which Muwatalliš II owing to his activities in the South could not directly oversee. Hattušiliš for his part maintained unimpeachable loyalty toward his brother. When Muwatalliš II marched against the Pharaoh of Egypt, Hattušiliš led all the troops he could gather and joined his brother at Qadeš. He thus contributed to the Hittites' victory at this crucial battle – both as Hittite administrator and general and as Vassal King leading vassal troops.²⁶

Now we have no cause to doubt that Hattušiliš held the ranks and offices which he claims to have held. We have no cause to doubt that Muwatalliš II – despite grave charges brought against Hattušiliš by high ranking Hittite notables – advanced him to the position of a virtual viceroy in the North. All of this militates strongly for the great trust which Muwatalliš II reposed in his brother. That Muwatalliš II removed troops from Hattušiliš' forces at will, that Muwatalliš II on at least one occasion came to inspect what Hattušiliš had done, and

²³ Hattušiliš thrice lists the lands which Muwatalliš II entrusted to him (Autobiography, II 57–62 [Otten, *Apologie* (first note), 14]; III 32–33 [Otten, *op.cit.*, 18]; KBo VI 29, I 26–28 [Götze, *MVAeG* 29/3 (first note), 46]). The two latter lists are abbreviated and omit many lands mentioned in the fuller one. KBo VI 29, I 28 does, however, add one detail, namely the specification of a border (the town of Kuruštama). For a synoptic listing of the lands involved see Ünal, *Hattušili* 1 (first note), 75.

²⁴ Autobiography, II 62–63 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 14); III 33 (Otten, *op.cit.*, 18); cf. KBo VI 29, I 26 (Götze, *MVAeG*, 29/3 [first note], 46).

²⁵ On such treaties with vassal kings who were members of the royal family see e.g. E. von Schuler, *Staatsverträge und Dokumente hethitischen Rechts*, in: (ed.) G. Walser, *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, Wiesbaden 1964 (*Historia Einzelschriften* 7), 41–42.

²⁶ Autobiography, II 69–73 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 14).

that Ḫattušiliš as an inferior accompanied Muuātalliš II to Qadeš – to all of this Ḫattušiliš himself readily admits – shews that Muuātalliš II did not make Ḫattušiliš co-king in any way. Ḫattušiliš may have had *de facto* a relatively free hand in the North, but he was definitely subject to Muuātalliš II's inspections and wishes. While Ḫattušiliš may have covered up any evidence of friction between himself and Muuātalliš II, the mere fact that Muuātalliš II accorded to Ḫattušiliš all of these positions and honours and maintained them all coupled with the fact that Ḫattušiliš remained clearly and indisputably subordinate (both as administrator and as vassal) bears witness of a good working relationship which probably dated back to the childhood of the two brothers. Muuātalliš II knew that Ḫattušiliš was competent and trustworthy, while Ḫattušiliš knew that Muuātalliš II would never let him twist in the wind if the political circumstances suddenly turned ugly – as they evidently once did. Ḫattušiliš knew he had no need to seize power from Muuātalliš II, while Muuātalliš II recognised that in his brother he would always have a loyal subordinate. This very interpretation of events seems to be borne out by Muuātalliš II's unparalleled transfer of the capital with all attendant administrative changes: it was his relationship with his brother which made this unheard of and potentially dangerous restructuring of the administration possible.²⁷

Muuātalliš II, however, died at a relatively young age, leaving as heirs, it would seem, two illegitimate sons perhaps still in their minority, of whom the elder, Urḫi-Tešub (who reigned as Muṣiliš III), in the absence of legitimate sons ascended the throne according to the tenets set down in Telipinuš' rules for the dynastic succession.²⁸ Ḫattušiliš states that it was he who placed Urḫi-Tešub on the throne²⁹, and we have no cause to doubt that his support was instrumental in Urḫi-Tešub's coronation: Ḫattušiliš saw himself impelled to justify his actions in this regard before both God and man! In the Autobiography he himself formulates for any human detractor the appropriate question in advance: *nu ma-a-an kiš-an ku-iš me-ma-i an-ni-ša-an-ua-ra-an LUGAL-iz-na-an-ni ku-ua-at ti-it-ta-nu-ut ki-nu-na-ua-aš-ši ku-u-ru-ur ku-ua-at ḫa-at-ri*

²⁷ It is important to note that this transfer of the capital had permanent ramifications. When Muṣiliš III moved the capital back to Ḫattuša, the national cultic centre, which Muuātalliš II had established in Tarḫundašša, remained and required maintenance. Ḫattušiliš solved the problem by turning Tarḫundašša into the capital of a vassal kingdom under a collateral lineage of the royal house. The perils inherent in this arrangement became apparent only much later when the King of the Land of Tarḫundašša, Kuruntaš (= Ulmi-Tešub) claimed the throne for himself as shewn by Hieroglyphic Luwian seals with the legend "the Great King, the Labarna, Kuruntaš": see H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV.*, Wiesbaden 1988 (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Bh. 1), 5.

²⁸ Telipinuš-Decree, II 36–39. Text: I. Hoffmann, *Der Erlaß Telipinus*, Heidelberg 1984 (Texte der Hethiter 11), 32.

²⁹ Autobiography, III 41–43 (Otten, *Apologie* [first note], 20); cited below.

eš-ki-ši,³⁰ “And should any ask, ‘wherefore madest thou him of former days King? Wherefore, then, writest thou now of enmity against him?’ ” His answer is of no relevance to us; important is that he felt the necessity to explain himself. In his and his wife’s Prayer various actions for which Hattušiliš might have to bear the blame are listed; these include his placing Urhi-Tešub on the throne, an act for which he somewhat whiningly craves pardon: his intentions had, after all, been good.³¹ If Hattušiliš really had not helped make his nephew King, would he not in his defense before the deity simply have denied complicity?

We have already seen that during the reign of Muwatalliš II Hattušiliš had chiefly concerned himself with the northern territories of the Hittite empire. We shall now attempt to demonstrate that during the reign of Muršiliš III his uncle remained active only in the North, i.e. that he did not attempt to run the government through an underage Muršiliš III. First, we know of only one concrete action taken by Hattušiliš during his nephew’s reign before they began their dispute. In his Autobiography Hattušiliš places his account of the retaking of Nerik immediately after that of the accession of Muršiliš III. Although the passage in question is somewhat damaged, we can make out enough to reconstruct the general import of the remarks:

41. . . . nu ¹úr-*hi*-^dU-up-an DUMU E-ŠE-ER-TI
42. ša-¹ra-a¹ [da-ab-*h*]u-un na-an I-NA KUR ^{URU}[*ha-a*]t-ti
43. EN-an-ni x[. . . ^{URU}*ha-at-tu-ša-an*] *hu-u-ma-an-da-an*
44. ŠU-i te-*eh*-*hu-un* na-aš A-NA KUR.KUR.MEŠ [*ha-at-ti* LUGAL.GAL] ¹e¹-eš-ta
45. am-mu-uk-ma-za LUGAL ^{URU}*ha-ak-piš-ša e-šu-un nu IŠ-TU KARAŠ*
46. ANŠE.KUR.RA[MEŠ. . .] nu ^{URU}*ne-ri-iq-qa-aš*
47. ku-it IŠ-TU U₄-UM ¹*ha-an-ti-li ar-*ha* *har-ga-an-za e-eš-ta**
48. na-an EGER-pa *ú-e-[da-ab-*h*]hu-un* [KUR.KUR.MEŠ]-*ia ku-e* [I]-NA ^{URU}*ne-ri-ik*
49. a-ra-ab-za-[an-da] e-eš-ta [. . . ^{URU}*ni-e-ra-an* ^{URU}*ha-aš-ti-ra-an*
50. ZAG-an [i]-ia-n[u-un n]a-at-za *hu-u-ma-an* [I]R-ab-*hu-un*
51. n[a-at-z]a ar-kam-ma-na-al-li-uš [i-ia-nu-un ^{HUR.SAG}*ha-har-ua-aš-za-kán*

³⁰ Autobiography, III 73–76 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 22). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1 + KUB XIX 66; B = KBo III 6 + KUB I 4 + 674/v; F = KUB XIX 67 + 1102/v + KUB I 10; L = KUB I 9. Although the variants are numerous, none truly alters the import: F II 26 has *ki-iš-ša-an* against the others’ *kiš-an*; B III 41 has *ku-iš-ki* “anyone whoever” against *ku-iš* “anyone” of A (III 73) and F (II 26). B III 41 has *an-ni-ša-an-* instead of the ¹a¹-[an]-ni-ša-an- in F II 26; it corresponds to A III 74 which is broken off here. B III 42 has *ki-nu-un-ma-ua-aš-ši ku-ru-ri-¹ia¹-ab-*hu-an-zi* [ku]-u-ua-at *ha-at-ri-iš-ki-ši**: “Wherefore, however, writest thou now to make war upon him?” A III 75 is as given in the text; F II 28 departs from this only with regard to the orthographical variant *ku-ru-ur* as opposed to *ku-u-ru-ur*.

³¹ Prayer of Hattušiliš and Puduhepaš, II 23–40 (Sürenhagen [first note], 92).

52. ^[17]*ma-ra-aš-ša-an-da-aš-ša x[. . .k]u-it IŠ-TU^{URU}ne-ri-ik*
 53. ^[18]*IŠ-TU^{URU}ḫa-ak-piš-ša da-ma-aš-ša-an ḫar-kir nu-za ḫu-u-ma-an-da-an*
 54. *ÌR-ab-ḫu-un*³²

“And I [too]k up Urḫi-Tešup, the son of a concubine, und [*advanced*] him in the land of [Ḫa]tti to the lordship. All [Ḫattuša] did I lay in his hand, so that he was [Great King] in the lands of Ḫ[atti]. I, however, was King of Ḫakpiša. And with the army and the chariot-fighter[s. . .] And since Nerik had lain destroyed since the days of Ḫantiliš, I bu[il]ded it again. The lands also, which bord[er]ed Nerik, [. . .] the towns of Nira and Ḫaštira did I [m]ak[e] (to be) the border, for I conquered them all and [made them] pay tribute. [Mt.] Ḫarḫuua and the River (?) Maraššanda [. . .wh]atever of Nerik or Ḫakpiša they held subjected, I conquered it all.”

We have, however, already had occasion to observe that the Autobiography does not follow a chronological arrangement of events. It remains, therefore, theoretically possible that Hattušiliš retook Nerik during the reign of Muwatalliš II or even during his own. Another document, although itself also fragmentary, does at least make clear, that Hattušiliš recaptured Nerik while still king of Ḫakpiša, i.e. before his coup d'état:

7. *[nu ku-it-ma-an A-BU-IA¹ ḫa-at-tu-ši-li-iš^{URU}U]ne-ri-iq-qa-an ú-e-da-aš na-an EG[ER-pa a-še-ša-nu-u]*
 8. *[nu ku-it-ma-an^{URU}ne-ri-ik URU-an (EGER-pa?) e-]^[ep]ta KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-ia-ši ḫu-u-ma-an-da za-ab-ḫ[i-ia me-na-ab-ḫa-an-da ti-ia-a]*
 9. *[nu A-BU-IA KUR.KUR.MEŠ^{LÚKÚR} ḫu-u-ma-an-da^{URU}]^[ep]ne-ri-iq-qa-az ar-ḫa u-i-ia-at x[. . .]*
 10. *[nu ku-it-ma-an A-BU-IA¹ ḫa-]ad-du-ši-li-iš LUGAL KUR^{URU}[ḫa]-ak-ki-me-i[š e-eš-ta . . .]*³³

“[While my father, Hattušiliš,] was building Nerik and [re]settling it, [and while] he was (re)conquering [the city of Nerik], even all the (enemy) lands

³² Autobiography, III 41–54, (Ottén, Apologie [first notel], 20). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB I 1 + KUB XIX 63; B = KBo III 6 + KUB I 7; E = KUB XIX 68 + KUB XIX 65 + KUB XXXI 13 + 1194/v + 922/v; F = KUB XIX 64. Textual variants are inconsequential: F I 41 adds the determinative MUNUS before *E-ŠE-ER-TI* (A III 41); E III 11 writes KÜ.BABBAR-*ti* instead of *ḫa-a]t-ti* (A III 42); E III 12 writes *ḫu-u-ma-an-]a-an* as opposed to the *ḫu-u-ma-an-da-an* of A III 43 and F I 44; E III 16 spells *ne-ri-iq-qa* instead of *ne-ri-ik* (A III 48); F I 49 has *ḫa-aš-te-ra-an* instead of *ḫa-aš-ti-ra-an* of A III 49 and E III 17; E III 17 has the ideogramme DÜ-n[u-un for the phonetic *i-]ia-n[u-un* of A III 50; E III 18 has *ḫa-ḫar-ua-aš* for the *ḫa-ḫar-ua* of A III 51 which Ottén reads as *ḫa-ḫar-ua-aš*’.

³³ KUB XXI 9, 1 7–10 (Text: Ünal, Hattušili 2 [first notel], 8).

[came against him] to batt[le. And my father] drave out [all the enemy lands] from Nerik. . .[And while my father, H]attušiliš, was King of H[akmi]š. . .]

Hakmiš ist but a variant spelling for H[akpi]ša³⁴, of which city Hattušiliš was made king by his brother. While the words “my father” do not appear in the preserved part of the text, this supplement does have some general probability, so Hattušiliš’ son, Tudh[alia]š IV, presumably wrote this text. Be that as it may, it seems virtually certain that Hattušiliš’ taking of Nerik antedated his accession to the throne. Did it, however, antedate Ur[hi]-Tešub’s? We may return a negative answer on the basis of the Prayer of Puduhepaš:

38. *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-za* ¹*mu-u-ua-ta-al-li-iš* [*a-pí-e*]-¹*el* [ŠEŠ-ŠU]
39. DINGIR^{LM}-*iš ki-ša-at* ¹*úr-ḫi*-^dIM-up-an [DUMU-a]n Š[EŠ-ŠU]
40. [*d*]*a-at-ta na-an* LUGAL-u-iz-na-an-ni ti-i[t-ta-nu-u]
41. [*n*]*u-kān* ¹*ḫa-at-tu-ši-li-in* ÌR-KA [. . .]
42. [*A*]-NA ^{URU}*ne-ri-iq-qa ma-aḫ-ḫa-an an-da* [*u-i-ia-at* ?]
43. *na-at* ^dUTU ^{URU}TÚL-na GAŠAN-IA *ša-ak-ti* [*ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-an*]
44. [*pa-ri*]-an *pār-ḫi-iš-ki-it* DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL-*ia-an* [*ma-aḫ-ḫa-an*]
45. [*ú*]-¹*e*-*ri-eš-kir* A-NA ^{URU}*ne-ri-iq-qa-ua* . . .³⁵

“But after Muwatalliš, [hi]s (i.e. Hattušiliš’) [brother], had become a god, he [t]ook up Ur[hi]-Tešub, [his] br[other’s son], and m[ade] him King. And thou, O Sungoddess of Arinna, my mistress, knowest that he (i.e. Ur[hi]-Tešub) . . . Hattušiliš, thy servant, (Acc.!), and how he (i.e. Ur[hi]-Tešub) [*pressed*] (Hattušiliš) on towards Nerik. [But how] he persisted in urging [him] on! [How] the Princes also continually called to him: ‘On to Nerik!’”

We now see clearly that Ur[hi]-Tešub was already on the throne when Hattušiliš reconquered Nerik. In this campaign he was only continuing his long-standing policy in the North of slowly reestablishing Hittite control³⁶; nothing implies that this could in any way have been construed as a threat towards Muršiliš III. Puduhepaš’ Prayer, if anything, seems to imply that Hattušiliš was under considerable pressure from Muršiliš III and the Hittite court swiftly to retake Nerik.

There is farther evidence that Hattušiliš confined his activities to the northern regions. When Hattušiliš at last revolted against his nephew, those willing to take the field with him were exceeding few. In a context in which it would

³⁴ See G. F. del Monte and J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*, Wiesbaden 1978 (*Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* 6), 65–67; del Monte, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement*, Wiesbaden 1992 (*Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* 6/2), 22–23.

³⁵ KUB XXI 27; Prayer of Puduhepaš, I 38–45 (Sürenhagen [first note], 110).

³⁶ We may note that KUB XXI 11 (Text: Ünal, Hattušili 2 [first note], 14) also attests wars with the Kaškaeans during Hattušiliš’ tenure as King of H[akpi]ša.

have behaved him to mention as many allies as possible he explicitly names only the Kaškaeans. In the Autobiography he claims that these and “all (the city of) Hattuša” came to his aid.³⁷ If with this he means the entire Hittite empire, then surely we may take him to task for an exaggeration. If he means only the city of Hattuša, then this is easily explained: an old crony of his, Mittannamuwaš had long been governor in that city.³⁸ It would not surprise if Hattušiliš had been able to gather some supporters in the capital. We do, however, possess a text in which he forgives the burghers of Hattuša for not supporting him.³⁹ In yet another text he boasts, *nu ḫa-at-ra-a-nu-un ku-e-[da](-aš KUR.KU)R-e-aš EGER-an-ua-mu ti-ia-at-ten na-at-mu EGER-an ti-[i]-e-ir Ú-UL-ia ku-e-da-aš KUR-e-aš ḫa-at-ra-a-nu-un nu ḫu-u-ma-an-pāt am-me-e-ta-az ti-ia-at*,⁴⁰ “whatever[r] lands I wrote, ‘follow me!’, they followed me; those lands also, to which I wrote not – they, all of them, took their place by my side.” We must take these vague generalisations for what they are really worth.⁴¹ In another passage Hattušiliš claims that Muršiliš III had to levy troops *A-NA ERÍN.MEŠ KUR UGU*^{77, 42} “against the troops of the Upper Land”; i.e. that Hattušiliš himself had succeeded in raising the muster of the Upper Land – and had received no support whatsoever from the Lower Land. Perhaps the entire Upper Land really did repair to his standard. On the other hand, it may well be that Hattušiliš took the field with only those troops which he could gather on short notice in the North: whatever Hittite troops he happened to have with him, troops from his vassal kingdom, allied Kaškaean clans from the hills. It had been with exactly these troops (minus the Kaškaeans) that he had marched with his brother against the Egyptians.⁴³ It is significant that Hattušiliš never explicitly claims that he received support from any area outside of his traditional power base: the Upper Land, which he had long governed; the Kaškaeans, with some of whom he had obviously established firm ties of allegiance. Even then we cannot really be certain that the entire muster of the Upper Land ral-

³⁷ Autobiography, IV 26–29 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 24).

³⁸ KBo IV 12, I 6–17 (Götze, MVAeG 29/3 [first note], 40–42). This contradicts other statements (e.g. Prayer of Hattušiliš and Puduḫepaš, III 9–10 [Sürenhagen (first note), 94]; Prayer of Puduḫepaš, I 29–30 [Sürenhagen, op.cit., 110]; Autobiography, III 46–47, [Otten, Apologie (first note), 20]) in which Hattušiliš claims that he himself governed the capital. Either Hattušiliš is arrogating something to himself which actually appertained to a crony, or both Hattušiliš and Mittannamuwaš governed the capital at different times. The distinction is not apposite to our purposes.

³⁹ KUB XXI 37 (esp. I 15). Text: Ünal, Hattušili 2 [first note], 116–122; cf. P. Meriggi, *Über einige hethitische Fragmente historischen Inhaltes*, WZKM 58 [1962] 66–68; Archi, Propaganda (note 1), 203–208.

⁴⁰ KBo VI 29, II 14–17 (Götze, MVAeG 29/3 [first note], 48).

⁴¹ Hattušiliš may well have written to various nobles while preparing his revolt. Perhaps they sent him veiled words of encouragement and no troops.

⁴² Autobiography, IV 4 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 22).

⁴³ Autobiography, II 70–74 (Otten, Apologie [first note], 16).

lied about his standard. Given the utter dearth of active help in the southern regions of the empire, we must conclude that Hattušiliš had never had opportunity to gather supporters there, to build up a power base there. With other words: during the reign of Muršiliš III as well as that of Muwatalliš II the activities of Hattušiliš remained confined to the North where he merely continued policies inaugurated under Muwatalliš II: we have no evidence of activities elsewhere.

We know of only one policy decision during the years of Muršiliš III's reign, in which Hattušiliš may have played a part. Muwatalliš II – so far the sources are agreed – had deposed Bentešina, the King of Amurru, and set up in his place Šapiliš, whom a successor of Muwatalliš II's deposed in favour of Bentešina.⁴⁴ The official position of both Hattušiliš and his son Tudḫaliyaš in their treaties with Amurru was that Hattušiliš had reenthroned Bentešina.⁴⁵ No one had doubted this, knew we not of the following curious document:

KUB XXI 33, Z. 1–17

1–2. Vest.

3. [. . .]x ^{ld}SIN^lLUGAL-*ma-kān*^l *me-mi-aš* ^l*mur-ši-DINGIR*^{LIM}-*iš-ma*[. . .]

4. [. . .]x-*ša²-ta* DAM ^{ld}SIN.LUGAL-*ma-kān* ŠĀ É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ[. . .]

5. [. . .]*kān* EN-IA *ku-it* UKÚ.MEŠ-*an-za* EGER-*an-da* *mar*[. . .]

6. [^l*mur-ši-DINGIR*]^{IR}^{LIM}-*iš-ma* DUMU-KA *a-pí-e-da-ni* *me-mi-ni* *še-ir*[x x x ?]

7. [*kar-tim-mi-ia*]-*nu-ut*

8. [. . .]x EN-IA ^l*ma-na-pa*-^dU-*an* I-NA KUR-ŠU Ū-UL EGER[*tar-ni-eš-ta*

9. [^l*mu-ua-at-ta-al-li-iš-kā*]*n* LUGAL.GAL EN-IA A-NA ^l*mur-ši-DINGIR*^{LIM}-*ia*-
 EGER-*pa* *ua*[*tar-na-aḫ-ta*]

10. [^l*ma-na-pa*-^dU-*an-ua* I-NA KUR-ŠU *li-e* EGER-*pa* *tar-na-at-ti*

11. [^l*mur-ši-DINGIR*^{LIM}-*i*]*š-ma-an* I-NA KUR-ŠU EGER-*pa* *tar-ni-eš-ta*

12. [. . .]EN-IA ^{MUNUS}DINGIR.MEŠ.IR_l-*in* A-NA ^l*ma-na-pa*-^dU AŠ-ŠUM
 É.G[E₄(A) Ū-UL AD-DIN]

13. [. . .]x-*it* ^l*mur-ši-DINGIR*^{LIM}-*iš-ma-an-ši* AD-DIN

14. [^l*mu-ua-at-ta-al-li-iš-kā*]*n* [EN]-IA ^lZAG.ŠEŠ-*an* I-NA KUR ^{URU}*a-mur-ri*
 LUGAL-*an-ni* *ar-ḫa* *ti-i*[*t-ta-nu-ut*]

15. [*nu-kān* ^l*ša-pi-DINGIR*^{LIM}-*in*] I-NA KUR ^{URU}*a-mur-ri* LUGAL-*un* *i-ia-at*

⁴⁴ “Muršiliš’ Sins” (cited immediately below); Treaty of Hattušiliš with Bentešina of Amurru, I 12–17 (Text: E. F. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien* 2, Leipzig 1923 [Boghazköi-Studien 9], 126); Treaty of Tudḫaliyaš IV with Šaušgamušaš of Amurru, I 37–45 (Text: C. Kühne and H. Otten, *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag*, Wiesbaden 1971 [Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 16], 8).

⁴⁵ Treaty with Bentešina, I 16–17 (Weidner [note 44], 126); Treaty with Šaušgamušaš, I 40–45 (Kühne-Otten [note 44], 8).

16. [¹*mur-ši-DINGIR^{LIM}-iš-ma* ¹*š*]*a-pí-DINGIR^{LIM}-in I-NA KUR^{URU}a-mur-ri*
LUGAL-*an-ni*
17. [*ar-ḫa ti-it-ta-n*]*u-ut nu* ¹*ZAG.ŠEŠ-an* LUGAL-*an-ni* E[GE]R-*pa* *ua-tar-na-*
*aḫ-ta*⁴⁶

“... said, however, ^dSIN.LUGAL. But Muršiliš ... the wife of ^dSIN.LUGAL, however, inside of the temples

“... since My Lord the people thereafter ... but [Muršiliš] was wr[oth] with Thy Son on account of that affair ...

“... My Lord [sent] not Manappa-^dU back to his country. [Muwatalliš], the Great King, my Lord, in[structed] Muršiliš (thus): ‘Send [Manappa-^dU] not back to his country.’ But [Muršiliš] sent him back to his country

“... My Lord [gave not ...] the woman DINGIR.MEŠ.IR to Manappa-^dU for a bri[de]. But Muršiliš gave her to him (for a bride).

“[Muwatalliš], My [Lo]rd, de[posed] Bentešina in the land of Amurru from the kingship, [and] made [Šapiliš] ... King in the land of Amurru.

“[But Muršiliš deposed [Š]apiliš [from] the kingship in the land of Amurru and entrusted Bentešina with the kingship a[ga]in.”

The document deals with an Hittite King named Muršiliš whom the unknown author accuses of various deviations from a proper course; hence its conventional name “Muršiliš’ Sins.” Some have identified the Muršiliš named with Muršiliš II, others with Muršiliš III.⁴⁷ For the former it can be alleged that Manappa-^dU is attested as king of Šeḫa-River-Land at the beginning of Muršiliš II’s

⁴⁶ KUB XXI 33. The latest paper on this difficult document known to me is that of C. Mora, KUB XXI 33 e l’identità di Muršili III, SMEA 29 [1992] 127–148. The best discussion, however, remains, in my opinion, that of Meriggi, *Fragmente* (note 39), 70–76, who saw clearly that the paragraphs were structured according to a simple pattern: “My Lord the King did such and such; Muršiliš, however, did exactly the opposite.” On the basis of this pattern we must restore “Muršiliš” in line 16 (despite H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v. u. Z.* 2, Berlin 1969, n. 123 [Pp. 241–243], who wishes to restore “Hattušiliš”). After “Muršiliš, however” the verb (when written Hittite) is without exception in the 3rd person. Therefore, *AD-DIN* in l. 13 is to be interpreted as a mistake for *ID-DIN* (lapses of this kind are hardly uncommon amongst Hittite scribes of whom many had but a meagre knowledge of Akkadian grammar). In l. 12 I have accordingly restored the incorrect form.

⁴⁷ R. Stephanini, KUB XXI 33 (Bo 487): Muršili’s Sins, JAOS 84 [1964] 22–30, prefers Muršiliš II, whereas Meriggi, *Fragmente* (note 39), 70–76, opts (rightly, in my opinion) for Muršiliš III. I find I cannot accept C. Mora’s arguments, *Identità* (note 46), 137–142, that the Muršiliš mentioned in this document is a different king from Muršiliš II but not Urḫi-Tešub, whom, she maintains, no one would have called by the name of Muršiliš after his dethronement. In my opinion this premise must be proved before one can base arguments on it.

reign.⁴⁸ By the reign of Muuatalliš II a man named Mašturiš was king in Šeḫa-River-Land; he ruled till at least the beginning of the reign of Ḫattušiliš III.⁴⁹ If our Manappa-^dU is identical with the homonymous king of Šeḫa-River-Land, then our Muršiliš will be the second of that name. However, the text does not say over what land this particular Manappa-^dU ruled, so we cannot exclude a homonym. The presence of Manappa-^dU in our text is therefore not decisive for identifying the Muršiliš named with Muršiliš II. The presence of Bentešina and Šapiliš are, however, decisive for Muršiliš III. We know from Ḫattušiliš' treaty with Bentešina that Muuatalliš II deposed this ruler and replaced him with Šapiliš, and that later Bentešina was restored. It would surely be stretching credulity too far to posit that a predecessor of Muršiliš II's (Arnuwandaš II? Suppiluliumaš I?) had deposed an earlier ruler named Bentešina in favour, coincidentally, of another ruler named Šapiliš, whom Muršiliš II replaced with Bentešina; and that two generations later actors with the exact same names should switch rôles in Amurru in the exact same order. For this reason, our text must refer to Muršiliš III.⁵⁰

Our text is obviously a letter or memorandum of a highly placed Hittite official who shews himself apprised of many aspects of policy under Muuatalliš II and Muršiliš III.⁵¹ He is writing (evidently after the reign of Muršiliš III) to someone even more highly placed than himself – hence his reference to him-

⁴⁸ Annals of Muršiliš (both versions, year 4): A. Götze, Die Annalen des Muršiliš, Leipzig 1933 (MVAeG 38 = Hethitische Texte 6) (Reprint Darmstadt 1967), 66–72.

⁴⁹ Treaty with Šaušgamušaš, II 15–30 (Kühne-Otten [note 44], 10).

⁵⁰ I should tentatively and with all due reserve like to make a suggestion as to who the Manappa-^dU involved in this text may have been. KBo I 24 + KUB III 23 + KUB III 84 E. Edel, Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi, Opladen 1994 (ARWAW 77), Nr. 28 preserves a letter written by the Pharaoh of Egypt, Ramses II, to the King of Mira, who had written to Egypt on behalf of the deposed Urḫi-Tešub, for whose sake Ramses II did not, however, wish to risk scuttling his good relations with Ḫattušiliš. Ramses II rejected the King of Mira's overtures and, apparently, sent copies of the correspondence to his Hittite counterpart. The King of Mira's name has now been read by Edel after collation by Klengel as ^{<1>}ku-¹pa-an¹[-ta-^dLAMA]. If the first vertical wedge of KU is taken as the missing *Personenkeil* then KU could be read MA. According to Edel's copy (Plate XIX) there seems to be very little room between KU and AN for PA (the vertical wedge of which seems to be missing anyway). Could one read ¹ma-¹na¹[-ap-pa-^dU]? If Muršiliš III took his aunt DINGIR.MEŠ.IR away from Mašturiš of Šeḫa-River-Land and gave her to the King of Mira, it could explain why Mašturiš who according to the Treaty with Šaušgamušaš, II 15–19 (Kühne-Otten [note 44], 10), had received DINGIR.MEŠ.IR to wife from Muuatalliš II did not lift a finger to help Muršiliš III; and why the King of Mira did. I gladly admit that this economical solution, which identifies the Manappa-^dU to whom Muršiliš III was friendly with the King of Mira who was friendly to Muršiliš III could easily be false economy.

⁵¹ This interpretation of Meriggi's, *Fragmente* (note 39), 70–76, remains for me the most plausible; but cf. the discussion of Mora, *Identità* (note 46), 134–135.

self as “Thy Son” – whom he expects to sympathise with his carping against Muršiliš III. One might even guess that the addressee of these comments was none other than Ḫattušiliš himself, for whom better to complain of Muršiliš III to?⁵² Yet we cannot substantiate this guess. At any rate, there were at least two highly placed officials during the reign of Ḫattušiliš III who knew that Muršiliš III had installed Bentešina as King in Amurru. As this is not the official story, we ought to believe it over against the official version according to which Ḫattušiliš reenthroned Bentešina; an official version which, by the way, omitted to mention that Ḫattušiliš did not succeed his brother directly but was instead preceeded by Muršiliš III.⁵³ Considering this undeniable glossing over of an unpleasant reality in the official version, the one presented to us in “Muršiliš’ Sins” (admittedly by restoration) gains in trustworthiness.

Therefore, it was Muršiliš III who reinstated Bentešina in Amurru. As Ḫattušiliš – at least officially – claimed responsibility, however, this affair could provide evidence for Ḫattušiliš’ guidance of Muršiliš III’s policies. Such a conclusion certainly does provide an easy means of reconciling the official version with what really happened: Ḫattušiliš merely took credit for what had been done on his advice and at his instigation in the first place.

Nevertheless, we must remember that Bentešina’s recall as King of Amurru apparently took place against the wishes of some high officials at court, officials who survived into the reign of Ḫattušiliš and corresponded concerning the wise policy of Muwatalliš II and Muršiliš III’s traducing of it. If this is so, then we should be cautious in assuming that Ḫattušiliš had anything to do with Bentešina’s reenthronement; let us recall that the author of “Muršiliš’ Sins” may have been writing to Ḫattušiliš himself! For all we know, Ḫattušiliš too may have adhered to that group of officials who considered Bentešina’s reinstatement unwise.⁵⁴ To conclude: the affair of Bentešina, while on superficial analysis seeming to provide evidence for Ḫattušiliš’ influence on Muršiliš III’s policies, can be interpreted as evidence for Muršiliš III’s independence of his uncle. At any rate, Ḫattušiliš’ smoothed-over official version of affairs need hardly reflect his real opinions which may have been closer to those expressed by the author of “Muršiliš’ Sins”, for whom Muwatalliš II could do no wrong and Muršiliš III no right: an attitude which appears remarkably close to that of Ḫattušiliš’.

⁵² Cf. Meriggi, *Fragmente* (note 39), 76: “ein in Briefform abgefaßtes Memorandum für Hattusili zur Anklage gegen Urhitesup.”

⁵³ For references see note 45 above.

⁵⁴ Of course, once Bentešina was installed, Ḫattušiliš as King may have deemed it better to accept the *fait accompli* and officially to pretend to have approved it all along. This too would explain why, officially, Ḫattušiliš took credit for what he declined to undo. At any rate, Ḫattušiliš clearly thought it better to accept Bentešina and later married off his son Nerikkailiš with a daughter of Bentešina’s (Treaty with Bentešina, I 18–19 [Weidner (note 44), 128]).

One farther person may have played an important rôle at the time of Hattušiliš' coup d'état: Ulmi-Tešub⁵⁵ or, with his Hittite instead of his Hurrian name, Kuruntaš (ideographically ^dLAMA).⁵⁶ This personage was with a high degree of certitude another illegitimate son of Muwatalliš II's, whose dual nomenclature bears a striking similarity to that of Urhi-Tešub/Muršiliš.⁵⁷ May we suspect the same mother? We now know that Ulmi-Tešub was Hattušiliš' first designated Crown Prince, i.e. *tub(u)kantiš* or Akkadian *TARTENU*.⁵⁸ If he

⁵⁵ The point has been noted by Archi, *Propaganda* (note 1), 203; cf. Ünal, Hattušili 1 (first note), 152–153.

⁵⁶ O. R. Gurney, *The Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub*, *AnSt* 43 [1993] 13–28 esp. 20–21, has established the identity of Kuruntaš with Ulmi-Tešub beyond any reasonable doubt. Cf. also G. F. del Monte, *Ulmitešub re di Tarhuntaša*, *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 14–15 [1991–1992], 123–148. The identity of Ulmi-Tešub/Kuruntaš as well as the chronological order of the treaties have been the subject of much discussion which Gurney's in large measure now supersedes: (a selection) T. P. J. van den Hout, *A Chronology of the Tarhuntassa-Treaties*, *JCS* 41 [1989] 100–114; P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Bronze Tablet of Tudhaliyas IV and its Geographical and Historical Relations*, *ZA* 82 [1992] 233–270; F. Imparati and F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Le relazioni politiche fra Hatti e Tarhuntassa all'epoca di Hattusili III e Tuthaliya IV*, *Eothen* 4 (1991), 23–68. The Bronze Tablet is edited by H. Otten, *Bronzetafel* (note 27). For the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub see van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, Wiesbaden 1995 (*Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 38).

⁵⁷ See now Otten, *Bronzetafel* (note 27), 3–4 with notes. The very close familial relationship of Muwatalliš II with Ulmi-Tešub has been farther clarified by R. H. Beal, *Kurunta of Tarhuntašša and the Imperial Hittite Mausoleum*, *AnSt* 43 [1993] 29–39: if Hattušiliš specifically forbade anyone to deny Ulmi-Tešub access to Muwatalliš II's mausoleum, how can Ulmi-Tešub have been anyone other than Muwatalliš II's son, to whom in the first place the maintenance of his father's grave will have been a solemn obligation?

⁵⁸ That the *tub(u)kantiš* was the crown prince or designated heir has now been conclusively established by Gurney, *The Hittite Title tubkanti-*, *AnSt* 33 [1983] 97–102. The *Taḡagalayaš* Letter, I 6–15, 67–74 (Text: F. Sommer, *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden*, München 1932 [ABAW, NF 6], 2 and 6), shews that Kuruntaš was Crown Prince. Gurney, *Treaty* (note 56), has now shewn conclusively that the Ulmi-Tešub Treaty preceded that with Kuruntaš, in which we learn that Tudḫaliyaš IV's brother was Crown Prince before him: *Treaty with Kuruntaš*, II 35 (Otten, *Bronzetafel* [note 27], 16). This brother can have been none other than Hattušiliš' other son Nerikkailiš (e.g. *Treaty with Bentešina*, I 18–19 [Weidner (note 44), 128]) who was Crown Prince when the *Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub* was sworn: *Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub*, II 28. We are entitled to assume that Ulmi-Tešub was Crown Prince before Nerikkailiš, who will have replaced Ulmi-Tešub upon attaining his majority. I cannot accept the arguments of A. Hagenbuchner, *War der ^{LÚ}tubkanti Neriqqaili ein Sohn Hattušilis III.?*, *SMEA* 29 [1992] 111–126, who answers the question in her title in the negative. This Nerikkailiš was also Crown Prince under Tudḫaliyaš IV (KUB XXVI 43, II 28 – Text: F. Imparati, *Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV*, *RHA* 32 [1974] 36), and Hagenbuchner argues that among the Hittites a man cannot have been Crown Prince under two different kings. How do we know this? What should have prevented Tudḫaliyaš IV from designating his brother as Crown Prince during the minority of his sons?

was Urḫi-Tešub's brother (perhaps full-brother?), then we have here a powerful statement on his feelings toward both Urḫi-Tešub and Hattušiliš. Ulmi-Tešub – although next in line to the throne after Urḫi-Tešub – seems to have been content to become Hattušiliš' Crown Prince.⁵⁹ When it became clear that he would not succeed his uncle, who by then had grown sons, Hattušiliš did handsomely by him for his loyalty at the time of Muršiliš III's deposition: Hattušiliš created for him a vassal kingdom about Muwatalliš II's new capital of Tarḫundašša, called alternately Hulaia-River-Land or Land of Tarḫundašša.⁶⁰ When Tudḫaliiaš IV ascended to the throne, he conceded yet more land to his cousin⁶¹, who apparently remained loyal to the dynasty⁶², as we thereafter find him active as Tudḫaliiaš' agent in the West.⁶³ At some later date he did attempt

⁵⁹ Did he hope to gain by his uncle's poor health what he otherwise would have had to fight for?

⁶⁰ For the equation of Hulaia-River-Land with the Land of Tarḫundašša the comparison of the Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, I 33–34, with the Treaty with Kuruntaš, II 4–6, (Otten, Bronzetafel [note 27], 16) is decisive; see now Gurney, Treaty (note 56), 26–28.

⁶¹ Note e.g. Treaty with Kuruntaš, I 22–25 (Otten, Bronzetafel [note 27], 10; cf. Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, I 19 [van den Hout, Vertrag (note 56), 26]); I 45–47 (Otten, op.cit., 12; cf. Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, I 27–28 [van den Hout, op.cit., 30]); I 87–90 (Otten, op.cit., 14); III 35–42 (Otten, op.cit., 22; cf. Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, I 43–44 [van den Hout, op.cit., 36]).

⁶² According to the Treaty with Kuruntaš, II 31–56 (Otten, Bronzetafel [note 27], 16–18) he and Tudḫaliiaš IV were bound to one another by friendship and by oaths. Again according to this treaty, I 10–11 (Otten, op.cit., 10), he had remained loyal to Hattušiliš at the time of the coup d'état. Why else would Hattušiliš have designated him as Crown Prince? Hattušiliš mentions him in the Autobiography (IV 62, [Otten, Apologie (first note), 28] as one whom he has rewarded (presumably for services rendered). Another text of Hattušiliš' mentions him in close proximity with the coup d'état albeit in a very fragmentary context (KUB XXI 37, I 37 – Text: Ünal, Hattušili 2 [first note], 116–122).

⁶³ Milawata-Letter, II 38–40 (Text: Sommer, Ahḫijavā-Urkunden [note 58], 202; H. Hoffner, The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted, in: AfO Bh. 19 [1982], 130–137: note new reading in l. 39 of van den Hout, Kurunta und die Datierung einiger hethitischer Texte, RA 78 [1984] 91). We now know that Tudḫaliiaš IV wrote the Milawata Letter: see E. Masson, Les inscriptions louvites hiéroglyphiques d'Emirgazi, JS [1979], 13–17, and M. Poetto, L'iscrizione luwio-geroglifico di Yalburt. Nuove acquisizione relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale, Pavia 1993 (Studia Mediterranea 8), Blocks 14–15 = §§ 21–22 (Pp. 70–71). The Milawata Letter, Left Edge, details negotiations for the release of alleged Hittite subjects allegedly held in the towns of Pina and Aḫarna. The Hieroglyphic Luwian texts published by Mme. Masson and Poetto shew that Tudḫaliiaš IV campaigned against exactly these two cities. Now we know that the Hittites' normal way of securing themselves a *bellum iustum* was to demand from the prospective enemy the release of alleged Hittite subjects allegedly held by him. If these were not forthcoming, the Hittites went to war. Therefore, the Milawata Letter will antedate the aforementioned Hieroglyphic Luwian texts which will in turn recount the steps taken by Tudḫaliiaš IV after failing to receive the subjects whose release he had been demanding in the Milawata Letter.

to seize the throne, but we do not know when.⁶⁴ Šuppiluliumaš II may have campaigned against the Land of Tarḫundašša.⁶⁵ If we do not wish to posit two rebellions here (one in Tudḫaliāš IV's reign, one in that of his son Šuppiluliumaš II's), then perhaps the by now elderly Ulmi-Tešub, advancing decrepitude notwithstanding, may have tried to seize power at the time of Šuppiluliumaš II's accession (which may have been contested⁶⁶). All in all, we have an unusually chequered career for this remarkable personage, who seems to have preferred his uncle on the throne to his own brother – to some degree even in disregard of his own claim to the throne. And given Hattušiliš' later relations with Ulmi-Tešub (first as Crown Prince, then as King of the Ḫulaia-River-Land), the two seem to have gotten on with one another famously enough.⁶⁷ The upshot of this digression is that Hattušiliš was capable of gaining the support of Muršiliš III's brother, who had, in fact, a better claim to the throne than Hattušiliš himself.

We have seen that there is no reason to question Hattušiliš' good working relationship with his elder brother Muwatalliš II. We have seen that Hattušiliš' known activities during the reign of his nephew Muršiliš III are limited to that area which Muwatalliš II had delegated to him. We have seen that no unambiguous evidence attests Hattušiliš' guidance of the affairs of Muršiliš III during the latter's reign. We have also seen that Muršiliš III's own brother Ulmi-Tešub may have been prepared to help place Hattušiliš on the throne, and that Hattušiliš seems later to have enjoyed a good working relationship with Ulmi-Tešub.

Now we have already noted that Muwatalliš II made Hattušiliš King of Ḫakpiša. Muršiliš III was, of course, unable to revoke this when he removed his uncle as administrator of the Upper Land. This latter action, however, lay well within Muršiliš III's prerogatives; and even Hattušiliš cannot as much as suggest otherwise: he accepted his deposition, with bad grace, no doubt, and

⁶⁴ Seal in Otten, Bronzetafel (note 27), 5. For considerations tending against the assumption of a revolt of Kuruntaš during the reign of Tudḫaliāš IV see also J. Börker-Klähn, *Der hethitische Areopag: Yerkapî, die Bronzetafel und der Staatsstreich*, AoF 21 [1994] 131–160.

⁶⁵ J. D. Hawkins, *The new Inscription from the Südburg of Boğazköi-Hattuša*, AA [1990] 310 (cf. also 313).

⁶⁶ We have at any rate an odd text which is at pains to justify the legitimacy of Šuppiluliumaš II's accession – KUB XXVI 32, II (translation by Meriggi, *Fragmente* [note 39], 94–95).

⁶⁷ Hattušiliš seems later to have pared away some territory from Ḫulaia-River-Land. But as this reduction of territory was accompanied (or rather preceded) by various concessions to Ulmi-Tešub (i.e. a reduction in the number of troops he was required to put at his sovereign's disposal: *Ulmi-Tešub Treaty*, I 40–47 [van den Hout, *Vertrag* (note 56), 34–36]), it may not have strained the two men's relations unduly. At any rate Ulmi-Tešub received even more generous terms from Hattušiliš' son, to whom he for some time at least remained loyal.

much gnashing of teeth.⁶⁸ But he accepted it: *I-NA MU.VII.KAM da-bu-ši-ia-ab-ḫa*,⁶⁹ “for seven years I held my peace.” When Muršiliš III attempted to depose him as King of Ḫakpiša Hattušiliš finally had just cause to revolt: *nu-mu-kân URU ḫa-ak-piš-ša-an URU ne-ri-ik-ka-an-na ar-ḫa da-a-aš nu Ū-UL nam-ma da-bu-ši-ia-ab-ḫa*,⁷⁰ “Then he took Ḫakpiša and Nerik away from me, and I held my peace no longer.” This action could be interpreted as a violation of a sworn treaty, i.e. Hattušiliš could claim that Muršiliš III was no longer acting within his rights. This is, of course, exactly the line Hattušiliš took in his account of the revolt.⁷¹ We do not know if Hattušiliš had engaged in treasonous activities which gave Muršiliš the right to consider the treaty voided and to take away from Hattušiliš the Kingdom of Ḫakpiša. After the successful revolt, at any rate, Hattušiliš had little cause to admit to having legitimised Muršiliš III’s disregard of treaty. Nor did anyone else – in accordance with the old rime – have much cause to enquire:

Treason doth never prosper, what’s the reason?
 For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.

But it remains quite possible that Hattušiliš had undertaken steps which could be interpreted as treasonous. Against this suggestion, however, militates the lack of direct and active support for Hattušiliš’ revolt: if the revolt had been well-planned in advance, we might expect that more Hittite notables would have supported Hattušiliš. On the other hand, many may have preferred to sit on the fence and await the outcome of events instead of compromising their own position in case Hattušiliš might not revolt at all (he had, after all, accepted his deposition as administrator of the Upper Land without a revolt and would now have only a handful of troops to help him against his nephew).

As it turned out, Muršiliš III had apparently even less support. When Hattušiliš did finally revolt, his opponent led an army to Šamuḫa, towards which Hattušiliš marched. Before Hattušiliš could arrive at Šamuḫa, the nobles in the rightful King’s camp had decided that they preferred Hattušiliš to Muršiliš III. They offered the former the latter’s head. It pleased Hattušiliš to

⁶⁸ One may compare the ill-will felt by the disgruntled SIN.^dU when he was removed from office by Muwatalliš II: Autobiography, I 27–35 (Otten, Apologie [first notel], 6).

⁶⁹ Autobiography, III 62 (Otten, Apologie [first notel], 22). Mss.: B = KBo III 6 + KUB I 4; E = KUB I 6; F = KUB XIX 67. B III 30 writes *ta-bu-ši-ia-ab-ḫa* with two *Glossenkeile*; F II 8 has *da-bu-u-ua-ia-a-ab-ḫa* with *ua* a simple scribal error for *ši*.

⁷⁰ Autobiography, III 64–65 (Otten, Apologie [first notel], 22). Composite text; Mss.: A = KUB XXVI 46; B = KBo III 6 + KUB I 4 + KUB XIX 70; E KUB I 6; F = KUB XIX 67. F II 12 places two *Glossenkeile* before *dabušiahḫa*.

⁷¹ See also Prayer of Hattušiliš and Puduḫepaš, III 26–45 (Sürenhagen [first notel], 94–96).

accept the head still attached, and the revolt was over.⁷² The nobles with Muršiliš III, faced with an actual revolt instead of one only rumoured, presumably judged it preferable to avoid bloodshed and to accept as King one whom they liked instead of someone whom, we have reason to believe, few had ever liked anyway.

Based on what we know of Hattušiliš' career as King, we may credit the nobles with perspicacious judgement: Hattušiliš went on to negotiate a mutually beneficial peace treaty with Egypt⁷³; to remove Ahhiya as a major power from western Asia Minor⁷⁴; and to find a – for the moment at least – elegant compromise between his own house and that of his brother's. Muršiliš III had inspired little loyalty (even in his own brother), had earned the contempt of statesmen for his erratic policy, had removed from a position of power a highly successful administrator in the person of his uncle, who, as we have seen, does not seem to have posed much of a threat to the then King. However we may choose to feel about legitimacy and usurpation, there is a little doubt that from a purely practical standpoint the nobles chose the proper course.

⁷² KBo VI 29, II 21–35 (Götze, MVAeG 29/3 [first note], 48–50). We probably should accept this account of events, as Hattušiliš would surely have relished telling how Ištar of Šamuha had once again held out her hand over him and granted him victory in battle. Furthermore, if we accept that Hattušiliš had found little active support for his coup d'état, then Muršiliš III should have been able to squelch his uncle's rebellion without much ado. That he was unable to do so militates in favour of the conclusion that many in the army were, in the final analysis, unwilling to fight against Hattušiliš.

⁷³ Treaty with Ramses II; Text: Weidner (note 44), 112–122.

⁷⁴ The Tauagalauaš Letter is now known to have issued from Hattušiliš' chancery: see e.g. H. G. Güterbock, *Wer war Tawagalawa?*, *Orientalia* 59 [1990] 157–165; S. Heinrich-Krahmer, *Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu, I*, *Orientalia* 52 [1983] 81–92 and *Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu, II*, *Orientalia* 55 [1986] 47–62; M. Popko, *Zur Datierung des Tawagalawa-Briefes*, *AoF* 11 [1984] 199–203. Decisive for this attribution are KBo XXII 10 a very late text, probably of Arnuandaš III or Šuppiluliumaš II, which shews the author's grandfather (i.e. Hattušiliš) in Ialanda, where the author of the Tauagalauaš Letter campaigned (I 22–23; Sommer, *Ahhiyā-Urkunden* [note 58], 2) – and KBo XXII 10 – which mentions Hattušiliš in the context of the extradition of Piyamaraduš – whose extradition the author of the Tauagalauaš Letter strove to achieve. Now the Tauagalauaš Letter recounts i.a. an invasion of the lands about Milayanda, the centre of the dominions of Ahhiya in western Asia Minor (I 5–58; Sommer, *op.cit.*, 2–4). It would seem that the power of Ahhiya collapsed at a touch when we peruse Hattušiliš' account of his unstoppable march to Milayanda. By the time of Tudḫaliyaš IV we read in the Milayata Letter of the Hittite King's redrawing of the border between Milayanda – no mention of Ahhiya! – and Šeḫa-River-Land: II 47–49; Sommer, *op.cit.*, 202–204.