

## THE HURRIAN DYNASTY AND THE DOUBLE NAMES OF HITTITE KINGS

Richard H. Beal, Chicago

The idea that Empire Period Hittite kings had double names, one traditional Hittite and the other in the language of a new dynasty of ethnically different rulers goes back to I. J. Gelb in 1935.<sup>1</sup> His understandings were based almost entirely on misreadings of the hieroglyphs of standard Hittite names.<sup>2</sup> The theory was given a much stronger philological foundation and considerably elaborated in H.G. Güterbock's influential article "The Hurrian Element in the Hittite Empire" of 1954/55.<sup>3</sup> There he pointed out that, in the new dynasty<sup>4</sup> beginning several generations before Šuppiluliuma I, all Hittite queens then known bore Hurrian names, in contrast to queens of the older period, where no queen bore a Hurrian name. One of these queens with a Hurrian name, Ašmunikal, was the daughter of the previous royal couple, "which means that a Hurrian name was given to a Hittite princess". He also listed some ten princes bearing Hurrian names from this same period. He went on to point out that one prince, probably a son by a woman other than the queen, bore a Hurrian name before his accession - Urḫi-Tešub, but called himself Muršili (III) when he took the throne.<sup>5</sup> From this Güterbock suggested that Urḫi-Tešub might not have been the only New Hittite king to have had a Hurrian personal name, who "adopted a traditional one" when he became king. He then referred to these as a ruler's "personal name" and his "throne name". He also noted a certain PU-Šarruma, whom Sommer<sup>6</sup> thought was a king, but who is not known among the sequence of Hittite kings, and therefore

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hittite Hieroglyphs* II, SAOC 14 (1935), 36 n. 3, elaborated in "The Double Names of the Hittite Kings," RO 17 (1951-52), 146-154.

<sup>2</sup> See E. Laroche, NH (1966), 358-360.

<sup>3</sup> "The Hurrian Element in the Hittite Empire," CHM 2:383-394.

<sup>4</sup> Already E. Weidner, PD (1923), 82 n. 6.

<sup>5</sup> This is based on a seals which say in the cuneiform ring "Seal of His Majesty [the *Tabarna*] Muršili [Great King, King of H]atti, the Hero, son of Muwattalli, Great King, [King] of Hatti, the Hero, grandson of Muršili, king of Hatti, the Hero, great-grandson of Šuppiluliuma, King of Hatti, the Hero" while the center hieroglyphics say: "His Majesty Muršili, the Great King," SBo 1 no.13 and Boğ. 3 nos. 2-3.

<sup>6</sup> HAB (1938), 163 n. 1.

Güterbock thought that PU-Šarruma should be the Hurrian personal name of a king known better by his Anatolian name. Güterbock expanded on this hypothesis some four years later.<sup>7</sup> He noted that Šuppiluliuma I's son and the first Hittite king of Kargamiš was sometimes called by the "Anatolian" name of Piyaššili and sometimes by the Hurrian name of Šarri-Kušuh. With the publication of seals from Boğazköy and Ugarit, it became clear that a number of Hittite kings' seals had, in addition to the "Anatolian" name of the king, a second Hurrian name. Güterbock lists these "double named" kings as: Tudḫaliya IV also known as X-Šarruma<sup>8</sup> = probably PU-Šarruma = Hešmi-Šarruma, a prince from the time of Hattušili III; Muwatalli [II] also known as X-Tešub,<sup>9</sup> with in both cases the Hurrian name occurring flanked by signs meaning "Great King"; Muršili III also known as Urḫi-Tešub; and finally Tašmi-Šarri who occurs beside Šuppiluliuma's first queen Taduḫepa in Hurrian language texts, and who was none-other than Šuppiluliuma himself.<sup>10</sup> Güterbock also suggested that Šattiwaza, King of Mittanni, was also known by the Hurrian name of Kili-Tešub.<sup>11</sup> Much the same argument was contemporaneously made by Laroche.<sup>12</sup> Laroche too referred to "seconds noms", "noms de trône" and "noms de naissance" or "vrai nom". More recently, texts have shown Tašmi-Šarri

<sup>7</sup> "The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma," JCS 10 (1956), 121-122.

<sup>8</sup> RS 17.159, Cl. Schaeffer, «Ugaritica» 3 (1956), 19-21 figs. 24-26 and pl. III; E. Laroche, «Ugaritica» 3:111f. In the center of the seal one finds "Tudḫaliya" written hieroglyphically and surrounded by signs for <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI, *tabarna*, LUGAL.GAL. Below that one finds written X-Šarruma flanked by LUGAL.GAL. The cuneiform part of the seal as far as preserved mentions only Tudḫaliya's filiation and his queen (and mother) Puduḫepa. More importantly, the text begins "before His Majesty, Tudḫaliya, the Great King, King of Ḫatti. No second Great King is mentioned in the cuneiform that could correspond to X-Šarruma, Great King in the hieroglyphs. Other similar Tudḫaliya IV bullae found at Boğazköy are published by H. Otten, *Zu einigen Neufunden hethitischer Königssiegel* (1993), 35-40. D. Sürenhagen, OLZ 87 (1992), 360f. n. 84, followed by S. Alp, AoF 25 (1998), 54-60, would read the X-Šarruma as Tašmi-Šarruma (a prince, probably a son of Hattušili III and a witness in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty KBo 4.10 rev. 28), suggesting that he was named after his grandfather Muršili II/Tašmi-Šarruma (for which, see below). This is not accepted by Th. van den Hout, StBoT 38 (1995), 197-199.

<sup>9</sup> SBo 1:39-41. These seals have in the center left in hieroglyphs beside the drawing of the king "Great King Muwatalli" and on the lower right side "<sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI X-Tešsubba" flanked by "Great King".

<sup>10</sup> H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956), 122.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. 121.

<sup>12</sup> "Matériaux pour d'étude des relations entre Ugarit et le Hatti," «Ugaritica» 3 (1956), 117-119, repeated in NH (1966), 360-362.

associated with Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, referred to as his mother,<sup>13</sup> as well as Taduḫepa, who is now known to have been a queen inherited by Šuppiluliuma I from his predecessor. Therefore, it is now argued that Tašmi-Šarri was the "Familiennamen" of Tudḫaliya III.<sup>14</sup> It has also been suggested that Tašmi-Šarruma is the personal name of Tudḫaliya III's grandson, Muršili II, based on a Hurrian section of the Ritual of Ummaya, which in one copy has "Muršili" and in two others "Tašmi-Šarruma".<sup>15</sup> Additionally, Šaḫurunuwā, king of Kargamiš and son of Piyašili/Šarri-Kušuh, well known from texts from Ugarit was probably the same person as the [x-x]-Šarruma, son of Piyašili/Šarri-Kušuh installed as king of Kargamiš on his father's death by Muršili II.<sup>16</sup> A number of scholars have also argued that Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša was another name for Ulmi-Tešub of Tarḫuntašša.<sup>17</sup> That Urḫi-Tešub was already known as such when he was crown prince has now been confirmed from a seal recently presented by David Hawkins at the 4th Hittite Congress.

The evidence of the Hurrian names in the royal family, the double names of the kings, the lack of evidence of connection between Ḫuzziya II and Tudḫaliya II, and the argument that there was discontinuity in the names of the kings between Ḫuzziya and his predecessors on one side

<sup>13</sup> V. Haas, ChS I/1 (1984), 7-9, AoF 12 (1985), 272.

<sup>14</sup> O.R. Gurney, StMed 1 (1979), 219-220, V. Haas, ChS I/1 (1984), 7-9, AoF 12 (1985), 272, O. Carruba, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/1998), 93. See discussion by A. Dinçol/B. Dinçol/J.D. Hawkins/G. Wilhelm, IM 43 (1993), 101 who write merely of "identity". The same evidence is used by Ph. Houwink ten Cate's, JEOL 34 (1995-1996), 52, 58-65, to suggest that Tašmi-Šarri should be identified with Tudḫaliya III's (half-)brother Hattušili II. He then suggests (ibid. 65-69) that Tudḫaliya III should be identified with Tulpi-Tešub (senior).

<sup>15</sup> KBo 15.1 iv 32 (Muršili), KUB 7.58 iv 2, 9 (Tašmi-Šarruma), KUB 45.20 iii 17 (Tašmi-Šarruma), translit. V. Haas/I. Wegner, ChS I/5 (1988), 238, 243f., 247; discussion ibid. 17 n. 1 ("Personnenamen"), D. Sürenhagen, OLZ 87 (1992), 360f. n. 84 ("Geburtsname"); A. Ünal, RIA 8 (1995), 436 ("Prinzennamen").

<sup>16</sup> KBo 4.4 iii 12-13, ed. AM 124f.; M. Liverani, RSO 35 (1960), 136f., H. Klengel, GS 1 (1965), 76f., J.D. Hawkins, RIA 5 (1980), 430, H. Klengel, GHR (1999), 199 w. n. 279 ([...] -Šarruma = "hurritische Name" and Šaḫurunuwā = "Thronname"), cf. H. Otten, MDOG 94 (1963), 8 n. 31, but considered two separate people by E. Laroche, «Ugaritica» 3 (1956) 133 and A. Goetze, CAH<sup>2</sup> fasc. 37 (1965), 32f. = CAH<sup>3</sup> 2/2 (1975), 124f.

<sup>17</sup> H.G. Güterbock, JNES 20 (1961), 86 n. 3, E. Laroche, NH (1966), 362, G. del Monte, EVO 14-15 (1991-1992), 123-148, H. Klengel, AoF 18 (1991), 231f., O.R. Gurney, AnSt 43 (1993), 20-21, R. Beal, THeth 20 (1992), 387 n. 1466. Those who believe them to be separate people include Th. van den Hout, JCS 41 (1989), 100-114, Ph. Houwink ten Cate, BiOr 51 (1994), 233, and Cl. Mora, Eothen 9 (1998), 85-91.

and Tudḫaliya II and his successors on the other,<sup>18</sup> led to the theory that Tudḫaliya II founded a new dynasty of Hurrian origin, whose members had Hurrian personal names and took "Anatolian" throne names upon their accession to the throne. Since then just about everybody has followed at least the basic outline of this theory.<sup>19</sup>

However there are major problems. To begin with, the discontinuity in royal names between the Old Hittite and Middle Hittite periods is not so complete. There was a Tudḫaliya I the great grandfather of Ḫattušili I.<sup>20</sup> There is a Middle Hittite Kantuzili, there was also a Kantuzili contemporary with or immediately before Tudḫaliya I,<sup>21</sup> and afterwards also a Kantuzili, the Priest of Kizzuwatna (perhaps Arnuwanda I's son),<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> H. Otten, *FWGesh* 3 (1966), 136f. Note also O.R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (1954), 26 ("there was a break in the line").

<sup>19</sup> For example, E. Laroche, «Anadolu» (O.S.) 2 (1955), 10 (Tudḫaliya, from the SE, perhaps Kizzuwatna, founded by a new dynasty in Ḫattuša); O.R. Gurney, *The Hittites* 2 (1954) 26 = <sup>22</sup> (1990), 20; A. Kammenhuber, *Hipp.Heth.* (1961), 17; T. Beran, *MDOG* 93 (1962) 67 n. 25 ("offiziellen" or "Thronnamen" and "Geburtsnamen"); A. Kammenhuber, *HbOr* (1969), 158 ("Die Dynastie ... ist hurrischer Herkunft," and "Hurrische Geburtsnamen"); O.R. Gurney, *CAH* 3 2/1 (1973) 675; H. Otten, *Pud.* (1975), 8f. ("Prinzennamen" and "Thronnamen"); M. Wäfler, *MDOG* 107 (1975), 26; O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977), 145 (throne-names); I. Singer, *ZA* 75 (1985), 113f. ("throne names" and "birth-names"); V. Haas, *AoF* 12 (1985) 272 w. n. 32, 274; D. Sörenhagen, *OLZ* 87 (1992), 360 n. 84 ("Geburtsnamen"); Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *BiOr* 51 (1994), 234 ("Hurrian Throne-name"); J. Freu, *Hit.Kongr.* 2 (1993/1995), 137-139 ("une nouvelle dynastie aux affinités hourrites" and "Le roi Tudḫaliya était un 'homo novus'"); A. Ünal, *RIA* 8 (1995), 436 ("Prinzennamen"); Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *JEOL* 34 (1995-1996), 67 ("Hittite throne names"); Freu, «Hethitica» 13 (1996), 25 (Tudḫaliya = "un autre clan"), 28 ("un 'nom de naissance' hourrite et un 'nom de trône' hittite"), A. Ünal, *RIA* 8 (1997), 524 ("Thronname"). O. Carruba, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/1998), 98, goes further than anyone else by assuming that a prince with an "Anatolian" name would take another "Anatolian" name as a throne name by suggesting that Kantuzili became king under the "Thronname" of Ḫattušili II (see further below). M. Wäfler, *MDOG* 107 (1975), 26 draws the logical conclusion that an inscription bearing just the "personal name" and not the "throne name" would date from before the prince's accession to the throne. However Wäfler's reading of Muwattalli's Hurrian name "X-Teššuba" on the Imamkulu relief has not found favor with J.D. Hawkins among others whose readings yield "Kuwalana-muwa" see J.D. Hawkins, *RIA* 6 (1983), 398 and J. Börker-Klähn, *ZA* 67 (1977), 64-67 (with earlier bibliography) and R. Beal, *THeth* 20 (1992), 415 w. n. 1555 and nn. 65, 1481.

<sup>20</sup> KUB 11.7 i 10-12, translit. H. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), 65 obv. 19-21. It is not clear whether or not this Tudḫaliya, known to modern scholars until recently as Tudḫaliya I, was king. See recent discussion by Beal, *FsHoffner* (forthcoming).

<sup>21</sup> KUB 11.7 i 8, see R. Beal, *FsHoffner* n. 13 (forthcoming).

<sup>22</sup> R. Beal, *OrNS* 55 (1986), 436 n. 59; idem. *THeth* 20:321 w. n. 1225, w. bibliography.

and a general Kantuzili in Muršili II's reign. There was an OH king Muršili and two NH kings Muršili. There was Old Hittite king Telipinu and New Hittite prince Telipinu, son of Šuppiluliuma, and there was an important Ḫuzziya at the very beginning of Hittite history,<sup>23</sup> an old Hittite Prince Ḫuzziya of Ḫakmiš,<sup>24</sup> and two Old Hittite kings Ḫuzziya and a late New Hittite prince Ḫuzziya, brother of Tudḫaliya IV.<sup>25</sup>

Other parts of this theory have begun to unravel in the past 15 years. In 1986 I redated the Šunaššura treaty to Tudḫaliya II<sup>26</sup> (by which I meant and still mean the conqueror of Aleppo and the conqueror of Aššuwa).<sup>27</sup> Since this treaty refers to the events in the time of Tudḫaliya's grandfather, this required accepting the necessity of creating another Tudḫaliya two generations earlier, as Gurney had suggested,<sup>28</sup> or of accepting the fact that Tudḫaliya was not the founder of the dynasty. It seems far easier to accept the latter than to split Tudḫaliya. I signaled my intention to show this,<sup>29</sup> which I, unfortunately have not gotten around to until now. Virtually simultaneously with my article, G. Wilhelm had grappled with the same problems,<sup>30</sup> and in an addendum he agreed with my point concerning there being only one Tudḫaliya II and pointedly refers to the consequences: "ich ... verweise aber noch einmal auf die Konsequenz, daß damit Tudḫaliya "II" wegen der Aussage des Šunaššura-Vertrages nicht als Begründer einer neuen Dynastie betrachtet werden kann".<sup>31</sup>

KUB 23.27 which deals with Tudḫaliya's campaign against Arzawa, was already dated in Carruba's edition to Tudḫaliya II.<sup>32</sup> Its first two lines read, following Carruba's restorations, [UM-MA T]a[b]arna m Tudḫaliya LUGAL.GAL [ma-a-an A-B]U-YA DINGIR-LIM-iš ki-ša-at "Thus

<sup>23</sup> Cruciform Seal, see A. Dinçol, B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins and G. Wilhelm, *IM* 43 (1993) 104-106 and KUB 36.121 obv. 1-5, translit. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), 64f.

<sup>24</sup> KUB 36.120 i 7, translit. H. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), 64.

<sup>25</sup> KBo 4.10 rev. 29; KUB 26.18 obv. 9-10, ed. and discussed by Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38 (1995), 100-109.

<sup>26</sup> *OrNS* 55 (1986), 424-445.

<sup>27</sup> See now Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *JEOL* 34 (1995-1996), 53.

<sup>28</sup> *StMed* 1 (1979), 219-221, followed by S. Košak, «Tel Aviv» 7 (1980), 166, J. Freu, *Les Archives de Mašat Höyük* (1983), 117, idem, *Hit.Kongr.* 2 (1993/95), 137-143, 147, O. Carruba, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/98), 87-107.

<sup>29</sup> fn 91.

<sup>30</sup> *FsOtten* 2 (1988), 359-370.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* 370.

<sup>32</sup> *SMEA* 18 (1977), 156 and Tafel a after 154, see tr. by G. del Monte, *L'annalistica* (1993), 143. It was dated to Tudḫaliya III by S. Košak, «Tel Aviv» 7 (1980), 164.

speaks Tabarna, Tudḫaliya, Great King, when my father became a god". These restorations fit the traces and spacing admirably. One cannot rule out, of course, that one should restore ŠEŠ "brother" rather than *A-BU* "father". However, since only kings become gods, it is clear that Tudḫaliya's father (or, less likely, brother) was king. Therefore, as St. de Martino has already pointed out,<sup>33</sup> Tudḫaliya II did not found a new dynasty.

Further support for this came in 1991 in a volume of a series, Eothen, founded and edited by our honoree, when one of her students, Stefano de Martino, convincingly argued based on content that KUB 23.16 was a part of the annals of Tudḫaliya II ("I/II"). He further notes that it had previously been anomalously dated to Tudḫaliya III only because in line obv. 2' it refers to the king's father.<sup>34</sup>

The first two preserved paragraphs of KUB 23.16<sup>35</sup> describe battles between Kantuzili and King Tudḫaliya on one side and Muwa, GAL *MEŠEDI* of the murdered Muwattalli I, and the Hurrians on the other.<sup>36</sup> Kantuzili is already known as the Overseer of Elite Chariot Fighters under Muwattalli I,<sup>37</sup> who with Ḫimuili, Chief of the Palace Servants, murdered that Muwattalli,<sup>38</sup> who had himself become king by murdering King Ḫuzziya II.<sup>39</sup> Thus it is quite clear that this text dates to Tudḫaliya II. In this context it too refers to "my father" (*attašmiš*). This text convinced Klinger that Tudḫaliya II was a member of the old dynasty.<sup>40</sup> Recently a new seal has been found that names Kantuzili as the father of Tudḫaliya.<sup>41</sup> With knowledge of the new seal it is probable that obv. 2 should be read *attašmiš* [*Kantuziliš*], and lines 6-7 *n[u attāšmiš]* *Kantuzziliš* though in the dative it simply has *ANA mKantuzili* (line 5).

<sup>33</sup> Eothen 5 (1996), 9.

<sup>34</sup> Eothen 4 (1991), 12f. O. Carruba, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/98), 96f. had cautiously suggested that this text showed that Tudḫaliya "I" was son of Ḫuzziya II. T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (1998), 131f. w. n. 5, who following a suggestion of Gurney, suggested that Tudḫaliya's father was Ḫimuili, who was in turn a son of Ḫuzziya II. That is, there was continuity of dynasty. For an earlier attempt to date the text to Tudḫaliya III see O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977), 162, S. Košak, *«Tel Aviv»* 7 (1980), 164.

<sup>35</sup> Ed. O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977), 162f.

<sup>36</sup> See discussion by T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (1998), 131f.

<sup>37</sup> KBo 32.185 rev. 14, cf. H. Otten, *Das hethitische Königshaus im 15. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, *AOAW* 123 (1986), 28-32.

<sup>38</sup> KUB 34.40:9-10, ed. Otten, *Königshaus* 29f.

<sup>39</sup> KBo 16.25 iv 15 (MH/MS), ed. O. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 (1977), 182f., A.M. Rizzi Mellini, *FsMeriggi*<sup>2</sup> = *StMed* 1 (1979), 534f.

<sup>40</sup> *ZA* 85 (1995), 95 n. 81.

<sup>41</sup> H. Otten, *ArchAnz.* 2000:375-376.

When, according to this text, both Kantuzili and Tudḫaliya were working together, the text names Kantuzili first (as later texts where Tudḫaliya II and his coregent and eventual successor Arnuwanda I were working together always mention Tudḫaliya before Arnuwanda). Although the text calls Tudḫaliya "king" but not Kantuzili, this could be because only Tudḫaliya was alive at the time of writing and meant "the present king".

In offering lists D and E Kantuzili is mentioned in same paragraph as a woman, Wall[anni].<sup>42</sup> Although some of the other names preserved in these lists are princes, in all the offering lists, when just one man and one woman are mentioned in the same paragraph, they are king and queen.<sup>43</sup> Wallanni also heads a list of queens: Nikkalmati, Ašmunikkal, Daduḫepa, Ḫenti and Tawannana, in a text of the Nuntarriyašḫa festival.<sup>44</sup> It therefore seems very likely that Kantuzili was king between Muwattalli I and Tudḫaliya II.

In summary, since Tudḫaliya speaks of his grandfather as king, fought wars after his father's murder of the usurper Muwattalli I, apparently as subordinate co-commander with his father, refers to his predecessor, who can only be either his father or his brother "becoming a god", it is clear, as Wilhelm,<sup>45</sup> Carruba,<sup>46</sup> Houwink ten Cate<sup>47</sup> and Bryce<sup>48</sup> already foresaw, that there is continuity from the old dynasty to the new; Tudḫaliya II did not begin a new dynasty.

If then there is continuity in the dynasty between the Old Hittite period and the Middle/New Hittite periods, what of the Anatolian "throne names" vs Hurrian "personal names" that Güterbock and others

<sup>42</sup> KUB 11.10:4-7 (= D), KUB 11.8 + KUB 11.9 v 11-12 (= E), translit. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), 66, 69. It is interesting that in the latter text the offering for Kantuzzili and Wallanni was to come from the "House of the Grandfather"; the offering for Ašmušarruma, known to be a son of Arnuwanda I (KUB 11.7 + KUB 36.122 rev. 6) was to come from "the House of the Father of His Majesty" and the offering for Takišarruma was to come from "The Palace".

<sup>43</sup> It was already suggested by S. Bin Nun, *THeth* 5 (1975), 163f.

<sup>44</sup> KUB 25.14 i 25-30, 42-49, iii 3-15 see S. Bin Nun, *THeth* 5 (1975), 163, T. Bryce, *Kingdom of the Hittites* 172 n. 13.

<sup>45</sup> See above.

<sup>46</sup> *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/98), 99 "In dem Sinne kann man also von Tuthaliya I. oder Tuthaliya II. an nicht von einer 'neuen', sondern von einer kulturell 'erneuerten' Dynastie sprechen, die eine deutlich wahrnehmbare, z.T. auch ethnische Wende ins Hatti-Reich brachte".

<sup>47</sup> *AoF* 25 (1998), 43 w. n. 18.

<sup>48</sup> *The Kingdom of the Hittites* 132.

have pointed to. Does the rest of the “throne name” hypothesis make sense?

Firstly, PU-Šarruma, the general, in the later years of the empire cannot be equated with king PU-Šarruma, the grandfather of Hattušili I, as I have argued elsewhere.<sup>49</sup> Secondly, the later PU-Šarruma cannot be equated with Tudhaliya IV, since the text says that PU-Šarruma “died” (BA.ÚŠ), whereas kings are always said to “become a god”.<sup>50</sup> Finally, Hišmi-Šarruma is a witness in Tudhaliya's Bronze Tablet Treaty and so cannot be Tudhaliya.

In any case, Tudhaliya IV, before he came to the throne, was the GAL MEŠEDI for his father Hattušili III.<sup>51</sup> As such he is mentioned in the documents of his father and there he is called not by some Hurrian name, but Tudhaliya.<sup>52</sup> This fact has now been confirmed by a seal impression of Tudhaliya the GAL MEŠEDI.<sup>53</sup> In other words, this man wasn't merely “Hešmi-Šarruma” before he ascended the throne.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> *FsHoffner* (forthcoming).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. I. Singer, ZA 75 (1985), 113f., Th. van den Hout, StBoT 38 (1995), 127-136. The latter suggests that PU-Šarruma should be rather be read Takišarruma.

<sup>51</sup> R. Beal, THeth 20 (1992), 336f.

<sup>52</sup> KUB 19.8 iii 27-42, w. dupl. KUB 19.9 iii, KUB 19.9 iv 3-16, KBo 12.44:1-12 + KUB 19.8 v! 5-15, ed. K. Riemschneider, JCS 16 (1962), 115-117; KBo 16.36 + Bo 5768 + KUB 31.20 ii-iii, ed. S. Alp, «Belleten» 41/164 (1977), 644-646. This was already remarked upon by J. Börker-Klähn, ZA 67 (1977), 68 and L. Mascheroni, *FsMeriggi* 2 (1979), 369f. Much earlier, Gelb, RO 17 (1951-52), 153 without giving specific examples stated that “Either as princes or as kings Hittite rulers referred to themselves only by the names attested in cuneiform sources.”

<sup>53</sup> Bo 91/940, cf. S. Herbordt, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/1998), 313, 318.

<sup>54</sup> Carruba's equation of Kantuzili with Hattušili II (see footnote above) requires following Gurney, StMed 1 = *FsMeriggi* 2 (1979), 219-221, (also J. Freu, «Hethitica» 13 [1996] 23-38) in splitting Tudhaliya the conqueror of Aleppo (“Tudhaliya I”) from Tudhaliya, the conqueror of Arzawa (“Tudhaliya II”), so that Hattušili II, mentioned after Tudhaliya in the Aleppo treaty can be placed somewhere. Then since a Queen Wallani is mentioned before Tudhaliya II's queen Nikkalmati, and since Wallani is associated with Kantuzili, therefore, according to Carruba, Kantuzili became Hattušili. However, it seems quite likely that the two Tudhaliyas are one and the same. Kantuzili has, since Carruba wrote, been seen to have been king under his own name between Huzziya II and Tudhaliya (see above), and was probably the husband of Wallani. Hattušili II is most likely to have been either the brother of Arnuwanda I (cautious suggestion of H. Klengel, GHR (1999), 125), and thus not of royal birth, or less likely, an elder brother of Tudhaliya III by a woman other than Ašmunikkal, who became regent for Tudhaliya III, and who took the throne, like the Macedonian Antigonos Doson, in order to govern with the full powers of king, on the clear understanding that the throne would return to the co-regent and rightful heir on his death. Perhaps, considering that Hattušili II is not mentioned in the offering lists, the understanding was not so clear, or perhaps he outlived his welcome. He was possibly mentioned in the

Additionally, while it is only a juxtaposition of people that suggests that Tudhaliya III was known as Tašmi-Šarruma, it is quite clear that he was known as Tudhaliya before he became king, when he was Arnuwanda I's crown prince (DUMU.LUGAL *tukhanti*).<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, Arnuwanda II was referred to as “Arnuwanda” by his father when his title was simply DUMU.LUGAL.<sup>56</sup>

The argument that Muršili II was also known as Tašmi-Šarruma is particularly weak. The texts showing the alternation of names are parallels and not duplicates, with sections left out or in a different order.<sup>57</sup> For other reasons it had been argued that the Hurrian passages were set passages inserted into different Hittite rituals.<sup>58</sup> In other words these texts have been reworked one from the other. Thus, while one can certainly argue that the scribe copying sections of one text from another copied the kings “throne name” where his master copy had his “personal name” or vice versa, one can make just as strong a case that the text was reworked in one case for the use of Muršili II and in another case for the use of a prince Tašmi-Šarruma.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, a seal which says in

lacuna on the cruciform seal beside Queen Taduḫepa among the predecessors of Muršili II. See A. Dinçol, B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins, G. Wilhelm, IM 43 (1993), 100f., w. bibliog. For my suggestion to work, one would have to assume that “Tulpi-Tešub, our (sc. Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal's) grandson” (KUB 36.119:9), mentioned in a list of the Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal's children in a decree naming Tudhaliya III as heir was not Tudhaliya III's son (if he was young enough to need a long term regent, he would have been too young to have had a son), but rather represented the line of a deceased older sibling. Ph. Houwink ten Cate, JEOL 35 (1995-1996), 51-72 comes to a somewhat similar reconstruction to my second option.

<sup>55</sup> KBo 5.7 rev. 46, 49-50, ed. K. Riemschneider, MIO 6 (1958), 354f. and KUB 31.42 iii 11-12. See Gurney, AnSt 33 (1983), 99f.

<sup>56</sup> KUB 19.25 i 2, 7, ed. A. Goetze, *Kizz.* 12f. The point was already made by J. Börker-Klähn, ZA 67 (1977), 68f.

<sup>57</sup> See Th. van den Hout, RA 81 (1987), 162f. and the apparatuses to the texts in Haas/Wegner, ChS I/5 (1988), 233, 240, 245.

<sup>58</sup> A. Kammenhuber, THeth 7 (1976), 30 n. 61 and Th. van den Hout, RA 81 (1987), 163.

<sup>59</sup> Th. van den Hout, RA 81 (1987), 161-164 makes a good case on orthographic grounds that this man, whose name is always written *Ta-aš-* is not the man of this name, always written *Tāš-* who was son of Hattušili III. However his attempt (repeated in StBoT 38 [1995] 197) to link him to Tašmi-Šarri/Tudhaliya III(?), also written *Ta-aš-*, by explaining our text's *-ma* as a Hurrian connective rather than the phonetic complement of Šarruma, fails; see G. Beckman, BiOr 48 (1991), 588. Thus we are left with an otherwise unknown Tašmi-Šarruma fitting orthographically between MH Tašmi-Šarri and late NH Tašmi-Šarruma.

hieroglyphs "Muršili, DUMU.LUGAL [GAL] *MEŠEDI*"<sup>60</sup> shows that Muršili II was known by that name and title before his accession.

What of Šuppiluliuma's son, whom he installed as king of Kargamiš. In his treaty with his brother Muršili II, in Šuppiluliuma's treaties with Šattiwaza, and in history from the time of Hattušili III he is called Piyaššili. However, in his installation decree, in Muršili's annals and in the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, and in documents from Ugarit he is called by the Hurrian name Šarri-Kušuh.<sup>61</sup> Everyone agrees that these must be the same person. Kargamiš is a largely Hurrian land and Laroche<sup>62</sup> assumed that prince Piyaššili took the name Šarri-Kušuh when he became king. However, as J. Börker-Klähn<sup>63</sup> has already pointed out, this hardly squares with Laroche's assumption that Hittite Great Kings all had Hurrian personal names and took "Anatolian" throne names on accession.

Recently, C. Mora has called attention to seals of Kurunta, the Prince.<sup>64</sup> These show that Kurunta bore this name before he became king of Tarḫuntašša. That is, he was not known by the Hurrian personal name of Ulmi-Tešub before he ascended the throne of the appanage state whereupon he took the Anatolian throne name of Kurunta. These seals, Mora indicates, will be difficult to explain for those who believe that Kurunta and Ulmi-Tešub were the same person.

One overlooked problem with the "throne names" hypothesis is that many of the so called "throne names" were not exclusively royal. Since Hattušili was a usurper, he of all people could have been expected to have taken an exclusively royal name. Yet, in addition to three kings, there is a general (GAL GEŠTIN), a magician, a priest, an officer, and a scribe attested with this name. Šuppiluliuma, another person with a less than perfect right to the throne, has no royal predecessors bearing this

<sup>60</sup> SBo 1.105. Mora, SMEA 29 (1992), 139 argues that SBo 1.105 is almost identical to SBo 2.26, a seal of Ziti. With S. Herbordt's discovery that L-363-L-173 is to be read GAL *MEŠEDI* (*Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/1998), 313), it is clear that SBo 2.26 belonged to Ziti, the well known GAL *MEŠEDI* of Šuppiluliuma I. Therefore it seems likely that the Muršili of SBo 1.105 is the future Muršili II. The sign GAL on Ziti's seal is to the left of the *MEŠEDU* sign. The area to the left of the *MEŠEDU* sign on Muršili's seal is broken away, so the GAL can safely be presumed. The seal probably dates to the reign of Muršili's brother Arnuwanda II.

<sup>61</sup> H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956), 120f.

<sup>62</sup> NH (1966) nos. 985 & 1118, also H. Klengel, GS 1 (1965), 72.

<sup>63</sup> ZA 67 (1977), 69.

<sup>64</sup> SBo 2.5, SBo 2.6, Newell Coll. no. 386, Cl. Mora, Eothen 9 (1998), 85-91, reinforcing O.R. Gurney, AnSt 43 (1993), 21.

name, but has a namesake in a wood tablet scribe of the time of his grandfather.<sup>65</sup> There also are non-royal Muwattallis.<sup>66</sup> There was a Kantuzili who was king, a Kantuzili who was an appanage king in all but name, and a Kantuzili who was merely a general. Thus the so called "throne names" are simply normal Anatolian personal names.

The other part of the hypothesis is that all members of the royal family had Hurrian personal names and took Anatolian throne names when they became king.

Yet we know the names of many members of the royal family, the vast majority of whom did not become king, even of appanage states. Many of these bore "Anatolian" names. Tudḫaliya the younger never, as far as we know, became king, but was known by the name Tudḫaliya. Other princes<sup>67</sup> with "Anatolian" names included Ziti, brother of Šuppiluliuma I, and his sons Hutupianza, and Arma-Tarḫunta, and the latter's son Šippa-ziti, and Šuppiluliuma's son Zannanza and daughter Muwatti. There was also Matanazi, sister of Hattušili III<sup>68</sup> and Nerikkaili and Huzziya, sons of Hattušili III. Other princes and princesses with "Anatolian" names, whose filiation is not currently known, include Karahnuili of Šuppiluliuma's family,<sup>69</sup> Kuwalana-muwa, the officer of Šuppiluliuma who is shown on the Hanyeri and İmamkulu rock reliefs,<sup>70</sup> Nuwanza, the GAL GEŠTIN of Muršili, Aranḫapilizzi, GAL UKU.UŠ

<sup>65</sup> KBo 5.7 obv. 7, 8, 26, translit. K. Riemschneider, MIO 6 (1958), 345f. (= LS 1).

<sup>66</sup> A. Ünal, RIA 8 (1997), 523.

<sup>67</sup> Despite the views of F. Imparati, Or NS 44 (1975), 80-95 and «Hethitica» 8 (1987) 190f., G. Bunnens, «Abr-Nahrain» 27 (1989), 26-28, this title DUMU.LUGAL, literally "son of the king," should most likely be taken literally, with the caveat that it was hereditary. See A. Rainey, UF 7 (1975), 429-431, I. Singer, «Tel Aviv» 4 (1977) 184f., H.G. Güterbock in R. Boehmer & H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy*, BoHa 14 (1987), 74 w. n. 57, R. Beal, THeth 20 (1992), 413 n. 1550, S. Herbordt, *Hit.Kongr.* 3 (1996/98) 310 w. n. 9. Bunnens's comment (27 n. 21) that RS 16.138:34-36, ed. J. Nougayrol, PRU 3 (1955), 143-145, and RS 16.204 rev. 10-12, ed. J. Nougayrol, PRU 3:119-120 "record the appointment of a 'Queen's son'" show no such thing. The purpose of both texts is for the king of Ugarit to grant land. There is no mention of granting the status of "Queen's son". The clauses in question are the final clauses in each land grant and serve only indicate that the person receiving the land grant will have to pay the taxes/services (*pilku*) equivalent to that of the Queen's sons. The land grant is made by the king of Ugarit, not by a Hittite. Finally, perhaps the very term "Queen's son" was meant to be taken literally (sons of the Queen (of Ugarit)), so as not to be confused with the Hittite "son of the king", who would presumably have had an even better deal with the Ugaritic tax officials.

<sup>68</sup> NH Suppl. no. 786a.

<sup>69</sup> KUB 11.7 + KUB 36.122 rev. 11, translit. H. Otten, MDOG 83 (1951), 66.

<sup>70</sup> Hawkins, RIA 6 (1983), 398 s.v. Kuwatna-muwa, Beal, THeth 20 (1992), 415.



of the Right under Muršili, Nana-ziti, used as a messenger under Muršili II,<sup>71</sup> Šahurunuwa, GAL UKU.UŠ of the Right under Hattušili<sup>72</sup> and Šahurunuwa's sons Tatamaru and Duwattanni, the brothers Mizra-muwa, GAL NA.GADA of the Left and Uppara-muwa, the UGULA LÚŠUŠ KÜ.SIG<sup>17</sup><sup>73</sup> under Tudhaliya IV, Uppara-muwa's son, Piḫa-<sup>d</sup>IM,<sup>74</sup> Hannutti and Halpa-ziti.

On the other hand there are plenty of princes with Hurrian names: Ašmi-Šarruma, son of Arnuwanda I,<sup>75</sup> Tašmi-Šarruma,<sup>76</sup> Ehli-Šarruma, Hešmi-Šarruma, Taki-Šarruma the Chief Scribe, Ewri-Šarruma.<sup>77</sup> In Syria the 3rd, 4th and 5th kings of the Hittite cadet dynasty at Kargamiš, Ini-Tešub, Talmi-Tešub and Kuzi-Tešub, have Hurrian names, as do other members of that branch of the family: Hišmi-Tešub brother of Ini-Tešub,<sup>78</sup> and Tili-Šarruma, “son of the king of Kargamiš”.<sup>79</sup> Of unknown filiation are Princes Teḫi-Tešub,<sup>80</sup> Hattušili III's messenger, and Tulpi-Šarruma.<sup>81</sup>

As Carruba has pointed out,<sup>82</sup> already in the Middle Hittite period the names of members of the royal family were a mixture of Hurrian names and names derived from various Anatolian languages. For example, the Middle Hittite Queen (Ašmunikkal?) who celebrates a festival with her children: the Priest (Kantuzzili), Pariyawatra, Manninni and grandson Tulpi-Tešub.<sup>83</sup> Three names are “Anatolian” and one is Hurrian. Other family members bore the Luwian derived names Lalantiwašḫa and Pariyawatri and the Hurrian derived Mušuḫepa. Much later Hattušili and Puduḫepa had at least two sons, both with Anatolian

names Tudhaliya and Nerikkaili. One of their daughters bore the Anatolian name of Gaššulawiya (named after Hattušili's mother) and at least two others bore Hurrian names: Kilušhepa<sup>84</sup> and Šauškanu.<sup>85</sup> In an important text edited by our dedicatee, the will of Prince Šahurunuwa, two sons of a lady with an Anatolian name, Tarḫumanawa, perhaps Šahurunuwa's daughter, receive parcels of land.<sup>86</sup> One brother has a Hurrian name, Tulpi-Tešub, the other an “Anatolian” (Luwian) name, Kuwalana-ziti.<sup>87</sup> In summary, it appears that from the time of Tudhaliya II the names used by members of the Hittite royal family were a mixture of Anatolian and Hurrian.

With so many members of the royal family carrying “Anatolian” names, it would be difficult to believe that every one who succeeded to the throne originally had a Hurrian personal name, and then had to take an “Anatolian” “throne name”. However, with so many members of the royal family known by Hurrian names, it would be equally difficult to believe that no prince with a Hurrian name, except Urḫi-Tešub, ever ascended to the throne. And, although an argument from silence is dangerous, there is no mention in the texts, as Gelb pointed out long ago,<sup>88</sup> of a prince of one name ascending the throne and adopting a new name. One could argue that princes borne by the king's wife, who thus had a reasonable chance of succeeding, were given “Anatolian” names, while princesses and other princes were named as the mood took their parents. This could account for Urḫi-Tešub who was not a son of the Queen.

Cl. Mora, in fact has argued, using some of the evidence presented above, that there are no double names at all. She further argues that since no seal known to her contains both the names Urḫi-Tešub and Muršili III, then in her opinion the enigmatic KUB 21.33 makes better sense if Muršili III was a short lived son of Muwattalli, who was

<sup>71</sup> KBo 4.4 ii 50-59, ed. AM 118f.

<sup>72</sup> NH 1076.2-3, see R. Beal, THeth 20 (1992), 382-386, 392-393, 414.

<sup>73</sup> KBo 4.10 rev. 30.

<sup>74</sup> “Prince of Hatti” at Ugarit & Emar; NH Suppl. no. 971.

<sup>75</sup> KUB 11.7 + KUB 36.122 rev. 6, ed. H. Otten, MDOG 83 (1951), 66.

<sup>76</sup> KBo 4.10 rev. 28.

<sup>77</sup> All four are witnesses to Tudhaliya's Bronze Tablet treaty with Kurunta. See discussion of all the names in this list in F. Imparati, *FsAlp* (1992) 305-322 and Th. van den Hout, StBoT 38 (1995).

<sup>78</sup> D. Arnaud, RA 68 (1974) 190, idem, *Emar* 6/3 (1986) nos. 18-19.

<sup>79</sup> RS 18.114:5 and RS 17.28:5-6, ed. J. Nougayrol, PRU 4 (1956), 108-109, and HCCT-E5, ed. A. Tsukimoto, ASJ 6 (1984), 65f.

<sup>80</sup> NH no. 1321.

<sup>81</sup> RŠ 17.251, PRU 4.236f., NH no. 1368.

<sup>82</sup> Hit.Kongr. 3 (1996/1998) 101.

<sup>83</sup> KUB 45.47 i 40-41, ii 5-6, 9-10, iii 24-27 and KUB 36.119:8-9 + KUB 36.118:3-4 (Otten, ZA 80 (1990) 224f.). For discussion see F. Imparati, *FsLaroche* (1979), 169-176, St. de Martino, Eothen 4 (1991), 14.

<sup>84</sup> See discussion, J. de Roos, JEOL 29 (1985-86), 74-83, Ph. Houwink ten Cate, AoF 23 (1996), 47-53.

<sup>85</sup> KUB 57.125 obv. 19, as rest. by E. Edel, ÄHK 1:226f.

<sup>86</sup> KUB 26.43 obv. 8, ed. F. Imparati, RHA XXXII (1974), 24f.

<sup>87</sup> This is probably the Prince Kuwalana-ziti who judges legal cases at Emar: J. Westenholz, *Cuneiform Inscriptions in the Collection of the Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem: The Emar Tablets*, CM 13 (2000) 3-5 Text 1, and Arnaud, *Emar* 6/3 (1986) 222 no. 211:1, for the correction of which see Westenholz, *Emar*, 5. Further seals of Prince Kuwalana-ziti are SBo 2.19, 21, BoHa 14 no. 265, Tarsus 54. See discussion of I. Singer, apud J. Westenholz, *Emar* 81. BoHa 14 no. 265 differs in that it also bears the Hurrian name [X]-sa-ti-Šarruma (see below).

<sup>88</sup> RO 17 (1951-1952), 153.

succeeded by his brother/half-brother Urḫi-Tešub. The Hurrian name on the royal seals with double names is dismissed as “il nome di un'altra persona che per qualche motivo a noi ignoto viene accostato a quello del re”. But this seems to go too far.<sup>89</sup> KUB 21.33 remains enigmatic despite Mora's useful discussion. More importantly, there are the royal seals. After Mora wrote, a seal having “Muršili” in hieroglyphics and preserving a bit of “Urḫi-Tešub” in the cuneiform rings, has been published.<sup>90</sup> This shows that this king officially used both names. Since the Urḫi-Tešub is found in the cuneiform ring, and only “Muršili” in the central field one cannot say that the Hurrian name or the “Anatolian” name is simply another person for some reason sharing the royal seal. On Muwattalli II's seal the Hurrian name is surmounted by the winged sun disk meaning “His Majesty” (dUTU-ŠA) flanked by signs meaning “Great King”. On a Tudḫaliya IV seal, one also finds the Hurrian name flanked by the signs meaning “Great King”. The cuneiform part of the seal as far as preserved mentions only Tudḫaliya and his filiation. More importantly, the text begins “before His Majesty, Tudḫaliya, the Great King, King of Ḫatti. No second Great King is mentioned in the cuneiform that could correspond to “X-Tešubba, Great King” in the hieroglyphs, so there can be no question of a co-regency. Yet, we can prove that Tudḫaliya was called Tudḫaliya before his accession, before indeed he was named crown prince.<sup>91</sup>

Perhaps Ḫattušili III was putting down Urḫi-Tešub by not calling him “Mursili” as has often been said. However, Mursili II was not putting down Piyassili by calling him Šarri-Kušuh. The two brothers seemed to get on well together and Muršili seems genuinely upset at his brother's untimely death. The use of the different names occurs in different texts dating to Muršili and the Hurrian name appears in official

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *BiOr* 51 (1994), 240f. n. 19.

<sup>90</sup> Bo 91/852, H. Otten, *Zu einigen Neufunden hethitischer Königsiegel* (1993), 27 w. fig. 20.

<sup>91</sup> See Bronze Tablet ii 43-44 for Ḫattušili's previous dismissal of his crown prince and his appointment of Tudḫaliya. For the possibility that Nerikkaili was originally crown prince and was passed over in favor of Tudḫaliya see H. Klengel, *AoF* 16 (1989), 185-188, idem, *AoF* 18 (1991), 230f., G. Del Monte, *EVO* 14-15 (1991-1992), 134f., O.R. Gurney, *AnSt* 43 (1993), 22 w. n. 27, T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* 299-300 w. n. 31. For the suggestion that Kurunta was originally crown prince, which after a reading of the Bronze Tablet seems to me unlikely, see H.G. Güterbock, *OrNS* 59 (1990), 162, Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *ZA* 82 (1992), 240, 259-268, *BiOr* 51 (1994), 233, Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38 (1995), 88-89, 94. For discussion see S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *AfO* 38-39 (1991-1992), 142-146, F. Imparati, *FsHouwink ten Cate* (1995), 151-153, M. Giorgieri and Cl. Mora, *Aspetti della Regalità ittita* (1996), 16f.

documents from the subordinate kingdom of Ugarit. Furthermore, if the Great King had disordered his Hurrian birth-name as beneath his dignity to use and had adopted an Anatolian throne name, why are both names used on royal seals? Perhaps Ḫattušili was using the name Urḫi-Tešub not so much as to insult him by using his Hurrian name, but rather so as not to constantly remind anyone that the deposed king was Muršili II's grandson.

What I would like to suggest is that since the time that Tudḫaliya II, a direct descendant of the old Hittite royal family, had married Nikkalmati, a Hurrian woman, perhaps a princess of Kizzuwatna, and his son-in-law Arnuwanda had annexed Kizzuwatna and begun the wholesale integration of Kizzuwatnan-Hurrian cult and customs into Hittite, the Hittite royal family members were called by a mixture of “Anatolian” and Hurrian names. The phenomenon of double names can be accounted for either of two ways. 1) Every prince had from birth two names, one “Anatolian” and one Hurrian. Indeed Gelb, already in 1951-52,<sup>92</sup> had suggested as much, ruling out terms such as “throne name” and rather pointing out the phenomena of double names, one Greek and one Semitic or Egyptian, among royal and non-royal people during the Hellenistic period such as the Hashmonean king of Judea whose coins say “Alexander” in Greek script on one side and “Yehonathan” in Hebrew script on the other. The Hittites, as we saw above could write both names in both scripts. However, a parallel with the situation in the Hellenistic period would account for the rare non-royal seals containing a Hittite and a Hurrian double name, such as that of Prince Kuwalanaziti/[x-]sati-Šarruma.<sup>93</sup> In normal parlance a prince or commoner would have been known by only one of these. But perhaps as Börker-Klähn has suggested<sup>94</sup> the Hurrian name would be preferred in Hurrian cultic ceremonies. Upon becoming a king and rating a fancy seal, a prince would often put both of his names on it. 2) Alternatively, a prince had either a Hurrian or an “Anatolian” personal name. On coming to the throne as Great King or appanage king he adopted an additional name, either an “Anatolian” one if he had a Hurrian birth name or a Hurrian one if he had an “Anatolian” birth name. In either way he would be considered king of both Hittites and Hurrians, Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna, high priest of Tarḫunt and Teššub. Authors of documents involving him

<sup>92</sup> RO 17:153.

<sup>93</sup> 313/q published by Th. Beran, *MDOG* 93 (1962), 66f. and as BoHa 14 no. 265. This may be the same Prince as the grandson(?) of Šahurunuwa discussed above.

<sup>94</sup> *ZA* 67 (1977), 69f.



were free to choose whichever name to refer to him. Neither name was a "birth name" or "throne name".<sup>95</sup>

If either of my suggestions is true, Piyaššili can be Šarri-Kušuh, and Šahurunuwa can be [x-x]-Šarruma without qualms. Tašmi-Šarri can be whichever known king our theory fits and Muršili II can even have been Tašmi-Šarruma.<sup>96</sup> Then seals with double names are fully explicable. It is no longer inexplicable that the future Tudhaliya IV was known as Tudhaliya long before his accession, and yet has a Hurrian name beside "Tudhaliya" on his royal seal. And finally, there is no problem in finding that Kurunta was known by this name before becoming appanage king of Tarhuntašša, and, like Piyaššili/Šarri-Kušuh, was known as both Kurunta and Ulmi-Teššub while king.

## PER UNA RIATTRIBUZIONE DI KBo 4.14 A ŠUPPILULIUMA II

Andrea Bemporad, Firenze

In questi ultimi quindici anni recenti scoperte archeologiche e il progredire degli studi hanno permesso di riesaminare con rinnovato interesse e con una diversa ottica il periodo finale della storia ittita. Queste nuove testimonianze hanno comunque interessato quasi esclusivamente l'attività politica e militare ittita nell'area sud-occidentale dell'impero,<sup>1</sup> mentre per quanto riguarda le nostre conoscenze circa il settore orientale, ed in particolare i rapporti tra Hatti e Aššur alla fine del XIII secolo, non vi sono grossi elementi di novità. Sembra tuttavia utile soffermarsi nuovamente su un testo studiato da tempo e assai discusso, KBo 4.14; come cercheremo di evidenziare nel presente studio, questo documento, che contiene importanti riferimenti alle relazioni politiche con l'Assiria negli ultimi decenni dell'impero ittita, può essere riattribuito - a mio parere - proprio all'ultimo sovrano che regnò a Hattuša, Šuppiluliuma II.<sup>2</sup>

Come è noto il testo KBo 4.14 (CTH 123) sembra consistere essenzialmente nella richiesta di impegno di fedeltà che l'autore rivolge ad un importante personaggio per ottenere il suo aiuto qualora in futuro una grave situazione di pericolo l'avesse minacciato.<sup>3</sup> Il cattivo stato di conservazione di alcune parti della tavoletta, corrispondenti all'inizio e

<sup>1</sup> Tra le più significative vedi: H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV* (StBoT Beih. 1), Wiesbaden, 1988; P. Neve, AA 1987, 401-403, e AA 1991, 328 e 330; J.D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa* (StBoT Beih. 3), Wiesbaden, 1995; A.M. Dinçol, "Die Entdeckung des Felsmonuments in Hatip und ihre Auswirkungen über die historischen und geographischen Fragen des Hethiterreichs", «Tüba-An» 1, 1998, 27-35. Inoltre più indirettamente un testo ugaritico (RS 86.2230) sembra fornire nuovi indizi cronologici sulla fine dell'impero ittita, J. Freu, «Syria» 65, 1988, 395-398.

<sup>2</sup> Per altro il nuovo quadro storico che si va delineando sembra progressivamente portare ad una rivalutazione della consistenza politica e cronologica del regno di Šuppiluliuma II. Cfr. H.A. Hoffner, in *The Crisis Years: the 12<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.*, Dubuque, 1992, 49 e ss., e S. de Martino, PdP 48, 1993, 239-240. Diversamente in precedenza vedi I. Singer, ZA 75, 1985, 100 e ss., con bibliografia.

<sup>3</sup> Questa situazione sembra potesse essere determinata da un'offensiva militare di un sovrano assiro (II 22-66 e IV 40), che storicamente e cronologicamente, come vedremo, potremmo identificare con Tukulti-Ninurta I.

<sup>95</sup> Already Börker-Klähn, ZA 67 (1977), 67-70.

<sup>96</sup> Though this remains very uncertain, see above.