

## STUDIES IN HITTITE HISTORY

Richard H. Beal  
University of Chicago

### 1. *Arnuwanda I's succession and his relationship to Queen Ašmunikal*

One of the more puzzling aspects of Hittite history is the relationship of Arnuwanda I to his Queen Ašmunikal. Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal act together in royal edicts the way other royal pairs do,<sup>1</sup> but she calls herself daughter of Tudhaliya and Nikalmati,<sup>2</sup> and Arnuwanda calls himself son of Tudhaliya.<sup>3</sup> This would appear to make Queen Ašmunikal the sister of King Arnuwanda. However, a married brother-sister pair would have constituted an abomination (*hurkel*), as is indicated in the treaty of Šuppiluliuma I with Huqqana: "A brother does not take his sister (sexually). . . It is not right. He who does such a thing, does not remain alive in Hatti, but he dies."<sup>4</sup> It is therefore usually assumed that since Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal are brother and sister, they cannot be husband and wife.<sup>5</sup> However, all adequately attested queens were the wife of either the

1. See KBo 57 = LS 1 = CTH 223 (grant to Kuwattalla; ed. K. Riemschneider, MIO 6 [1956] 344-56) esp. obv. 1, rev. 46-50, and the seal; KUB 17 21 and duplicates = CTH 375 (prayer concerning Nerik; ed. E. Von Schuler, Die Kaškäer [1965] 152-67) esp. ii 14, iii 11-12.

I wish to thank J. D. Muhly, S. Košak, and in particular H. G. Güterbock for reading this paper and making many valuable suggestions. Abbreviations used here follow those used by the Chicago Hittite Dictionary.

2. SBo 1 60 = T. Beran, WVDOG 76 no. 162. The outer ring is Tudhaliya's inscription (see below, note 3). The inner rings read: [NA<sub>4</sub>]KIŠIB SAL.ta-wa-na-an-na 'Aš-mu-ni-kal SAL.LUGAL.GAL D[UMU.SAL 'Ni-kal-ma-ti SAL.LUGAL.GAL x? ] Ū DUMU.SAL "Du-ut-ḫa-li-i[a LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG], "Seal of the Tawananna Ašmunikal, the Great Queen, d[daughter of Nikalmati, the Great Queen] and daughter of Tudhaliya [the Great King, the hero]." SBo 1 77 = Beran, WVDOG 76 no. 152: 'Aš-mu-ni-kal SAL.LUGAL.GAL DUMU.SAL Ni-kal-ma-ti, "Ašmunikal the Great Queen, daughter of Nikalmati."

3. The following numbering of kings Tudhaliya is used here: the husband of Nikalmati and Arnuwanda's immediate predecessor will be called Tudhaliya II, and Arnuwanda's successor will be called Tudhaliya III. For Arnuwanda's parentage, see SBo 1 76 = Beran, WVDOG 76 no. 153: [NA<sub>4</sub>]KIŠIB "Ar-nu-w[a-an-ta LUGA[L.GAL DUMU "Tu-ut-ḫa-]li-ia LUG[AL.GAL], "Seal of Arnuwanda, the Great King, son of Tudhaliya, the Great King"; SBo 1 60 = Beran, WVDOG 76 No. 162: [N]A<sub>4</sub>.KIŠIB ta-ba-ar-na "Ar-nu-an-ta LUGAL.GAL DUMU "Du-u[t-ḫa-li-ia LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG?], "Seal of the tabarna Arnuwanda, the Great King, son of Tu[dhaliya, the Great King, the hero]"; see also KUB 23 21:26 (= CTH 143, Joint annals of Tudhaliya and Arnuwanda, ed. O. Carruba, SMEA 18 [1977] 168-69).

4. KBo 5 3 iii 28-31 = CTH 42 (ed. SV 2:124-25).

5. H. G. Güterbock, "The Hurrian Element in the Hittite Empire," CHM 2 (1954-55) 387 n. 27; more strongly in S. Bin-Nun, The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom, THeth 5 (1975) 86: "We find Ašmunikal, the king's *sister*, who was Tawananna at this time, after Arnuwanda in the sacrificial list and not his wife. We never hear of Arnuwanda's wife." See also O. Gurney, FsMeriggi 2 (=Studia Mediterranea 1 [1979]) 217ff.

current king or of his predecessor<sup>6</sup>; why, then, should Arnuwanda's queen have been his sister rather than his wife?

A second curious situation concerning Arnuwanda is the coregency between Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda. In his annals Arnuwanda describes several campaigns that were conducted simultaneously by his father, Tudhaliya, the Great King, and himself, Arnuwanda, the Great King.<sup>7</sup> For two men simultaneously to bear the title Great King is rather unusual in Hittite history. Hattušili I appointed his sister's son Labarna heir to the throne; but nothing in Hattušili's testament indicates that Labarna became coregent. When Labarna was subsequently disowned, Hattušili only says "he is no longer my son"<sup>8</sup>; he did not add "he is no longer king." Similarly Muršili was only made heir to the throne; he was not expected to become king until after Hattušili's death. Arnuwanda I is mentioned together with his son Tudhaliya III. Tudhaliya is called DUMU.LUGAL and *tuhukanti*, but never Great King; that title is reserved only for Arnuwanda.<sup>9</sup> The case made by Gurney<sup>10</sup> for a Middle Hittite coregency between a Tudhaliya and his father, while plausible, is based on restorations, and the text in question may be interpreted differently.<sup>11</sup> Further examples exist. Suppiluliuma I's crown prince, Arnuwanda, was also a leading general for his father<sup>12</sup> but Arnuwanda is not referred to as king, only as DUMU.LUGAL.<sup>13</sup> Similarly Tudhaliya IV serves his father Hattušili III, but he bears only the title of GAL MEŠEDI, never Great King.<sup>14</sup>

Why, then, is there a coregency between Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I? Tudhaliya was apparently not a senile or decrepit old man needing a regent; on the contrary, he was active in the field together with Arnuwanda

6. See the fourth section of this article, below.

7. Ph. Houwink ten Cate Records p. 58 with n. 2. The best preserved example is KUB 23 21:26-27: *attaš-miš Tudhaliyaš LUGAL.GAL [ū]qqa Arnuwandaš LUGAL.GAL EGIR-anda pāwen*, "We, i.e., my father Tudhaliya, the Great King, and I, Arnuwanda, the Great King, went after (them)"; cf. also lines 12-15, 17, 32, rev. 4, 7, and 19-20, and KUB 23 21 (=CTH 143, ed. Carruba, SMEA 18 [1977] 166-71).

8. *dāla UL DUMU-YA*, KUB 1 16 = BoTU 8) ii 14 (HAB §3).

9. KBo 5 7 (LS 1) rev. 46, 49-50 (CTH 223, ed. Riemschneider, MIO 6 [1958] 344-55); KUB 31 42 iii 11-12 (CTH 260 2).

10. FsMeriggi 2 213-223, based on KUB 36 119.

11. See section 2, below.

12. KBo 5 6 ii 29ff. (DŠ Frag. 28A, ed. Güterbock, JCS 10 [1956] 93); KUB 19 13 (= BoTU 44) iii 4 (DŠ Frag. 36, ed. Güterbock, JCS 10 [1956] 111).

13. KUB 19 25 i 6-7 (CTH 44 1, ed. A. Goetze, Kizzuwatna pp. 12-16).

14. KUB 19 8 iii 27-38 continued by KBo 12 44 + KUB 19 8 v 5'-15' // KBo 16 36 + KUB 31 20 + Bo 5768 (ed. S. Alp, Belleten 41 [1977] 644-45; A. Ünal, THeth 6 [1973] 67; Riemschneider, JCS 16 [1962] 115-16).

while Arnuwanda was already coregent.<sup>15</sup> It might be suggested that Arnuwanda's claim to the throne was shakier than that of other Hittite crown princes. If, however, he was the son of Tudhaliya,<sup>16</sup> why should it have been so shaky? If he was the son of someone other than Tudhaliya's Queen Nikalmati, that might account for his position. But Urḫi-Tešub, whose mother was only Muwattalli's concubine,<sup>17</sup> does not seem to have been coregent with his father Muwattalli, so that explanation for Arnuwanda's status is not compelling.

There is a solution to the problem, however, which would also resolve the question of the "brother-sister" marriage: perhaps Arnuwanda was the *adopted* son of Tudhaliya. It is well known that Hattušili I, who had no son, adopted his sister's son Labarna as his own son.<sup>18</sup> When that princeling later proved unworthy, he was disowned.<sup>19</sup> Hattušili then adopted his grandson<sup>20</sup> Muršili as son and heir.<sup>21</sup> Thus Hattušili can refer to both princes as his son, although neither one was genetically his son.

As an alternative to adopting a relative as son, a king who had no son could provide for the succession by getting a husband for his daughter-heiress. This is a well-known provision of the Telipinu edict: *mān DUMU.LUGAL-ma DUMU.NITA NU.GÁL nu kuiš DUMU.SAL hantezzš nuššišan LÚ.antiyantān appāndu nu LUGAL-uš apaš kišaru*, "But if a prince, a son, does not exist, let them take an *antiyant-* for the eldest daughter and let him become king."<sup>22</sup> The *antiyant-* is a man who, rather than paying a *kušata* (bride price) to a girl's father and then taking the girl to his (or his family's) house as his wife, instead receives (or his father receives) a *kušata* from the girl's family. Her family then takes the

15. Arnuwanda does not hesitate to use first person for things he himself did as coregent (KUB 23 21:3, 7, 11, etc.), so we should believe him when he says that he and his father went on campaign together (KUB 23 21:12-15, 17, 26-27, 29, 32, rev. 4, 6, 7, ed. Carruba, SMEA 18 [1977] 166-71).

16. See n. 3 above.

17. Apology of Hattušili III iii 38-44 (ed. A. Götze, NBr = MVAeG 34/2 [1930] 22-23; Sturtevant and Bechtel, Chrest. [1935] 74-75; H. Otten, StBoT 24 [1981] 20-21).

18. [*nušmaš TUR-lan*] *labarnan tenun [apašwaššan ešaru LUGAL-šan] DUMU-laman ḫalziḫun*, "I announced to you the child Labarna. Let him sit (on the throne). I the king called him my son." KUB 1 16 (= BoTU 8) ii 2-4 // *anumma TUR-am labarna [aqb]iākkunušim šu littašabmi LUGAL-ru [al]sišuma*, KUB 1 16 i 2-4 (ed. HAB §1).

19. *dāla UL DUMU-YA*, "Enough (literally: be gone)! He is not my son." KUB 1 6 ii 15 (ed. HAB §3). [*kāša*] *DUMU-mi labarni [E-ir] piḫ[un]*, "... Behold I gave [a house] to my son Labarna." KUB 1 6 ii 31 (ed. HAB §6). *DUMU NIN-šu mammān ul urabbā*, "... Don't bother (in the future) raising the sister's son." BoTU 8 (KUB 1 16) i 9 (ed. HAB §2).

20. See the third section of this article, "The Parentage of Muršili I," below.

21. [*kāšma Muršiliš DUMU-YA [nuza] ap[un] šekten nu]ššan apūn ašešten*, "Behold Muršili is my son. [Recognize] him and seat him (on the throne)." BoTU 8 (KUB 1 16) ii 37-38 (ed. HAB §7); cf. KUB 1 16 ii 57 (HAB §10), iii 55 (HAB §22).

22. KBo 3 1 (= BoTU 23A) ii 38-39 (ed. Chrest. 188-89).

bridegroom into their house as a husband for the girl, and his loyalty ties are subsequently to her family.<sup>23</sup>

The Old Hittite *İnandik* text<sup>24</sup> gives a further variation for the procedure. That text records that Tuttulla raised his son Pappa to a priestly position and adopted Ziti as his son. Tuttulla then gave his own daughter Zizzatta to this adopted son as wife. The tablet is witnessed by high officials and is sealed by the king, thus assuring that Tuttulla's testamentary provisions would be carried out. As noted by Balkan,<sup>25</sup> Ziti was an *antiyant*-. The *İnandik* text shows a combination of the type of inheritance attested in Hattušili I's regulation of the succession and that prescribed in the edict of Telipinu: in addition to being married to an (the?) heiress, Ziti was himself adopted as Tuttulla's son.<sup>26</sup>

23. For another example of the *antiyant*-marriage see Hittite Law §36 and compare it to the similar law §34 for a more normal marriage (trans. ANET 190). See also KUB 13.8:14-15 (CTH 252), according to which men of the Rock Sanctuary may not give daughters out for *É.GI.A-TIM*, "daughter-in-lawship" or sons for *antiyantatar*, "living-in-son-in-lawship." This proscription prevents the alienation of any of the next generation of personnel belonging to the Rock Sanctuary. See K. Balkan, *AnDergi* 6 (1948) 147ff. and H. A. Hoffner, *BiOr* 37 (1980) 200. For the loyalties involved in the *antiyant*-marriage see version two of the Illuyanka Myth (CTH 321; trans. ANET p. 126 "Later Version") and the discussion by Hoffner, "Hittite Mythological Texts: A Survey," in H. Goedicke and J. J. R. Roberts, eds., *Unity and Diversity* (Baltimore, 1975) p. 137.

It is interesting that a custom similar to the Hittite *antiyant*-marriage is attested in medieval France: "The son-in-law who came to live with his wife in her home often took his wife's [family] name, instead of the other way around." (Emmanuel LeRoy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, the Promised Land of Error (trans. B. Bray; New York, 1979 [French ed. 1975]) p. 34. See below, n. 26.

The references given here should be added to the examples of Indo-European "uxoripatrilocality" (the husband living with his wife's father's family) cited by O. Szemerényi, "Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the Indo-European Languages," *Acta Iranica* 16, *Textes et Memoires* 7 (1977) 205. Cited there are the households of Priam and Nestor in Homer, and also the case of [Kari Solmundarson] in *Njal's Saga*. In *Njal's Saga* we can note the contrast in the loyalties of the outsider Kari, who moves in with his father-in-law Njal's family, fights beside the Njalsons, and eventually is the family's avenger, and those of Ketil of Mork, who on marrying a daughter of Njal moves away. Ketil tries to mediate the dispute between his relatives and his in-laws, but when it comes to blows he sides with his blood relatives. Unfortunately for purposes of comparison with Hittite custom, Kari never faces a situation where he must choose between Njal and Solmundar.

24. K. Balkan, *Eine Schenkungsurkunde aus der althethitischen Zeit Gefunden in İnandık 1966* (Ankara, 1973).

25. Balkan *İnandık* p. 46.

26. It should not be surprising that an adopted son can marry his newly-acquired "sister" without committing incest, for in another society in which true brother-sister marriages are similarly abhorred, that of medieval France, there are parallels to this Hittite procedure. One medieval man advises a friend about a certain girl: "She is so rich that with what her father will give you and with what you have already at Arques . . . you will be well enough off not to have to work with your hands anymore. . . . For Raymond Pierre, who will thus become your future

I would suggest that this is the paradigm followed by Tudhaliya II in providing for the succession, and that Arnuwanda was the *antiyant*-husband of Tudhaliya's heiress-daughter, Ašmunikal, as well as Tudhaliya's adopted son. Arnuwanda can therefore call himself the son of Tudhaliya, because legally he is. The problem of the relationship between Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal then evaporates, for what this arrangement produces is a "brother-sister" marriage that is neither consanguineous nor illegal. Thus king and queen were husband and wife as would be expected, and while both could claim to be children of Tudhaliya, there is no question of *hurkel*. Furthermore, if Arnuwanda was the *adopted* son of Tudhaliya, it would explain why he never traces his genealogy back to Tudhaliya's father. The fact that he was only an adopted son would also explain quite adequately why Tudhaliya felt it necessary to take the, for the Hittites, unusual step of naming his successor as coregnant Great King.<sup>27</sup>

## 2. The Hypothetical coregency between a Tudhaliya and his father

Gurney<sup>28</sup> has assumed a coregency between a Middle Hittite king named Tudhaliya and his father, based on his understanding of KUB 36

father-in-law, will adopt you as a son and he will give you to wife his daughter Bernadette Pierre . . . and you will live in the *domos* of Raymond Pierre" (Ladurie, *Montaillou* pp. 79-80). The translator, Ladurie, explains that the reason for this is that Raymond Pierre had three daughters, but no sons, so he needed to find a man who would agree to come live with him and become his "son-in-law" in order to continue his line and *domos*.

Closer to Hatti in the Hurrian milieu of Nuzi, one also finds this custom. According to RA 23 126, 155 (no. 51), Našwa adopted Wullu as a son. Wullu was to take care of Našwa (in his old age) and see to his burial, for the reason that Našwa had no sons to do this. In return, Wullu will inherit Našwa's entire estate. As part of this arrangement Našwa gave his daughter, Nuhuya, to his adopted son Wullu as his sole wife. Thus again one has a man marrying his newly-adopted son to his daughter. Note that the adoption of a man as son serves to bind the man particularly strongly to his father-in-law, but it does not affect his relationship with his wife, who remains only his wife and does not become his sister. See B. Eichler, *Essays Finkelstein* pp. 45-59; S. Greengus, *HUCA* 46 (1975) 5-31; D. Freedman, *JANES* 2 (1970) 77-85. See now also C. H. Gordon, *FsLacheman* (1981) pp. 155-60, and Katarzyna Grosz, *FsLacheman* pp. 161ff., esp. 166-69. T. R. Bryce, *AnSt* 31 (1981) 9-17, suggests, quite plausibly, that Hattušili I's grandfather disowned his natural sons for rebellion against him, adopted a son, Labarna, as heir, and married him to his daughter Tawananna. The assumption that she, rather than her husband, was the real heir would nicely explain why Hattušili relates himself to her and not to Labarna, her husband. If this reconstruction is correct, it provides another example of the type of succession discussed in this article.

27. If the premise of this article is correct, then all reconstructions based on the "fact" that Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal are not a married pair must be cast into doubt. Some of the implications of this for Hittite history will be discussed later.

28. "The Anointing of Tudhaliya," *FsMeriggi* 2 (=Studia Mediterranea 1) 214f.

119. He argued<sup>29</sup> that the crucial lines 6-7 are to be read "Let all of Hatti know" [*kāšawa* <sup>m</sup>D]uthaliyaš LUGAL.GAL UR.SA[G LUGAL.KUR.URU *Hatti*], "Here is Tudhaliya, the Great King, the hero, [King of the land of Hatti]." <sup>30</sup> However, Gurney's restoration of the end of line 7 as "LUGAL.KUR.URU.*Hatti*" is unlikely to be correct because the only element of titulature that normally follows UR.SAG is *NARAM DN*, which is used only by the author of a text to refer to himself, and which, moreover, is attested with UR.SAG only from the time of Šuppiluliuma I on. Thus something else is needed to fill this space; given Hittite word order, this is likely to have been a verb. One could plausibly restore KUB 36 119:3-7 as follows:

[<sup>m</sup>Du-ut]-ha-li-ia-an LÚ.t[u-uh-kán-ti-in i-e-er(or i-ia-u-e-en, cf. *NI* in line 9)]

[na]-an <sup>m</sup>Du-ut-ha-li-ia-[an . . .]

5. [n]a-an-kán LUGAL-u-iz-ni iš-ki-ir [nu me-e-mi-e-er]

---

[KUR UR]U.Ha-at-ti-wa hu-u-ma-an š[a-ak-du ka-a-ša-wa]

[<sup>m</sup>Du-]ud-ha-li-ia-aš LUGAL.GAL UR.SA[G ki-i-ša-ri/ru]

---

[We made] Tudhaliya the *tu[hkanti* (a title borne by the crown prince)], [and they . . .-d] Tudhaliya and they anointed him for kingship. [They said] "Let all of Hatti k[now]. [Behold,] Tudhaliya [will become] (or may Tudhaliya become) the Great King, the hero."

If the text is restored as shown above, with a verb in the present-future tense, the anointing merely designates Tudhaliya as heir apparent; that is to say, Tudhaliya is not yet "Great King and Hero," but he will eventually be. Restoration using a past tense of the verb (*kišat*) would mean that Tudhaliya had already become the "Great King and Hero," in other words, he was made coregent. Which tense one chooses for the verb in the restored section depends on one's interpretation of the significance of the anointing ceremony.

Does this anointing designate the prince as the official heir apparent, as Carruba suggested: "wurde er vielleicht zum Königtum gesalbt, jedoch nicht auf den Thron gesetzt"<sup>31</sup>? Or does this anointing make the prince the

legitimate king as Gurney<sup>32</sup> has assumed? Some support for Gurney's position might be seen in EA 51:4-7: "When your grandfather PN made my grandfather PN king of Nuḫašše and put oil on his head." A case might also be made for the anointing of kings on their accession to the throne based on the biblical evidence. However, all but one of the cases attested there concern men (Saul<sup>33</sup> and Jehu<sup>34</sup>) who are nominated as future king by prophets, or men (David<sup>35</sup>, Solomon<sup>36</sup>, and Joash<sup>37</sup>) who, although they are anointed at the time of their accession to the throne, had not previously been proclaimed crown prince by their predecessor. Solomon, indeed, is simultaneously publicly proclaimed successor, anointed and made coregent. The single exception, Jehoahaz,<sup>38</sup> may perhaps be placed in the second of these groups since it was the people of Israel who anointed him on his father Josiah's unexpected death in battle, but this is uncertain. In cases of normal succession to the throne it is not mentioned whether the anointing accompanied the naming of the heir apparent or the coronation.

In the Hittite substitute king ritual<sup>39</sup> the anointing is an integral part of the enthronement, but as Kümmel points out,<sup>40</sup> it is done first, before the substitute king is truly crowned. Perhaps it was done this way in the regular Hittite enthronement as well. But it may also be that, due to the special circumstances inherent in the substitute king ritual, the period between the legitimizing of a person as the next king and his accession to the throne would virtually be eliminated. An analogy may be drawn from a modern shotgun wedding, in which the placing on of the engagement ring might immediately precede the placing on of the wedding ring.

According to Kümmel, the broken Middle Hittite text KBo 16 25:51ff. gives the impression that "es handle sich hier um die Anerkennung eines vom König (?) durch Salbung designierten Thronnachfolgers."<sup>41</sup> This text is perhaps to be restored LUGAL-uš-ša-an ku-[in DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL iš-tar-na ša-ra-a(?) d]a-a-i na-an A-NA LUGAL-TIM iš-ki-iz-zi na-an-za [šu-me-eš kat-ta DUMU.MEŠ-KU-NU DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-KU-NU [ša-ak-t]e-en, "Let you [with your sons and] your [grandsons recog]nize the [one] whom the king [takes up from among the royal princes] and anoints

29. FsMeriggi 2 214 n. 9.

30. FsMeriggi 2 221ff.

31. SMEA 18 178 n. 11.

32. FsMeriggi 2 214f.

33. I Sam. 10:1ff.

34. II Kgs. 9:1ff.

35. II Sam. 2:1ff., 5:3ff.

36. I Kgs. 1:17-40.

37. II Kgs. 11:2-12.

38. II Kgs. 23:30.

39. Kümmel, StBoT 3 10-11.

40. Kümmel, StBoT 3 45.

41. Kümmel, StBoT 3 44f.

for kingship." The fact that in the next few lines of this text, as well as in KUB 36 119, oaths of loyalty are sworn to the person just anointed is no reason to assume that he has now become king or coregent. In Assyria, for example, the loyalty oath (*adē*) could be sworn to the crown prince as well as to the king. Esarhaddon states that "My father who begat me truly raised my head among my brothers and said 'This is my crown prince' . . . The people of Assyria, great and small, my brothers, the seed of my father's house he gathered, and before . . . the gods of Assyria he made them swear to protect my succession."<sup>42</sup> In the case of Assurbanipal we similarly read: "Esarhaddon, King of Assyria, the father who begat me . . . gathered together the people of Assyria, great and small, from the upper and lower sea, and made them swear to protect my crown-princeship and afterwards (my) kingship over the land of Assyria."<sup>43</sup>

Perhaps supporting the idea that anointing might indicate that a person has become crown prince rather than king is the fact that in Mesopotamia and in the Amarna correspondence the anointing of the head of a woman is the sign of betrothal rather than marriage.<sup>44</sup>

Thus, while anointing can be seen to be a sign of legitimization, it could just as well be part of the legitimization of an heir-apparent as of a new king; for that matter it could be both. As Carruba wrote, "es ist nicht klar, wann Salbung und Königsernennung stattfanden und wie sie verliefen."<sup>45</sup>

The existence of this hypothesized coregency between Tudhaliya and his father must therefore remain doubtful until more Hittite evidence such as, for example, an edict in the name of both Great King Tudhaliya and Great King PN, or combined annals such as that of Tudhaliya and Arnuwanda, is found.

### 3. The parentage of Muršili I

Muršili I is known to be the genetic grandson of Hattušili I from the Talmi-Šarruma treaty.<sup>46</sup> Although that text is admittedly of New Hittite date, there is no reason to doubt the tradition; Muršili I was obviously adopted as Hattušili's son and heir.<sup>47</sup> Since Hattušili's whole problem

42. Borger Asarhaddon (=AfO Beih. 9) 40:10-19.

43. Streck Assurbanipal (=VAB 7) 2 2ff. i 8-22.

44. Landsberger, *Symbolae David* p. 79 n. 4.

45. SMEA 18 178.

46. KBo 1 6:13 (ed. PD 82-83) and dupl. 21/c:5 (ed. Klengel, ZA 56 [1964] 213).

47. [k]āšma "Muršiliš DUMU-YA [nuza] ap[un šekten], "Behold, Muršili is my son; [recognize h]im" KUB 1 16 (BoTU 8) ii 37 (ed. HAB §7).

seems to have been a lack of legitimate sons, it is unlikely that Muršili was the son of a son of Hattušili.<sup>48</sup> He is also unlikely to have been the son of the daughter who revolted,<sup>49</sup> so it seems probable that Muršili was the genetic son of another daughter of Hattušili. Might that other daughter perhaps be the Haštayara so kindly addressed in the last paragraph<sup>50</sup> of Hattušili's testament in favor of Muršili? Forrer<sup>51</sup> suggested the idea that Haštayara was Muršili's mother, but he also assumed her to be Hattušili's wife. Since Sommer<sup>52</sup> accepted the idea that Haštayara was Hattušili's wife, and since he realized that Muršili was an adopted and not a genetic son of Hattušili, he could not accept that Haštayara was Muršili's mother. Despite Forrer, Sommer, and (much later) Bin-Nun's<sup>53</sup> assumptions, Haštayara is nowhere in the testament or anywhere else called Hattušili's wife. In the offering lists<sup>54</sup> Hattušili ("Labarna II") is paired with Kadduši while Muršili is paired with Kali; these women are presumably their wives.<sup>55</sup> As Haštayara thus appears to be the wife of neither Hattušili nor Muršili, yet still has such a prominent place in the text that attests Hattušili's adoption of his grandson as son and heir, it seems to me that it is likely that Haštayara was a daughter of Hattušili and was Muršili's mother.

If Haštayara was Hattušili's daughter and Muršili's mother, then perhaps Muršili's father was Maratti, who is mentioned immediately *after* Hištayara (=Haštayara) in the "Palace Chronicle,"<sup>56</sup> actually a collection of anecdotes concerning government personages, dating from around the time of Hattušili I. Maratti is mentioned *after* Haštayara as might be expected if he were merely the consort of a royal princess. The context indicates that both Haštayara and Maratti are quite important people:

ṁZil-di-<ṛ(iš)> LÚ.ZABAR.DAB e-eš-ta A-BI LUGAL  
DUG.ḫar-ḫa-ra-a-an [(GEŠTIN)] A-NA ḫi-iš-ta-i-ia-ra ṁMa-  
ra-at-ti-ia ma-ni-ia-aḫ-ḫi-iš LUGAL-i SIG<sub>5</sub>-an-ta-an GEŠTIN-  
an ḫi-in-kat-ta a-pé-e-da-aš-ša ta-ma-in GEŠTIN-an pi-i-e-er a-  
pa-a-aš-ša ú-it LUGAL-i te-et na-at-ta a-pu-u-un GEŠTIN-an

48. HAB §13.

49. HAB §§13-18.

50. KUB 1 16 (BoTU 8) iii 64-74 // iv 64-72 (ed. HAB §§23).

51. 2 BoTU p. 3\*.

52. HAB 189 n. 1, 209. For other suggestions as to Haštayara's identity see Hardy, *AJSL* 58 (1941) 198 n. 75.

53. Bin-Nun Tawananna p. 77.

54. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 64-70 and *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie*, Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Kl. der Akad. Mainz (1968) p. 26.

55. See Section 4 of this article.

56. KBo 3 34 (BoTU 12A) ii 1-7, dupl. C KBo 3 36 (BoTU 12C) i 11-15.

*pi-i-e-er* LUGAL-*uš* *ku-in a-uš-ta a-pa-a-aš-ša ú-it QA-TAM-MA IQ-BI ša-na-aš-ta! ar-ḥa pé-e-ḥu-te-er ša-an e-eš-ši <iš>-kir* (C: *e-eš-ši-iš-kir*) *ša-aš* BA.ÚŠ

Ziti was the cellar-master (?). The king entrusted a *b*.-vessel of wine (to him) for Hištayara and Maratti. To the king, he (Ziti) offered good wine, but to the others they gave other wine. The one (Hištayara) came and said to the king: 'They did not give (us) that wine which the king saw.' The other (Maratti) came and said the same thing. They led him (Ziti) away and worked him over (?) and he died.

The attention paid to Haštayara and Maratti in these texts does not, of course, prove that they were Muṣili's parents, but it does suggest the interesting possibility that they might have been.

#### 4. *The right of the king's sister to the throne in Hatti: a reply to S. Bin-Nun*

Bin-Nun's contention that many queens were queen by virtue of being the king's sister rather than by virtue of being his wife<sup>57</sup> is based on dubious argumentation. The "first" Tawananna's relation to the "first" Labarna is not clear. She is just as likely to have been his wife<sup>58</sup> as his sister.<sup>59</sup> Kadduši is not likely to have been Hattušili's sister.<sup>60</sup> She is listed with him in the offering lists,<sup>61</sup> and in these offering lists in all cases that are ascertainable the women listed with kings are known from other sources to be the wives of those kings: Hantili and Harapšili,<sup>62</sup> Telipinu and Ištapariya<sup>63</sup> Alluwamna and Harapšeki,<sup>64</sup> and Tudhaliya and Nikkal-mati.<sup>65</sup> Therefore Kadduši is most probably Hattušili I's wife. Bin-Nun, citing HAB §23,<sup>66</sup> insists that Haštayara was Hattušili's wife<sup>67</sup>; I discussed my reasons for thinking it more likely that she was Hattušili's daughter in the preceding section of this article.

Bin-Nun also tries to argue that every female relative who was ever a thorn in the side of Hattušili was a Tawananna and/or a queen. That Hattušili was in conflict with the Tawananna of his time is beyond dispute,

57. Bin-Nun Tawananna.

58. O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (1954) p. 66 (=1981 p. 68).

59. Bin-Nun Tawananna p. 69.

60. Bin-Nun Tawananna pp. 77-78.

61. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 64-70 and *Hethitischen historischen Quellen* p. 26.

62. KBo 3 1 (BoTU 23A) i 31-32 (Telipinu edict).

63. KBo 3 1 ii 9-10.

64. KUB 26 77 i 10-11.

65. SBo 1 60 and SBo 1 77.

66. KUB 1 16 (= BoTU 8) iii 64-73 // iv 64-72.

67. Bin-Nun Tawananna pp. 77-78.

for a Tawananna, whose relationship to Hattušili is unknown, is banished in KBo 3 27 = BoTU 10b. There is, however, no reason to believe that Hattušili's two other nemeses were Tawanannas. The two women are identified in the texts as Hattušili's sister and daughter, respectively. Hattušili, having made his sister's son Labarna his heir, was rewarded by having the boy ignore the king's commands and listen instead to the seditious words of his family. As a result the boy, to the fury of his mother, was disowned and pensioned off.<sup>68</sup> Hattušili's daughter revolted at the instigation of the people of the capital, in an effort to secure the throne of the sonless Hattušili for her son. Hattušili suppressed the revolt only with difficulty and banished this daughter from the capital.<sup>69</sup>

There is no evidence that Hattušili's sister, the mother of prince Labarna, was a Tawananna and/or queen, unless one accepts Bin-Nun's unsubstantiated claim<sup>70</sup> that this woman is to be identified with Kadduši. This sister's son became heir to the throne only because Hattušili, himself without legitimate sons, adopted him. This sister is the one who bore the brunt of Hattušili's anger, presumably because he felt that she, and not her son Labarna, was the chief intriguer. Similarly, this sister cannot be assumed to have been a Tawananna<sup>71</sup> merely because Hattušili calls her a snake<sup>72</sup> (his favorite invective), a metaphor which is used also in reference to the banishment of a Tawananna and the appointment of Muṣili as heir: if the people transgress his words, "a snake will come and coil about Hattuša."<sup>73</sup>

As for Hattušili's daughter who revolted, she need not have been a Tawananna merely because a Tawananna is mentioned in line 10 of KBo 3 24 (= BoTU 10a), while a daughter is mentioned in lines 13-14, in a context which is otherwise totally broken (less than a quarter of each line is preserved). There is absolutely no reason to equate the two women mentioned in this text. Similarly the fact that a Tawananna is banished in KBo 3 27 (= BoTU 10b) does nothing to equate this Tawananna with Hattušili's daughter,<sup>74</sup> especially since collation of KBo 3 27 (=BoTU 10b)

68. HAB §§2-4.

69. HAB §§ 13-18 (KUB 1 1 + KUB 40 65 ii 68-iii 25).

70. Bin-Nun Tawananna p. 78.

71. Bin-Nun Tawananna p. 76.

72. KUB 1 16 (= BoTU 8) ii 10, 20 (ed. HAB §§2, 4).

73. KBo 3 27 (BoTU 10b):26-27.

74. We know, of course that Hattušili's daughter was banished. But so could queens be. Two later examples come readily to mind: Eleanor of Aquitaine was banished by Henry II of England whose other problem was too many ambitious sons, and Eudoxia Lopukhina was the banished first wife of Peter I of Russia, who would also eliminate a son for sedition and banish a sister.

by Güterbock has shown that this is not a fragment of the same text as KBo 3 24 (=BoTU 10a). The only female relative of Hattušili I who can be clearly shown to be a Tawananna is Hattušili's aunt. Whether or not it is she who is banished in KBo 3 27 (= BoTU 10b), or whether perchance it is Hattušili's wife Kadduši,<sup>75</sup> perhaps implicated in her daughter's rebellion, who is banished cannot be ascertained on current evidence.

As for the king's sister's innate right to the throne, there is no reason to believe that her right to the throne was in any way equal or superior to that of her brothers, even though sometimes a king's sister did eventually become queen. Harapšili,<sup>76</sup> Muršili's sister,<sup>77</sup> as far as we know, had no special title or right to the throne for herself and her husband, Hantili; so long as Muršili was alive, she would have stood in line to the throne behind any children Muršili might have had. Thus in order to become king himself Hantili had to pull a coup d'état and eliminate Muršili before Muršili had children. For a more modern parallel, Mary II became Queen of England, not because the king's daughter had some innate and latent right to the throne, superior to that of her brother (and in that particular case her father as well), but because her husband, William III of Orange, pulled a coup d'état eliminating from the political scene her father and brother, that is, those closer to the throne than his wife. This done, his wife could become queen and he king. The situation in Hatti is similar if bloodier. Ištapariya's right to the throne was ranked after the rights of her two legitimate brothers, Titti and Hantili. Only after these two princes and their families had been eliminated by the illegitimate Huzziya did Ištapariya's claim become relevant.

The only right of a Hittite king's daughter in the Hittite royal succession for which there is any evidence at all is neatly laid out by the well-known passage in the Telipinu edict: "If there is no legitimate male issue, let them take an *antiyant*-husband for the eldest daughter, and let him become king."<sup>78</sup> The implementation of that very prescription is posited in the case of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal, discussed in the first section of this article.

75. Bin-Nun Tawananna pp. 74-75.

76. Bin-Nun Tawananna pp. 80-81.

77. The text actually calls her DAM, "wife," of Muršili, but virtually all commentators agree that the DAM should be emended to the nearly identical NIN, "sister." See Goetze, JCS 11 (1957) 55, and Bin-Nun Tawananna pp. 87-88 with nn. 129-30, both with further bibliography.

78. KBo 3 1 (= BoTU 23) ii 4-12 (ed. Sturtevant and Bechtel, Chrest. 186-87).