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### Abbreviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AoF</td>
<td>Altorientalische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Anatolian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Istanbuler Mitteilungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo</td>
<td><em>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkōi</em>. Leipzig – Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB</td>
<td><em>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkōi</em>. Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDOG</td>
<td>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABU</td>
<td>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA</td>
<td>Studi Micenei ed Egeo Anatolici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>Ugarit-Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>Die Welt des Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABR</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The Hittite kingdom, situated in the heartland of Anatolia, sprung up into the political scene of ancient Near East during the 17th century BCE. During its existence, lasting about a half a millennium, the kingdom became on par with the contemporary political entities of the area, like Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia and Mitanni. Stable succession is the key to sustainable authority, especially in the states ruled by an absolute monarch, like the Hittite kingdom was. Strong and secure kingship has, however, an undeniable impact on the kingdom’s position in the geopolitical situation. For Hittites, the royal succession and the transmission of regal power had many critical moments. At the start of the kingdom’s history, kingship was often conveyed unnaturally. After many assassinations and usurpations, King Telepinu (ca. 1525–1500) attempted a change. He issued an edict to enforce a strict rule of succession, putting the multiple ranks who were eligible for the throne in order. His Edict also stipulates the suitable actions against those who would violate these principles. Telepinu’s aim was to prevent any further bloodshed and unite the royal court, which, in turn, would result in the prosperity of the kingdom.

Hittitologists have had different views on the importance of this Edict. Its importance has been over-emphasised and also over-depreciated by the scholars, while on the other hand, several aspects of the Edict are usually left without attention. The present thesis approaches on the Edict of Telepinu from three different standpoints and tries to afford a many-sided analysis of the text. The study aims to answer three main questions:

- What was the political situation before and during the time of Telepinu?

No political document is created ex nihilo but is a reaction to a specific situation of the past and/or present. Research into the events preceding the compilation of the text helps us to understand the context in which it was created, and the goals it was purported to achieve. In

---

1 All the following dates are BCE, except for the release dates of modern literature and where stated differently. For the Hittite history, two- or threefold divisions are used – Old (17th - 15th c.), Middle (15th - 14th c.) and New kingdoms (14th - 12th c.), also called the Empire period. For the twofold division, the Empire starts with 14th c.). Some historians use the Middle kingdom only for noting linguistical criteria and not for a historical period. Such divisions are modern periodization and do not reflect distinctive changes of the status quo of Hittite history, like it was, for example, in the case of ancient Egypt. This thesis prefers the twofold periodisation.

2 All the dates for the Hittite history are approximations and open for debate. This study follows the chronology proposed by Trevor Bryce, who advocates for a middle chronology over a short chronology; see Bryce, Trevor. (2005). The Kingdom of the Hittites. New York. Oxford University Press, p. xv and also p. 375–382 for the problems of Hittite chronology.
this way, we can understand why the document was written the way it was, why some aspects were present in and some others were omitted from the text.

Related to this are the questions if there was already an established norm of inheritance in place and if such an edict was really necessary.

- **What were the nature, purposes and implications of the Edict?**

The structure of the *Edict* and its accentuations indicate the underlying themes of the text. Each rhetoric device used by the author of the *Edict* served a certain purpose. Another question is whether the motives of the text were something new in the Hittite society or were these principles already known.

The related questions are what was the nature of the succession rule established by the edict and of the preventative measures he imposed? Are the events in the historiographical prologue of the *Edict* realistically depicted or propagandistically distorted? What Telepinu wished to achieve with it? What was the overall *Sitz im Leben* of Telepinu’s *Edict*?

- **The impact of the Edict for the future**

The impact of the reform can be judged from the practices of the period after Telepinu. The investigation into this will show whether the *Edict* can be considered a part of the foundation of the Hittite kingship or only a text with limited relevance, relative only to Telepinu’s reign. Also, did the succeeding kings consider the *Edict* as binding? Did they follow Telepinu’s ideas? If not, then which principles they followed? Did the unlawful usurpations continue? Had the succession become stable for the end of the Hittite kingdom?

The main method of the investigation is a critical analysis of the Hittite written sources. For covering the gaps in our knowledge, we have to rely on the theories proposed by modern historians. The temporal scope of the thesis covers the period from the birth of the Hittite state (in the 17th century) until the decline of the Hittite kingdom (the turn of the 13th century). The study is divided into three main part, addressing respectively the three main problems. The first chapter aims at reconstructing the sequence of the events in the Old kingdom, focusing on the patterns of succession and the conflict between king Huzziya I and his dethroner Telepinu and the subsequent events. The second chapter investigates the nature of Telepinu’s *Edict* – the cause of its composition, its purpose and tenor. The third part examines the historical events after the reign of Telepinu, to search for the *Edict’s* impact on the later history. A translation of the *Edict* is added as an appendix for a quick reference.
Sources

On the matter of royal succession of the Hittite state, historians rely above all on literary sources, usually in the form of clay tablets in Hittite or Akkadian language written in cuneiform script. The largest collection of tablets originates from Hittite capital Hattuša (modern Boğazköy), but archives from other locations have been found. As we are dealing with very old tablets, a lot of them have succumbed to time, resulting quite often in fragmented texts with many lacunae and preserved out of order. The restoration of the history they reflect is therefore inevitably conjectural. In addition, despite the over a century-long research into the Hittite language we are sometimes still faced with some incomprehensible words and phrases.

The principal source for this study is the Telepinu Edict (referred to as Edict with paragraph number, instead of specific tablets). It is collected under CTH 19 and to this point, 24 tablets and smaller fragments have been identified as a part of the Edict, belonging to at least seven copies, five of which were written in Hittite and two in Akkadian. All of its surviving manuscripts are dated, through palaeographical analysis, to the Empire period, the oldest of them is placed to circa 14th century. This means that we do not have any copies from Telepinu’s contemporary period, from the last quarter of the 16th century when it was composed. From these fragments, the researchers have restored most of the text, although some paragraphs entirely missing.

---

3 Hittites had first come in contact with cuneiform writing thanks to Assyrian merchants who traded with Anatolia from the beginning of the 2nd millennium. With the disappearance of the trading colonies, this script version also vanished. With the birth of Hittite Old kingdom in the middle of 17th century, writing reappeared, but in the form of ductus used in the old Babylonia instead of the old Assyrian ductus and this was adapted to Hittite language.


5 For instance, those in Tapikka (modern Maşat), Sapinuwa (modern Ortaköy), and Sarissa (modern Kuşakl); see Bryce, 2005: 383–384.

6 See the appendix for the full text.


Until recently, the critical editions with philological commentary of the Edict had been sparse. The edition of Sturtevant and Bechtel was published in 1935 and Hoffmann’s study in 1984. Both of them have their shortcomings. In 2015 two editions were published, including both the original text and a translation, but they again lack in the philological investigation, as their main attention is elsewhere. There have been, however, numerous translations into different languages. This study uses all of them in conjunction. The content and the nature of the Edict is discussed in detail in chapter 2.

The Edict, however, is not the sole document concerning succession. Predating the Edict, the bilingual Testament of Hattušili I was written to appoint the successor (referred to as Testament in this thesis). The Testament (CTH 6) justified Hattušili’s decision of choosing his grandson over his son to succeed him on the throne. The literary and verbatim similarity of both texts (the Testament and the Edict), lets us wonder if the Testament of Hattušili I might have been an example for Telepinu when he wrote his proclamation. We also have other administrative texts issued by the king that have sections dealing with succession. Such are the king’s treaties with vassals or foreign rulers. These usually had segments that guaranteed the succession for the parties of the treaty. The royal instructions to the subordinates of the king often included passages about acknowledging the king and his heirs. Oath impositions, oaths, reprimands and even edicts are placed in this group. Hittite laws (CTH 291 & 291) also reflect the inheritance principles in the Hittite society in general.

---

13 Beckman, Gary. (1996). Hittite Diplomatic Texts. SBL. This collects the most notable Hittite treaties, but not all of them.
14 Miller, Jared L. (2013). Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts. SBL. This book gathers a portion of these texts.
For the reconstruction of the Hittite dynasty, historians rely on a variety of writings. Historiographic texts were common in the Hittite literature and the annals and res gestae (the manly deeds) of the kings give an account of the political events. The most noteworthy are, for example, the Annals of Hattušili I, Annals of Muršili II and the Manly Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I.

The Apology of Hattušili III (CTH 81) is an autobiographical report about the king’s unlawful rise to power (referred to as Apology), which took place contrary to the normal succession norms and made Hattušili to feel the need of justifying his actions.

In addition, numerous Hittite royal seals and seal impressions contain the name of the king, his status, and sometimes his genealogy. Although we have found texts that one can call a “king-list”, these are not drawn up for the purpose of perpetuating the succession of the kings. These lists for recorded the offerings made to the royal ancestors, but they omit some known kings and add other figures with unknown affiliation and status. They help us to confirm in some cases the sequence of some kings, but caution must be taken for putting too much trust in them.

---


19 Güterbock, Hans G. (1956). The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by his Son, Mursili II. JCS, 10 (2–4).


Historiography

As Telepinu’s Edict is perhaps the most important source for the history of Hittite Old kingdom, it has been the subject of many studies. It is above all used for reconstructing the political events that took place before and during Telepinu’s reign, and is the basis for both the general overviews of Hittite history and for the special studies.

Due to its retrospective segment, the Edict has been of interest to those writing about Hittite historiography. In Mario Liverani’s opinion, its value as a depiction of the real events is very dubious and has been over-emphasised by historians. Liverani’s views seem too extreme in this case. Amir Gilan examined the Edict in comparison to other historiographic writings and pointed out the didactic nature of these texts. Both Harry Hoffner and Andrew Knapp focused, like Liverani, on the rhetorical aspects, and found the Edict to be apologetical and self-justificatory. Richard Haase, whose focus is on the judicial and legal matters, has contributed to understanding the legalistic stances of the Edict but may have exaggerated some aspects of the document. Michel Mazoyer, however, saw the Edict as conforming with the mythology of his namesake – the fertility god Telepinu and its importance for the formation of Hittite kingship. His theories seem too conjectural at times, as, for example, the Edict itself encompasses almost no religious characteristics. Recent studies by Vladimir Shelestin draw the attention to the foreign policy of that era and states that Telepinu introduced a new approach as the king gave preference to diplomacy rather than full-on domination.

The principles of Hittite royal succession have also long been under investigation. Several different hypotheses have been constructed. Albrecht Goetze proposed that the Hittites had elective kingship. He theorised that the ruler might have been appointed by an assembly of the

---

22 In addition to, for example, The Annals of Hattušili I (CTH 4), The Testament of Hattušili I (CTH 6), The Text of Anitta (CTH 1).
higher echelons of Hittite royal court, called *panku or tuliya*. This understanding has evoked strong opposition and has now been discarded.  

Riemschneider, influenced by some Russian scholars, proposed a form of matrilineality in the Hittite royal succession where the son of the sister of the king inherited the throne. This view was based on the significant power the queens of the Hittites held, and some odd references in the texts. Shoshana Bin-Nun took over some elements of it and expanded it, adding a brother-sister marriage to the pattern. These concepts too were challenged by others.

In 1998 Dietrich Sürenhagen published an article which emphasised an avunculate principle. In this system, the dynasty consisted of two main branches, who would intermarry. The sister of the king is important in his opinion. She was to marry her cousin and their son would become the next king, whereas their daughter would again marry the son of the old king – her cousin. Massimo Forlanini agreed on the existence of two royal lines but posited a greater distance between them. He proposed that the “southern” and “northern” line (hinted by supposed Hittite onomastic tradition) would intermarry and basically would take turns to rule. David Atkins has proposed an inheritance system of Omaha IV type, meaning that the king’s heir alternated between a son-in-law and a son.

Unfortunately, all these supposed systems rely heavily on conjectural reconstructions of the genealogies and therefore none of them has prevailed yet. The mainstream opinion still supports patrilineality and Gary Beckman and Richard Beal have been the most vocal about this. This study agrees with them for the most part but refrains from imposing one absolute theory when it comes to Hittite succession.

---

However, the discussions about succession have for the greater part concerned the period before Telepinu. The analysis of the *Edict* itself, although fruitful, has been isolated from a larger discussion of the succession issue. Also, there is usually an emphasis that the stimulus for the writing of the *Edict* was the *longue durée* situation, while the investigation of Telepinu’s contemporary period has been rather superficial. This present study, on the other hand, aims to describe the development of the succession, both before and after the *Edict*, for establishing if the principles stated by Telepinu had any real effect, and takes full account of the events leading to the Telepinu’s rise to power as the immediate impulse for issuing the *Edict*. 
1 THE POLITICAL SITUATION BEFORE AND DURING TELEPINU

1.1 The succession of the kings prior to Telepinu

To our knowledge, there were seven rulers in the Hittite Old kingdom that reigned before Telepinu (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Rulers before Telepinu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Title/Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labarna</td>
<td>1690–1650</td>
<td>son-in-law of the “grandfather of the king”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattušili I</td>
<td>1650–1620</td>
<td>“grandfather’s” grandson, Tawannanna’s nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muršili I</td>
<td>1620–1590</td>
<td>son or grandson of Hattušili I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hantili I</td>
<td>1590–1560</td>
<td>brother-in-law of Muršili I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidanta I</td>
<td>1560–1550</td>
<td>son-in-law of Hantili I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammuna</td>
<td>1550–1530</td>
<td>son of Zidanta I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huzziya I</td>
<td>1530–1525</td>
<td>lower-rank son of Ammuna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telepinu’s Edict, the main source of this period, begins its historical prologue with the reign of Labarna I. But of course, his dynasty did not emerge from nothingness – there had to be kings before him, although the information about them is quite scarce. For example, we know of king Pithana and his successor Anitta, who originated from a city called Kussara and ruled about a hundred years before Labarna. Hattušili I (also called Labarna II), the second monarch of the Old kingdom hailed from Kussara as well but later moved the capital to Hattuša.

---

39 Bryce, 2005: xv. Following middle chronology throughout the thesis; see McMahon, Gregory. (1989). The History of the Hittites. The Biblical Archaeologist, 52 (2–3), p. 64. The lower chronology has the same durations for the reigns of the kings but shifts the dates 80 years into the future. All these dates are approximations. See also Bryce, 2005: 379–380.
42 Annals of Hattušili I (CTH 4) §1.
Hattušili III (1267–1237), some four centuries later, linked his lineage to Kussara.\textsuperscript{43} Hattušili I was also present in Kussara when he fell ill and died, as evident from the Testament.\textsuperscript{44} But no relations between Pithana’s and Labarna’s dynasty have been found, nor does any later Hittite king claim descent from the Pithana’s dynasty.\textsuperscript{45} Hattušili I does speak of his grandfather in his Testament,\textsuperscript{46} but his identity is still under dispute.\textsuperscript{47} This “Grandfather of the king” had appointed Labarna as an heir to the throne, but this decision sparked a rebellion, as some wanted to see a man named Papahdilmah be enthroned as the next ruler.\textsuperscript{48} Despite the opposition, Labarna became the king. Hattušili I had similar troubles with finding a successor. He went through a couple of possible candidates before settling for Muršili. First, Hattušili’s son Huzziya (different from a later king Huzziya I) was the supposed heir,\textsuperscript{49} but he became rebellious and was therefore deposed. Then the son of Hattušili I’s daughter was pushed for the kingship by the opposition and the daughter also revolted. The third option was the son of Hattušili I’s sister, another Labarna. But the latter showed no characteristics suitable for the king in Hattušili’s opinion and was under the influence of his mother and siblings. He too was ousted. Hattušili then set his eyes on Muršili (on his disputable relationship to Hattušili I, see below), still of young age, who became king thereafter.\textsuperscript{50} A man named Pimpira may have served as a regent in Muršili I’s earlier years.\textsuperscript{51} Muršili continued Hattušili I’s successful military activities, and his expedition to Syria culminated in the sack of Babylon.\textsuperscript{52} But it came to be that Muršili I was killed by his brother-in-law Hantili. It is unknown whether Muršili I

\textsuperscript{43} Apology §1.
\textsuperscript{44} Testament – colophon.
\textsuperscript{45} Beckman et al., 2006: 215, 249, note 7; Forlanini, 2010: 122.
\textsuperscript{46} Testament §20.
\textsuperscript{47} Beal, 2003a: 14–19; Forlanini, 2010: 116. There is one unknown king on a cruciform seal, listed before Labarna, Hattušili and Muršili. Only the ending of the name (-zi-[ya]) is preserved, which historians have restored as Huzziya; see Dinçol, Ali M, et al. (1993). The “Cruciform Seal” from Boğazköy-Hattusa. IM, 43, pp. 95–95, 104–106.
\textsuperscript{48} Testament §20.
\textsuperscript{49} Because after Huzziya was removed, there was an outcry: “There is no heir for your father’s throne”; see Testament §13.
\textsuperscript{52} Edict §9. Only one laconic line about the sack is recorded by the Babylonians: “At the time of Samsu-ditana the Hittites marched against Akkad”; in BM 96152 rv. 11’; see Grayson, Albert K. (2000). Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles. Eisenbrauns, p. 156.
had any heirs of his own, but Hantili managed to usurp the throne. As the king, Hantili came into conflict with Hurrians, plus his queen died because of some mysterious circumstances. He himself may have died of natural causes, after which Zidanta, who had aided (and abetted) him in the assassination of Muršili, killed his son Pišeni to clear his way to the throne. But Zidanta I met a violent end as well – instigated by his own progeny Ammuna. After claiming the title of the Great King, Ammuna I was faced with turbulent times. When he passed on, another bout of bloodshed took place. His heirs were eliminated and Huzziya I stepped into the spotlight.

This set of events clearly indicates an instability in the matter of succession. There are almost no instances where the throne was inherited naturally – although regicide happened only twice, most of the violence was performed against the expected successors.

But one should keep in mind that although the Edict narrates a very dynamic rotation of the kingship, these events took place over a rather long period and the kings usually enjoyed quite lengthy reigns – the first four were in power for about 30 years, Ammuna about 20, Zidanta I 10 and Huzziya I about 5 years – together, about one and a half centuries for seven rulers. Therefore, alternation of power may have been bloody, but not so frequent.

### 1.1.1 How were the kings related to each other?

When we look at the relationships between these kings, a vast variety can be seen (see Figure 2). But again, in some cases, there are still a lot of uncertainty with the genealogies. To start with Labarna I – he probably was not tied to the royal family by blood, but only through marriage with Tawannanna, his queen, who might have been a daughter of a previous ruler. He was a son-in-law (antiyant) and might have been even an adopted son of the preceding king.

---

53 The Edict §8 does say that “When Muršili was king, his sons … were united”, but this may be topos, for the purpose of resemble the Edict’s accounts of Labarna’s and Hattušili’s reign.
54 Edict §10, 16–17.
55 Edict §11, 18–19.
56 To our knowledge, but it would be probable that Telepinu would have included all the cases where a king was murdered in his text.
57 His father was probably the lord of Hurma, who was granted the lordship over the town in the so-called Zalpa text – CTH 3 §5; see Hoffner, 2003c: 181; Beal, 2003a: 21; Forlanini, 2010: 117, note 17.
58 See chapter 2.1.2.2.
so-called “Grandfather of the king” (Hattušili I’s grandfather), who chose to neglect his rebellious sons and selected a son-in-law to succeed him to the throne. Although Hattušili I presented us with a genealogy of sorts in his annals, it is a bit unorthodox. He is the “son of the brother of Tawananna”, meaning his aunt was Tawananna, queen of Labarna I. He omits the name of his father. This may be because he wanted to emphasize his connection with the ruling royal couple – his father probably did not hold this position. The second possibility is that his father may have been one of the sons of his grandfather who had rebelled, and Hattušili I simply did not want to highlight the fact. As the candidate for his father, historians usually have their bets on a man named Papahdilmah, who was one of these sons and whom the opposition of Hattušili I’s grandfather tried to enthrone.

When it comes to Muršili I, we are less certain. The Testament of Hattušili I goes into detail about the circumstances surrounding the designation of Muršili I but does not speak a word of his lineage. A much later treaty from the time of Muwatalli II (1295–1272) says him to be the grandson and adoptive son of Hattušili I. This view has its opponents – some consider him to be the son of Hattušili I. To this day, neither of the opinions has prevailed.

When it comes to the subsequent kings, things are a bit more straightforward, as the Edict indicates their relationship. Hantili had Muršili’s sister, Harapšili for his wife and bore the title “cupbearer” – LÚ SÍLA.ŠU.DU. A. No ancestry of his is mentioned, but Forlanini maintains that Pimpira – possible tutor and a regent of Muršili I, might have been his father.

---

61 CTH 4 §1.
62 This has prompted some historians to see the queens as the “connective tissue” of Hittite dynasties and seeing matrilineal principles present in the Hittite society; Riemenschneider, 1971: 79–102. They did have an important ritualistic and even political role and they remained in the position of the queen even after the death of their husband; see Macqueen, James G. (1959). Hattian Mythology and Hittite Monarchy. AS, 9, pp. 184–188.
67 Although the Edict uses the cuneiform sign of “wife” – DAM, this must be considered a scribal error. Reading NIN – “sister” is correct. The two signs are very similar – compare them in Rüster, Christel and Neu, Erich. (1989). Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten. Harrassowitz, p. 239. On the matter of reading this way, see Bin-Nun, 1975: 87–88.
68 Edict §10. This is a variant of the LÚ SAGI title. For the institution of cupbearer, see Bilgin, Remzi Tayfun. (2015). Bureaucracy and Bureaucratic Change in Hittite Administration. (PhD), University of Michigan. p. 147.
There is no strong evidence for this view, though. Zidanta I too was connected to the dynasty through marriage, being the son-in-law of Hantili I, but his parentage is also unknown.\textsuperscript{70} The next ruler, Ammuna was a son of Zidanta I. The places of Huzziya I and Telepinu in the dynasty are discussed below.

\textit{Figure 2: Rulers of the Old kingdom}\textsuperscript{71}
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  \node {“GRANDFATHER OF THE KING”}
    child {node {rebellious sons}
      child {node {Papahdilmah?}}}
    child {node {Tawannanna $\propto$ LABARNA}}
    child {node {rebellious sister}}
      child {node {HATTUŚILI I}}
        child {node {Labarna}}
          child {node {Huzziya \ ?}}
            child {node {rebellious daughter}}
              child {node {HANTILI I $\propto$ Harapšili}}
                child {node {MURŠILI I \ son}}
                  child {node {ZIDANTA I $\propto$ daughter}}
                    child {node {Pišeni}}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

We have no reason to be pessimistic about the reliability of the source in the matter of these relationships in general, but in some instances, “son” or “father”, for example, might be mere \textit{topos}, used familiarly.\textsuperscript{72}

When we look at these relationships, no fixed scheme emerges. Various patterns can be seen: son-in-law $>$ nephew, nephew $>$ grandson/son, son $>$ brother-in-law, brother-in-law $>$ son-in-law, son-in-law $>$ son, son $>$ son. The in-laws form almost a half of the successors. This may represent some older principles of matrilineality that existed in the past, but the cases of patrilineal inheritance do not allow to advocate a general matrilineal system for the Hittite society.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{70} Forlanini, 2010: 126 suggest a man called Ammuna of Sugziya.
\textsuperscript{71} This figure leaves out some know members of the dynasty. For a more complete reconstructions, see Beal, 2003a: 34–35; Forlanini, 2010: 119–120 and Sürenhagen, 1998: 93.
\textsuperscript{72} See chapter 2.1.1.2.
\textsuperscript{73} Beckman, 1986a: 19.
It is characteristic of the succession in the Hittite Old kingdom that the struggle for power occurred between close relatives – the members of the royal family. We do not know of any outsider pretenders. One must also keep in mind that these ties stated by the sources might not have been their only connection to the dynasty. Royal families tend to be very interwoven and in-laws, for example, could still have royal blood through some other line, being descendants of some other member of the dynasty.

1.2 Huzziya I

1.2.1 The position of Huzziya I and his ascension to power

To understand the political situation at the time of king Telepinu, one must start with his predecessor Huzziya I (ca 1530–1525). Unfortunately, not much is known about Huzziya – our knowledge about him is almost completely derived from texts that are attributed to his political opponent and dethroner Telepinu. Information about Huzziya’s reign is given in the Edict itself and in few other, quite fragmentary texts – CTH 20 for example. So, in this matter, historians must rely on an obviously biased source.

Huzziya steps into the political arena after the passing of his predecessor Ammuna. The Edict depicts the death as a natural one, otherwise, Telepinu would have certainly emphasised in the Edict that Ammuna was taken from the world by violent means. The phrase “become a god” was generally used in the cases of natural death. Right after the death, a man named Zuru, the chief of the royal bodyguard – GAL LÚMES MEŠEDI, sent his son Tahurwaili, who bore the title “Man of the Golden Spear” to kill “Titti’s family, together with his sons.” Zuru also sent Taruhšu, a courier, to kill “Hantili together with his sons.” After that, Huzziya became king.  

---


75 He led the royal bodyguard (MEŠEDI), which was responsible for the safety of the king. The duty of this band of perhaps twelve men was preventing any threats against the king’s life and averting the possible conspiracies; see Bin-Nun, Shoshana R. (1973). The Offices of GAL MEŠEDI and Taḫkanti in the Hittite Kingdom. Revue Hittite et Asianique, 31, pp. 6–8; Burney, Charles. (2004). Historical Dictionary of the Hittites. Scarecrow Press, pp. 234–235.

76 Haššammassas DUMU-ŠU – “natural son” or “son of his begetting”, meaning son of a prostitute; see Bin-Nun, Shoshana R. (1974). Who was Tahurwaili, the Great Hittite King? JCS, 26 (2), p. 115.

77 LÚ GŠUKUR.GUSKIN. The Men of the Golden Spear were a kind of auxiliary unit of the royal bodyguard MEŠEDI, who were given the task of guarding the royal courtyard and the gates of the palace. Burney, 2004: 235; Collins, Billie Jean. (2007). The Hittites and Their World. SBL, p. 102.

78 Edict §21–22.
Those that were killed, were most certainly heirs and probably the sons of Ammuna, who must have had the legitimate right to the throne. Otherwise, these killings would make no sense in this context. A curious aspect is that the text does not say directly that Titti himself was killed, but his family together with his sons.\textsuperscript{79} A lot of authors, however, draw this conclusion.\textsuperscript{80} This may only be a peculiarity of the wording and Titti was killed also with his family. But if not – possibly Titti was already dead – then this may show a situation where the grandsons of the old kings were potential heirs and therefore already a threat to the usurper. The line of succession could then skip a generation. When we take the sequence of the events into account, i.e. Titti’s family was eliminated before Hantili, then it can be argued that Titti’s grandsons had a paramount right to the throne compared to Hantili. But Titti’s and Hantili’s relations to the dynasty are not entirely sure.

Although it is not directly stated, it is reasonable to see Huzziya as the instigator of these murders because he came out of this as the main beneficiary. Why would Zuru, one of king Ammuna’s highest officials and possibly his own brother, betray his lord and side with the alternative claimant is another question, especially if Huzziya’s place in the royal line might have been quite modest.\textsuperscript{81}

The position of Huzziya and the base of his accession is clouded with uncertainty – no data about his lineage is given. Telepinu may have left out Huzziya’s genealogical link to the previous king Ammuna for a reason – he did not want to display himself as a person with a lower status, compared with Huzziya. Mentioning the fact that Telepinu’s rank was inferior to the person he overthrew, would undoubtedly set his own legitimacy under question. On the other hand, this clarification may have been omitted from the text because these events had taken place only recently and the audience of the \textit{Edict} was already familiar with the situation and its participants.

Only meaningful relation of Huzziya that the text reveals, is that he had a sister – ḫāntezziya\textit{n} NIN-ZU – named Ištapiya, whom we unfortunately also cannot tie firmly to the previous kings.\textsuperscript{82} The word ḫāntezzi\textit{yya} is used both for “first, oldest, firstborn” and “first rank”\textsuperscript{83} and

\textsuperscript{79} Nu-za-kán “Ti-it-ya-aš ḫa-aš-ša-tar QA-DU DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ-ŠU} ku-en-ta – “and he killed Titti(ya)’s family together with his sons.”

\textsuperscript{80} Bryce, 2005: 103; Klengel, 1999: 76.


\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Edict} §22; Beckman, 1986a: 24.

\textsuperscript{83} HED III: 108.
different authors have also used it differently when translating this passage. The second possibility seems more likely. The term *ḥantezzi(ya)* is also used later in the focal point of the *Edict* – in the succession rule, where the meaning “first rank” is unquestionably meant. The *Edict* also points out Huzziya’s five nameless brothers and in another text about Telepinu’s reign, seven nameless relatives are mentioned who are banished and later killed along with Huzziya himself. Would not these brothers also be a threat to Huzziya’s accession? The situation would make more sense if Ištapariya was Huzziya’s half-sister, from a rivalling line which was ranked higher and had priority in succession. She may even have been a full-sister of Titti and Hantili who were assassinated.

The actions of Huzziya cast doubt on the possibility that his rise to power was the culmination of the conflict between full siblings. Huzziya may have therefore been Ammuna’s son with a lower status – son of an *EŠERTU* wife (concubine). He may have been even a son of an unfree woman – *pahḫurzi*, meaning “bastard, extramarital progeny” – who were third tier offspring and excluded from succession, after the sons of the first wife (*tawannanna*) and *EŠERTU* wives.

There are also alternative possibilities. Riemschneider proposes and Sürenhagen expands the theory that Huzziya was not the son of Ammuna at all, but a son of Ammuna’s sister (and the GAL LÚMES MEŠEDI, Zuru), supporting the theory of matrilineality. But this would mean that Telepinu’s position from the core of the dynasty would have been even more distant. He would be too far to Ammuna to ascend to the throne – king’s nephew’s brother-in-law. Of course, this problem could be resolved with little incest – Telepinu could still have been the son of Ammuna with a lower status – son of a *EŠERTU* wife (concubine). He may have been even a son of an unfree woman – *pahḫurzi*, meaning “bastard, extramarital progeny” – who were third tier offspring and excluded from succession, after the sons of the first wife (*tawannanna*) and *EŠERTU* wives.

---

85 *Edict* §28. Otherwise the succession rule would state that if there’s no older son, the younger son is to become the king, which defies logic.
86 CTH 20 25’–26’.
87 Bin-Nun suggest that these five brothers included also Huzziya himself and the other four were also named in the *Edict*: Zuru, Tahrwalli, Taruhšu and Tanuwa; Bin-Nun, 1975, 219–220. It is doubtful that Zuru, chief of the king’s bodyguard, was Ammuna’s lower rank son, as usually a brother of the king filled this position. See Collins, 2007: 102; Bryce, Trevor. (2002). Life and Society in the Hittite World. Oxford University Press, p. 22. Tahrwalli is said to be Zuru’s son in §22. Bin-Nun’s construction that in the phrase “his son”, “his” is meant for Ammuna, is not very convincing. Another problem lies with Tanuwa. The *Edict* §26 clearly states that Tanuwa was sent by the higher dignitaries to kill Huzziya and his brothers, in which he was successful. And it also says right after that Tanuwa, Tahrwalli and Taruhšu were banished by Telepinu – this means they could not have been Huzziya’s brothers, who were dead by this point.
89 HED VIII: 26–27.
90 See chapter 2.1.2.2 ; Bin-Nun, 1975: 217–218.
of Ammuna and wed his first cousin Ištapariya. But Hittite customs were very strict about marrying one’s relatives. Sürenhagen’s point that the Hittite law code does not explicitly prohibit such relations, making Telepinu’s marriage to his cousin possible, does not quite follow through. The law code is very detailed about incest – eight of the fifteen clauses about sexual behaviour deal with this matter, so it would be natural to assume that marrying one’s cousin was also a taboo. There is also a treaty from over a century after Telepinu confirms having intercourse with female cousins as a crime punishable by death.

Forlanini, who sees papponymical traditions in the Hittite court, puts forward an assumption that Hattušili I’s son Huzziya of Hakmis would be a suitable candidate for Huzziya I’s grandfather. In his opinion, an unnamed GAL.GEŠTIN, who was in the service of Hattušili I, could be the father of Huzziya I. But Forlanini provides no compelling evidence for his argument. In all cases, Huzziya’s lineage depends on Telepinu’s parentage, which is talked about in below.

Establishing Huzziya’s time of reign is also problematic for us. Precise years of his rule are not important in this case, but the duration is. Most chronologies give an about a five-year period for his sovereignty, which seems too long in the light of the events described in the Edict. Of course, Hittite chronologies are rudimentary at best, due to deficient use of temporal values in the Hittite texts so these dates must be taken with a grain of salt. The Edict depicts the events to have been running their course in a shorter time span – the only deed by Huzziya described in the Edict during his rulership is the move against Telepinu. How can it be that it took years for Huzziya to try to eliminate Ištapariya and Telepinu, his rivals in succession? There is no hint of a long-lasting civil war, for which Telepinu probably did not have enough political power. That Huzziya started to consider his sister and her husband Telepinu as a threat to his rule not until some time after his ascension, is also doubtful. While the Edict does not connect

94 Mladjov, 2016: 22.
96 Forlanini, 2010: 124–125. See also his proposed family trees on pages 119–120.
97 McMahon, 1989: 64 – ca. 1530–1525 (middle chronology) or ca. 1470–1465 (low chronology).
Huzziya directly with the murders of Titti and Hantili, it does tie him with the plot against Telepinu. It is uncertain if Huzziya himself tried to kill him and his wife or delegated the matter to his subordinates. In the cases of previous assassinations, the Edict describes these acts in the manner that hints to the usurper’s more “hands-on” approach – they themselves did the killing, but this can also be mere rhetoric. The use of plural personal pronoun -uš, meaning “them” in the line does suggest that Huzziya had some companions in the plot.\footnote{Edict §22.}

1.3 Reign of Telepinu

1.3.1 Genealogy of Telepinu

As implied previously, the genealogy of Telepinu is tricky as researchers are faced with a dilemma. There are two mainstream views: firstly, Telepinu may have been the son of Ammuna,\footnote{This opinion is represented by Gurney, 1973: 663–664; Riemschneider, 1971: 93–95; Sürenhagen, 1998: 76, 90–91; Bryce, 2005: 103, 417–418, note 35.} and secondly, he may have been the son-in-law of king Ammuna.\footnote{This view was adopted by Goetze, Albrecht. (1957b). On the Chronology of the Second Millennium BC. JCS, 11 (2), pp. 56–57; Hoffner, 1975b: 51–53; Beckman, 1986a: 22.} Both theories have their strong and weak points.

To start with the former (see Figure 3), the strongest evidence for this opinion is a line in the Edict, where it is explicitly said that, Telepinu “sat to the throne of his father” – \textit{ma-an-ša-an} \textit{Te-li-pi-nu-uš I-NA GISGUZA A-BI YA e-eš-ḫa-at}.\footnote{Edict §24.} This is a very common phase in Hittite texts, at least ten instances are known.\footnote{For example (some with slight alternations), KBo III 27 obv. 14‘ (CTH 5); KUB XXVI 71 i 8’ (CTH 1); KBo III 1 ii 16’ (CTH 19); KBo X 34 iv 12’ (CTH 700.1); KBo III 4 i 5’ (CTH 61); KUB III 14 obv. 12‘ (CTH 62); KBo VI 29 i 23‘ (CTH 85.1.A); KUB XXI 17 ii 17’ (CTH 86); KBo I 8 obv. 16’ (CTH 92). For other terminology used for describing ascension, see Beckman, 1986a: 26–31.} In most of these cases, the kings, who used the term, were indeed the sons of previous kings and in at least one case the adopted son. But they may not have inherited the throne subsequently from their fathers, sometimes they were preceded by a brother or some other relative. Also, the name of Telepinu’s son and expected heir\footnote{Edict §27.} may hint to Telepinu’s connection if we believe papponymical traditions to be present in Hittite royalty like Forlanini does.\footnote{Forlanini, 2010: 126–127.} But if it was possible for Telepinu to claim royal descend, why does he refrained from doing so in the Edict? One could argue that Telepinu chose to distance himself from Ammuna because of the latter’s violent and unsuccessful past. It would be
counterproductive for Telepinu to say: “Ammuna was unsuccessful”, and then “I am his son.” Telepinu wanted to differentiate himself from the unsuccessful rulers and show himself as a spiritual heir to the first three kings. He may have even chosen his throne name for the purpose to stress this point.106

*Figure 3: Telepinu as a son of Ammuna*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telepinu</th>
<th>Istapariya</th>
<th>Huzziya</th>
<th>(+ 5 brothers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ammuna</td>
<td>Titti</td>
<td>Hantili</td>
<td>Tahurwaili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIDANTA I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But this genealogy would make Huzziya’s ascension to power quite difficult – would it be possible to seize the throne from a rather distant position, as a king’s daughter-in-law’s brother? Despite frequent usurpations of the throne in the Hittite Old Kingdom, these coup d’état were always conducted by someone from the king’s immediate circle. Of course, when Telepinu said that Huzziya was Istapariya’s sister, it does not mean that this necessarily was Huzziya’s only tie to the dynasty, as the royal houses tend to be rather exclusive institutions. But Huzziya did come to power right after the deaths of Ammuna’s possible sons Hantili and Titti and before his reputed third son – Telepinu, which suggests his quite close position to the king. Huzziya came into conflict with Telepinu only after the former had already entered kingship. So Telepinu was a problem for Huzziya, but one that could be dealt with later. One would also expect condemnation of Huzziya for Edict’s part if he had come to power from a lower position, but there is not any. The Edict is more concerned with how, not from which position he rose to the throne.

The point of view that Telepinu was related to Ammuna only by marital ties also has its merits and problems (see Figure 4). Not presenting his genealogy may not be only to distinguish himself from the previous kings. It may also imply to the fact that he simply could not claim to be descended from a king and his parent may have been with a modest background. As said previously, Huzziya seems to be a better fit as (a lower-rank) son of Ammuna, rather than Telepinu. This would explain how Huzziya came to power before Telepinu was considered a

---

106 Hoffner, 1975b: 53. See chapter 2.2.2.1.
threat. As a son-in-law of the king, Telepinu would be qualified to become king. Sons-in-law were considered eligible heirs in the light of the Hittite law code and sanctioned by the *Edict* itself. With this so-called *antiyant* marriage, adopting the son-in-law was sometimes practised.\(^{107}\) This would explain Telepinu’s statement that he “sat to the throne of his father.” It would not be the only time when the son-in-law of the Hittite king calls himself the son of the king. For instance, both Arnuwanda I and his wife Ašmunikal name Tudhaliya I/II\(^ {108}\) as their father on their seals.\(^ {109}\) But as brother-sister marriage was considered *hurstel* (abomination) in Hittite society, therefore Richard Beal has proposed that Arnuwanda was an *antiyant* and merely the adoptive son of Tudhaliya I/II. Similarly, Hattušili I called his heirs “sons”, though they were not necessarily that.\(^ {110}\)

Figure 4: Telepina as a son-in-law of Ammuna

![Diagram](image)

The fact that Telepinu’s son shared his name with king Ammuna does not mean that Telepinu was Ammuna’s son as Forlanini believes. Telepinu’s son Ammuna could still be named with papponymical tradition in mind because the king Ammuna was still his grandfather – only from his mother’s side. And the son Ammuna was undoubtedly born only after Telepinu became an *antiyant* and adoptive son of king Ammuna, so he could still name his new-born son after his step-father.

Mladjov states that the fact that Huzziya sought to kill Ištapariya also may indicate that her status may have been more troubling for Huzziya than Telepinu’s.\(^ {111}\) This may be true, but

---

\(^{107}\) On the issue of *antiyant*, see chapter 2.1.2.2.

\(^{108}\) The numbering is such to account for the possible existence of two kings at that time with the same name, who are indistinguishable in the sources; see chapter 3.1.1.1.

\(^{109}\) Güterbock, Hans G. (1967). *Siegel aus Boğasköy 1. Teil: Die Königssiegel der Grabungen bis 1938*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft, Beiheft 5, pp. 31–32, no. 60. [\[N]A4KIŠIB ta-ba-ar-na =Ar-nu-an-ta LUGAL.GAL DUMU ٢Du-ṣa-li-li-ta LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG? = Seal of the tabarna Arnuwanda, the Great King, son of Tudhaliya, the Great King, the hero’; [\[N]4KIŠIB  Slut-ta-ya-na-an-na ٢Aš-mu-ni-kal S̱AL.LUGAL G̱AL ٢DUM.SAL ’Ṉi-kal-ma-ti S̱AL.LUGAL GAL ] U DUM.SAL ٢Du-ṣa-li-li-ta ... = Seal of the Tawananna Asmunikal, the Great Queen, daughter of Nikalmati, the Great Queen and daughter of Tudhaliya the Great King, the hero.”

\(^{10}\) Beal, 1983: 115, 117.

\(^{111}\) Mladjov, 2016: 23.
Ištapariya could still produce an heir for Telepinu, even shortly after his death – as reproduction takes time – and therefore she was dangerous to Huzziya. Although according to the Edict there were rebellions throughout the land at the start of Telepinu’s reign, we are not aware of any direct plots against Telepinu’s life. There is one, however, against Ištapariya and her son Ammuna, in which, they are killed.\textsuperscript{112}

The understanding of Telepinu as Ammuna’s son-in-law also has counterpoints. Why did Huzziya not consider his five to seven other brothers a threat? Would not they also have been in the same position as Huzziya to ascend to the throne? Instead, they seemed to be working with Huzziya. This problem could be solved if we consider Huzziya and his brother to be Ammuna’s lower rank children born from concubines or even from unfree women. The struggle for power may thus have been between different lines of Ammuna’s descendants.

One thing is certain – Telepinu had to fall into one of the three categories mentioned in §27 – first rank son, second rank son or an adopted son-in-law – otherwise, he would have delegitimised himself with the Edict and its succession law.

\subsection*{1.3.2 Reconstruction of the events of Telepinu’s reign}

\subsubsection*{1.3.2.1 Rise to power}

The Edict does not go into detail in the matter of Telepinu’s rise to power, laconically saying: “When Huzziya wanted to kill them\textsuperscript{113}, the matter came to light and Telepinu chased them\textsuperscript{114} away.”\textsuperscript{115} After that, Telepinu became king. This coup d’état seems to have happened rather quickly and to believe Telepinu, without much blood. If a lasting war had been taking place, the Edict would have most certainly taken notice.\textsuperscript{116} Violent means did not coincide with Telepinu’s ostensibly pacifist behaviour either. But how was Telepinu able to seemingly usurp the throne with such an ease? As most chronologies attribute to Huzziya I only a brief period of reign,\textsuperscript{117} meaning he may not have had a chance to consolidate much power. But still, according to established chronologies, he had at least couple of years to secure his position and

\textsuperscript{112} Edict §27.
\textsuperscript{113} Telepinu and Ištapariya.
\textsuperscript{114} Probably the assassins are meant.
\textsuperscript{116} Or, again, the explanation is that as the audience of the Edict must have been up to date with topical issues and much elucidation was not necessary. The man named Lahha, who rebelled against him later (§25) could have been a supporter of Huzziya.
\textsuperscript{117} On the problem of timeframe of his reign, see chapter 1.2.1.
establish at least the most basic defence – the royal bodyguard (LÜMES MEŠEDI), especially if he was in league with Zuru, the chief of the royal bodyguard in Ammuna’s time. How did Telepinu manage to banish Huzziya? Where did he get the resources? We do not have any information about Telepinu’s previous endeavours – was he some court dignitary or some local LUGAL? Hattušili III, a later king also exiled his predecessor Urhi-Tešub and usurped the power. But Hattušili had a quite large power base to do so. He was the chief of his brother’s bodyguard, king of Hakpiš, a priest in Nerik and an established general. Even the otherwise rebellious Kaškaeans seem to have supported Hattušili. Telepinu also must have had some force behind him because he could not banish his adversary – a king – with mere words. The author of the Edict has unquestionably left some details out about the power-grab and we have not (yet, hopefully) discovered secondary accounts of these events.

Telepinu then went on showing that he can be a merciful ruler, sparing Huzziya’s and his brothers’ lives, only banishing them. According to his own words, Telepinu refused to carry out vengeance against his opponents – “They did evil to me, but I will not do evil to them.” Exiling members of the royal family was done already before Telepinu. Hattušili I chose to spare his rebellious nephew and daughter from death and simply sent them away from the capital. But their personal safety and well-being were guaranteed, as they were both given a small estate to live in. Inversely, the king could sometimes force disobedient vassals to live in the capital. Expatriation was also sometimes used for crimes that brought religious pollution to the area – incest and bestiality for example (although the Hittite law code was very draconic in the matter). It might even be that Telepinu chose this punishment because he saw the bloodshed in the royal court more as a religious offence, resulting in the revenge of the gods, rather than a secular crime. Banishment was again used not long after the events of the Edict.

There even can be hesitation to whether this attempt against Telepinu and his wife was real. The alleged victim himself might have fabricated the plot to for justifying a coup d’État of his

---

118 Apology §11–12. Urhi-Tešub similarly may have ruled only for a brief time – about seven years – if we trust Hattušili’s account.
120 Apology §12.
121 Edict §23.
122 Testament §6, 17.
125 Hoffner, 1975b: 51; Riemschneider, 1971: 94.
own. The *Edict* says that the plot against him was “exposed” rather than failed on execution. There is no indication of an action undertaken by Huzziya, only a plan, as evident from translations – “When Huzziya wanted to kill them, …” and “Huzziya wanted to kill them (both) …” Telepinu’s action was totally pre-emptive in nature. This is of course, convenient for Telepinu to blame someone for planning to kill him. After Huzziya was removed from the scene, Telepinu was free to claim the throne.

### 1.3.2.2 Military expeditions and diplomatic treaties

Telepinu then felt secure enough to undertake some military actions in south-eastern Anatolia to regain the territories that were lost during the reigns of his predecessors. Telepinu’s predecessor Ammuna had troubles in the region as several cities had become hostile and he, according to the *Edict*, was ultimately unsuccessful of subduing them. Although, another text that some scholars ascribe to Ammuna, paints a bit different picture.

Telepinu set off on campaigns against the cities of Haššuwa and Zizzilippa with a purpose to possibly gain a jumping-board for further campaigns into Syria. Although he is said to be victorious in the former city – even destroying (*harninkun*) the city, in the case of the latter the outcome of the conflict is not stated, only that a battle ensued. This vague statement could, therefore, be only a mild way of describing the failure on the battlefield. Even more, Astour has suggested that his success in Haššuwa may also be exaggerated. There is no archaeological indication of the site’s destruction and no hints to booty nor prisoners (like in the case of Muršili I and the sack of Babylon in §9). In addition to meaning “to destroy”, the word

---

126 *Uttar ištuwāti*. See HED I-II: 483–484.
127 Following van den Hout, 2003b: 196 and Hoffmann, 1984: 27 respectively.
128 *Edict* §21.
129 CTH 18. Edition and translation in Shelestin, Vladimir. (2014). The Foreign Policy of the Late Old Hittite Kingdom – the Case of Ammuna. In Taracha and Kapeluš (Eds.), Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology. Wydawnictwo Agade, pp. 805–814. Some authors consider Telepinu to be the author. For an overview of the dispute about the authorship of this text, see Shelestin, 2014: 801–802. From the so-called Ammuna Chronicle we learn that despite the negative image created by Telepinu, Ammuna may have enjoyed some success in his military activities. The *Edict* tells that in the west and south-east, he underperformed, probably resulting in loss of some territories and even independence of Arzawa and Kizzuwatna, whereas according to the chronicle, in the north he might have been even able to conquer some new territories. The cause of his failures elsewhere may have been due to a shortage of resources. See Shelestin, 2014: 814–816.
130 Both are located north of Carchemish. For the detailed discussion about the location of Haššuwa, see Шелестин, 2014: 154–158; see also Bryce, Trevor. (2009). The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia: The Near East from the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire. Routledge, pp. 295, 793–794.
131 *Edict* §24.
132 Moreover if the reconstruction of CTH 20 (KBo XII 8 rv. iv 14”–15”) is correct – URU *Ha-as-su-u-[w[a-an ar-ḥa] ḫar-ni-in-ku-un* – “vernichten gänzlich” – destroyed entirely; see Hoffmann, 1984: 66.
ḫarninkun can also stand for to “devastate/ruin” (133) (the same verb is used in §9 for the attack on Babylon, which was sacked, not destroyed). Also, in cuneiform script almost always the city name was preceded by the determination “URU”, but in some rare occasions, it was used for country names too. Therefore, the fight with Haššuwa may have resulted in just a devastation of the countryside then the destruction of the city. (134) Then, hostilities from the city Lawazantiya (135) followed, led by a man called Lahha – possibly the governor of the city, (136) but Telepinu managed to come out on top. (137) In CTH 20 a parallel account of this mission is given, mentioning Lahha and his rebellion and the destruction/devastation (ḫarninkun) of Haššuwa. (138) But as Miller notes, the order of events is reversed in this text – first the rebellion, then the battle of Haššuwa. (139)

At that time, Telepinu may have also entered a treaty with the state of Kizzuwatna, situated in southeast of Anatolia, around central Taurus and Anti-Taurus mountains,(140) and its king Išpuṭahšu. This is the oldest preserved Hittite treaty with a foreign power.(141) The need for a diplomatic resolution may show that Telepinu was still not at the height of his power and internal affairs had still not been resolved. The expansion of Hittite power stopped there for the time being, perhaps because Telepinu did not want to come into conflict with the neighbouring Hurrians. If Telepinu had pressed his agenda forward in the area, Kizzuwatna could turn to Mittanni for help. And Telepinu was not ready to deal with the Hurrians at this stage, especially if troubles in the capital continued. (142) But to be clear – it is not certain that this treaty with

137 Edict §25.
138 CTH 20; see Hoffmann, 1984: 63–64.
139 Miller, Jared L. (2001). Anum-Ḫirbi and his Kingdom. AoF, 28 (1), p. 80. Lahha may have been connected to Haššuwa as well.
140 Bryce, 2009: 392.
Kizzuwatna was concluded during the events of §24–25 – it may as well come from a later period. Then again, we do know that the towns Lawazantiya and Zizzilippa, against which Telepinu fought, are attested as belonging to Kizzuwatna during the New kingdom.\footnote{Bryce, 2009: 793–794.}

Additionally, the much later annals of Muršili II state that the land of Tapapanuwa and the city of Hatenzuwa, which lie in the north of Hattuša, near Nerik,\footnote{For the detailed locations of these places, see Matthews, Roger and Glatz, Claudia. (2009). The Historical Geography of North-Central Anatolia in the Hittite Period: Texts and Archaeology in Concert. A$S, 59, pp. 66, 68, also see the map on 58.} had not been in the hands of the Hittites since the time of Telepinu.\footnote{von Schuler, Einar. (1965). Die Kaškäer. Walter de Gruyter, p. 27. This information derives from KUB XIX 39 I 1–2, belonging to The Annals of Muršili II (CTH 61).} But any information about possible campaigns to the north are absent from the Edict, so these must have happened later in Telepinu’s career. Besides, the fact that Telepinu controlled the area does not mean he was the one who assumed the control of it. It could just as well have been part of Hittite domain from the time of his predecessors. The Edict itself gives an extensive (but fragmentary) list of some 100 towns, where Hittite storehouses were situated.\footnote{Edict §37–38.} Research into the locations of these towns would give some overview of the places controlled by the Hittites during Telepinu’s reign.\footnote{Singer, Itamar. (1984). The AGRIG in the Hittite texts. A$S, 34, pp. 124–126.} Some of these places could have been the (re)conquests of Telepinu but most of them were under Hittite control probably already during his predecessors.

The description of Telepinu’s military endeavours in the Edict serves also a rhetorical purpose – Telepinu aims to compare himself to Labarna, Hattušili I and Muršili I – the great kings of the past. Hattušili I had also fought with Haššuwa.\footnote{Annals of Hattušili I (CTH 4) §10.} Like his predecessors, Telepinu might also have tried to “make the sea the border”, like the aforementioned kings had done. Rhetorical aspects of the Edict and Telepinu’s military undertakings are treated in chapter 2.2.2.2.

1.3.2.3 Elimination of Huzziya I

If we believe the sequence of events given in the Edict to be true, then the troubles within the royal family continued. According to the source, a number of higher dignitaries of the king’s court, unknowingly to Telepinu, sent a Staffbearer named Tanuwa to kill the banished Huzziya and his brothers, in which he was successful.\footnote{Edict §25–26, CTH 20 rv. IV 24’–26’.} The instigators of this act are mentioned and even named – “... the Overseer-of-1,000 Tarhu-[...], Karruwa, the Overseer-of-the-
Chamberlains Inara, the Overseer-of-the-Cupbearers Killa, the Overseer-of-the-[
...], Tarhumimma, the Overseers-of-the-Staffbearers, Zinwaseli and Lelli ...
” 150

Huzziya, who had been previously exiled by Telepinu, was therefore still considered a threat by some and was consequently killed. This was, according to the Edict’s author, done in secrecy (duddumili), much like in the instances of §16 (murder of the queen of Hantili I) and §21 (murder of Ammuna’s heir). CTH 20 also stresses the clandestineness. 151 These unlawful murders were certainly a different kind of action than the death sentence imposed by panku – the Hittite assembly. This difference is also directly referred to in §31. Why did these higher officials act in this matter? What had they to gain? Was the elimination of Huzziya and his posse prompted by revenge? For example, the man named Lelli, mentioned as one of the initiators in §25 is also present in the text from Ammuna’s reign, serving as a DUMU É.GAL – a palace servant. 152 If they were the same person, then the former dignitaries of Ammuna might have sought vengeance against Huzziya for his wrongdoings. Or was it perhaps fear of revenge? There’s no doubt that Huzziya had still supporters in the court and he may have sought an opportunity for restoration. Especially as Telepinu was away from the capital, engaged in his military endeavours. Then the officials who remained in the capital might have decided to act accordingly to the threat. The sheer number of conspirators – it is emphasised that “there were many” – points to the political nature of the act, as it was instigated by a partisan faction in the court. There was probably already a push to kill Huzziya and his entourage after the plot against Telepinu’s life, as the latter felt a need to justify and emphasised his non-violent approach in §23. But this could, of course, have been only a way to cover the tracks of his involvement in the later plot. Telepinu stressed his ignorance and non-participation in the matter again in §26.

When Telepinu said to have learned about the assassination, three killers – Tanuwa, Tahrwaili and Tarushu were sentenced to death by panku. But this decision was overruled by Telepinu, who chose to degrade and possibly banish them instead of killing them: “Why do they die? They will hide their eyes concerning them! I, the King, made them into true farmers: I have taken their weapons from their shoulders and have given them a yoke.” 153 Telepinu’s policy on dealing with the conspirators is not consistent with his actual behaviour. He gives the panku

151 KBo XII 8 rv. iv 25’. Huzziya is probably mentioned also on the obverse of the tablet, but it is too fragmentary to make sense of the context.
152 KUB XXVI 71 rv. iv 19’ (CTH 1); de Martino, 2005: 226–227.
153 Edict §26. CTH 20 rv. IV 27’–30’. Hoffmann, instead of “yoke”, translates “fesseln” – shackles; Hoffmann, 1984: 31, see also note 3; but see Beckman, 1986b: 571.
authority over conspirators in §31 but revokes its decision in an earlier case in §26. And he allowed death sentence for the offenders, but refrained from exercising it personally, where it would be proper in the spirit of the Edict. He again chose banishment over it. The exile that the offenders faced could have been a rougher sentence than it seems, or at least Telepinu could have thought so, as suggested by the way he cautions his officials: “Let Tanuwa, Tahrwaili and Taruhšu be a warning to you!”

Also, does this mean that Tahrwaili and Taruhšu were still at large and were not chastised for their deeds against Ammuna’s heirs a few years ago? If the appropriate punishment for their crimes, as the panku intended, would be the capital one, surely this matter would have been brought to attention earlier.

The main question is – was Telepinu innocent when it comes to the death of Huzziya? Telepinu personally abstained from direct violence. It is noteworthy that when in the Edict somebody is killed, only the executors are blamed and punished, not the instigators. Zidanta I is not answerable for the death of Muršili I; Zuru, the chief of the royal bodyguard is not together with Tahrwaili and Taruhšu punished for the deaths of Ammuna’s heirs, and the higher dignitaries who sent Tanuwa to eliminate Huzziya are not penalised either, although all of them had played their part in these actions. Above the instigators Liverani sees beneficiaries. Telepinu no doubt benefited from Huzziya’s death, similarly as Huzziya had profited from the actions of Zuru and his subordinates. So maybe Telepinu tried to shift the responsibility for Huzziya’s death on his officials who in turn delegated it to Tanuwa. The expedition to the south was also a suitable alibi. But naturally, one would not hope for Telepinu’s self-incrimination from in such a biased text as the Edict.

---

154 For example, in §31: “If anyone does evil amongst both (his) brothers and sisters and lays eyes on the king’s head, summon the assembly and, if his testimony is dismissed, he shall pay with his head” and in §32: “So now, if some prince sins, he shall pay with (his) own head ….” §33 ends with a rather bizarre phrase: nu-us-ma-ša-an KAXUD-ii ka-ri-ip-tin – “devour him with your teeth”, but it’s not certain what is meant by this. Hoffner has suggested that confiscation of the land from the perpetrator is meant; see Hoffner, Harry A. (2013). The King’s Speech: Royal Rhetorical Language. In Collins and Michalowski (Eds.), Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman. Atlanta. Lockwood Press, p. 141.

155 Edict §33.

156 Zuru is equated with Tanuwa, Tahrwaili and Taruhšu later in the Edict in §31, where they are said to have killed secretly. So, it is likely that Zuru had already died and could not be brought to justice for his crimes.


158 Easton even proposes that the first executors, Tahrwaili and Taruhsu and Zida, who are grouped together with Tanuwa, even sharing punishment, were supporters of Telepinu; see Easton, Donald F. (1981). Hittite Land Donations and Tabarna Seals. JCS, 33 (1), p. 26.
1.3.2.4  Death of a successor and compilation of the Edict

The wrongdoers were exiled, but this did not bring peace to the royal court. Telepinu’s queen Ištapariya and his son and possibly his crown-prince Ammuna passed away. Even though the Edict says that they died, rather than were killed, unnatural causes for the deaths can be assumed from the following lines: “The ‘Men of Gods,’” too, each said: ‘Behold, blood(shed) is widespread in Hattuša.’” Also, the demise of Ammuna occurred later than Ištapariya’s. CTH 20 holds a similar line: “and on that year blood (and) tears became abundant.” There’s no clue as to who, if any, was behind this. Telepinu could have been unaware of this also, as he would certainly have used the attack against his family for propagandistic purposes.

If both Ištapariya and her son were killed, was it to eliminate possible heirs and to push some other claimant’s agenda? In the historiographical prologue of the Edict, eliminations of the heirs happened only when the king was on the verge of dying or had recent deceased. The Edict seems to be compiled rather sooner than later in Telepinu’s reign as only few events are given of Telepinu’s rule. What use would it be then to kill Ištapariya and Ammuna if Telepinu was still the ruling king and could still produce more heirs? One could look in the direction of Telepinu’s lesser wives, who tried to elevate their own offspring. Telepinu’s son-in-law Alluwamna rose to power after and may, therefore, be also the suspect, clearing his way to future accession.

Liverani suggests that Telepinu’s mild reaction and laconic statements about the deaths in his family even illustrates a contrary situation where the king himself may have been involved in

---

159 These are probably some kind of priests. We meet the “men of Gods” (šiunan antuḫšišša) also in two of Muršili II’s prayers – in CTH 378.2 §2 and in CTH 376.A §7; see Singer, Itamar. (2002b). Hittite Prayers. Brill, pp. 52, 58 for the translations. In there, similarly to the Edict, the “men of Gods” are mediating the anger of gods: “Let the matter on account of which it has been decimated either be established through an oracle, or let me see it in a dream, or let a man of god declare it.” Or “O gods, whatever sin you perceive, either let a man of god come and declare it . . .”

160 Edict §27. EGIS-pa-ma āš-ir “Am-mu-na-aš DUMU LUGAL BA.UŠ – “Later, it happened, that Ammuna, the prince, died.”

161 CTH 20 rv. IV 31′–33′. The preserved lines of this tablet do not mention Ištapariya and Ammuna but the tablet breaks off after these lines, so clarification may have followed.

162 “And when Hantili grew old and began to become a god, Zidanta killed Hantili’s son, Pišeni together with his sons . . .”, in §18 of the Edict.

163 “When Ammuna, too, became god, . . . Tahirwaili . . . killed Titi’s family together with his sons”, in §21 of the Edict.

164 A similar circumstance may have happened to Tudhaliya I/II, as evident from KBo XV 10 and KBo XX 34 (CTH 443 & 395). In this case, his sister Zipfłatawi performed sorcery against Tudhaliya himself and against his wife and the prince, the reason being probably claim for power. See Bin-Nun, 1975: 257–258; Christiansen, Birgit. (2007). Ein Entsühnungsritual für Tutḫalija und Nikkalmati? Betrachtungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von KBo 15,10+. In Archi and Francia (Eds.), VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005. Rome, pp. 93–94.
this matter. But it’s very hard to see what Telepinu had to gain with the murder of his queen probable heir, so this hypothesis seems to be a stretch. Neither does he make much effort to depict himself as the victim in this situation to side with the possible accusers.

After that, an assembly (tuliya) is summoned for the matter, much like the time when Hattušili I called for the ranks of the army and the dignitaries to witness his words. The political situation of the past and present prompted Telepinu to come forward with his Edict, in which he hoped a solution for the problems of the state and particularly for the problems of his own. The reasons for the compilation are discussed below.

Telepinu may have taken some further steps. A text in several copies has survived that has the name Hantili (I) in it. This reports Hantili’s failure to cleanse his army and himself of impurity which fell upon them because of a defeat and subsequently caused religious pollution in Hattuša as well. It contains several motives similar to Telepinu’s Edict. A rhetoric question is asked: “Why has bloodshed become widespread? Why have tears become abundant?” which is very reminiscent of §27 of Telepinu’s Edict and of the lines 31’–33’ of CTH 20, adding the tear motif. And the §11 of the document, if the restorations are correct, corresponds to Edict’s §10–11, which speaks of Hantili’s connection to Muršili through his sister and murder of Muršili. These accounts could, therefore, be contemporary. The rest of the preserved text discusses ritualistic actions taken, perhaps against the religious impurity brought on by Hantili. Beckman thinks this composition to be part of Telepinu’s program to redeem the misdeeds of his predecessors.

---

165 Liverani, 2004: 42–43. The historian proposes that these deaths may have been achieved by magical means and this motivated the last paragraph (§50) of the Edict which deals with the criminalisation of witchcraft.
166 Edict §27.
167 Testament §1.
168 CTH 655. For a long time, there was no consensus, which of the two kings named Hantili is meant. Thanks to some additional fragments, Beckman has solved this problem and it can be firmly identified to be former, Hantili I. See Beckman, Gary. (2001). Hantili I. In Richter, et al. (Eds.), Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Saarbrücken, pp. 51, 58.
170 CTH 655; translated in Beckman, 2001: 52–57.
171 CTH 655 §10, 24’–27’.
172 Moreover, behind the LU HADANU (in-law) in §16 could hide Zidanta, the accomplice of Hantili – Beckman, 2001: 57.
173 CTH 655 §7–9.
174 Beckman, 2001: 58. He compares this to the “First” Plague Prayer of Muršili II (CTH 378.1). This also represents the king’s attempt to counter pollution caused by a previous ruler.
Thus, Telepinu lost his expected successor. He still had daughters,\textsuperscript{175} and therefore a hope for a suitable heir. One of the daughters, Harapšeki\textsuperscript{176} and his husband Alluwamma\textsuperscript{177} were set to succeed to power.\textsuperscript{178} But in another text, the same royal pair is exiled – “[…] you Alluwamma and Harapšeki […] with your sons I have banished you […] to Mallitaškur.”\textsuperscript{179} It is not clear who is the banisher. Some historians believe, based on the similarities to the Edict’s language and motives,\textsuperscript{180} it to be Telepinu, who might have punished them for the actions against for his son Ammuna and daughters during the competition for power.\textsuperscript{181} Others attribute the text to Tahirwaili,\textsuperscript{182} a king whose place in the line of kings\textsuperscript{183} is still uncertain and who may or may not be the same man named in the Edict.\textsuperscript{184} The first case would mean that despite the Edict, Telepinu was once again left without a successor. It is not plausible that he who was so concerned about succession would send them away without having a contingency plan. Either way, the expulsion of king’s heir does hint that the problems with royal succession were not solved with the Edict, or at least they took some time to entrench.

\textsuperscript{175} Forrer considers the four women named in 2 BoTU 26 (KUB XI 3 – CTH 23) to be his daughters; see Forrer, Emil. (1926). Die Boghazkôi-Texte in Umschrift. Leipzig, p. 16 for his comments.

\textsuperscript{176} The name is very similar to Harapšili – the sister of Muršili I and the wife of Hantili I; see Edict §10. These could also be different version of the same name, making the distinction of the two queens harder; see Bin-Nun, 1975: 86–87, note 128. She bears the title DUMU.MUNUS.LUGAL “daughter of the king” in KUB XXVI 77 2’ (CTH 23).

\textsuperscript{177} Titled MUNUS.LUGAL – “son of the king” in KUB XI 3 (CTH 23). This cannot be taken literally – it is preferred to define it as a “royal prince”. He could still have been adopted by Telepinu, as was done to Telepinu himself.

\textsuperscript{178} This succession is evident from the offering lists (CTH 661); see 2 BoTU 24 (KUB XI 8+9; text E in Otten, 1951a, ) & 26 (KUB XI 11, in Otten, 1951a: text B ).


\textsuperscript{180} In Addition, some lines (KUB XXVI 77 5’–8’ – CTH 23) of the text tell us about withholding grain and wine, which can be aligned with the sections of Edict (§39–40) that demand penalties for economic fraud. This could also contribute to Alluwamma’s and Harapšeki’s exile, as the banishment is mentioned right after these lines.


1.3.2.6 Additional episodes of Telepinu’s reign

In our current understanding of the chronology, Telepinu could have reigned for about 25 years. The Edict’s historiographical section probably covers only a small portion of his reign. The other sources describing Telepinu’s rule – especially the latter period – are almost non-existent. Some older land donation tablets could be dated to his period. Not much can be scrutinised from these to learn about Telepinu’s reign. However, in one of these a prince called Labarna occurs, who Wilhelm believes to be Telepinu’s son, but who might have died before his putative father. There is no firm indication to this connection, beyond the detail that there could have been a prince (DUMU.LUGAL) named Labarna if the tablet indeed comes from Telepinu’s period. The case with the title DUMU.LUGAL – as first brought to attention by Imparati – is that all these titleholders present at the court, are not likely to be the sons of the reigning ruler. From the hieroglyphic evidence, it is clear that the title is reserved for all the (male) offspring of the king in power and of the previous kings. It is also expanded to the descendants of the vassal state rulers. The title could also be held by a vassal king who has married a member of Hittite royal family, like in the case of Šaušgamuwa, the king of Amurr. This means that the number of DUMU.LUGAL’s must have been quite large and associating this one with Telepinu is improbable, but not possible.

The quite extensive revision of the Hittite law code is placed to the time of Telepinu. This is in line with the juridical nature of the succession law and last paragraphs of the Edict which stipulate (or change) rulings for murder and sorcery. If we see Telepinu as the reformer of the laws, then the redaction of the law collection must have happened after the compilation of

---

185 About 1525–1500, according to middle chronology; see Bryce, 2005: xv.
186 For the list of sources see Klengel, 1999: 77–78.
188 Wilhelm, 2005: 278 (No/LhK 22 = Bo 90/732). The name Labarna appears without the determinative. In this land donation, a rather extensive piece of land (ca 925 hectares, together with households) is transferred from a man named Happuwaššu to Labarna DUMU.LUGAL.
191 In addition to cuneiform script, hieroglyphs (see note 3) were frequently used for the royal seals.
193 Characterised by the form karu, ..., kinuna ..., meaning “previously..., now ....” See Hoffner, 1997: 5–6.
195 Edict §28, 49–50.
the *Edict*. Hoffner points out that the reason there is no clause for premeditated homicide in the law corpus is that it was already described in the *Edict*.196

One can doubtlessly assume that Telepinu’s military actions were not confined to those reported in the *Edict*. As the Hittites were surrounded by hostiles and powerful countries and tribes, they must have come to conflict with some of them at some point of his reign. It is not entirely certain that the treaty with Kizzuwatna happened during the events of §24–25, and if Shelestin’s hypothesis is true, the two copies – one in Hittite and the other in Akkadian – may represent two different treaties,197 *contra* to the general understanding. If we believe Telepinu to have been influenced by the successful reigns and martial achievements of Hattušili I and Muršili I, then he could very well have hoped to repeat the accomplishments of his predecessors – to make the sea the border of his empire.

---

197 Шелестин, 2014: 161–163. For the treaty, see CTH 21.
2 ANALYSIS OF THE TELEPINU EDICT

2.1 The divisions of the text and their role

Examination of the Edict itself is essential for understanding the nature of the Hittite royal succession. The Edict has a thought-out structure, from which three distinctive sections can be brought out:

- Historical prologue §1–27
- The rule of succession and instructions for dealing with conspirators §28–34
- Administrative and other reforms §34–50

All these segments have a great importance and specific rhetorical role – whether it is to show the need for a change, to legitimise oneself or to consolidate power.

2.1.1 Historical prologue

The historical prologue of Telepinu’s Edict, on which most of the research of Hittite Old kingdom is based, is the most substantial part of the text, covering over half of the entire document (paragraphs 1–27 of 50). The use of historical introduction is quite common in the Hittite texts, especially in Hittite vassal treaties, in which previous relations between Hittite kingdom and a vassal are put forth. But historical reviews have also a part in other texts, for example, the Testament of Hattušili I, the Edict of Telepinu and the Apology of Hattušili III. These texts offer a complementary view to the Hittite historiographical texts – annals and res gestae.

Their purpose is to give an account of events that led to the necessity of issuing these texts and show the reason for political action.

In fact, Telepinu’s Edict may even be considered to be the frontrunner in this tradition. Although the Testament of Hattušili predates the Edict, its historiographical parts are not as well-crafted and not an independent part of the text, rather serving as anecdotal extras to

---


199 See note 16 for details about Hittite annals and res gestae.
Hattušili I’s commands. The Edict, on the other hand, offers a chronological summary, covering a lengthy time-period of some 150 years.

### 2.1.1.1 Structure of the prologue

The prologue is structured chronologically and offers a brief overview of the reigns of eight Hittite old kingdom rulers – Labarna (§1–4), Hattušili I (§5–7), Muršili I (§8–11), Hantili I (§9–18), Zidanta I (§18–19), Ammuna (§19–21), Huzziya I (§22) and Telepinu (§23–27). But the summary is very unbalanced – some kings are granted more attention, some less. The information about the first three kings is idealising, but also repetitive. Almost identical expressions are used for all three. The author of the Edict tried to leave an impression of a golden age of the Hittite state which prospered at the time because of the unity of the royal court; Hittites also achieved success in the military front, which culminated in the sack of Babylon. The only digression in this part is the fleeting reference of some rebellious servants in §7, but the text does not get into details about that. The prosperous period ended abruptly, as Muršili I was killed by his brother-in-law Hantili with the help of Zidanta, the latter’s son-in-law. Both ascended to the throne successively, but their and also Zidanta’s heir Ammuna’s reigns are portrayed as a stark contrast to the first three kings rule. These were troubled times when the kings failed in their military endeavours and the land suffered from famines. These problems were, according to the composer of the Edict, caused by the anger of the gods, seeking revenge for the bloody acts in the royal court. The composer of the Edict is particularly interested in Hantili, to whom he devotes eight paragraphs, while all the other kings get about three paragraphs each. This may be because Telepinu saw Hantili as the first sinner – the one who started the violent bloodshed. The quite fragmentarily preserved paragraph describes the unnatural death of Hantili’s wife and children. Hantili’s regret over his deeds is emphasised.

---

201 Sadly, for historians, without using any dates or temporal values.
202 Edict §1–9. The repetitions led some historians to believe that the first two kings – Labarna and Hattušili I – were actually the same person and the composer of the Edict accidentally turned them into two separate kings (Hattušili I also used the name Labarna as his throne name); Otten, Heinrich. (1968). Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie. Verlag der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, p. 104. But a study into royal seals has proved the existence of Labarna as a ruler of his own; See Dinçol, et al., 1993: 87–106; also Güterbock, Hans G. (1983). Hittite Historiography: a Survey. In Tadmor and Weinfeld (Eds.), History, Historiography and Interpretation. Jerusalem. The Magnes Press, pp. 28–29.
The events lead up to the time of Huzziya I and Telepinu and their conflict. The reign of the latter is depicted as a new golden age, much like the time of Labarna, Hattušili I and Muršili I.

The prologue is set up to show the necessity of reforms for stabilising the country. A lot of Hittite political texts use historical narrative to bring out the reason for political actions.\(^{204}\) It carries an admonitory function as well – in §30 the future kings are instructed to learn from it what happens when the royal family is not united.

### 2.1.1.2 Edict’s prologue as a source of history

There are conflicting opinions on the reliability of the Edict’s prologue as a source of history. Some historians have put their trust in the depiction of the events in the Edict,\(^{205}\) but others have rather pessimistic views.\(^{206}\) One thing is sure – this text is definitely not a fully historiographic writing, but it does include historiographic narratives. It is not comparable in this respect to Hittite annals, written to commemorate the achievements of the kings. Hittite annals are, despite their lack of chronologies, thought to be quite truthful – much more than their Assyrian and Egyptian counterparts, for example.\(^{207}\) But the Edict is undoubtfully a biased creation that uses history for furthering the author’s program.\(^{208}\) But to what extent the description matches the reality?

The champion of the pessimistic school of Hittite historiography that scruples the reality of events depicted in Hittite sources, is Mario Liverani. In his opinion, we should not view the text as a source of information, but as the information itself. Concerning the Telepinu Edict, instead of dwelling on what the text reports historians should explore why it was reported and why was it reported in this particular manner. Its task certainly is not recording the past objectively but

---

\(^{204}\) Gütterbock, 1983: 29–30. For example, in CTH 258.1 §1–4; see Miller, 2013: 134–137.


using history to serve the narrative and rhetoric.\textsuperscript{209} Therefore, it can be subject to distortion of the historical facts. But it seems too extreme to think that there is nothing in the prologue that historians can put their trust in.

We have information that we can be quite confident about. We probably can trust the succession of the kings. It would have undermined the efficiency and credibility of the text if the author had used a sequence of events drastically dissimilar from the reality and so contradict the Geschichtsbewusstsein – the comprehension of history of the Hittites. Thankfully, the offering list (CTH 660–661) supports the order of the rulers presented in the Edict.\textsuperscript{210} There is no reason to doubt some other aspects too – that the persons mentioned there did really die during the power struggle, maybe just not for the reasons and through the hands of those stated in the text. Some family ties given the Edict are certainly correct, but others may be topos, e.g. the use of “father” and “son” does not necessarily mean direct biological descent.

The military actions described in §24–25 would also be too fresh in the memories of Telepinu’s subordinates to be falsified. Although it is quite plausible that he went against his enemies in the places he referred to, the alleged outcome can be disputed.\textsuperscript{211} As stated in §5–9, Hattušili I and Muršili I were very active in the military front and this is maintained in other sources as well – Hattušili I’s annals, his Edict and the Testament. But moreover, from these we learn about the rebellions of the princes, the invasions of the Hurrians and other tensions inside the royal family – the reigns of the three first kings were not as golden as the Edict demonstrates. Telepinu does acknowledge in §7 that during the reign of Hattušili there were problems, but he does it very briefly. He must have been familiar with Hattušili I’s Testament, which reports a bulk of these intrigues. The Edict emulates the former text in many parts.\textsuperscript{212} Inversely to upgrading the achievements of some rulers, he denigrates others’ – in some cases unjustly. Ammuna may have enjoyed a more successful reign that ascribed to him by Telepinu.\textsuperscript{213} For some reason, Zidanta I was treated more leniently – there is nothing about military mishaps or famine caused by the vengeful gods. Instead, divine retribution was enacted through patricide.

\textsuperscript{210} For these, see Otten, 1951a: 64–70; Gilan, Amir. (2014). The Hittite Offering Lists of Deceased Kings and Related Texts (CTH 610–611) as Historical Sources. Kaskal, 11 (11), pp. 86–89. The sequence is also supported by a cruciform seal; see Dinçol, et al., 1993: 93–96.
\textsuperscript{211} See chapter 1.3.2.2.
\textsuperscript{213} See note 129.
The narrative makes an impression of troubled times during the reigns of Hantili I, Zidanta and Ammuna, but this is extremely one-sided. Chronologies give for the total length of their rule about 60 years, which is a quite long time. The events that Telepinu talks about certainly do not represent the entire timespan.

The author of the proclamation possibly relied not only on oral tradition but used other texts as sources for the reigns of the monarchs of the more distant past. He could have used annals or similar compositions with historiographical elements. This is suggested, for example, by insertion of the detailed list of towns in §4 that Labarna was engaged with. The report on Hantili’s rule is also very specific. Telepinu was aware of his situation and endeavours in detail. The quotes of §13 attributed to him, however, seem to be fabricated by the author of the *Edict*, as opposed to being derived from a text composed by Hantili. Because would a Hittite king really stoop to such self-loathing in a written text?

The selection of the facts in the *Edict* may therefore be more-or-less true to the reality. What is definitely biased and unbalanced are the assessments of these events. It is questionable whether the well-being and the somewhat decline of the kingdom was solely the result of the state of inner cohesion. It is more likely that larger external conditions – strength and weakness of the neighbouring countries had a greater effect on the kingdom.

### 2.1.2 The law of succession

The focal point of the *Edict* is unquestionably §28 which gives the principles of royal succession. Therefore, it needs a separate analysis. This paragraph introduces the legislative section of the composition. It is preserved on two of the copies out of seven.

§28  36’. LUGAL-uš-ša-an ḫa-an-te-iz-zi-ja-aš-pát DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-RU

\[ ki-ik-[i-š]ta-r\acute{u} t\acute{a}k-ku DUMU LU[\text{Gal}] \]

37’. ḫa-an-te-iz-zi-š NU.GÁL nu ku-iš ta-a-an pi-e-da-aš

\[ ([DU])MU-RU nu LUGAL-uš a-pa-a-aš \]

---

214 McMahon, 1989: 64.
217 On KBo III 1 (Hoffmann’s copy A), which is best preserved and KBo XII 4 together with KBo XII 15 (Hoffmann’s copy G); Hoffmann, 1984: 3.
218 Copy G translates “Of the sons only the prince of first rank shall become the king”; see Starke, 1985: 112.
§28 36’. King shall become a son (who is a) prince of first rank only. If there
37’. is no first rank prince, he who is a son of second rank shall become King.
38’. If there is no prince, (no) male, she who is a first rank princess,
39’. for her they shall take an in-marrying (son-in-law) and he shall become King.\(^{219}\)

2.1.2.1  The sons of first and second rank

So, according to the rule, princes of the first rank (\(\text{ḫantezzī(ya)}\)) have the priority to the throne. Although the term \(\text{ḫantezzī(ya)}\) can carry also the meaning “oldest, firstborn”,\(^{220}\) it does not suit for this occasion, because if there is not an older brother, then there cannot be a younger brother either. “First rank” is, therefore, the correct translation. This term “first rank” can be assigned to the category which consisted of king’s and his main consort’s – the queen’s (titled \(\text{tawananna}\))\(^{221}\) or SAL.LUGAL (wife of the king) offspring. The clause does not specify whom to choose, when there are multiple candidates within the first rank, and how to act when there are several lines of first rank successors – when the king took another queen after the first one. To our knowledge, four Hittite kings took another queen: Hattušili I\(^{222}\), Tudhaliya III, Šuppiluliuma I, Muršili II. In the case of Tudhaliya III, his second queen Taduhepa mothered the heir; but Šuppiluliuma I’s first wife Henti was the mother of his children.\(^{223}\) Muršili II sired his successors Muwatalli II and Hattušili III with his first queen Gassulawiya but had also children with his second wife Tanuhepa.\(^{224}\)

The Edict does not require that the oldest son must inherit the throne. Primogeniture may have been common, but not the mandatory practice among the kings. Subsequently, for example,


\(^{221}\) See note 40 and cited bibliography for the title \(\text{tawananna}\).

\(^{222}\) Some authors consider Haštajar to be a daughter of Hattušili I, not the wife. See Beal, 2003a: 34, note b. This would omit Hattušili as an example here.

\(^{223}\) Bryce, 2005: 159–160.

\(^{224}\) Bryce, Trevor. (1998). How Old was Matanazi? The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 84, p. 214; CTH 383 §4. There are hints that Tanuhepa did try to advance one of his son to the throne, but only much later, after the reign of Muwatalli II; see Houwink ten Cate, Philo H.J. (1994). Urhi-Tessub Revisited. Bibliotheca Orientalis, 51, p. 240.
Muršili II inherited the throne despite his older brothers. Hattušili III was at first supposed to be followed by Nerikkaili, who bore the title of the crown prince (tuhkanti) but was later swapped in favour of Tudhaliya (IV). Therefore, distinction within the first rank does not seem to have been an issue and the king was able to choose a suitable heir at his discretion. This is apparent again from some later treaties, where it is said to: “… recognize my son whom I, My Majesty, designate …” and that “Šunaššura must protect for kingship whichever son of His Majesty he designates to.” But the options to choose from usually came from within the first rank, not from all three possibilities of succession stated in §28.

The second rank – dan pedan – consisted of king’s offspring born to his concubines (ESERTU) and secondary wives (SAI-NAPTARTU). These women were contrasted to the queen, as reflected in the Hittite treaty where Šuppiluliuma I had married off his daughter to Mitannian ruler:

Prince Šattiwaza shall be king in the land of Mittanni, and the daughter of the King of Hatti shall be queen in the land of Mittanni. Concubines will be allowed for you, Šattiwaza, but no other woman shall be greater than my daughter. You shall allow no other woman to be her equal, and no one shall sit as an equal beside her. You shall not degrade my daughter to second rank.

Naturally, Hittite kings maintained a sizable harem. This was to guarantee non-stop source of royal princesses for marriage alliances with foreign and vassal kings. Princes born out of concubinage would serve as military commanders or palace officials. The differentiation (and priority) of the first and second ranks offspring is apparent from Tudhaliya IV’s treaty with Šaušgamuwa: “But you shall not desire anyone (else) as overlord from among those who are

---

227 CTH 41.I.A §12; CTH 42 §2.
228 HED IX: 65.
230 CTH 51 §7; translated in Beckman, 1996: 40.
brothers of My Majesty, (or) those who are legitimate sons of secondary wives of My Majesty's father ...."  

The involvement of the second rank in the succession would in some cases give a wide range of options. Although it is unknown how big the harems of the kings were and if the sons of all the women were part of the second rank, one would presume that the rulers had plenty of concubines who could give birth to numerous sons and daughters. Tudhaliya IV laments: "The Land of Hatti is full of the seed of kingship. The seed of Šuppiluliuma, the seed of Muršili, the seed of Muwatalli, (and) the seed of Hattušili, is numerous." The high volume of the rank could cause competition amongst the second-tier sons. But the king undoubtedly appointed a successor from the suitable candidates in his lifetime, as soon as one was available, although he could change his mind and choose another.

2.1.2.2 Antiyant marriage

The third option for a legitimate successor is a husband of the first rank daughter. The term that is used for the son-in-law in the text is antiyant – meaning “he who has gone in.” This is a kind of an uxorilocal marriage, also represented in the Hittite law code: “If a slave pays a bride-price for a free young man and acquire him as a son-in-law, no one shall free him from slavery.” In this case, the father-in-law paid the kušata – brideprice to the future son-in-law, rather than received it like he normally would. This practice is also known in two of the Hittite myths – the second version of the Illuyanka myth and in the story of god Telepinu and the daughter of the Sea God. Antiyant marriage is described in the Inandık tablet too.

234 CTH 255.2 §2; translated in Miller, 2013: 297
235 Similarly as the first rank son – born from the queen.
238 HED IV: 293.
240 CTH 321 §23 and CTH 322 §4–6, Hoffner, Harry A. (1998). Hittite Myths. Atlanta. Scholars Press, pp. 13, 26–27; also see comments in Hoffner, 1975a: 137. In both myths, a male character is married off to the antagonist’s family, in hopes to retrieve some stolen items as kusata. However, the term antiyant is not used in these.
institution is similar to Mesopotamian *erebu* marriage where the husband becomes the member of the wife’s family. In the *antiyant* type of marriage, the husband was also adopted into the family of his father-in-law and his obligations laid with them, rather than with his own family. The *antiyants* seem to have a more-or-less equal status with the sons of the father-in-law: “In the future Prince Šattiwaza (kings son-in-law) shall be a brother and equal to my sons …” The inclusion of sons-in-law in the succession was to guarantee the continuance of the family line in the absents of male heirs.

The third clause of §28 says: “for her they shall take.” It is not explicitly said who are “they” are – as evident from the verb (Imp. 3. Sg.) – who are supposed to choose a son-in-law. Probably they are the future kings and queens whom Telepinu addresses. In the Hittite society, the parents of the bride had a lot of say in their daughter’s marriage, especially in dynastic marriages, where it was part of state policy. With this also comes a degree of choice. The king could select a son-in-law according to his aptness to the throne. Interestingly, there are no requirements for the son-in-law in respect of his lineage. The king certainly would not have given his daughters into marriage to anyone unworthy, but this allows some wiggle-room and may have allowed the king to prefer merit over birth when choosing an heir. The clause should be read as in future tense. What if a daughter was already wedded? Could that son-in-law also become the king? The sons-in-law (Zidanta and Telepinu) who appear in the *Edict* are all already married before they come to power. But of course, in these cases their accession was not natural.

There are some categories that were excluded from the succession. By that, one should assume that the principle “everything that is not allowed is forbidden” applies in this situation. The king

document, a man named Tuttulla gives his daughter in marriage to the man named Zidi, adopts him and makes him his heir, despite having a biological son.


244 CTH 51.1A §7.

245 The *Edict*’s appeal to the future king is also in 3. Sg. in the start of §29, right after the succession law, but changes to 2. Sg. in the middle of the paragraph. *Contra* Haase, 2001: 394; Haase, 2002: 71–72, who thinks that “they” stands for *punku* or the royal family. But he assumes that the marriage takes place only after the death of the old king. If a king did not have any sons, then he surely would try to look for a son-in-law, who could succeed him already during his lifetime.


248 Likewise, Alluwamna could have been married to Telepinu’s daughter already when Telepinu’s son Ammuna was still alive, because all three names appear in KUB XI 3 (CTH 23).
could have had even lower tier children than those born from his concubines. These are the pahḥurzi, born of slaves or prostitutes, usually translated as “bastard”.249 Again, CTH 105 illustrates their position compared to higher ranks: “those who are legitimate brothers of My Majesty, sons of the concubines of the father of My Majesty, or even other royal progeny who are to be regarded by you as pahḥurzi.”250 Secondly, the Edict establishes a hereditary sequence, as it does not allow the king’s brothers and nephews to succeed to the throne. It does not say anything about the grandchildren of the king either. Could the succession skip a generation? Could the king make one of his grandchildren his heir? Before Telepinu, the assassinated heirs of the king were eliminated together with their sons.251 So their position in the line of successors must have been quite high and were thus a threat to the usurper.252

The succession law had some shortcomings. As we see from later Hittite history, in some circumstances the king did not have an heir in accordance with the law. Some of the rulers passed on without producing any offspring, for example because of dying young – Arnuwanda II253 and Arnuwanda III254. By default, in these cases, the throne passed to a brother. Thus, there would still remain grounds for regicide. With the inclusion of second rank sons and sons-in-law, both of whom could have been numerous, the succession could still suffer from rivalry among the claimants.

2.1.2.3 Inheritance in Hittite society

The Edict follows a patrilineal principle of succession – the sons of the king have priority when it comes to accession. This is in the spirit of the general inheritance in the Hittite society. Although there is not a lot of information about who received the property upon the death of one’s parents, there are some clauses of the Hittite laws that deal with this. In these, all the inheritance passed to the male members. And it would be unlikely that the rule of royal succession would differ much from the norms of the Hittite common law.255

Hittite dynasties also progressed generally patrilineally, already in the time before Telepinu – or at least tried to until it was infringed by usurpers. Although the rules of succession were

250 CTH 105 §7.
251 Edict §18, 21–22.
252 In Hattušili I’s Testament §13, Hattušili’s grandson was pushed by the opposition to inherit the throne, showing that this was acceptable.
254 Bryce, 2005: 327.
written down by Telepinu, a similar standpoint must have existed already in the earlier tradition. To see for this, one should not look for a norm itself, but for the violation of a norm, which is clearly visible in the Edict. Before Telepinu, usurpers who did not remove the king himself usually eliminated the sons of the king (Pišeni, Titti, Hantili, Ammuna), who must have had the priority in the line of succession. Similarly, the queens, who could bore more heirs, fell victim to this. The Testament of Hattušili also bears evidence to this. The purpose of the Testament is to secure the position of Muršili I – a choice of an heir that was a deviation from the norm. The norm in the Testament was represented by Hattušili’s son Huzziya, who became rebellious and was therefore deposed. Due to a shortage of sons, fear that someone low-born – a slave – would rise to power took root and this culminated in revolt.\textsuperscript{256} So there was an understanding of who had the right to the power and who did not. Antiyants functioned as possible heirs already before the compilation of the Edict. Labarna is thought to be a son-in-law of the previous king. Zidanta I too, as a son-in-law of Hantili, followed the latter to the throne. Although removal of Hantili’s son was necessary for this, we do not know of any further obstacles for Zidanta. His connection with Hantili may have been sufficient for the throne. In Forlanini’s opinion, Telepinu’s aim was to lower the position of sons-in-law in the line of succession compared to the sons of the king.\textsuperscript{257} But in reality, they were already of lower rank than the sons of the kings. The order (sons > sons-in-law) again is apparent from the fact that the latter killed the former and not the other way around. Furthermore, if Telepinu’s goal would have been the demotion of antiyants, he would also have stressed his own inferiority compared to his main adversary Huzziya who was a son of a king. This would undoubtedly have worked against his legitimacy as a Great King.

The taciturnity and shortness of §28 may be the result of the circumstance that these principles of succession were already known in the Hittite society and did not need any clarifications. If §28 was an attempt to replace some other type of succession (matrilineality for example, as some have speculated\textsuperscript{258}), surely more explanations and justification would have been necessary. The succession law of Telepinu’s Edict thus did not an introduce new ideas but was rather a codification of a known practice.\textsuperscript{259}

\textsuperscript{256} Testament §12–13.
\textsuperscript{257} Forlanini, 2010: 115–116.
\textsuperscript{258} Riemenschneider, 1971: 85.
2.1.3 Instructions for dealing with future crimes in the royal family

The part concerning the succession rule is very brief compared to measures given in §29–34 which covers about a quarter of the text of the Edict. This section was a necessary part of the composition, meant to avoid the violation of the succession rule. These expected consequences were to empower the succession law. Without them, one could have usurped the throne, but still retained legitimacy in the eyes of the Edict. Second rank sons and sons-in-law could seize the power through the removal of higher standing claimants and be eligible for the title of the king. The primary focus was thus avoiding any further bloodshed. In the historical prologue, it is never mentioned that someone with unsuitable lineage for kingship was holding the position. Such reprimands would be expected from a document, dealing with stabilising the royal succession, especially if there could have been grounds for doing that. The Edict was not concerned about who came to power, but how it was accomplished.

This segment combines punishments, warnings, prohibitions and instructions. Of the penalties, only a few are mentioned. Death sentence occurs three times and the same expression is used – “he shall pay with his head.”260 This is the sentence for the king’s siblings who plot against the king261 and for princes who “sin”. Prince (DUMU.LUGAL) is probably meant as a wider category than king’s son.262 There is no specification of what the “sinning” (wastai) is.263 Death sentence was quite common for the crimes against the king, ranging from offences against his life and position to acts that jeopardised the purity of the king.264 But this is not aligned with Telepinu’s own behaviour, who seemed to abstain from taking a life, even if it was brought upon by panku and by legal means. The precondition for a capital punishment was a conviction by panku, as stated in §31.

260 Edict §31, 32. SAG.DU-naz šärnikādu. On top of that, death sentence is also a theme in the section dealing with administrative reforms (§35–50), dealt below.

261 There is an argument about what is meant with the lines II 50’–51. Some think that it gives a possibility for the king himself to be called to account and put to death. See van den Hout, 2003b: 197, note 54 for the discussion and bibliography.

262 Imparati, 1975: 87–88

263 Haase, 2005: 57; Haase, 2002: 70 thinks that because the word wastai is used in the Hittite laws in the provisions on sexual offences (§187–189, 199, 200), this interpretation is valid here as well. But these are all offences regarding bestiality, and to think that a proclamation about royal succession would concern itself with the topic is questionable, especially since this theme is absent from the rest of the Edict.

There is only one more chastisement in the Edict, but it’s an odd one. When evil deeds were performed by court members, they were to be “devoured by teeth”.\textsuperscript{265} It is unclear what the phrase stands for. Hoffner has suggested confiscation of lands.\textsuperscript{266} This is believable because the verb for “devour” occurs also in §7 – “they took to devouring their properties” – which can be understood as a deprivation of economic wealth. Exile could also be a part of it because Tanuwa’s, Tahurwaili’s and Taruhšu’s banishment was put forward as a warning in the same paragraph.

All of this is a bit too vague and unclear for a code of conduct as the phrases are open to a broad scope of interpretation. Although the Edict has casuistic elements like the law code, neither the offences nor proper punishments are clearly defined like in the Hittite laws. Unless panku and tuliya were given any further instructions how to deal with outside the Edict, it would be rather hard to follow the Edict for juridical advice. The last two paragraphs of the text (§49–50) do present us with provisions comparable with Hittite laws – these are discussed below.

Telepinu stipulated that punishments should not be extended beyond the person of the offender. After the verdict, the domain and properties of the convict were not subject to redistribution and his family was to be left untouched. This point was directed against higher dignitaries – Chief of the Bodyguard (GAL LÚ\textsuperscript{MES} MEŠEDI), Chief of the Wine (GAL GEŠTIN), etc.\textsuperscript{267} This was meant to remove the economic incentives for bloodshed. The Edict does not directly denote any instances in the historical prologue where someone was killed for economic gain, but this clause only makes sense if there was some precedent for this, omitted from the introduction. Previously, the exile sentence for Huzziya extended to his brothers too, but we do not know if the brothers were accomplices in Huzziya’s crimes or only part of his family and punished because of Huzziya’s wrongdoings.\textsuperscript{268} We have equivocal evidence from the Hittite treaties, whether collective punishment was practised in the later Hittite history. In some, guarantees were given to not to punish the children and confiscate the properties of the offender.\textsuperscript{269} At the same time, another treaty suggests that such generosity was not common:

Are you, Kupanta-Kurunta, not aware that if in Hatti someone commits the offense of revolt, the son of whatever father commits the offense is an offender too? And that they

\textsuperscript{265} Edict §3 – nu-uš-ma-ša-an UZU KAXUD-it ka-ri-ip-tin.
\textsuperscript{266} Hoffner, 2013: 141.
\textsuperscript{267} Edict §32.
\textsuperscript{268} Controversially, in KUB XXVI 77 10’–11’ (CTH 23, see chapter 1.3.2.5), of which some think Telepinu to be the author, Alluwama and Harapšeki are banished together with their sons.
\textsuperscript{269} For example, CTH 106 II.2 §1; CTH 106 I.1 §20; translated in Beckman, 1996: 104, 113.
take the house of his father away from him, and either give it to someone else or take it for the palace?²⁷⁰

The rest of the segment of the Edict is reserved for exhortations and political advice on how to bring unity and prosperity to the royal family in the best tradition of Hattušili I. §29 reproduces the essence of §1–2, 5 and 8. The panku should refer to the Edict itself and point out the mistakes of the past to someone who seeks to do evil in the court and to warn him/her of possible ramifications – the anger of the gods.²⁷¹

2.1.3.1 Power of the assembly

The Edict uses two different words for the assembly – panku and tuliya. Their nature is still under a debate, but what we know about them, is that they both consisted of the upper echelons of the royal court.²⁷² The panku seems to be have been continuously present in the court, but the tuliya was something to be summoned. The former is more prominent in the Edict as it gave the panku the right to penalise anyone who did anything evil against the king or his relatives. Panku did already figure in the Testament of Hattušili I as an audience to the king’s announcement. Secondly, it functioned in the Edict as an advisory body for the king in the instances of crime, but the king always reserved the final ruling in these matters.²⁷³ It has been thought to have been an institution that could limit the power of the king and at times even elect a ruler, but this has been proven wrong.²⁷⁴ The panku is also present in one article of Hittite laws where it is only a forum before which royal verdict is proclaimed: “… the father of the king stepped into assembly and instructed: ….²⁷⁵ A similar occasion is presented in CTH 272.²⁷⁶ So it seems that prior to the time of Telepinu, the assembly did not have any power to administer justice himself. However, following the chain of events described in the Edict’s prologue, panku did have the authority to judge and penalise offenders independently of the king, as it tried to execute Tanuwa, Tahirwaili and Taruhsu, although this decision was

²⁷⁰ CTH 68 §7; translated in Beckman, 1996: 70.
²⁷¹ Edict §30.
²⁷³ Testament §1, 22.
²⁷⁵ Hittite laws §55.
²⁷⁶ KBo XXI 1 16’–20’ (CTH 272). For a treatment of this text, see Gilan, 2015: 107–110.
annulled by Telepinu.\textsuperscript{277} Then, this right of assembly was sanctioned in §31 and §33. Its duty was also exhorting the king himself, for him to learn from the mistakes of the past.\textsuperscript{278}

After the reign of Telepinu, the assembly is attested only twice in the extant sources.\textsuperscript{279} In neither of these cases does it exercise the power to judge or punish someone. But as we see later on, there were certainly instances that could fit into the jurisdiction of the assembly as crimes by and against the members of the royal family took place. So maybe the task bestowed upon the assembly in §31 and §33 was not a strict code of conduct in the likes of royal instructions, but rather, as its vagueness implies, an appeal to behave morally and to discipline oneself to stay alert for any possible conspiracies in the royal court.

### 2.1.4 Administrative reforms

The \textit{Edict} ends on a different note. This section is often left aside from attention by historians analysing the \textit{Edict}. Starting from §35 the text has a lot of gaps – §36, 41–43 and 54–47 are almost completely lost. Paragraphs 35–46 contain various administrative measures. First paragraphs of these give instructions for supplying the fortified cities with water and grain. §37 and §38 comprise two lists, together with about a hundred town names. The first list consists of the cities with grain depots. The locations of about half of these are known, other are \textit{hapax legomena}. The second list is that of the towns with storehouses for fodder-mixture. Only one of the towns can be located.\textsuperscript{280} These lists show a complex network of granaries. Next paragraphs give an account of some bad experience that Telepinu had, as some kind of economic fraud was committed concerning grain. The future kings are then given instructions on how to avoid this. Paragraphs 44 and 48 are about deportees and inheritance, respectively. The last two paragraphs (49–50) complement the Hittite laws on the issues of murder and sorcery. This segment is thus quite diffused and at first glance not related to previous parts of the \textit{Edict}.

Why was it necessary to supplement the \textit{Edict} about royal succession with such themes? Some of its segments share a theme with the Testament of Hattušili I. Telepinu gives advice to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{277} \textit{Edict} §26.
\textsuperscript{278} \textit{Edict} §30.
\textsuperscript{279} Beckman, 1982: 441–442. These are CTH 271 and CTH 255, one from the time of presumably Tudhaliya I/II and the second from the time of Tudhaliya IV.
\textsuperscript{280} For the analysis of the list, see Singer, 1984: 103–104, 124–126. It is possible that §36, which is almost completely lost contained a similar list.
\end{footnotesize}
future kings how to rule justly just like Hattušili I had for his successor Muršili. By listing the cities, Telepinu might have boasted to his successors about his administrative skills. The fortification of cities helped Telepinu and the kings after him to consolidate power while depriving some administrators of some functions induced centralization. The reason for the sections about murder and sorcery was to prevent strife in the royal family – these measures were to avoid more killings. This is all connected to the increase of writing activity during Telepinu’s time, with the purpose to advance the state administration. Through this measure, Telepinu could have imposed more systematic and effective control over his domain. These last segments of the Edict can be viewed as a way to legitimate the king and his ascension to the throne by showing him as a just lawgiver and a proprietor of power.

2.2 The rhetoric of the Edict

2.2.1 The genre of the Edict

There is a difference of opinion concerning the genre of Telepinu’s text. Usually, it is categorised as an “edict” (German Erlaß) or a “proclamation”. Some have taken a different approach and advocate its belonging to the constitutional sphere, naming it a Verfassung. This seems a bit too advanced and has anachronistic connotations.

As an edict – an official order or proclamation issued by a person in authority – its aim was to regulate specific issues related to the practical administration. Edicts were in essence written announcements of the royal will to which officials and subjects had to obey. They were also binding on the future Hittite monarchs. Telepinu’s text does share similarities with

281 Compare Edict’s §40 with §21–22 of the Testament.
286 Knapp refrains from using the word “edict” for the whole document as “this predisposes the reader towards treating the first two sections as simply a preface instead of an integral part of the discourse.” In his opinion, the term “edict” is only suitable for the second segment of the text, which directly deals with legislation; see Knapp, 2015: 76.
another prevalent type of Hittite composition – royal instruction. Telepinu gave a rather wide range of arrangements for the administrators of the land for fortifying and supplying the cities. A curse concludes §39 – “Whoever does it, may they allot him an evil fate!” , which parallels the oath formulae also present in the instructions. It also encompasses moral advice for the succeeding kings. But a point of difference in Telepinu’s text is the absence of a contractual character (for example oaths) – a vital part in some Hittite instructions.289

In addition to formal administrative character, Telepinu’s Edict contains apologetic and self-justificatory elements. Although there are numerous texts on Ancient near east that carry these elements, there was not a fully developed genre in the likes of classical and Christian times.290

2.2.2 Rhetoric and form

2.2.2.1 Patterns in the narrative

Telepinu’s main rhetorical strategy was the use of contrast.291 The reigns of the first three kings are depicted as a golden age (with a small digression in the form of §7, but note Hoffner’s and Liverani’s comments292). The royal family was united and from this, the success in the foreign policy and prosperity of the cities ensued. The repetitious language used for all the three kings illustrates that all three behaved alike and, on that score, enjoyed the same fruitful outcome. The opposite is the period under the four next kings – Hantili I, Zidanta I, Ammuna and Huzziya I. They had to deal with invasions, crop failure and conspiracies within the royal family. This was clearly only a selection of low points from that time period. On the other hand, Telepinu’s reign represents the re-establishment of the golden age.

This is a quite black and white depiction and, as described in above, a distorted notion. The pattern the author of the text used is all too apparent. Events from all the three periods – prosperity, decay, restoration – are juxtaposed in the retrospective. Telepinu says himself to have been strictly followed this formula for success of the first kings: he avoided using violence

289 Miller, 2013: 16.
290 In Knapp’s opinion, apologetic is not a genre but a literary mode: “Treating apologetic as a historically realized institution forces the implication that the apologists themselves were familiar with the genre and deliberately employed it for the purpose of their defenses. I argue that this is not the case. Literary genres are artificial human constructs; apologetic is a natural human disposition.” See Knapp, 2015: 40–41.
292 Hoffner, 1975b: 52 says that these agitations took place in the provinces and not in the Hittite heartland. Liverani, 2004: 33–34 – the troubles were caused by servants – lower social strata and the ruling class was not involved.
against the members of the royal court, promoting unity. He was also ostensibly triumphant in his military endeavours. Even more, he enjoined the future rules to follow these steps as well.

Telepinu’s essence as a restorer might have been symbolised in his name. The god Telepinu, Hattic by origin, was associated with fertility and assumed the role of a “missing god”, in the likes of Dumuzi and Persephone. Choosing a name after a god whose absence meant stagnation and wilting in nature and reappearance brought on the revival of natural forces would have stressed king Telepinu’s similar role.

The Edict is concerned particularly with the rule of Hantili I. Maybe this is because Telepinu saw himself in a similar position. They were both brothers-in-law of the previous king and rose to the throne through this connection after disposing of the preceding monarch. Both of their queens and some of their children were killed under mysterious circumstances.

The difference is that Telepinu acted differently in an analogue situation. He used no violent means to eliminate his opponent (at least he wanted to leave this impression) and was thus free from consequences which the author of the Edict describes as divine retribution. The murder of Muršili I by the hands of Hantili was considered by Telepinu to be the “original sin” that triggered all the following killings. The text also regards the ascensions of Hantili and Telepinu as the conclusion of eras – in the first case end of the prosperity and in the second, end of decay. In CTH 655, a text concerning with both historic and ritual narrative,

294 We actually do not know whether he chose this name or was it his birth name. Earlier, Hattušili I probably chose the name Hattušili to emphasise his connection with the city Hattuša, which he rebuilt and made into the capital of the kingdom; Sommer and Falkenstein, 1938: 20; Bryce, 2005: 68; Klengel, 1999: 35–36.
297 Telepinu’s son, Ammuna also carried a name associated with the Telepinu-Myth, namely §9 of version II has “Mount Ammuna”; see Hoffner, 1998: 19.
298 For the investigation into the so-called Šukziya episode (§12–18 in the Edict), which brought on the demise of Hantili’s queen; see Helck, 1984: 103–108; Soysal, 1990: 271–279. Щелестин, 2014: 91–95 proposes that the murder of Muršili, the brother of Hantili’s wife Harapšili, propelled the latter to oppose his husband.
300 Hoffner, 1975b: 52.
301 See chapter 1.3.2.4.
is again the one who neglected his religious duties and this may have been used propagandistically by Telepinu. Hantili, contrasted to the preceding “hero kings”, played the part of “wicked king” – a ruler (sometimes unfairly) deemed bad and failed by the later generations and political successors.

2.2.2.2 Other motifs used

Telepinu deployed motifs that are very common among the texts with apologetic nature. Andrew Knapp distinguishes between ten common themes in his selection of sources that are used emphatically to service the apologetic and self-justificatory agenda. Some of them are clearly visible in the Telepinu’s Edict:

- Unworthy predecessor – Equally to Hantili I, Huzziya I was also not fit to rule in the eyes of the text’s author – he was the antagonists who initiated the conflict as he tried to kill Telepinu and his own sister. Telepinu used the opportunity to figure as the victim. It is important to note that Telepinu took action only as a reaction to the threat – this coincides with the passivity motif.

- The merciful victor – regardless of the (alleged) acts against his life, Telepinu took pity on Huzziya and banished him instead of a more severe punishment.

- Military success – The intention of covering his battle prowess in §24–25 was to mirror the deeds of Labarna, Hattušili I and Muršili I and to contrast himself to the

---

303 It is very similar to the king of Akkad, Narām-Su’en (2254–2218). His grandfather Sargon I was inversely held as an ideal king, but he himself in the later traditions – especially in the propaganda of Ur III dynasty rulers (2112–2004) and in the “Curse of Akkad” – was considered arrogant and impious and whose behaviour resulted in divine retribution that brought down the Akkadian Empire. The aim of this unfavourable view of him was to justify the hegemony of the Ur III dynasty; Sazonov, Vladimir. (2010). Mõningad märkused neetud Akkadi kuninga karistamise legendide kohta Usuteaduslik Ajakiri, 61 (2), pp. 112–126; Liverani, Mario. (2014). The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy. Routledge, p. 150. For other “wicked kings” in the history, see Kõiv, Mait. (2015). Kangelane ja kaabakas: kuulsad kuningad muistse Lähis-Ida ja Kreeka pärimustes. Tuna, 2015 (2), pp. 9–13; Шелестин, 2014: 97–101.
304 Knapp, 2015: 47–56. These are: divine election, royal prerogative/affiliation, popular acclamation, military success, the unworthy predecessor, the unworthy rival(s), passivity, the merciful victor, transcendent nonretaliation, the younger brother. He is, however, cautious: “Moreover, most of these motifs occur in all sorts of royal inscriptions, not only those that feature an apologetic mode. There is nothing exclusively apologetic about them. Some, such as the unworthy predecessor, appear frequently in apologetic texts but rarely in nonapologetic texts, but others, such as the concept of the divine election of the king, are ubiquitous in royal propaganda. But the more mundane motifs tend to appear in apologies in atypical ways and with special emphasis. For example, any Hittite king might refer in passing to his divine election, but Hattusili III constantly brings up Ishtar’s special selection of him during his childhood and her providence for him throughout his life as she groomed him for kingship.” See Knapp, 2015: 46.
305 Knapp, 2015: 52
306 Knapp, 2015: 54.
“unsuccessful kings”, who in the author’s view, flunked in their foreign policy. This can be viewed as a sign of divine approbation – gods granted him the victory.\textsuperscript{308} Report of his activities on the battlegrounds also distanced Telepinu from the murder of Huzziya I.

There are additional themes, which are not so strongly presented:

- Royal Affiliation – This motive is very meagre in Telepinu’s case. He did present us with a link to the dynasty – his wife Ištapariya, but not in an emphasised way, compared to others, who cite their (somewhat made-up) royal ancestors as a way to legitimise themselves.\textsuperscript{309}

- Passivity – Showing that he did not intend to claim the title of the king but acquired it only by chance. Telepinu depicted himself as a victim of circumstance – he acted only against the threat, issued by Huzziya and as an outcome, came to the possession of the throne.\textsuperscript{310}

These motifs were used by Telepinu to justify his accession. Through these, he was shown to be a ruler on par with the first three kings. Although the use of these does not necessarily grant the text definition “apology” (as these are also utilised in nonapologetic royal propaganda), they do set the tone of the \textit{Edict}.

A distinctive feature of the \textit{Edict} is its non-religiousness. Divine favour might be the most commonly used method for self-justification and self-legitimation by the ancient near eastern rulers.\textsuperscript{311} For Hattušili I and Muršili II, the “gods ran before” them,\textsuperscript{312} and for Hattušili III “Ištar took her by hand.”\textsuperscript{313} It is true that the usage of divine intervention in historical events ramped up in the Empire period, it had its part already in the Old kingdom.\textsuperscript{314} But Telepinu did not state that he rose to power through the divine election. Hattušili I and Hattušili III saw themselves as being appointed to the throne by the divine providence, but not Telepinu. The gods of the \textit{Edict} (and frequently in the Hittite myths also) act as angry and vengeful entities, rather than helping

\textsuperscript{308} Knapp, 2015: 51.
\textsuperscript{309} Knapp, 2015: 49.
\textsuperscript{310} Knapp, 2015: 54.
\textsuperscript{311} Knapp, 2015: 47–48.
\textsuperscript{312} Annals of Hattušili I (CTH 4) §6; Annals of Muršili II (CTH 61) §8, 15, 17, etc. Although the overuse of the phrase makes it seem as a \textit{topos} in the latter text, there are other attestations in the text that are presented as divine favour.
\textsuperscript{313} Apology §3, 4.
and loving deities. The wrath of the gods was caused by the bloodshed in the royal family and took different forms – invasion of the enemy, murder, crop failure. The only deviation is in §25, where the gods granted a military victory over rebel Lahha; also “the men of Gods” take the stage in §27 to warn about the bloodshed. It is interesting that Telepinu does not project the possibility of the revenge of the gods to the future – he warns the kings about secular and not sacral consequences.

2.3 The motivation(s) of the Edict

There can be various reasons, hidden and visible, for the promulgation of the text. As a royal edict, this was to express the king’s will, projected to his subjects, but also to his successors. Different possibilities of what guided Telepinu’s will in this direction is a problem to be studied.

- To stabilise the succession and end the bloodshed

The simplest and most idealistic answer when looking for the reason behind the Edict is that Telepinu really did want to cease the bloody usurpation practices of the past. We have no reason to doubt that this indeed may have bothered him. The rhetoric – internal unity leads to a successful state – does have a valid premise. This, however, is surely not the principal factor of national prosperity, but one of many.

Much of the Edict is addressed for the future, to the coming rulers and the royal court. A great illustration is §30, which bids the monarchs to learn from the internal conflicts of the past: “Furthermore, whoever becomes King and seeks evil for (his) brother (or) sister, you too are his Council and tell him straight: ‘This (is) a matter of blood.’ Look at the tablet (that says): ‘Formerly, blood(shed) became excessive in Hattuša, and the gods took it out on the royal family.’”

The main topic is the violence. Although there are shortcomings about his penal provisions, this does not necessarily mean that these were useless. Further steps could have been made. The administrative reforms (§35–50) are also meant for the betterment of the Hittite state.

But the historiographical prologue culminates with Telepinu’s reign and the present is the focal point in the narrative. It would be wise to assume that when it came to the compilation of the

---

316 Edict §30.
text, Telepinu was more influenced by the contemporary situation and not solely by the events that occurred hundreds of years ago.

- Self-legitimation

Telepinu was not originally set to claim the throne. As someone connected to the dynasty perhaps only by marriage, he had few hopes to succeed Huzziya I lawfully. After usurping the power, he thus may have faced accusations concerning his legitimacy on the basis of his descent.\(^{317}\) He did overthrow Huzziya, whose ties may have been closer to the previous king. But Telepinu barely addressed this issue: he mentioned his affiliation with Ištapariya and that he “sat on the throne of his father”, latter of which could be understood as a non-literal way. There were no further attempts to show his belonging to the dynasty. He even downplayed this by omitting his genealogy – a usual introduction to Hittite royal texts.\(^{318}\)

The ruler who does not have a connection to the previous king could take another rhetoric route – to stress that his accession was the will of the gods, will of his predecessor or will of the people.\(^{319}\) None of these motifs was exploited by Telepinu. The circumstances might not have required this because his position had sufficient grounds to take the throne. If this were a problem, his Edict would certainly try to link himself more closely to the preceding rulers or used some other mean to show the title of the Great King to be his destiny. This was not a point of concern for him. Whether he was a son or a son-in-law, both statuses as a royal heir had precedents in the past. And Huzziya considered Telepinu a threat because the latter’s position was such, where he could claim the throne once the person with precedency was removed.

- Self-justification

If Telepinu’s status was not a problem, then his actions might have been. There are two instances in the Edict that could be reactions to the vexations of his political opponents.

First, the deposition of Huzziya I. Although Huzziya did not ascend to the position of Great King lawfully, this did not authorise Telepinu to “overthrow the overthrower”. And Telepinu did not use this justification. Telepinu did not reproach Huzziya for usurping the throne. He did not even connect Huzziya directly with the murders of Ammunua’s heirs. The only condemnation from Telepinu’s part was the purported move against his life and of his wife

---

\(^{317}\) Hoffner, 1975b: 51.


(§22). This was reinforced by the proposition in the next paragraph that “they\(^\text{320}\) did evil to me.” The brevity of this issue causes suspicion. Hattušili III was very detailed in his Apology in describing his conflict with Urhi-Teššup, pointing out alleged causes for the removal of the latter.\(^\text{321}\) Telepinu could very easily show himself as the sufferer to impel the rhetoric. But he diverted the attention from the usurpation and presents himself as the pardonner and not as the victim.

As said previously, it is a possibility that he himself orchestrated the attempt on his life to give himself the excuse to supersede Huzziya.\(^\text{322}\) Telepinu’s response to the threat seems to be preemptive. Huzziya “wanted to kill”, not “tried to kill” Telepinu and Huzziya “was exposed” rather than “failed on execution” of the plot. Blaming somebody for premeditating a crime is convenient as these claims can be easily fabricated. Or again, the topicality might have shaped the laconic account of the passage – everybody was aware of the particulars of the issue. It is unknown how the upper echelons of Hittite state received the changeover, but the Edict does not seem to concern itself deeply with the possible backlash against Telepinu’s rise to power.

Secondly, the murder of Huzziya and his five brothers. In this, Telepinu was much more apologetic and outspoken. He laid the groundwork for his defence already prior to the passage about Huzziya’s death. §23 was set to present Telepinu as being disinterested in the demise of his opponent. He is basically saying: “I had the opportunity to execute Huzziya after his dethronement, but I spared him – why would I act contrary to this now? It is not in my nature.” His expedition to Kizzuwatna served as an alibi,\(^\text{323}\) and he strongly stressed his unawareness in the assassination. Moreover, he said that the instigation came from others – extensive list of “chiefs” are named as accomplices.\(^\text{324}\) When it came to punishing the executors, Telepinu again demonstrated his virtuous of mercy. The reprieve may indicate the complicity between him and Taneuwa, the murderer of Huzziya, but Telepinu may have tried to use this, again, for showing benevolence.\(^\text{325}\)

Telepinu’s self-justification is clearly visible and one also cannot discard the fact that he had a motive – Huzziya, who definitely still had supporters, could incite a rebellion and threaten

\(^{320}\) Huzziya I and his brothers.

\(^{321}\) Apology §10.

\(^{322}\) Like Peisistratos, the tyrant of Athens, who inflicted wounds on himself and accused his enemies in this. He appealed to the Athenians to grant him a band of citizens for a personal bodyguard and with its help, he seized the Acropolis; Hdt. I.59.

\(^{323}\) Liverani, 2004: 42.

\(^{324}\) Edict §25.

Telepinu’s position. But without compelling evidence, it is hard to say if he was guilty of these deaths. But as the public opinion on this was such that he felt the need for vindication, there may have been some truth to this.

- **Securing the position of Telepinu’s successor**

Telepinu’s son and the supposed heir Ammuna died before his father. We do not know if he had any brothers. And what worsened the situation is that Telepinu’s queen Ištapariya, who could give birth to more male progeny, had also deceased. When following the events in the *Edict*, the summoning of the assembly and thus the proclamation of the *Edict* happened right after the untimely deaths of Ammuna and Ištapariya.\(^{326}\) From this, one could presume this to be the main incentive for the creation of the text. Without any sons, Telepinu may have been forced to look in the direction of his sons-in-law for someone to succeed him to the throne. It is highly doubtful that he would have left the matter open. It is curious that during his quite lengthy reign, Telepinu did not beget any more first rank sons with a new queen\(^ {327}\) or second rank sons with some of the concubines he surely had at his disposal, and he had to resolve to the most extreme clause of the succession rule and take up Alluwamna as his heir. So this part of the *Edict* could have been added to suit Telepinu’s present needs. He wanted his son-in-law to succeed him and with the help of his proclamation, he hoped to secure his heir’s position through *Edict*’s threatening punishments and add further legitimacy to him with the succession rule. Despite inheritance passing to *antiyant* was nothing new in the Hittite society, within the royal family it was quite rare. Of the kings after Telepinu, we have knowledge of only a few cases when it happened – Arnuwanda I\(^ {328}\) and possibly Šuppiluliuma I, added by a recent study,\(^ {329}\) although the latter’s accession was not by natural means. This was not a usual occurrence. This would then approximate the *Edict* to the *Testament* of Hattušili I – a document for designating a successor.

None of these suggested motivations that prompted Telepinu to craft the *Edict* are mutually exclusive. There was probably not one main cause, but a range of them, from idealistic to more personal reasons. It is quite hard to look for his incentive without secondary sources, which we sadly do not have, and we rely only on the underlying themes of the partial and selective *Edict* itself to fathom his motivations.

\(^{326}\) *Edict* §27.

\(^{327}\) He could take another queen for himself, like three to four kings after Telepinu had done.

\(^{328}\) Beal, 1983: 115–119.

3 ROYAL SUCCESSION AFTER THE EDICT

To look for the Hittite understanding about royal succession and what principles were adhered, we have two main options. We can analyse the historical events and the facts to see which king followed which, what was their relationship, whether any patterns emerge, and if they do, then are these comparable to Telepinu’s suggested succession order. Or we can investigate other Hittite sources, written after the Edict for general concepts about succession. The first of these routes reflects the realities, the other the mentalities.

3.1 Royal succession evident from the historical events

This segment will focus on the transference of the throne after Telepinu’s rule. Restoring the sequence of the Hittite monarchs and their relationships will produce a perspective comparable to the principles stipulated by Telepinu.

3.1.1 Kinship of the kings after Telepinu

3.1.1.1 Reconstructing the succession

As said previously, there were no king lists of the Hittite rulers and we do not have any texts with a retrospective that expands to as distant past as the Edict does, naming all the ruling kings of the past in sequence. We rely in this matter on the genealogies of the kings and historiographic texts with shorter-term narratives, where the king, for example, recounts the events of his and also his father’s and grandfather’s reigns. These puzzle pieces constitute in a larger picture of the succession of the kings. There are, however, a lot of uncertainties, as we have not yet managed to get the whole picture. From the immediate time after Telepinu, which is crucially important for assessing the impact of the Edict, very few texts have survived. The status, lineage, and placement of some of the known rulers are still questionable.

- Tahurwaili

This man may or may not be identical with the assassin reported in the Edict.\textsuperscript{330} That he was a king at some point is evident from a royal seal and from a treaty with Kizzuwatna, where he holds the title LUGAL.GAL. He is, however, absent from the offering lists. His placement is

uncertain – historians have placed him almost every position between Telepinu and Huzziya II.\textsuperscript{331}

- **Tudhaliya I/II**

Such numbering of Tudhaliya is caused by a possibility that there were actually two subsequent Tudhaliyas in that period and that they have been melded together in the sources, making them almost indistinguishable.\textsuperscript{332} We know that there was a king Tudhaliya at that time, but we do not know if there was more than one. To keep the traditional numbering of the later Tudhaliyas (III and IV) but also to accept the possibility of multiple rulers of that time, this kind of numbering is used.\textsuperscript{333}

- **Hattušili II**

In his treaty with Talmi-Šarrumma, the king of Aleppo, Muwatalli II refers to a “Hattušili, king of Hatti” after a king Tudhaliya.\textsuperscript{334} A Hattušili is also named in the genealogies of Šuppiluliuma I and Muršili II.\textsuperscript{335} His reign may have been very brief, maybe only ruling as a co-regent of Arnuwanda I.\textsuperscript{336} Present thesis leaves Hattušili II in the sequence of the kings, in the place suggested by Bryce, but has its reservations.

- **Kurunta**

Kurunta was the son of Muwatalli II who was made the king of the appendage kingdom Tarhuntassa by Hattušili III.\textsuperscript{337} Kurunta had apparently a very close bond with Hattušili III’s son and successor Tudhaliya IV, who granted him several concessions.\textsuperscript{338} But at some point, he


\textsuperscript{332} Carruba, Onofrio. (2005b). Tuthalija 00I. (und Hattusili II.). AoF, 32 (2), pp. 246–267. Previously, the numbering “I” was reserved for a pre-Hattusili I prince Tudhaliya, who could have ruled also; see McMahon, 1989: 64, note 6.


\textsuperscript{336} Bryce, 2005: 141.

\textsuperscript{337} *Apology*, §12b.

\textsuperscript{338} CTH 106.1.1 §9, 13–14, 17, 19.
also held the title Great King, which is evident from seal impressions and from a rock relief. Archaeological evidence suggests that at some point in Tudhaliya IV’s reign, Hattuša suffered a violent destruction. Historians have interpreted this as the rebellion and attack of Kurunta against his cousin, who might have tried to claim for his rightful position as the Great King. If indeed, he was successful in securing the title, it must have been very short-lived. Kurunta is therefore considered part of the line of Hittite kings by the present thesis.

3.1.1.2 Relationships of the kings after Telepinu

This study does not into details about the blood ties of each king, as the matter is very complicated and would require a rather voluminous treatment. Instead, general standpoints of previous research are given.

From what can be restored from the sources, we know of these relationships (see Figure 5). Alluwamna was a son-in-law of Telepinu. Tahrurwaili is hard to place, but if he indeed was the same person that of mentioned in the Edict, his father was the chief of the bodyguard, Zuru. Hantili II, Zidanta II and Huzziya II represent a dunkelzeit in Hittite history and we have very few sources about them. Hantili II was probably a son of Alluwamna. The relationship between Hantili, Zidanta and Huzziya is unknown, but the first two are thought to

342 Alluwamna’s wife was the daughter of Telepinu – KUB XXVI 77 2’ (CTH 23). Alluwamna is said to be a MUNUS.LUGAL (son of a king), but this could also stand for adoptive sons; Gurney, 1973: 669.
343 Some restore his name in a text where he is said to be a son of a prostitute; see Bin-Nun, 1974: 117–120; Carruba, 1974: 81.
344 In KBo XXXII 136 (CTH 222.26), Alluwamna grants land to his son Hantili who also succeeds him in the offering lists; see Otten, 1951a: Text B.
be brothers or cousins or Zidanta to be a nephew of Hantili II.\textsuperscript{345} Huzziya II might have been the son of Zidanta II.\textsuperscript{346}

\textit{Figure 5: Rulers after Telepinu}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alluwanna</th>
<th>son-in-law of Telepinu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahurwalli?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hantili II</td>
<td>1500–1400 son of Alluwanna?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidanta II</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huzziya II</td>
<td>son of Zidanta II?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwatalli I</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudhaliya I/II?</td>
<td>grandson of Huzziya III?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuwanda I</td>
<td>1400–1350 son-in-law of Tudhaliya I/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattušili II?</td>
<td>son of Tudhaliya I/II?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudhaliya III</td>
<td>son of Amuwanda I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šuppiluliuma I</td>
<td>1350–1322 son-in-law of Tudhaliya III?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuwanda II</td>
<td>1322–1321 son of Šuppiluliuma I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muršili II</td>
<td>1321–1295 son of Šuppiluliuma I, brother of Amuwanda II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwatalli II</td>
<td>1295–1272 son of Muršili II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urhi-Tešub</td>
<td>1272–1267 son of Muwatalli II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattušili III</td>
<td>1267–1237 son of Muršili II, uncle of Urhi-Tešub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudhaliya IV</td>
<td>1237–1209 son of Hattušili III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karunta?</td>
<td>? son of Muwatalli II, cousin of Tudhaliya IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuwanda III</td>
<td>1209–1207 son of Tudhaliya IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šuppiluliuma II</td>
<td>1207–? son of Tudhaliya IV, brother of Amuwanda III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Muwatalli I served as a GAL\textsuperscript{LU}\textsuperscript{MEŠ} MEŠEĐI in the service of Huzziya II.\textsuperscript{347} This could mean that he was a brother or some other close relative of the king, but it is hard to say for sure. Tudhaliya I/II’s father was a man named Kantuzzili, who was one of the assassins who killed Muwatalli I. Kantuzzili, in turn, might have been a son of Huzziya II. So, despite the interloper


Muwatalli, the previous dynasty continued. Arnuwanda I was the son-in-law and the adopted son of Tudhaliya I/II.

We have no concrete knowledge of how Hattušili II was connected to the dynasty, but considering him a son or adopted son of Tudhaliya I/II seems to be the most supported possibility. There is no consensus about Tudhaliya III either – he is mostly thought to be the son of Arnuwanda I. Šuppiluliuma I could have been a son of Tudhaliya III, as evident from one of his seal impressions. This theory has been called into question and it has been proposed that he was instead a son-in-law and an adopted son of Tudhaliya III.

We are a bit more certain about the relationships of the next rulers. Arnuwanda II and Muršili II were both sons of Šuppiluliuma I. Besides them, Šuppiluliuma I had at least three more sons. Arnuwanda I had died early on in his reign. He might have had a son, according to a fragmentary tablet, but despite this, Muršili II inherited the throne. It is unknown why the succession passed over two of the older brothers of Muršili. He, in turn, was succeeded by his son Muwatatli II.

After the death of Muwatatli II, Urhi-Tešub, who also used the name Muršili III, came to power. As reported by Hattušili III in his Apology, Urhi-Tešub was not a first rank son of Muwatatli, but that of a second rank – a son of a concubine. The throne was then taken by Hattušili III, who was Urhi-Tešub’s uncle and son of Muršili II. Hattušili III bequeathed his title to his son Tudhaliya IV. He was not Hattušili’s first choice – another son named Nerikkaili first held the title of the crown prince. But for some reason, Tudhaliya was picked instead to succeed to the throne. Kurunta, who may or may not have ruled as a great

---

350 Bryce, 2005: 141 theorises that he could have been a coregent of Tudhaliya I/II and possibly his son but offers no evidence for this reasoning. Carruba proposes the same, based on the offering lists; Carruba, 2005b: 260–261, 265; Forlanini proposes that he was a son-in-law of Tudhaliya I/II; see Forlanini, 2005: 230–242.
352 Gurney, 1973: 672–674; see Dinçol, et al., 1993: 100 for previous understandings and bibliography concerning the debate about Šuppiluliuma’s lineage.
354 KBo XII 33 1’–2’ (CH 58); Apology §1.
355 Bryce, 2005: 160. Two of them, Telepinu and Šarri-Kušuh were appointed as viceroys in Syria and the third – Zannanza – was sent to Egypt to marry the widow queen but was killed on the way.
356 KBo XIII 42 (CH 661); see Bin-Nun, 1975: 279–281, 283.
357 Apology, §4.
358 Apology, §10b.
359 CTH 106.1.1 §13–14.
king, was another son of Muwatalli II. After Tudhaliya IV, two of his sons ruled subsequently – first Arnuwanda III and secondly, as the latter had no sons to succeed him, Šuppiluliuma II. Almost all the kings had a rather close relationship with the royal dynasty. Even the kings who are considered to be interlopers by historians (Tahurwaili, Muwatalli I and Hattušili II), were probably, in some way or other, part of the royal family. The kings after Telepinu were mostly descendants of some earlier king. But the succession did not necessarily pass linearly from father to a son, as sometimes it took a side step (from brother to brother) or even a step back to the previous generation. Both second rank sons and sons-in-law were represented, although as a minority. Sons-in-law were probably adopted and some even appointed as co-regents. Brothers were to inherit the throne if the previous ruler had no children. It is hard to say if this was the direct result of Telepinu’s Edict. As said in the second chapter, father-son sequence was probably the default mode already in the Old kingdom, before Telepinu. And the requirements for the lineage of the king-to-be was not even the focal point of the Edict, so perhaps the contradictions to Telepinu’s rule are because this side of the Edict did not matter much to the later kings.

3.1.2 Known and possible cases of usurpation

Although the throne seemingly passed on more or less in the concordance with Telepinu’s principles, there are several occurrences where the title of the Great Kings was acquired unlawfully.

- Tahurwaili?

Having left behind only little evidence of his reign, we know a very little about him. He is often considered to be a usurper. He is absent from the offering list, as are some of the previous usurpers – Zidanta I and Huzziya I. They were possibly left out from the lists by the succeeding kings, who tried to erase them from the history. He could be the one who banished Telepinu’s son-in-law and possible heir and claimed the throne for himself. If Tahurwaili

---

360 CTH 122 §1.
361 Like in the case of Tudhaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I; see Bryce, 2005: 128–129.
363 For a compendious table about the names mentioned in the offering lists, see Blasweiler, Joost. (2016). The Bloodline of the Tawananna and the Offering to the Ancestors in the Kingdom of Hatti. Arnhem, pp. 18–19 or Otten, 1968: 122–124.
364 Bin-Nun, 1974: 120.
365 See 1.3.2.5.
indeed was a usurper who came to power not long after the reign of Telepinu – this would speak strongly against the impact of Telepinu’s Edict.

- **Muwatalli I**

Although possibly being related to the previous kings, as hinted by his position of GAL ¹_flutter Méš Mesedi, he came to power after killing the previous king – Huzziya II.³⁶⁶ He himself was then eliminated, by two men – Kantuzzili and Himuli, thought to be the sons of Huzziya II.³⁶⁷ This act brought on a retaliation from Muwa, Muwatalli I’s chief of the bodyguards, aided by the Hurrians, but who was ultimately unsuccessful.³⁶⁸ Similarly to Tahirwaili, Muwatalli was not included in the offering lists, which may imply to Damnatio Memoriae.

One could therefore also see the enthronement of Tudhaliya I/II by Kantuzzili and Himuli as a usurpation, but as this marked the restoration of the line of Huzziya II, it is not seen as such.

- **Šuppiluliuma I**

The perhaps the most prominent ruler of the Hittites was a usurper. Although being one of Tudhaliya III’s commander and supporters, even bearing the title Lugal,³⁶⁹ he was sidelined from the succession. Tudhaliya III preferred his son³⁷⁰ Tudhaliya “the Younger”. The latter could have even ruled for a brief time because in a prayer of Muršili II calls him “lord of the Hatti” and that the princes, including Šuppiluliuma, and other subordinates swore an oath to him.³⁷¹ But Tudhaliya “the Younger” and his brothers were killed and some of his supporters were banished to Alasiya (Cyprus), while the rest of the court sided with Šuppiluliuma I.³⁷²

- **Hattušili III**

Hattušili III took the throne from his nephew Urhi-Tešub, whom he then banished. His justification for the deed was that Hattušili had to tolerate increasing degradation and humiliation by his envious nephew to a point of breaking. Hattušili fomented a rebellion which

---

³⁶⁶ CTH 251 §34.
³⁶⁸ KUB XXIII 16 4’–9’ (CTH 211).
³⁷¹ CTH 378.1 §2. “KUR URI Hā-ati BE-EL-ŠU-NU eš-ta”. Note that he is said to be the lord (Bēlu), not the king (Lugal or Lugal.Gal).
evolved into a civil war and exiled his opponent. He then issued the *Apology* as a self-
justification to vindicate himself.

- *Kurunta?*

As said before, it is not known whether Kurunta rose to the position of Great King through a
coup, but this thesis remains open to the possibility.

### 3.1.2.1 Attitude towards the unlawful kings

There are at least two instances where the successors of the usurpers may hint at some
unfavourable attitude towards their predecessor’s misbehaviour and their unlawful rise to
power. Muršili II, in one of his prayers, cited the bloody deeds of his father Šuppiluliuma I as
the main cause for the devastating plague, sent by the gods as a revenge, that swept the country.
Muršili called the murder of Tudhaliya “the Younger” sin and evil. Muršili II was in an
extreme situation where the appeasement of the gods at the expense of his father was apparently
necessary.

Tudhaliya IV, the son of Hattušili III, also expressed some reservations about his father’s
power-grab:

But when Muwatalli died, then Urhi-Tešub, son of Muwatalli, became King. My father
wrested the kingship away from Urhi-Tešub. Masturi committed treachery. Although it
was Muwatalli who had taken him up and had made him his brother-in-law, afterwards
Masturi did not protect his son Urhi-Tešub but went over to my father.

Siding with Hattušili III clearly was considered treasonous, although Tudhaliya’s aim here is to
make a point about loyalty and not legitimacy.

---

373 *Apology* §10b–11.
374 CTH 378.1 §4–8.
375 CTH 105 §8.
### 3.1.3 Other recorded conflicts concerning succession

In addition to the known usurpations, sources indicate other frequent troubles inside the royal court. Some of them were related to succession rights, as different branches of the dynasty fought over the right for the kingship.

- **Ziplantawi against Tudhaliya I/II**

A woman named Ziplantawi, possibly the sister of Tudhaliya I/II, performed magic against the royal couple and their children. Although her motive is not stated in the sources, Bin-Nun has suggested that this was because of a quarrel over succession. Perhaps Ziplantawi wanted to promote her own lineage in the dynasty while attempting to eliminate Tudhaliya I/II and his family.

- **Tanuhepa against Muwatalli II**

Tanuhepa was the queen of Muršili II who remained in office years into the reign of Muwatalli II. However, Muwatalli was born from his father’s first queen Gassulawiya and Tanuhepa – Muršili’s second queen – was only his stepmother. Tanuhepa was brought to trial by Muwatalli II for some activity that is not clearly stated. It is known that Tanuhepa had sons of his own. It is very probable that the two clashed over who should inherit the throne – Urhi-Tešub, the second rank son of Muwatalli or the son of Tanuhepa. The former prevailed and Tanuhepa was banished from the court, together with her sons and retinue. The extension of punishment to the family members (as her sons shared his fate) would also be a violation of Telepinu’s Edict.

---

376 For a list of known conspiracies and affairs in the Hittite history, see Giorgieri, 2008: 372–375.
377 KBo XV 10 and KBo XX 34 (CTH 443 & 395).
383 Houwink ten Cate, 1994: 240.
384 CTH 383 §4.
- Puduhepa against Nerikkaili?

Although there is no concrete evidence of a large-scale conflict, there might have been some friction concerning the heir of Hattušili III.° He speculated that Nerikkaili might not have been born from Hattušili III’s queen Puduhepa but from an earlier marriage. Puduhepa, possibly the most powerful Hittite queen, might have advocated for a son of her own to take the throne.° We know from an oracle text, from the time of Tudhaliya IV and Puduhepa (who reigned on as the queen) that shows the existence of different parties in the court, one tied to the queen (probably Puduhepa) and another against her.°

- Hešni against Tudhaliya IV

The so-called Hešni conspiracy is perhaps the most representative case about the instability of the royal court. Hešni was one of the sons of Hattušili III and a (half?)brother of Tudhaliya IV.° A text of a court proceeding about the matter has survived.° Hešni, together with a group of other dignitaries, planned to kill Tudhaliya and some of his closest supporters. But the matter came public and Hešni was brought to trial. The motive behind the coup d’état can only be guessed, but succession rights seems the most likely. He might have tried to restore the other branch of Hattušili III, which had been sidelined by Puduhepa.

We can observe several critical moments. After Telepinu, there were at least four larger scale conflicts over inheritance – at the time of Tudhaliya I/II, Šuppiluliuma I, Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV. In all of them, problems arose between the different branches of the dynasty, usually between the progeny of the previous ruler. These conflicts were not concluded with the prevailing of one party, but frictions in the court continued also after the enthronements of the kings, as disenfranchised branches still tried to interfere with the succession.

Like it was the case with rulers from the Old kingdom, usurpers in the latter part of the Hittite history (except for Muwatalli I and maybe Kurunta) managed to secure their position and

---

386 Bryce, 2005: 272–274. Hattušili III does distinguish between his lineage: “... our sons, our grandson, the son of My Sun, the descendants of Puduhepa, the great queen”; see KBo IV 12 rv. 8’–9’ (CTH 87).
389 CTH 297.8.
remain in power for multiple decades. The direct violence against royalty does seem to have lessened but the conflicts were, on the other hand, larger in scale, sometimes reaching to the scope of civil war, for example, in the cases of Muwatalli I and Hattušili III.\textsuperscript{391}

Usurpations would be unlawful, with or without the Telepinu’s Edict. It does not take a written regulation to impose that rising to power violently and unnaturally is wrong. But the fact that despite having committed evil and in the eyes of the Edict should have been punished, these usurpers remained in power shows that Telepinu’s preventative measures were not implemented.

\textbf{3.2 Succession in the written sources after Telepinu}

In this chapter, an assortment of Hittite instructions, treaties and other texts containing passages concerning royal succession are analysed. Was the order of succession stated by Telepinu reflected in these sources? Who had the right to inherit a position? How were the conspirators against the king treated? Did Telepinu’s ideas entrench?

\textbf{3.2.1 The Apology of Hattušili III}

Hattušili’s Apology is one of the major historical texts from the Hittite Empire period. It relates to the Telepinu’s succession law indirectly as it is a straight-up violation of the Edict. Instead, it justifies the infringement of the traditional succession principles. Hattušili III was a son of Muršili II (1321–1295) and a younger brother of Muwatalli II (1295–1272).\textsuperscript{392} He was not in line to become the Great King, but was appointed to various important positions in the royal court: a military commander, the governor of the kingdom’s northern regions and the chief of Muwatalli II’s bodyguard (GAL LŬMEŠ MEŠEDI).\textsuperscript{393} After the death of Muwatalli II, the throne

\textsuperscript{391} Telepinu’s Edict leaves an impression that the usurpations in the Old kingdom were assassinations, rather than larger conflicts with military involvement. However, that Telepinu failed to mention this in his proclamation, does not mean there could not have been any full-scale battles between the opponents.

\textsuperscript{392} Apology §1, 3. Dates according to Bryce, 2005: xv.

\textsuperscript{393} Apology §4.
was to go to latter’s second rank son,394 Urhi-Tešub.395 After seven years,396 Hattušili blamed his nephew of oppression and thus deposed and exiled Urhi-Tešub.397 The aim of the Apology was the vindication of Hattušili III. For this, he implemented motifs that are very common in the Ancient Near Eastern apologetic writings.398 above all, an emphasis on the divine favour of Ištar.

Are the principles of Telepinu’s succession rule observable in the Apology? Hattušili III no doubt recognises Urhi-Tešub’s priority for the throne. He never openly discredits399 his opponent’s position and right to rule, but he does point out his unkind behaviour and fiendish deeds against him. The fact that Hattušili III felt the need to defend his seizure of power by literary means supports the contradiction with the traditional succession principles. Although he never referred to the Edict of Telepinu, he too chose a non-violent action – exile – when it came to the removal of his opponents.400

Hattušili III states: “Therefore, since my brother did not have a huihuiššuwali son, I took up Urhi-Tešub, son of a concubine. I put him into lordship over Hatti Land ….401 The word

394 Hattušili calls him a son of a concubine in §10b in the Apology and in KUB XXI 15 6’–8’ (CTH 85.1.B). Mašturi, a king of the land of the Seha river, snubbed him to be a bastard – pahhurţi in CTH 105 §8; see Beckman, 1996: 100. One has to take into account that these are Tudhaliya IV’s words and Mašturi was only mentioned as a bad example.
396 See Bryce, 2005: 460; note 65 for the length of Urhi-Tešub’s rule.
397 Apology §10–11.
398 A few examples of these apologetic writings are the tradition of David’s rise in 1 Sam16–1 Kgs 2; the succession narrative of Solomon in 1 Kgs 1–2; the account about the rise of Esarhaddon (BM 121005); see Knapp, 2015: 56–65.
399 At least the tone of which he uses is quite neutral. Delegitimising Urhi-Tešub would be counterintuitive for Hattušili, as he declares himself responsible for his nephew’s coronation; see Knapp, 2015: 151, note 95.
400 Apology §10a–10b. Urhi-Tešub was banished to the country Nuhašše (see Bryce, 2009: 515 for the location) and later, when he tried to plot with the Babylonians (probably hoping to return to Hattuša and reclaim his lost title) he was sent to “across the sea” or “alongside the sea” (meaning to Cyprus probably, see Gurney, 1969: 37; on the translation of “across” or “alongside”, see Helck, Wolfgang. (1963). Urhi-Tešup in Ägypten. JCS, 17 (3), pp. 87, 95–96). From there he ventured to Egypt. For his later life, see Bryce, Trevor. (2003). Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East: the Royal Correspondence of the Late Bronze Age. Routledge, pp. 204–212; Houwink ten Cat, Philo H. J. (2006). The Sudden Return of Urhi-Tešub to his Former Place of Banishment in Syria. In van den Hout (Ed.), The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tutḫḫaliya IV. Leiden, pp. 1–8; van den Hout, Theo P.J. (1991). Hethitische Thronbesteigungsorakel und die Inauguration Tudḫḫaliyas IV. ZA, 81 (1–2), p. 296. Hattušili also employed exile for the family of his former adversary Armatarhunta in §10a.
401 Apology §10b.
ḫuihuiššuwali, only appearing in two different Hittite texts, was previously read as šahuihuiššuwali and was (and is still by some) translated as “legitimate”. Hattušili III’s choice of words implies that he did not consider sons of concubines legitimate and eligible to the throne in the normal circumstances. According to the rule set by Telepinu they, however, would have been. This speaks against the Edict’s long-term impact on the royal inheritance.

A study by Košak has shown that ša- should be separated from the word and read as Akkadian ŠA. This does not help with the translation, however. Košak suggests “own, natural” (leiblich). Singer, following Goetze, advocates for “adult”. So Urhi-Tešub might have been appointed tuhkanti, only for the time being, until some of the Muwatalli II’s first rank son became of age. Somehow, Urhi-Tešub remained on the position and ascended to the throne. If Urhi-Tešub deposed the first rank son of Muwatalli II, then this was a violation of Telepinu’s succession law, although his own appointment by his father would certainly have helped his case.

The principles similar to these expressed in Telepinu’s Edict’s do glow through the Apology, but these simply were not followed – not by Hattušili nor even by Urhi-Tešub.

### 3.2.2 Royal instructions

#### 3.2.2.1 CTH 271 (So-called Protocoles de succession dynastique)

Under this category, there are two or three heavily damaged manuscripts (A, B, C), broken into numerous fragments. It is very hard to make sense of these texts, but from some of the lines it can be understood that succession is one of the subjects. These compilations have been compared to Telepinu’s Edict, since all of them were attempts to legitimise kings and impose loyalty to them, but the “Protocoles” are considerably narrower in scope. The first one (manuscript A) is attributed to Tudhaliya I/II, and tries to justify his enthronement after the

---

402 KUB XIX 64, KUB XIX 68, which are part of the Apology and KBo VI 29 which parallels the Apology (CTH 85.1.A).


disposal of Muwatalli I. Manuscript B\textsuperscript{407} is hard to connect with any certain king, but because of the appearance of a name in KUB XXXVI 109, some have linked this to weakly attested Hattušili II.\textsuperscript{408} It is however uncertain if he is the one whom “they designated for kingship” and whom “his brothers and his sisters/their wives […] and the assembly, the men of Hattuša, shall recognize.”\textsuperscript{409} The next line of the same tablet adds: “But since/what his brothers (and) his in-laws do not […] before the person of Hattušili […] he shall be his enemy! And they shall haunt him!” Here the brothers and in-laws are depicted as confrontative for Hattušili II. The text C is from the reign of Tudhaliya III and it too obliges the subordinates to recognise the kingship.

From what can be understood from these texts, they do not directly reflect any guidelines given by Telepinu, or the reflections these ideas are simply hidden in the numerous lacunae. However, these kings took steps to secure their position, which proves their precarious status.  

3.2.2.2 Loyalty oath impositions

This subgenre of instructions comes from the empire period. Issued on the behalf of the king, these documents prescribe in detail the acceptable and unacceptable behaviour of king’s subordinates with the threat of being “placed under oath” – a violation of which evokes the anger of the oath deities.\textsuperscript{410} Among other topics, loyalty to the king and acknowledgement of rightful succession have a big part in these texts.

- CTH 255.2 (Tudhaliya IV’s Instructions and Oath Imposition for Courtiers)

This partly fragmented text is from the reign of Tudhaliya IV (1237–1209) and it is addressed to his courtiers. Our point of interest lies in the first paragraph:

My Majesty has many brothers, and they have many fathers. The land of Hattuša is full of royal progeny. In Hattuša the progeny of Šuppiluliuma, the progeny of Muršili, the progeny of Muwatalli (and) the progeny of Hattušili are numerous, and (yet) you shall

\textsuperscript{407} It could very well belong to manuscript A, due to its similarities, but was found from another building; see Miller, 2013: 154


\textsuperscript{410} These were the witnesses of the oath, who could bring retribution to the one who breaks the oath; see Feder, Yitzhaq. (2010). The Mechanics of Retribution in Hittite, Mesopotamian and Ancient Israelite Sources. Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions, 10 (2), pp. 121–126; Miller, 2013: 7.
recognize no other man for the lordship, and after (me) you must protect the sons and grandsons, the seed of Tudhaliya alone, for the lordship! And if evil ever befalls My Majesty – My Majesty (has), after all, many brothers – and perhaps you even do this: you support someone else, and you speak thus: “Whomever shall we raise up (as king) for ourselves? Is that other man not in fact a son of our lord?” Such an utterance shall not be made! For the lordship protect hereafter only the progeny of My Majesty! You shall not support anyone else!411

CTH 255.2 goes further on exhorting to disclose any conspiracies and against the king. From this text it is apparent that Tudhaliya was worried about the competing family-lines who desired power. He was above all worried about the interference of his more distant relatives, not about the conflict among his progeny.

- CTH 255.1 (Tudhaliya IV’s Instructions and Loyalty Oath Imposition for Lords, Princes, and Courtiers)

This text was also composed by Tudhaliya IV and it even more vocally corroborates the themes of CTH 255.2. The instruction was addressed to lords and princes (and courtiers) – those who would surely be involved in power struggles within the dynasty. 412

§4 Or if a brother of My Majesty, born (of the queen) or some son of a secondary wife says this to you: “Am I not also a son of your lord? Then support me!” ….
§5 Or if some brother of My Majesty, born of the queen, or some brother, (i.e.,) sons of a secondary wife, or some lord proposes the ruin of My Majesty to someone …. 
§9 Or if […] or […] listens to a brother of My Majesty, born of the queen, or brothers, (i.e.) sons of secondary wives and he say this: “Stand behind me!” …. 
§24 And you shall not recognize My Majesty’s full brothers, born of the queen subsequently, nor those who are sons of a secondary wife of the father of My Majesty. For the lordship you shall support only My Majesty and after (him) his sons (and) grandsons. You shall discard the oath of the person who makes you swear to the brothers of My Majesty, and you shall support only My Majesty and the sons of My Majesty for

411 CTH 255.2 §2–3; see Miller, 2013: 297 for the translation.
the lordship; or (if) the full brothers of My Majesty or a son of a secondary wife has done some wicked thing, (e.g.,) blood(shed) or rebellion …. 413

This document sees the danger coming especially from the king’s brothers, both full and half-brothers. This demonstrates that they still had claims for kingship, despite that Hattušili III had had some 30 years to solidify his and his heir’s positions, possibly even assigning Tudhaliya as a co-regent. 414 Tudhaliya IV was not Hattušili’s first choice for the throne – Nerikkaili, another son of his, had held the title tuhkanti before him, but he was at some point excluded for some reason. 415 This could have instigated enmity among the brothers.

It is also noteworthy that §19 contains the only reference to the assembly from the latter history of the kingdom, 416 but it does not indicate the function of the assembly, or if it had something to do with succession or with exercising power: “When I, My Majesty, call together the assembly, as soon as someone steps […], then that shall be placed under oath for him.” 417

- CTH 85.2 (Hattušili III’s Loyalty Oath Imposition)

This document is ascribed to Hattušili III. 418 Similar to the previous ones, it too demands loyalty to the king and recognition of his successor: “What son the king (with his) queen (has), protect (only) this queen’s son for the lordship.” 419 Here, the importance of the first rank sons are emphasised, and there is no mention of second rank sons and sons-in-law. This could be because Hattušili III had by that time many first rank sons and believed that at least one would be able to take the throne.

413 CTH 255.2 §4, 5, 9, 24; translated in Miller, 2013: 282–293.
415 CTH 106 1.1 §13–14. “But when my father deposed my brother whom he had placed in the office of crown prince and installed me in kingship …”; see Beckman, 1996: 112. He could be a substitution until Tudhaliya was old enough; see Hagenbuchner, Albertine. (1992). War der tukanti Neriqqaili ein Sohn Ḫattušilis III? SMEA, 29, pp. 111–126. But from the same paragraph (§14) it is apparent that Tudhaliya was not even sure that he would become the heir: “But at that time Kurunta protected me and swore as follows concerning my person: ‘Even if your father does not install you in kingship, I will protect you alone in whatever position your father does install you, and I will be your subject.’”
417 CTH 255.1 §19.
These texts illustrate the fact that royal succession was not self-evident and that the king had to impose further measures to secure his and his successor’s position. Of course, demanding loyalty to the king and his descendants was probably typical for any ruler, but CTH 255.2 and CTH 225.1 are especially insisting and very detailed in this matter, which could mean that these texts were composed as a reaction to certain problematic situations. Especially Tudhaliya IV was either very insecure about his position or very paranoid. He could still suffer from the stigma of his father’s unruly ascension.

There are hints to possible punishments of conspirators who did evil against the king, usually (as one would expect from the genre) taking the form of being put under an oath and dealing with its consequences, but also of death penalties. There are other royal instructions which might contradict the ideals of Telepinu – in CTH 251, another oath imposition which imposes the recognition of the king, this is stated:

And you must desire life for My Majesty! [...] no one concoct evil [...] the king takes, and [...] anoints for the kingship, you and thereafter your sons and] your grandsons must recognize him! And whoever learns of anyone at all who concocts evil against him, he must seize him and denounce him! Whoever hides him, though, let these oath deities grab him, and let them destroy him along with his wife and his sons!

Telepinu prohibited the expanse of chastisement to the family of the guilty prince. CTH 251 which at least to some extent is addressed to the princes, however, contradicts this. Collective punishments can be found in other Hittite instructions as well.

---

420 Starke, Frank. (1995). Zur urkundlichen Charakterisierung neuassyrischer Treueide anhand einschlägiger hethitischer Texte des 13. Jh. ZABR, 1, pp. 72–73, 81 has proposed that loyalty oaths were only composed by irregular rulers with dubious legitimacy, starting from Hattušili III. This is opposed by Giorgieri, 2005: 329–338; Koch, Christoph. (2008). Vertrag, Treueid und Bund: Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im alten Testament. de Gruyter, pp. 35–37, who proves the existence of loyalty oaths well before Hattušili III.

421 For example, CTH 255.1 §3, 4, 5, 6, etc.; 255.2 §10, 22, etc.; KUB XXXVI 112 and KUB XXXVI 113 (both CTH 271).

422 CTH 251 §13; translated in Miller, 2013: 169–180.

423 Edict §31–32.

424 Miller, 2013: 169.

### 3.2.3 Oaths

CTH 124 (Scribe’s loyalty oath to Šuppiluliuma II)

This is a part of a loyalty oath of a scribe to the king Šuppiluliuma II: “I will acknowledge only the descendants of my lord Šuppiluliuma. I will not appear on the side of another man, (whether) a descendant of Šuppiluliuma the Older (i.e. Šuppiluliuma I), a descendant of Muršili (II), a descendant of Muwatalli (II) or of Tudhaliya (IV).” Again, concern about the rivalling branches of the royal family is evident. Šuppiluliuma II succeeded to the throne after his brother Arnuwanda III, who died without male children – which makes his enthronement an abnormal succession. This evidently caused disapproval by other branches of the dynasty and the need to stress the acceptance of his lordship over others in the loyalty oath.

### 3.2.4 Treaties

Numerous Hittite treaties contained segments concerning succession. Usually, the parties agreed to acknowledge the successors chosen by the other as the next king. A glaring example:

And when you take a wife and produce a son, he shall later be king in the land of Amurru. And as you protect My Majesty, I will likewise protect your son. You, Tuppi-Tešub, in the future protect the King of Hatti, the land of Hatti, my sons, and my grandsons.

Sometimes the question was more elaborated and from which cases, it is possible to attain information about Hittite royal succession after Telepinu, and if his principles were followed. In some treaties, only the vassal’s succession is discussed. Although it is hard to state with full confidence that the succession principles of the vassals displayed in treaties paralleled these of Hittite kings, these treaties do reflect the attitude of the Great Kings toward the practices of their subordinates. The Hittite kings were, in certain questions assertive with their partners and

---

428 CTH 62 §5.
forced policies on them, when it came to taboos for example.\(^{429}\) So this could apply to succession concepts as well.

- **CTH 41.I (Tudhaliya I/II of Hatti and Sunaššura of Kizzuwatna)**

Here the clause concerning succession is quite straightforward: “Sunaššura must protect for kingship whichever son of His Majesty he designates to Sunaššura as his successor.”\(^ {430}\) Sons were to inherit the throne, although the sons-in-law, if being adopted, would possibly also fit this category. We know that Tudhaliya I/II was succeeded by his son-in-law Arnuwanda I\(^ {431}\) who was even appointed co-regent.\(^ {432}\) The choice of the words in the treaty certainly fitted Tudhaliya’s situation, allowing the possibility to choose the heir from among different candidates is evident from this.

- **CTH 42 (Šuppiluliuma I of Hatti and Huqqana of Hayasa)**

This treaty repeats the ideas of CTH 41.I: “And recognize my son whom I, My Majesty, designate: ‘Everyone shall recognize this one’, and thus distinguish among (his brothers(?))”\(^ {433}\) Šuppiluliuma had at least five sons, all of whom held important offices and therefore plenty of political power. Thus, the choosing of the heir was necessary from an early date and Šuppiluliuma accomplished this.\(^ {434}\)

- **CTH 51 (Šuppiluliuma I of Hatti and Šattiwaza of Mittanni)**

Here Šuppiluliuma I forced his Mittanni partner to make the former’s daughter whom he gave in marriage to Šattiwaza the queen and not to allow her to be degraded to a second rank:

Concubines will be allowed for you, Šattiwaza, but no other woman shall be greater than my daughter. You shall allow no other woman to be her equal, and no one shall sit as an equal beside her. You shall not degrade my daughter to second rank. In the land of Mittanni she shall exercise queenship. The sons of Šattiwaza and the sons of my daughter – their


\(^{430}\) CTH 41.I §12.

\(^{431}\) Beal, 1983: 115–119

\(^{432}\) They both have the title LUGAL.GAL in KUB XXIII 21 II 12, 14, 27, III 20 (CTH 143); see Houwink ten Cate, Philo H J. (1970). The Records of the Early Hittite Empire. Leiden. nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, p. 58.

\(^{433}\) CTH 42 §2; translated in Beckman, 1996: 23–29.

sons and grandsons – shall in the future be equals in the land of Mittanni. […] and the sons of Prince Šattiwaza – his sons and grandsons […] – shall be brothers and equals to my grandsons.435

The passage suggests that the sons and grandsons of Šattiwaza who are to be equal to Šuppiluliuma’s progeny are the ones born from Šattiwaza’s queen (and Šuppiluliuma’s daughter). Šattiwaza’s second rank sons would not be then be equal to Šuppiluliuma’s sons. This demonstrates Šuppiluliuma’s unequal attitude towards the different rank sons.

- CTH 68 (Muršili II of Hatti and Kupanta-Kurunta of Mira-Kuwaliya)

This treaty illustrates two important aspects related to Telepinu’s Edict. Firstly, adopted sons were legally suitable for being heirs.

Formerly, when I installed Mašuiluwa for lordship in the land of Mira, Mašuiluwa said to me as follows: “I have no son. The population grumbles against us: “Tomorrow will it be this way or that way?” Because I have no son, while Kupanta-Kurunta is the son of my brother, give him to me, my lord, as son. Let him be my son. And in the future let him be lord in the land.” I gave you, Kupanta-Kurunta, to Mašuiluwa as son.436

Although in this case, an adoptive son where to inherit the throne of a vassal state – Mira-Kuwaliya, situated in western Anatolia,437 and a nephew was the one to be adopted, not a son-in-law, Muršili II nonetheless sanctions this succession.

The second point is something that heavily contradicts the ideas of Telepinu.

Are you, Kupanta-Kurunta, not aware that if in Hatti someone commits the offense of revolt, the son of whatever father commits the offense is an offender too? And that they take the house of his father away from him, and either give it to someone else or take it for the palace?438

Telepinu had stated that no harm should fall to the offender’s families. Muršili II, however, expresses the opposite view. The passages by Telepinu concerning collective punishment only

435 CTH 51.I §7; translated in Beckman, 1996: 38–44.
437 Bryce, 2009: 476.
438 CTH 68 §7.
pertain to the king’s brothers and sisters and royal princes, whereas here no specification is given. Penalties did in some cases in the Hittite laws expand to the family of the offender, and this is also clear from some royal instruction and oath impositions. But why would Muršili threaten Kupanta-Kurunta with this if it would not apply to the latter who was a prince after all? Thus, the Telepinu’s ban on collective punishment might not have been followed in the later history. However, Muršili does not follow his threat and leaves Kupanta-Kurunta’s status and positions untouched. To play the devil’s advocate, one could also argue that this was only a way for Muršili to intimidate his inferior partner by demonstrating his authority, exertion of which he only refrained from because of his magnanimity, and in the reality this collective punishment might not have been practised by the Hittites.

- **CTH 76 (Muwatalli II of Hatti and Alaksandu Hittite of Wilusa)**

Compared to CTH 51, this treaty takes a different, more indulgent stance:

In regard to the son of yours whom you designate for kingship – whether he is by your wife or by your concubine, and even if he is still a child – if the population of the land refuses him and says as follows: “He is the progeny […]” – I, My Majesty, will not agree.

Muwatalli is more lenient in the matter, accepting not only first rank sons but lower rank sons as well for the kingship, unlike Muršili II had done in CTH 68. However understandably, differently from Šuppiluliuma I, Muwatalli did not have his own daughter involved, whose position he would need to worry about.

- **CTH 91 (Hattušili III of Hatti and Ramses II of Egypt)**

Succession guarantees were a theme in international diplomacy as well:

And the son of Hattušili, King of Hatti, shall be made King of Hatti in place of Hattušili, his father, after the many years of Hattušili, King of Hatti. And if the people of Hatti commit

---

439 *Edict* §31–32: “So, if a prince sins, he shall pay with (his) own head, while they shall not commit evil against his house and his children. For the reason for which princes usually die (does) not (affect) their houses, their fields, their vineyards, their male (and) female servants, their oxen (and) their sheep.” Princes are here meant in a wider sense, see chapter 1.3.2.6.

440 Hittite laws §173: “If anyone rejects a judgement of the king, his house will become a heap of ruins.” This is more than a demolition of a house, probably the whole family was to be killed; see Hoffner, 1997: 138, 218; Haase, 2003: 651. For the assortment of curses in the Hittite Instructions, see Miller, 2013: 27–29

an offense against him, then Ramses, Beloved of Amon, must send infantry and chariots to take revenge on them.\textsuperscript{442}

This is a quite standard clause. What is noteworthy, is that it is unilateral. Only Ramses II was asked to recognize Hattušili’s progeny – there was no such demand on behalf of Ramses, not in Hittite (which was written in Akkadian) nor Egyptian version, which are otherwise very similar. The position of the latter was more secure and therefore he felt no need to include this clause, Hattušili III, however, was a usurper, and there were collateral royal branches of the family who could jeopardise his or his heir’s position.\textsuperscript{443} One of these possible threats was Urhi-Tešub, whom Hattušili had supplanted and who had escaped to Egypt. Urhi-Tešub had after his exile approached the Babylonians, possibly with the aim of setting the stage for his return to Hattuša and reclaiming the throne, but this was foiled by Hattušili III. Then the former king set his path to Egypt.\textsuperscript{444} Hittite king probably would not have had any sway concerning Egyptian dynastic succession whatsoever, but Egyptians could thwart Urhi-Tešub’s ambitions.\textsuperscript{445}

\textit{- CTH 92 (Hattušili III of Hatti and Bentešina of Amurru)}

Bentešina, the king of Amurru\textsuperscript{446} was a loyal vassal to Hattušili III and this relationship was strengthened by marriage alliances.

As long as Bentešina has not yet taken the princess (Gassuliyyawiya sexually) and has not yet gotten any sons, Bentešina may elevate (to crown prince) either a prince of the land of Amurru, or his brother, or his nephew, or any citizen of his land. The King of Hatti and the Hittites shall not be anxious concerning this matter.\textsuperscript{447}

In the absence of sons, appointing some other close relative to inherit the throne may have been practised by Tudhaliya IV. Before becoming the king, his older brother Nerikkaili hold the title


\textsuperscript{446} Situated between Orontes river and central Levantine coast; see Bryce, 2009: 41–42.

\textsuperscript{447} CTH 92 §8; translated in Beckman, 1996: 95–98.
of crown prince (tuhkanti), but he was replaced by Tudhaliya for some reason. However, at the beginning of Tudhaliya’s reign, Nerikkaili again appears with the title tuhkanti.\footnote{In KUB XXVI 50 28’ (CTH 225), a land donation by Tudhaliya IV: “Ne-ri-iq-qa-DINGIR\textsuperscript{140} DUMU.LUGAL\textsuperscript{140} tu-ḫu-kānti”; Imparati, 1995: 152. For the edition and translation of the text, see Imparati, Fiorella. (1974). Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV. Revue Hittite et Asianique, 32, pp. 35–39.} From the last sentence of the passage one could assume that the push for this kind of backup heir probably came from Bentešina. The king of Amurru already had children with a previous wife because a daughter was given to Nerikkaili in marriage, recorded in the same text (§5). As Bentešina was active already in the time of Muršili II,\footnote{Klengel, Horst. (1992). Syria, 3000 to 300 BC: a Handbook of Political History. Akademie Verlag, pp. 168–169.} and thus probably had already a queen and numerous descendants. So again, Hittite king forced his partner to make the progeny born of his daughter paramount in the succession. Second rank sons were therefore totally downgraded, and sons-in-law are not even considered.\footnote{Which is curious because would not it be simpler and time-effective for Bentešina to adopt one of Hattušili III’s sons as a son-in-law and make him the heir, in the vein of Telepinu’s third clause of the succession rule? Yes, Amurru might have difficulties to take over such a practice from the Hittite society, but as Bentešina was allowed to designate “any citizen of his land” as his heir, they must not have been very strict with their own succession rules. This could mean that Hittite kings did not necessarily want to make use of this son-in-law succession. However, Šuppiluliuma I had sent one of his sons to Egypt at the request of its widower queen to take up kingship there, but this ended very badly for the hittites; see Güterbock, 1956: 96–97.}

\begin{itemize}
\item CTH 106.II.2 (Hattušili III of Hatti and Ulmi-Tešub (alias Kurunta) of Tarhuntassa)  
\item CTH 106.I.1 (Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Kurunta of Tarhuntassa)  
\end{itemize}

These two treaties have numerous similarities with each other (and are therefore treated together), but reveal a quite different tone compared to the treaties discussed above, reflecting the principles of Telepinu to some extent. Firstly, Tudhaliya is very open-minded about the successors of Kurunta:

And in regard to the fact that it is stipulated on the treaty tablet of my father as follows: “Set in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa the son of the woman whom the Queen (of Hatti) will give you in marriage”\footnote{Meaning Kurunta was to be succeeded by a son he had with the first rank daughter of Hattušili III.} – at the time when they made the treaty tablet in the reign of my father, Kurunta had not yet even taken this woman for himself. If Kurunta now takes this woman for himself, or if he does not take her for himself this matter will not be taken up further. Whichever son Kurunta approves, whether he is the son of this woman or of some other woman, whichever son Kurunta has in mind, and whichever...
son he approves, he shall install in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa. No one shall determine this matter for Kurunta.\textsuperscript{452}

This is a complete about-turn compared to CTH 51 and CTH 91. Usually, vassals made these kinds of concessions to the Hittite kings and not the other way around.

Sons from the female line are also involved in the inheritance:

Someone of the male line shall take them; those of the female line shall not take them. … But if there is no male line of descent, and it is extinguished, then only someone of the female line of Ulmi-Tešub shall be sought out. Even if he is in a foreign land, he shall be brought back from there and installed in authority in the land of Tarhuntassa.\textsuperscript{453}

According to the principle stated by Telepinu, sons-in-law would step up instead of a son of a daughter for the position. Tudhaliya allows to some extent the female line to be part in the succession. He, however, does not consider the husband of the king’s daughter for the kingship, but their male children, skipping a generation. It is closer to Telepinu’s requirements, but not fully.

In the future occurrence of offences by Kurunta’s princes, a death sentence could be imposed, but no sanctions would have been extended to his family, which has to preserve its domain and status:

If he is deserving of death, he shall perish, but his household and land shall not be taken from him and given to the progeny of another. Only someone of the progeny of Ulmi-Tešub shall take them.\textsuperscript{454}

If he is deserving of death, he shall perish his household and land shall not be taken from him, and he (the King of Hatti) shall not give them to another descendant (of the Hittite royal family).\textsuperscript{455}

This is indeed consistent with §31–32 of Telepinu’s \textit{Edict}, but as seen above, somewhat at odds with other texts discussed above. However, this does not automatically mean that these concepts stemmed directly from the principles Telepinu had once laid down. These points, certainly pursued and negotiated by Kurunta, could have been included in the treaties because Kurunta

\textsuperscript{452} CTH 106.I.1 §19.  
\textsuperscript{453} CTH 106.II.2 §1. This passage is almost word for word, reproduced in CTH 106.I.1 §20.  
\textsuperscript{454} CTH 106.II.2 §1.  
\textsuperscript{455} CTH 106.I.1 §20.
was probably afraid of losing his position which he had gained only recently from Hattušili III.\textsuperscript{456} And of course, Hattušili and Tudhaliya IV would also benefit from this – they sent Kurunta away from Hattuša, who, being the son of Muwatalli II and from a rightful but supplanted line, had the most substantial claim to the title of Great King.\textsuperscript{457} This could have been an appeasement policy, which is also suggested by the rather mild obligations put on Kurunta by Hattušili III.\textsuperscript{458}

- \textit{CTH 105 (Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru)}

Tudhaliya IV takes a noticeably harder line with Šaušgamuwa, son of Bentešina, compared to Kurunta.

Protect My Majesty as overlord. And later protect the sons, grandsons, and progeny of My Majesty as overlords. You shall not desire some other overlord for yourself. This matter shall be placed under oath for you. You shall not desire anyone as overlord from among those who are legitimate brothers of My Majesty, sons of the concubines of the father of My Majesty, or even other royal progeny who are to be regarded by you as bastards.\textsuperscript{459}

Tudhaliya IV returns to the standard formulas of royal speech, stressing that his sons must be the sole candidates for inheriting the Hittite throne and downgrading his own brothers.

- \textit{CTH 122.1 (Šuppiluliuma II of Hatti and Talmi-Tešub of Carchemish)}

This is a reciprocal treaty between Šuppiluliuma II and a viceroy\textsuperscript{460} of Carchemish, most likely a man named Talmi-Tešub.\textsuperscript{461}

\textsuperscript{456}Apology §12b.
\textsuperscript{457}Tudhaliya IV even warns Kurunta not to yearn for the title of the Great King in CTH 106.I.1 §25: “… if you even desire the kingship of Hatti for yourself, or if someone brings difficulties upon My Majesty or upon the progeny of My Majesty concerning the kingship of Hatti, and you show him favour and do not combat him, then these oath gods shall eradicate you together with your progeny.”
\textsuperscript{458}CTH 106.II.2 §6: “But if some king of equal rank rises up against My Majesty (Hattušili III), then the king of the land of Tarhuntassa (Kurunta) himself shall come to his assistance, but absolutely no infantry or chariotry shall be sought from him.”
\textsuperscript{459}CTH 105 §7.
\textsuperscript{460}On Hittite viceroyalties, see Burney, 2004: 306.
The people of Hatti […] against him (i.e. Arnuwanda), and myself I did not sin (too). If he had an offspring, if I had not excluded this, I would have protected his offspring! But he had no offspring. I asked about a pregnant woman, and there was no pregnant woman. If Arnuwanda had an offspring, I would have sinned! I would have excluded the offspring of my Lord! I would have made Lord someone else […]. Furthermore, Tudhaliya (IV) had another son of young(er) age. Since he was the only one, I put Hattuša, (her) women and her men in his hands.462

Talmi-Tešub presents himself as a king-maker, who installed Šuppiluliuma II to kingship. It shows that there was no policy on how to act if the king had no children at all, male or female. Such an extreme case was left untouched in Telepinu’s Edict, nor had it (to our knowledge) a precedent from the past. Talmi-Tešub, who was a descendant of Šuppiluliuma I,463 rose to the occasion. It is curious that a viceroy was the one to do this. This shows again the inferiority of king’s brothers in the line of succession.

3.2.5 Succession principles in the written sources

The sources discussed here draw on the following principles:

- **Designation** – the king was allowed to appoint whichever son he considered fit for the kingship. But we cannot tell if the king could, for example, opt for any lower rank sons or son-in-law, despite having a first rank son.
- **Sons and grandsons** – almost exclusively seen as rightful heirs. Sometimes their birth from a queen is emphasised, which testifies the priority of the first rank sons. They are the heirs by default. This was probably so already before the time of Telepinu.
- **Second rank sons** – heavily downplayed, yet they may have had ambitions, as they are seen as a threat by some. But in some exceptional cases they were eligible to inheritance.
- **Brothers** – were excluded, but evidently troublesome, as kings repeatedly underline that their brothers, full or half, were not to succeed them.
- **Cousins** – were also troublesome. Especially in the later history of Hittite kingdom, the number of collateral royal branches had increased, and kings felt threatened by them as the issue about which line should prevail arose.

• Sons-in-law – are almost never mention. It could be that, as antiyants were also adopted, they were considered as part of the “son” category (Arnuwanda I and Šuppiluliuma were referred to as such) and not distinguished otherwise. The treaties with Kurunta, which are most liberal (concerning succession) of the bunch, mentions a female line, but in these the progeny of the king’s daughter is the heir and not her husband.

• Punishments – are described very vaguely. For “evil deeds” one could be put to death or under an oath. The purposes of these texts are not to state the punishments, rather these passages were to point out the actions that brought upon the retribution – these are code of conducts and treaties, not law codes. Also, such threats against offenders should be expected with or without the existence of Telepinu's Edict. Curse formulae were common in all kinds of Hittite writings and the introduction of the death sentence can hardly be credited to Telepinu. According to the written sources, the assembly has no obvious part disciplining the evil-doers and resolving the succession issues.

• Collective punishments – are shown to be present in the sources rather than being absent and reprehensible. The glaring anomaly is the case in the treaties with Kurunta, where, in the vein of Telepinu, actions against the offender’s property and status of his family are forbidden. The concession to Kurunta in this matter could, however, indicate the opposite reality – these points were emphasised in the treaty precisely because they were not practised in real life and the expanse of punishments to the offenders’ families and properties was a standard. Afraid for his family, Kurunta may have pressed this issue. If collective punishment was prohibited, would Kurunta have stressed this?

• The more insecure the position, the more extensively the succession was regulated – Tudhaliya I/II, Šuppiluliuma I, Hattušili III, Tudhaliya IV, Šuppiluliuma II, whom we know had problems with their legitimacy, implemented additional measures and pressed for the acknowledgement of their status.

It is important to point out that the texts chosen for analysis are only a selection, but they could represent the reality quite reliable, since instructions and treaties were not as susceptible to propaganda than, for example, historiography.

Some norms of succession are visible, as the son of the king was the default heir, but they cannot, with full confidence, be traced back to Telepinu’s Edict. The other ideas proclaimed by the Edict are very weakly attested in the selection of sources.
CONCLUSIONS

For the historians, the Edict of Telepinu offers a significant insight into the institution of Hittite kingship, and is one of the most prominent literary composition from their history. Whether the Hittites themselves felt this way about the text, and what motivated Telepinu to write this edict, are the subjects of this study.

The internal politics of the Hittite kingdom were, from its very birth, in a constant flux. Numerous assassinations and struggle for power were characteristic of the Old kingdom period (17th – 14th century). Although no clear pattern for succession seem to have been followed by the Old kingdom kings, the patrilineal principles can be seen in the background. Telepinu could have been affected by this violent past, but a much greater impulse for the change must have come from his contemporary period. There could have been at least two decisive instances that motivated Telepinu to draw up his Edict. Firstly, the conflict with his reigning brother-in-law Huzziya I who had acquired the title of Great King by violent means and had then attempted to kill Telepinu and his wife. Clearing his path to the throne, Telepinu exiled his opponent and started to secure his own position. He could have been a usurper, and was probably considered to be that by his contemporaries. Being connected to the dynasty probably only by marriage, he wanted to strengthen the position of sons-in-law as the eligible heirs to the throne. Furthermore, he tried to set contingencies for future, against those who sought to take revenge. For this, Telepinu employed the royal propaganda machine and issued the Edict, but he might also have had a hand in the final elimination of his political opponents. The second crucial moment was the loss of his son and successor. Wishing to see the continuance of his lineage, Telepinu took necessary steps to secure the position of his son-in-law as his heir to the throne.

The Edict itself is a text viewed very differently by the hittitologists. Some see it as a constitution and the fundamental text of Hittite state, others as a mere propagandistic self-justification. The Edict proposed a succession rule – the throne should be inherited only by a son of the king and the queen or a son of the king and a concubine. In the absence of those, a husband of the king’s and the queen’s daughter should be enthroned. This order of succession was in accordance with Telepinu’s own situation – he was probably a son-in-law of an earlier king and he himself was succeeded by a son-in-law. As seen from the later history, this rule was not sufficient for granting stabile succession. There were occurrences where none of these clauses could be applied. And the rule itself would not guarantee a stable succession. Aspiring conspirators could still come to power once having removed the persons with higher priority.
But the research shows that the countermeasures stated in the *Edict* to prevent any actions against the person of the king and his family are very vague in the terms of explicit ramifications – at least the language of the text relating to this matter would be very hard to follow. Threats of death are stated several times, but the actions – the evil deeds – that will result in the capital punishment are not stated clearly. The much-debated role of the assembly (*panku*) could have been to further investigate and arbitrate between the contesters, but the assembly was probably a too ambiguous institution, composed of sundry officials and lower-rank dignitaries to function as a judicial body. Telepinu’s remark concerning the assembly could be more a call for self-discipline. Thus, this part seems to be a tirade of exhortations than a clear code of conduct.

The final part of the *Edict* consists of various reforms, possibly added to the document with the purpose of advancing the state administration and thus reinforce the Telepinu’s position. The introductory historiographical narrative can be viewed as a relatively reliable source for some aspects, but great caution is required in its interpretation. It was, first and foremost, a tool for the author of the *Edict* to communicate the necessity of such a document and for legitimising Telepinu’s rise to power. The *Edict* seems, therefore, to have been composed to suit Telepinu’s own needs, rather than strengthen the prospects of a stable institution of the kingship in the future.

The struggle for the succession rights continued after the reign of Telepinu. Although the father-son succession was the standard for the kings after the *Edict*, there were many deviations from this throughout the history. Sometimes rulers bequeathed their title to someone other than a first rank son. Second rank sons and sons-in-law as heirs were also part of the practice – as permitted also by the *Edict*. We know of several instances where the throne was usurped. These unlawful usurpations seem to have been much larger in scale, reaching even to the levels of civil war, compared to smaller scale usurpations of the Old kingdom when the throne was usurped through assassinations of certain people. The recorded conspiracies against the reigning king and his family, but also the plots within the family itself, show continuous problems concerning the succession. The later Hittite writings demonstrate a similar partial departure from some principles of the *Edict*. Again, sons were the primary candidates for the throne, which is in accordance with Telepinu’s ideas. Also, sons-in-law were sometimes included. But the numerous digressions which are also recorded in these texts do not allow to see their categorical compliance with the statements of the *Edict*. Some of these principles, however, reflected in the post-*Edict* sources, present a very natural practice and would probably be expected with or without the *Edict*, for example, that those not eligible to the throne should not conspire and try
to usurp the throne. The fact that the kings whose position might not have been secure and whose reign were burdened with conspiracies were prompted to take extra steps for legitimising and strengthening their position indicates some instability of the kingship.

In the light of the present study, it seems that the effect of Telepinu’s proclamation and its implications on the Hittite kingship was modest or minimal rather than significant. Firstly, it probably did not introduce any ground-breaking reforms – the principles of the succession law were practised already in the past. This research also shows that the Edict’s precepts for insuring the security of the king and his heirs, do not carry any judicial power and are more like a collection of exhortations. The pursuance of the Edict’s principles after Telepinu’s reign has been overlooked by past researchers. From the sequence of the kings and also the written texts of those rulers presented in the third chapter do not express a steadfast compliance with Telepinu’s principles. Each king after him acted on the basis of his own contemporary situation and needs, not so much under the influence of the Edict. However, they probably still were aware of the Edict, as numerous copies of the text were made in the New kingdom. If the Edict had some effect, it clearly was not enough for achieving its ostensible purpose. Conspiracies against the throne still happened and the later kings attempted to safeguard their position with additional measures. Telepinu could have written the Edict primarily to push his own agenda.
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RESÜMEE: Telepinu edikt ja Hetiidi riigi troonipärilus

Magistritöö eesmärk on lahata hetiidi kuningas Telepinu (u 1525-1500 eKr) välja antud edikti ajendeid, selle dokumenti sisu ja mõju hetiitide hilisemas ajaloos.

Stabiilne võimu edasikandumine on kahtlemata monarhia üks alustalasid. See paneb aluse tugevale kuningavöönilule, mis omakorda mõjutab riigi võimsust. Selles osas oli hetiitidel aga probleeme, kuna võimuvahetus oli tihtipeale korrapäratu – selleks kasutati sageli vägivalda ja vandenõusid. Kuningas Telepinu soovis oma ediktiga tuua muutust. Ta fikseeris, kellel oli üleüldse õigus troon pärida ning viis sisse karistusi ja käitumisjuhiseid nende suhtes, kes neid päritusnorme rikuvad.


Vastuseid otsitakse kolmele põhilisele küsimusele:
- Milline oli Telepinu aegne ja temale eelnev poliitiline olukord ja mis ajendas kuningat taolist edikti koostama? Edikti loomise konteksti avades mõistame paremini selle sisu ja eesmärke ja miks see oli kirjutatud just sel viisil.
- Milline oli Telepinu koostatud edikti sisu, toon ja eesmärgid. Edikti struktuur ja rõhuasetused viitavad selle taotlustele.
- Kas Telepinu edikti printsiipe järgiti järgnevalt kuningate pool? Analüüsides pärast Telepinu valitsenud kuningate pärluspraktikaid on näha kas ediktil oli fundamentaalne roll hilisema kuningavööimu juures või piirdus selle dokumendi mõju vahetult ainult Telepinu enda kaasajaga.

Baseerudes nii hetiitide kirjutatud allikatel kui tänapäeva ajaloolaste teooriatel ja hüpoteesidel, üritab käesolev magistritöö leida üheks kõige silmapaistvamaks peetava allika kohta hetiidi riigi ja selle kuningavööimu ajaloos.


Seega on selge et nii Telepinule eelneval kui ka tema aegsel perioodidel oli troonipärilusega probleeme. Murekohtadeks olid just usurpeerimised ja sellega kaasnev vägivald.


Peatükist on selgesti nähtav, et tülid päriluse ja trooniõiguse üle jäid kestma. Ediktis esindatud printsiipidel oli küll mõningaist kandepinda, kuid nagu selgub magistritöö teisest peatükist – edikt ei toonud tõenäoliselt endaga kaasa midagi uut vaid ainult kinnitas kirjalikult varasemaid praktikaid – võisid need tuleneda pikaajalistest tavadest, mitte Telepinu ediktist endast. Paljud arusaamad kuningavõimu päriluse osas, näiteks keeld usurpeerida vägivaldsel teel teel troon on aga iseenesest mõistetavad ning oleks eksisteerinud ka ilma ediktita.


Siiski on kindlamate järelduse tegemiseks vajalik edasine kuningate vaheliste sugulussidemete uurimine, sest selles on siian palju lünk, mis takistavad kõikehõlmava troonijärglust möistmist ja suuremate mustrite nägemist. Loodetavasti pole savitahvlid vastava informatsiooniga hävinenud vaid ootavad alles leidmist.
APPENDIX: The Edict of Telepinu


§1 (I:1’–4’) [Thus] the Tabarna, Telepinu, Great King: [Formerly, Labarna was Great King and his [son]s, [brother]s, as well as his in-laws, his (further) family members and his troops were united.

§2 (I:5’–6’) The land was small but wherever he went on campaign, he held the enemy country subdued by (his) might.

§3 (I:7’–9’) He destroyed the lands, one after another, stripped(?) the lands of their power and made them the borders of the sea. When he came back from campaign, however, each (of) his sons went somewhere to a country:

§4 (I:10’–12’) The cities of Hupišna, Tuwanuwa, Nenašša, Landa, Zallara, Paršuhanta (and) Lušna, the(se) countries they each governed and the great cities made progress.

§5 (I:13’–16’) Afterwards Hattušili was King and his sons, too, his brothers, his in-laws as well as his (further) family members and his troops were united. Wherever he went on campaign, however, he, too, held the enemy country subdued by (his) might.

§6 (I:17’–20’) He destroyed the lands one after the other, stripped(?) the lands of their power and made them the borders of the sea. When he came back from campaign, however, each (of) his sons went somewhere to a country, and in his hand the great cities made progress.

§7 (I:21’–23’) When later on, however, the princes’ servants became corrupt, they took to devouring their properties. they took to conspiring continually against their lords and they began to shed their blood.

§8 (I:24’–27’) When Muršili was King in Hattuša, his sons, too, his brothers, his in-laws, his (further) family members and his troops were united. The enemy country be held subdued by (his) might, he stripped(?) the lands of their power and made them the borders of the s[e]a.

§9 (I:28’–34’) He went to the city of Halpa, destroyed Halpa and brought Halpa’s deportees (and) its goods to Hattuša. Now, later he went to Babylon, he destroyed Babylon and fought the Hurrian [troops]. Babylon’s deportees (and) its goods he kept in Hat[tuša].

§10 And Hant[i]li was cupbearer and he had Muršili’s sister Harapši[i]li for his wife.
§11 Zidanta, [the …, had …] …, the daughter of Hantili, for a wife, and he stole up to Hantili and they [committ]ed an evil deed[d]: they killed Muršili and shed (his) blood.

§12 (I:35’–38’) Hantili got afraid (saying): “Will I be protected? The gods prote[cted] him. […] … wherever (he) went, the population [… …] … the cities of Aš[t]a, [Šukz]iya, Hurpana, Carchemi[sh …] … [troops] they began to [giv]e and troo[ps …].”

§13 (I:39’–42’) And [when H]antili reac[hed] the City of Tegarama he began to say: “What (is) [t]his (that) I have done? [Why] did I listen to [the words of] Zidan[ta, m]y(?) [son-in-law]?” [As soon as] he (however) [reig]ned [as King], the gods sough[t] (revenge for) the blood [of Muršili].

§14 (I:43’–46’) […] the H]urrian [troops, chased (like) foxes in the b[ushes,] they [c]alled. [When the Hurrian enemy(?)] came [t]o Hatti-L[and, he [… -]ed [and … ] in(?)] [the l]and he roamed(?). […] … they called and the[m … ].

§15 (I:47’–52’) (almost completed lost).

§16 (I:53’–57’) […] nd the Queen of the city of [Šukz]iya [The Que]en was dy[ing]. […] Ilal]iuma secretly s[ot] out palace [attendant]s and […] -ed: “May the Queen of Šukziya die!”, so [they seized] her [and ki]lled (her) [together with her children].

§17 (I:58’–62’) When Hantili inquired into (the case of) the Queen of Šu[kziya and her children (saying:) “Who [has] ki[lled] them?”, the Chief of the palace attendants brought word. They rounded up h[er fam]ily and [drove] them to Tegara[ma]. They chased them in the bushes and [they] d[ied(?)].

§18 (I:63’–65’) And when Hantili [gre]w ol[d] and began to become a god, Zidanta killed Hantili's son, [Pišeni] together with his sons, [and] his [chie]f servants he killed.

§19 (I:66’–68’) And Zidanta bec[a]me King. The gods sought (revenge for) the blood of Pišeni, so the gods made him Ammuna, his begotten (son), his enemy and he killed his father Zidanta.

§20 (I:69’–71’) And Ammuna became King. The gods sought (revenge for) the blood of his father Zidanta and [they did] no[t make] him, the grain, wine, oxen (and) sheep [prosper(?)] in his hand [but it all …] in (his) hand.

§21 (II:1’–7’) Now, the land became his enemy: the cities of … agga, [Mat]jila, Galmiya, Adaniy[a], Arzaw[iya, Šallapa, Parduwa]ta and Ahhula. But wherever (his) troops went on campaign, they did not come back succesfully. When Ammuna, too, became god, Zuru, the
Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, in those same days secretly sent, of his own offspring, his son Tahurwaili, Man of the Gold Spear, and he killed Titti(ya)’s family together with his sons.

§22 (II:8’–12’) He sent Taruḫšu, a courier, as well and he killed Hantili together with [his] sons. Now, Huzziya became King and Telepinu had Ḫštípāriya, his sister of first rank, as his wife. When Huzziya wanted to kill them, the matter came to light and Telepinu chased them away.

§23 (II:13’–15’) Five (were) his br[ot]hers and he assigned houses to them (saying): “Let them go (and) live! Let them each eat (and) drink!” May nob[ody] do harm to them! And I declare: “They did evil to me, but I [will not do] evil to them.”

§24 (II:16’–19’) When I, Telepinu, had sat down on my father’s throne, I went on campaign to the city of Haššuwa and I destroyed Haššuwa. My troops were in the city of Zizzilippa as well and in Zizzilippa a battle ensued.

§25 (II:20’–25’) When I, the King, came to the city of Lawazantiya, Lahha was [hostile to me] and made Lawazantiya rebellious. The gods put him at my mercy. Of the Chiefs (there were) many: the Commander of Thousand, […] Karruwa, the Conunander of the Chamberlains, Inara, the Commander of the Cupbearers, Kill[a, the Commander of the …], Tarhumimma, the Commander of the Staffbearers, Zinwašeli and Lelli, and they secretly sent (a message) to Tanuwa, the Staffbearer.

§26 (II:26’–30’) I, [the Ki]ng, did not k[no]w [and he killed H]u[zzi]y[a] and his brothers as well. [W]hen I, lhe King, heard (of it), they brought Tanuwa, Tahrwaili [and] Taruḫš[u] and the Assembly sentenced them to death. And I, the King, said: “[Wh]y do they die? They will hide (their) eyes concerning them! I, the King, made them into tru[e] farmers: I have taken their weapons from the shoulder and have given them a yok[e(?)].”

§27 (II:31’–35’) The blood of the whole royal family spread: Ḫštípāri[y]a, the Queen, died, later it happened that Ammuna, the prince, died. The “Men of the Gods,” too, each said: “Behold, blood(shed) is widespread in Hattuša.” So I, Telepinu, summoned an assembly in Hattuša. From now on in Hattuša, let nobody do evil to a son of the family and draw a dagger on him.

§28 (II:36’–39’) King shall become a son (who is a) prince of first rank only. If there is no first rank prince, he who is a son of second rank shall become King. If there is no prince, (no) male, she who is a first rank princess, for her they shall take an in-marrying (son-in-law) and he shall become King.
§29 (II:40’–45’) Who will become king after me in future, let his brothers, his sons, his in-laws, his (further) family members and his troops be united! You will come (and) hold the country subdued with (your) might. And do not speak as follows: “I will clean (it) out,” for you will not clean anything. On the contrary, you will get involved yourself. Do not kill anybody of your family. It (is) not right.

§30 (II:46’–49’) Furthermore, whoever becomes King and seeks evil for (his) brother (or) sister, you too are his Council and tell him straight: “This (is) a matter of blood.” Look at the tablet (that says): “Formerly, bloodshed became excessive in Hattuša, and the gods took it out on the royal family.”

§31 (II:50’–58’) If anyone does evil amongst both (his) brothers and sisters and lays eyes on the king’s head, summon the assembly and, if [h]is testimony is dismissed, he shall pay with his head. They shall not kill secretly, however, like Zuru, Tanuwa, Tahurwaili and Taruhšu. They shall not commit evil against his house, his wife (and) his children. So, if a prince sins, he shall pay with (his) own head, while they shall not commit evil against his house and his children. For the reason for which princes usually die (does) not (affect) their houses, their fields, their vineyards, their male (and) female servants, their oxen (and) their sheep.

§32 (II:59’–65’) So now, if some prince sins, be shall pay with (his) own head while you shall not commit evil against his house and his son. Giving (away) even a princes’ blade of straw (or) a chip of wood is not right. Those who commit these evil deeds, the [Chiefs of Staff(?)], (that is,) the Major-Domos, the Chief of the Palace Attendants, the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard and the Chief of the Wine, [if?] they want to take a prince's houses and [say] thus: “I wish that city to be mine,” then he commits evil against the city lord.

§33 (II:66’–73’) But now, from this day onwards in Hattuša you, palace attendants, royal bodyguards, golden-chariot fighters, cupbearers, w[aite]rs, cooks, staff bearers, grooms, commanders of a [field] ba[tallion], remember this word. Let Tanuwa, Tahurwaili and Taruhšu be a warning to you! [I]f someone commits evil again, either the Major Domo, the Chief of the [palace] attendants or the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard or the Chief of commanders of a field battalion – whether a low(er) or higher ranking one – you too, Council, seize (him) and devour him with your teeth!

§34 (III:1’–3’) Now, in Hattuša they must take the Chiefs of Staff, (that is,) the Major-Domos, the Chief of the Palace Attendants, the Chief of the Wine, the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, the Chief of the Chariot Fighters, the Commander of the Bailiffs, the troop[s], those who are
great in the King's house, as well as further more their subordinates. Administrative and other reforms

§35 (III:4′–6′) Now, [in the territory of] Hat[us]a the fortified cities [must be] protected. Do not leave them! The fortified cities […] after, but divert it 10 (to) 20 times to the grain.

§36 (III:7′–16′) (hardly anything is preserved here; line 7 mentions T[e]lipinu, Great King)

§37 (III:17′–33′) (fragmentarily preserved; contains a list of at least 60 [+ x?] cities (and their) storehouses.)

§38 (III:34′–42′) (fragmentarily preserved; contains a list of 34 cities (and their) storehouses for (fodder) mix.)

§39 (III:43′–48′) I made the grain abundant again […] the fanners those very fields […] they must [s]eal. All those the population […] but(?) let] them [not(?)] commit fraud! Beyond (their) ration(?) they kept binding either one or two cubits(?), so they drank out the country's blood. But do not let them do (it) now! Whoever does it, may they give him an evil death!

§40 (III:49′–54′) (You) who in future will bec[om]e king after me, al[w]ays seal the gra[i]n with your name. Behold, the administrators of the seal house will leave you and speak to you thus: “[… there (is) n]ot(?). Do not seal it, however, for yourself(?), always [se]al [it … ”] And, behold, the[y will] lift you up …

§41–43 (III:55′–68′) [except for a few traces not preserved]

§44 (III:69′–75′) [Who from n]ow on [will become king after] m[e and … ] … [humili]lates and] says thus [to yo]u: “[… .]”Do not listen![… ] If you [have] harnesse[d] a deportee, you shall always compensate the equipment. The troops[…] and […] him to either your wife o[r … ”].

§45–47 (IV:1′–20′) (partly lost, partly too fragmentarily preserved to be translated)

§48 (IV:21′–26′) [Wh]en [lat]er on the karpinattis of mortals took to divid[ing] …, and [they were], oh so disr[espectful] and therefore they were struck by the god(s). But now, from no[w on, …] if he somehow calls on them, (his) living parents because of (his) share, and whatever he calls on them with (his) mouth to share, they must throw him out of the house, and he must forfeit his own
§49 (IV:27’–29’) And the procedure in case of bloodshed (is) as follows: whoever commits bloodshed, only (that) which the “lord of the blood” says (will happen): if he says “He shall die,” let him die, but if he says “He shall pay” let him pay. For the king (there will be) nothing, however.

§50 (IV:30’–34’) (The procedure in case) of witchcraft in Hattuša (is) as follows: You must clear all matters of (it). Whoever within the family knows witchcraft, you must seize him from the family and bring him to the palace gate. But [wh]oever does not bring him, for that man a bad end will come.

Colophon (IV:35’–36’) First tablet of Telepinu. Finished.
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