

HAŠTAYAR AND KADDUŠI

Turgut Yiğit*

Although the Hittite Kingdom existed in Anatolia for more than four hundred years, however, our knowledge pertaining to the foundation of the Hittite Kingdom is quite limited. The Hittites started to use cuneiform in the foundation period of the kingdom, thus, there is not a plentiful supply of written documents pertaining to the era. However, some main historical resources, royal offering lists and various other documents from the period of King Hattušili I do exist. It is not always possible to distinguish all the events with geographical details and names of people, with precise description of their locations and the roles within the historical incidents from documents offering limited information of the establishment era. The original borders of the Hittite kingdom were essentially the region of Central Anatolia. This was where King Hattušili reigned and from where he extended the borders of the kingdom through a series of intense military campaigns. Furthermore, as noted in the documents the Hattušili era was time in which inner rivalries and tumults occurred. From various texts, especially from the text known as the Political Testament, it can be seen that members of the royal family played an active role in the inner affairs of the kingdom.

Haštayar (Laroche 1966: 69; Otten 1972-75: 141) and Kadduši (Laroche 1966: 91; Franz-Szabo 1976-1980: 286) are the names of two women noted in the documents belonging to the era of Hattušili I. While the name of Haštayar appears in the Testament and the palace chronicles, the name Kadduši is observed in the royal offering lists on three occasions. It is uncertain whether these two women were members of the royal family who had actively partaken in events during the reign of Hattušili I but were not mentioned in the documents. It is also impossible to determine whether they were amongst those women who took on significant roles in Hittite political life. When contemplating the documents which relate the events, the stance of these

documents, and the development of historical events of the period, it is possible to comment on the status of Haštayar and Kadduši in the royal family during the Foundation Period of the Hittite Kingdom.

The lines that involve Haštayar in the Political Testament of Hattušili I are as follows (KUB I 16 III 64-73) (Beckman 2000: 81):

*“The Great King, Labarna, says to Haštayar:
‘Don’t forsake me’
The king does not say thus to her, the courtiers say:
‘She now still keeps on consulting the Old Women.’ The King says, as follows, to them: ‘Is she now still consulting the Old Women?’
I don’t know.’ Furthermore,
don’t forsake me, don’t. Always consult me.
I will reveal my words to you. Wash me well.
Hold me on your bosom and at your bosom protect me from the earth.”*

Hattušili I presented Muršili as the heir, and ordered the notables of the country to prepare him for the throne, all of which classifies this document as a testament. Moreover, as it conveys the instruction on how Muršili would be crowned king after him and his advice to Muršili on how to rule the country this also grades this document as a testament (KUB I 16 II 37-57, III 55-63). Additionally, this document gives a summary of the inner affairs of the kingdom in the period. It relates the revolts conducted by the son, sister and daughter of the king and how much harm these incidents had done to the country (KUB I 16 II 8-36, 63-8, III 6-25). From the colophon of the document it is understood that the king was on his deathbed when this text was being written (KUB I 16 IV 73-75). After relating the sequence of betrayals of those closest to Hattušili I and listing the difficulties the people and country experienced, it addresses Haštayar in the last lines of the Testament, as given above. The emotion displayed in this commentary, reveals the trust felt by someone who was dying. Haštayar, amongst the very few people who had stood by the king who had been betrayed by his

* Doç. Dr. Turgut Yiğit, Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, 06100 Sıhhiye-Ankara / TÜRKİYE.

family, must have been the most trusted relative of the king, someone who had been emotionally cherished.

The name Haštayar also appears in a palace chronicle which belonged to the period of Muṣṣili I, however, due to its context, had also concerned the era of Hattušili I (KBo III 34 II 1-4):

“Zidi was the cupbearer. Father of the king, the harhara vessel full of wine hand over to Haštayar and Maratti. presented the king the good wine. To them presented a different wine...”

The name Haštayar in this text is written as Hištayara. As understood from the passage, Haštayar and, Maratti, the person mentioned alongside her were people who had been considered significant by the “father of the king”. Haštayar and Maratti were sufficiently important members of the royal family that it was worth an official’s life. Zidi was an official in charge of the wine vessel and when he presented a different wine than that was meant for Haštayar and Maratti, he was sentenced to death (KBo III 34 II 7). While the “father of the king” refers to Hattušili I, “the king” is believed to be Muṣṣili I (Yiğit 2003: 149 and n. 29). Hištayar referred to in the text must be the same woman mentioned in the Testament of Hattušili I.

The privileged status of Haštayar and Maratti, mentioned in the chronicle and also as understood from the first lines of the passage above, were bestowed during the time of the “father of the king”, that is to say Hattušili I. This situation had continued during the time of “the king”, Muṣṣili I. In the period when religious symbols were of great importance in carefully carried out ceremonies which involved members of the royal family, any mistake by an official, for example giving the wrong wine to a member of the royal family, would have resulted in severe punishment of those responsible. As Haštayar and Maratti were regarded with great esteem during the reign of both kings, although it is clear that they were not of the Muṣṣili I generation, they had held respected status within the royal family prior to the time of the “king”. This is supported by the language used to describe Haštayar in the Testament.

There are also other texts pertaining to the same period in which the name of Haštayar is mentioned: the KBo III 36 palace chronicle; the KUB XXXVI 105// VBoT 33 palace chronicle fragments and the KBo III

29 palace chronicle fragment. However, it is not possible to obtain a ny further information about her.

The most detailed discussion about Haštayar concerned whether she might have been the wife or daughter of Hattušili I. There is no reference to the wife of Hattušili I in any of the documents pertaining to the period. His daughter, however, is mentioned as one of the people responsible for a revolt cited in the Testament and which caused much bloodshed. But this woman is not named. In fact, it is apparent from the lines that it could not have been the Haštayar referred to in the Testament since she was, as mentioned above, seen as a very trustworthy person. The part addressing Haštayar in the Testament, the expression “don’t forsake me” makes one think that it was meant for the rebellious daughter. Nonetheless, it is highly unlikely to be followed by a description within the same document relating to her taking part in a bloody revolt and also in the ceremony of sending the king off to his eternal voyage. However, other than the woman who had been involved in the revolt, Haštayar might have been the other daughter of the king (Beal 1983: 123; Astour 1989: 13). The possibility of her being the wife of Hattušili I (Forrer 2BoTU 3; Sommer-Falkenstein 1938: 189 and n.1, 190-191, 209; Goetze 1957: 87) is not out of the question either.

The name Kadduši appears in the royal offering lists in connection with Hattušili I. From these lists, while the name Kadduši appears after Labarna and before Muṣṣili in KUB XXXVI 120 and KUB XI 4, her name appears after Hattušili and before Muṣṣili in KBo XIII 43 (Otten 1968: 122). Accepting that the name Labarna is the other name of Hattušili, established from the documents, it can be clearly seen that Kadduši appears before Muṣṣili I and after Hattušili I in all three lists. Though, the name Kadduši does not appear in any other texts.

The question arises as to what the relationship was between Hattušili I and Kadduši and what her role was within the Hittite political life in the Hattušili era. Tawananna which appears before Labarna (Hattušili I) in one of the lists (KUB XI 4), is the name of a significant institution in Hittite political life, it must also have been the name of a person. There is a great probability the Tawananna was the person in the introduction of the Annals of Hattušili I (KBo X 2 I 1-3) presented

as the nephew of Tawananna. The names Pušarruma, Papahdilmah, Labarna and Tawananna appear as the previous generation in the texts pertaining to the era of Hattušili I. Among them, Pušarruma, Papahdilmah (as Pawatelmah) and Tawananna are the names which, yet again, appear before Hattušili I (Labarna II) in the royal offering lists. Hattušili I presenting himself as the nephew of Tawananna can be explained as an act to legitimize his ascension the throne. Thus, it is possible to reach the conclusion that the Tawananna who is referred at this stage, had taken on a significant role in the early period of Hittite political history. In this way, it is possible that Kadduši, who had appears just after Hattušili I in the lists, took on a similar role. From the Testament of Hattušili I it is known that the son of his sister had been adopted by the king and was announced heir to the throne, however, for various reasons, later his changed his mind and the sister of the king thereupon created a great turmoil in the capital, directly opposing the king (KUB I 16 II 1-36). All the events support the idea that the sister of Hattušili I was Tawananna (Bin-Nun 1975: 70). For only a woman with the title of Tawananna could have had such an effect. The act of Hattušili I presenting himself as having a connection with Tawananna and proclaiming the son of his sister as the heir to throne; and also observing the various applications which followed, forms the idea that women who were members of the royal family had a role in designating the heir during this period (Riemschneider 1971: 79). Acting on the parallelism put forward by this situation, it can be stated that the sister of the king might have borne the title Tawananna. The thought that Kadduši might have been the sister of Hattušili I (Bin-Nun 1975: 77-78) which is the only name that appears after Tawananna in the royal offering lists and the historical events can be considered from the impact they had on the Hittite political life.

The names of some women established as the wives of the kings in other historical sources throughout Hittite history appear immediately after the names of these kings in the royal offering lists. While the names Hantili and Harapšeki appear one after the other in the royal offering list KUB XXXVI 120 9-10 (Otten 1968: 122), in the Proclamation of Telipinu they are perceived as spouses (KBo III 1 obv. I 31-32:

Hoffmann, 1984: 18); while the names Telipinu and Ištapariya appear one after the other in the royal offering list KUB XI 11 12-13 (Otten 1968: 122) they are seen as spouses in the Proclamation (KBo III 1 obv. II 9-10: Hoffmann, 1984: 26); the names Alluwamna and Harapšili are seen one after the other in the royal offering lists KUB XI 11 14-15 (Otten 1968: 122), KUB XI 8+9 and 1307/z (Otten 1968: 122), as also observed in KUB XXVI 77 10-11; while Tuthaliya and Nikalmati are observed to be one after the other in the royal offering lists KUB XI 8+9 and 1307/z (Otten 1968: 122), they appear side by side in H.G. Güterbock, SBo I 60 and 77. This information leads to the idea that there is a strong possibility that Kadduši was Hattušili’s wife appearing right after Hattušili I (Beal 1989: 124). Moreover, it is stated that on the cruciform seal bearing the names of the great king and the queen, found in Boğazköy, the name of the great queen which appears together with Hattušili and seen as kà-x, which can be interpreted as Kadduši (Dinçol at al. 1993: 95).

It is important to note that Haštayar was known to be the closest person who could be trusted by Hattušili I when he was on his deathbed after being betrayed by the members of his family. Muṣṣili was in fact the grandson of Hattušili I (according to Treaty between Muwatalli II and Talmi-Šarruma §4) rather than the son. Hattušili I had declared his young grandson Muṣṣili to the throne as his son and heir after the inner turmoil in the country; and, the respected status of Haštayar presented in the palace chronicle elaborated on the above. Accordingly it can be stated that Haštayar was the faithful daughter of Hattušili I and her son was declared crown prince by the king who had adopted him as his son. Haštayar, aside from the one who had opposed the king, must have been the faithful daughter of Hattušili I who had trusted her; and Muṣṣili must have been her son. For in the last section of the Testament, Hattušili I after expressing his thoughts explained to Muṣṣili how to rule the country, he then addresses Haštayar. As the text possesses a vivid exposition, it is clear that both Haštayar and Muṣṣili were beside the king while the text was being written and as mentioned above, Kadduši whose name did not appear in the documents must have been the wife of the king.

ÖZET

Haštayar ve Kadduši

Hitit Krallığı’nı politikaları ve kurumları ile ilk kez tanıdığımız I. Hattušili zamanı, sınırların Orta Anadolu’dan başlayarak genişletildiği, bununla bağlantılı olarak askeri seferlerin yoğun olarak yapıldığı, onun yanı sıra belgelerden takip edebildiğimiz yine yoğun iç çekişmelerin, karışıklıkların yaşandığı dönemdir. Bu döneme ilişkin sınırlı bilgileri edindiğimiz belgelerde kaydedilmiş tüm olayları, coğrafya ve kişi isimlerini geniş bağlantılarıyla, tarihsel olaylar içindeki yerleri ve rolleri ile her zaman ortaya koymak mümkün olmamaktadır. Yaşanan iç olaylarda kraliyet ailesi mensuplarının etkin roller üstlendiği hem isimler verilerek hem de isimler olmaksızın özellikle I. Hattušili’nin Vasiyetnamesi olarak adlandırılan belge ve bununla birlikte birkaç başka belgeden de öğrenilebilmektedir.

Haštayar ve Kadduši, söz konusu döneme ilişkin olmak üzere belgelerde okunabilen iki bayan adıdır. Haštayar adı Vasiyetname’de ve saray kroniklerinde yer alırken, Kadduši ismi kurban listelerinde üç kez tespit edilebilmektedir. Bu iki bayanın belgelerde adları verilmeden bahsedilen ve I. Hattušili zamanındaki olaylarda etkin olarak rol alan kraliyet ailesi mensuplarından olup olmadığı açıkça anlaşılamamaktadır. O olaylarda yer almayan ancak kraliyet ailesi mensubu olmanın ötesinde Hitit siyasal yaşantısında da önemli roller üstlendiklerini bildiğimiz bayanlardan olup olmadıklarını da tespit etmek mümkün değildir. Ancak yer aldıkları belgeler, bu belgelerdeki konumları, onlara ilişkin ifadeler ve dönemin gelişen tarihsel olayları dikkate alındığında Haštayar ve Kadduši’nin Hitit Krallığı’nın kuruluş döneminde kraliyet ailesi içinde hangi konumda olduklarına dair yorum yapmak mümkün olmaktadır.

I. Hattušili, Vasiyetnamesi’nde en yakınıdakilerin bir biri arkasına gelen ihanetlerini ve ülkesinin, halkının katlandığı büyük sıkıntıları sıraladıktan sonra metnin son satırlarında Haštayar’a hitap eder. Duygu yüklü bu hitap, kullanılan ifadeler, ölmek üzere olan bir kişinin duyduğu güveni bize göstermektedir. Ailesinin ihanetine uğrayan kralın yanında kalan çok az kişi arasında en güven duyduğu ve duygusal bir bağ hissettiği yakını olmalıydı Haštayar.

I. Muršili dönemine ait ancak içeriği itibariyle I. Hattušili zamanını da ilgilendiren bir saray kroniğinde Haštayar adını buluyoruz. Haštayar ve Maratti bu kronikte belirtilen ayrıcalıklı konuma, metindeki ifadelerden anlaşıldığı üzere “kralın babası” yani I. Hattušili zamanında sahip olmuşlardır. Bu durum “kral”, yani I. Muršili zamanında da devam etmiştir. Haštayar ve Maratti her iki kral zamanında da itibar gördüklerine göre, I. Muršili kuşağından değil, en azından ondan daha önce krallık ailesinde saygın mevkiye sahip kişiler olmalıdırlar. Haštayar’ın yukarıda bahsettiğimiz Vasiyetname’de anılışında kullanılan ifadeler de bunu göstermektedir.

I. Hattušili’nin Vasiyetnamesi’nde kendisinden sonra tahta çıkarılmasını istediği ve oğlu olarak sunduğu Muršili’nin aslında onun torunu olduğunun saptanması, Vasiyetname’de anlatılan ülke içindeki karışıklıklardan sonra I. Hattušili’nin henüz küçük yaştaki torunu Muršili’yi kendi oğlu olarak tahta varis ilan etmesi ve Haštayar’ın I. Muršili zamanına ait olduğu anlaşılan saray kroniğinde çok saygın konumda bulunuyor olması dikkate alındığında, Haštayar’ın I. Hattušili’ye sadık kalan kızı olduğu ve onun oğlu Muršili’nin de kral tarafından kendi oğlu olarak veliaht ilan edildiği söylenebilir.

Kadduši bayan adı ise yine I. Hattušili ile ilgili olmak üzere kurban listeleri’nde yer almaktadır. Diğer tarihsel kaynaklarla Hitit tarihi boyunca kimi kralların eşleri olduğu saptanabilen bayanların adlarının kurban listelerinde yine bu krallardan hemen sonra geçiyor olması, I. Hattušili’dan hemen sonra yer alan Kadduši’nin onun eşi olabileceği yolunda güçlü bir fikir verir.

Bibliography

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Astour, M.C.
1989 <i>Hittite History and Absolute Chronology of The Bronze Age</i>, Partille.</p> <p>Beal, R.H.
1983 “Studies in Hittite History,” <i>JCS</i> 35: 115-126.</p> <p>Beckman, G.
2000 “Bilingual Edict of Hattusili I,” <i>The Context of Scripture</i>, vol. II (ed. W.H.Hallo), Leiden: 79-81.</p> <p>Bin-Nun, S.R.
1975 <i>The Tawananna in The Hittite Kingdom</i>, Heidelberg.</p> <p>Dinçol, A.M. – B. Dinçol – J.D. Hawkins – G. Wilhelm
1993 “The ‘Cruciform Seal’ from Boğazköy-Hattusa,” <i>Istanbuler Mitteilungen</i> 43 (Fs. P.Neve): 87-106.</p> <p>Franz-Szabo, G.
1976-80 “Kaddussi(ti),” <i>RIA</i> 5: 286.</p> <p>Forrer, E.
1922-26 (2BoTU) <i>Die Boghazköi-Texte im Umschrift</i> (WV-DOG 41/42).</p> <p>Goetze, A.
1957 <i>Kleinasien</i>, München.</p> | <p>Güterbock, H.G.
1940 SBo I: <i>Siegel aus Boğazköy</i>, Erster Teil, Die Königs-siegel der Grabungen bis 1938. Berlin.</p> <p>Hoffmann, I.
1984 <i>Der Erlass Telipinu</i>, Heidelberg.</p> <p>Laroche, E.
1966 <i>Les Noms des Hittites</i>, Paris.</p> <p>Otten, H.
1968 <i>Die Hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie</i>, Wiesbaden.</p> <p>1972-75 “Haštaiar,” <i>RIA</i> 4: 141.</p> <p>Riemschneider, K.K.
1971 “Die Thronfolgeordnung im althethitischen Reich,” <i>Beiträge zur Sozialen Struktur des alten Vorderasien</i>, Berlin: 79-102.</p> <p>Sommer, F. – A. Falkenstein
1938 <i>Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I[Labarna II]</i>, München.</p> <p>Yiğit, T.
2003 “Hitit Krallığı’nın Kuruluş Dönemindeki İç Olayların Sırası,” <i>Archivum Anatolicum</i> 6/2: 143-154.</p> |
|---|--|