

“ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY OF IAȘI  
FACULTY OF HISTORY  
INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTRE FOR ARCHAEOHISTORICAL STUDIES

**STUDIA ANTIQUA**

**ET**

**ARCHAEOLOGICA**

**28/1, 2022**

EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA”  
IAȘI – 2022

EDITORIAL BOARD

Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba (**editor in chief**) (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Robin Brigand (French National Centre for Scientific Research, Besançon), Ashley Dumas (University of West Alabama), Alexander Falileyev (Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Sankt Petersburg), Svend Hansen (German Archaeological Institute, Berlin), Martin Hose (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich), Gheorghe Iacob (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Ion Niculiță (Moldova State University Chișinău), Attila Laszlo (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Ioan Carol Opriș (University of Bucharest), Daniele Vittorio Piacente (University of Bari), Alexandru-Florin Platon (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Adrian Poruciuc (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Alexander Rubel (Iași Institute of Archaeology), Ion Sandu (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Eugen Sava (National Museum of History of Moldova, Chișinău), Christoph Schafer (University of Trier), Wolfgang Schuller (University of Konstanz), Claire Smith (Flinders University, Adelaide), Acad. Victor Spinei (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Dan Gh. Teodor (Iași Institute of Archaeology), Nicolae Ursulescu (“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași), Mihail Vasilescu (“Al. I. Cuza” Univ. of Iași), Olivier Weller (Pantheon-Sorbonne University, Paris).

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Roxana-Gabriela Curcă (**chief secretary**), Marius Alexianu, Neculai Bolohan, Octavian Bounegru, Vasile Cotiugă, Iulian Moga, Iulia Dumitrache, Andrei Asăndulesei, Felix-Adrian Tencariu (**members**), Casian Gămănuț, Radu Alexandru Brunchi (**web editor**).

Postal address (materials sent for reviewing purposes and other correspondence):

*Universitatea “Al. I. Cuza”, Facultatea de Istorie, Bulevardul Carol I, nr. 11, 700506 - Iași, Romania.*

Tel.: (+04) 0232 201 615; Fax.: +(4) 0232 201 201, +(4) 0232 201 156;

Website: saa.uaic.ro; Email: saa.uaic.ro@gmail.com, blucretiu@yahoo.com.

The responsibility for the content of the materials published falls entirely on the authors.

This volume uses the free open-source typeface *Gentium* by SIL International.



© 2022 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ISSN 1224-2284

ISSN-L 1224-2284

Power and Opposition in the Ancient Near Eastern and  
Mediterranean World

edited by Mait Kõiv and Vladimir Sazonov



# Table of Contents

## Power and Opposition in the Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean World

Mait KÕIV, Vladimir SAZONOV, Introduction .....	7
Walter SOMMERFELD, Sumerischer Widerstand gegen semitische Herrschaft. Migration, Machtkämpfe und Demographie im 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. ....	11
Giulia TUCCI, Religious Syncretism and Control Over the Territory: Pharaohs in Southern Levant During the Late Bronze Age .....	41
Andres NÕMMIK, Egyptian Control in the Southern Levant and the Late Bronze Age Crisis .....	55
Vladimir SHELESTIN, Old Hittite Opposition in the Religious Aspect .....	83
Vladimir SAZONOV, Mait KÕIV, Justification of the Usurpation of Power by Hittite Kings .....	93
Siim MÕTTUS, Some Observations About Succession Principles in the Hittite New Kingdom .....	109
Lynette G. MITCHELL, The Politics of Power: The Rise and Fall of the Deinomenid Dynasty in Fifth-century Sicily .	123
Luca MACALE, «Like an unseen god» (Ctesias F1b §21, 7 Lenfant): The Unapproachability of the Near Eastern Kings in Greek Sources as Tool of Power .....	143

Priit-Hendrik KALDMA, The Tyranny of the Peisistratidai in Athens: Expenses, Revenues and the Opposition to the Sole Rule .....	157
Mait KÕIV, Monarchy in the Iron Age Levant and Archaic Greece: the Rulers of Corinth in a Comparative Context .....	179
Eleni TZOVLA, Compliance and Endurance. The Athenian Power Building through the Melian Dialogue .....	233
Salvatore TUFANO, Show Trials and The Opposition to Pelopidas and Epameinondas .....	245

## Justification of the Usurpation of Power by Hittite Kings

Vladimir SAZONOV\*, Mait KÕIV\*

**Abstract.** *The article explores the ways how Hittite kings justified their usurpations of power, such usurpations happening almost constantly during the whole period of the Hittite kingdom, from the Old Hittite period until the fall of the empire. It focuses on three outstanding texts illuminating prominent cases in the Hittite history: the Proclamation of Telepinu which gives important information about several usurpations during the late 17<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century BC, the First Plague Prayer of Muršili I which illuminates the reaction to the 14<sup>th</sup> century BC usurpation of Šuppiluliuma I, and the Apology of Ḫattušili III from the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC, which stands out as our best example of justification of a successful usurpation in the ancient Near Eastern region. These three cases reveal different strategies of justification accepted by the Hittite kings.*

**Rezumat.** *Acest articol explorează modul în care regii hitiți și-au justificat uzurpările, ele fiind prezente aproape constant pe parcursul întregii istorii a regatului, de la începuturi și până la căderea sa definitivă. Studiul este centrat pe trei surse scrise de mare importanță datorită cărora sunt clarificate cazuri bine cunoscute din istoria hitiților: proclamația lui Telepinu, ce oferă informații prețioase cu privire la câteva uzurpări de la finalul secolului al XVII-lea și de pe parcursul celui de-al XVI-lea î.Hr., Prima Rugăciune pentru Îndepărtarea Ciumei a lui Muršili I, care ne oferă detalii în legătură cu reacția la uzurparea lui Šuppiluliuma I în secolul al XIV-lea î.Hr., respectiv Apologia lui Ḫattušili al III-lea din secolul al XIII-lea î.Hr., care reprezintă cel mai bun exemplu de justificare a unei uzurpări cunoscut în Orientul Apropiat antic. Aceste trei exemple aduc la cunoștință diferite strategii de justificare a uzurpării, cunoscute și acceptate de către regii hitiți.*

**Keywords:** Ancient Near East, Hittite kingdom, Telepinu, Šuppiluliuma I, Ḫattušili III.

### Introduction

Usurpations of power have been usual in most of the monarchies in world history, the ancient Near East and the Hittite empire being no exception.<sup>1</sup> The usurper could come from outside the ruling dynasty, even from outside the given state, in which case the seizure of power would equate to the foundation of a new dynasty or state. Sargon (2334–2279 BC)<sup>2</sup>,

---

\* University of Tartu, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Centre for Oriental studies, Associate Professor in Ancient Near Eastern studies, Estonian Military Academy, Research-Professor, vladimir.sazonov@ut.ee.

\* University of Tartu, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Institute of History and Archaeology, Associate Professor of General History, mait.koiv@ut.ee.

<sup>1</sup> RIEMSCHEIDER 1971, 79–102.

<sup>2</sup> All the following dates are BC.

founder of the Akkadian empire in Mesopotamia, and Cyrus the Great (558–530), founder of the Teispid-Achaemenid empire of the Persians, serve as perhaps the most famous examples of this.<sup>3</sup> Sargon indeed became a paradigmatic example for subsequent ancient Near Eastern kings early on, and the way he was believed to have achieved power therefore became exemplary. To quote Marilies Heinz: “As a rebel and usurper, Sargon came to power in a way that could be considered almost classic.”<sup>4</sup> The usurpations about which we have information from the Hittite kingdom, on the other hand, generally took place inside the ruling family, involving numerous cases of fratricide and patricide.

We cannot tell if the founders of the Hittite state, Anitta<sup>5</sup> the king of Kuššar(a) (18<sup>th</sup> century) and Ḫattušili I<sup>6</sup> (1650–1620) the real founder of the imperial state,<sup>7</sup> were usurpers or not. Anitta wrote in his own text<sup>8</sup> that he was “*Son of Pithana, King of Kuššar(a)*”,<sup>9</sup> which does not give any information about how he became king.<sup>10</sup> When Ḫattušili I, ruling ca 100 years later, mentioned in his annals<sup>11</sup> that he was “*the brother's son of Tawananna*”,<sup>12</sup> thus not stating his paternity, he may have been implying illegitimate descent, but we cannot prove this for certain. With the murder of Muršili I in 1590, successor of Ḫattušili I, after his successful campaign against Babylon in 1595 there began however a long period from which a series of usurpations is testified by sources. King Telepinu in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century apparently tried to halt this with his “Proclamation” but clearly failed, as shown by the following events, some of which will be touched upon in the present paper.

The seizure of power inevitably entails some illegitimacy and required justification. In most of the Hittite cases we have no evidence of how this was attempted or achieved. However three examples allow some insight into the strategies used by the Hittite kings. These are the “Proclamation of Telepinu” (late 16<sup>th</sup> century), a statement of a usurper presenting himself as the re-establisher of the good order,<sup>13</sup> the First Plague Prayer of Muršili II (1321–1295) where

<sup>3</sup> SAZONOV 2008, 195–214; BRISCH 2012, 120.

<sup>4</sup> HEINZ 2007, 69.

<sup>5</sup> STARKE 1979, 47–120; CARRUBA 2001; SAZONOV 2017, 179–182.

<sup>6</sup> MELCHERT 1978, 1–22; KEMPINSKI & KOŠAK 1982, 87–116.

<sup>7</sup> For Anitta see NEU 1974; BADALÌ 1987, 43–44; CARRUBA 2001; CARRUBA 2003; HOFFNER 2003, 182–184; WILHELMI 2016, 223–239; SAZONOV 2017, 179–182. For Ḫattušili I see MELCHERT 1978, 1–22.

<sup>8</sup> The Text of Anitta consists of different literary subcategories (e.g., HAAS 2006, 28; SAZONOV 2017a, 179–182). See also HOFFNER 198, 291–293.

<sup>9</sup> Compare with BECKMAN 2006a, 217, § 1 (A-1–4): “Anitta, son of Pithana, became king of (the city of) Kušsara. He behaved in a manner pleasing to the storm-god in heaven”.

<sup>10</sup> See more on SAZONOV 2017, 179–182.

<sup>11</sup> See more about Hittite annals SAZONOV 2019, 57–88.

<sup>12</sup> For more on Tawananna see BIN-NUN 1975, 105: “Ḫattušili’s introduction in the Annals as Tawananna’s brother’s son seems to declare the king a legitimate successor”. BECKMAN 2006b, 219: § 1; DEVECCHI 2005, 34 and 35.

<sup>13</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003B, 194–198; GOEDEGEBUURE 2006, 228–23.



the king had to justify the usurpation of his father Šuppiluliuma I (1344–1322),<sup>14</sup> and the “Apology of Ḫattušili III” (13<sup>th</sup> century), which appears as the most detailed and glorifying justification of usurpation known from the Hittite texts.<sup>15</sup>

### Telepinu: a merciful king restoring order in the state

The “Proclamation of Telepinu” (CTH 19),<sup>16</sup> issued by the late 16<sup>th</sup> century king with the ostensible intention to codify the rules of succession to the Hittite throne,<sup>17</sup> is one of the main sources for the history of the Old Kingdom. It gives important information about several usurpations during the period from the murder of Muršili I until the usurpation of power by Telepinu himself. The text starts with describing the glorious conquests of the early kings Labarna, Hattušili I and Muršili I, and contrasts these ‘good old days’ with the following disastrous period of internal violence. Muršili I was killed by his brother-in-law Ḫantili I and Ḫantili’s son-in-law Zidanta. When Ḫantili died Zidanta killed the sons of Ḫantili and usurped the throne. Zidanta was in turn murdered by his own son Ammuna<sup>18</sup> who was however not successful as king, and when he died his family members were killed by Ḫuzziya, a new usurper and probably an illegitimate son of Ammuna. Then Telepinu, possibly a son-in-law of Ammuna, managing to escape death dethroned Ḫuzziya and became king himself. Telepinu however did not kill Ḫuzziya, if we can believe his account.<sup>19</sup>

The whole 16<sup>th</sup> century, from Muršili I to Telepinu, thus appears as an era of usurpations. Telepinu, although himself a usurper, clearly condemned in his proclamation this way of achieving power, or at least the act of murdering the predecessor and his relatives in addition. Such murders were presented as resentful of the gods who therefore punished the usurpers. Ḫantili I, the first usurper, already came to regret what he had done, as stated in the proclamation:

§ 13 (I 39-42) *And [when H]antili reac[hed] the city of Tegarama he began to sa[y]: "What (is) [this (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 Mursili]."*<sup>20</sup>

The subsequent death of his son Pišeni at the hands of Zidanta might have been seen as the result of divine vengeance. However, the gods certainly avenged the crimes of Zidanta, making his son Ammuna his enemy:

---

<sup>14</sup> SINGER 2002, 61–64.

<sup>15</sup> SCHMID 1985.

<sup>16</sup> HOFFNER 1984; HAASE 2005, 56–61; VAN DEN HOUT 2003; KÜMMEL 2005, 464–469.

<sup>17</sup> COEDEGEBUURE 2006, 228–229.

<sup>18</sup> MLADJOV 2000, 21–24. See also more about Ammuna SHELESTIN 2014, 800–826.

<sup>19</sup> COEDEGEBUURE 2006, 230–231.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 230.

§18 (I 63–65) Now, when *Ḫantili* had become old and started to “become a god” (=to die)<sup>21</sup>, *Zidanta* killed [*Pišeni*], son of *Ḫantili*, together with his sons, and he also killed his first-ranked servants.

§19 (I 66–68) So now *Zidanta* had become king. But the gods started to seek the blood of *Pišeni*. The gods made *Ammuna*, his (i.e. *Zidanta*’s) son, his enemy, and he killed *Zidanta*, his father.<sup>22</sup>

The patricide of *Ammuna* again evoked the wrath of the gods. At first this caused misery for the Hittite land, followed by internal revolts and external disasters:<sup>23</sup>

§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.<sup>24</sup>

§21 (II:1–7) Now, the land became his enemy: the cities of ...*agga*, [*Matjila*, *Galmiya*, *Adaniyfa*], *Arzawiya*, *Sallapa*, *Parduwata* and *Ahhula*. But wherever (his) troops went on campaign, they did not come back successfully.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, after the death of the king there followed the massacre of his family by *Ḫuzziya*, apparently an illegitimate son of his. *Telepinu*, son-in-law of *Ammunas* and brother-in-law of *Ḫuzziya*, was also threatened but succeeded in saving his and his wife’s lives:

§21 (II:1–7) When *Ammuna*, too, became god, *Zuru*, the Chief of the Royal Bodyguard, in those same days secretly sent, of his own offspring, his son *Taḫurwaili*, Man of the Gold Spear, and he killed *Titti(ya)*’s family together with his sons.<sup>26</sup>

§22 (II:8–12) He sent *Taruḫšu*, a courier, as well and he killed *Ḫantili* together with [his] sons. Now, *Ḫuzziya* became King and *Telepinu* had *Ištapariya*, his sister of first rank, as his wife. When *Ḫuzziya* wanted to kill them, the matter came to light and *Telepinu* chased them away.<sup>27</sup>

*Telepinu* does not say how he came to power, stating briefly that he ‘chased away’ his killers, but it is obvious that he must have removed his predecessor *Ḫuzziya* from power and was therefore a usurper himself. He nevertheless presented his assumption of the kingship as a legitimate takeover of his “father’s” (actually probably father-in-law’s) throne: *When I, Telepinu, sat down on the throne of my father ...* (§24 II: 16–19).<sup>28</sup> Moreover, he clearly pointed out how he differed from his murderous predecessors whose crimes he presented as bringing a sort of curse upon the royal family:

<sup>21</sup> According to Hittite beliefs the king became a god after his death.

<sup>22</sup> COEDEGEBUURE 2006, 231.

<sup>23</sup> Compare with the case of *Šuppiluliuma* I who, according the *Muršili* II text, was also punished by the gods for the usurpation of power and killing *Arnuwanda* (VAN DEN HOUT 2006, 259–260).

<sup>24</sup> COEDEGEBUURE 2006, 231.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

§27 (II:31-35) *The blood of the whole royal family spread: Istarpari[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 Hattusa."*<sup>29</sup>

He himself pointedly diverged from the previous pattern, pardoning his alleged enemies inside the family:

§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."*<sup>30</sup>

He even wished to preserve the life of his murderous predecessor Ḫuzziya but when some dignitaries still killed him, allegedly without the knowledge and approval of the king, he decided to pardon the killers despite the death sentence passed by the council – *panku* –, and made them 'farmers' instead:

§26 (2:26-30) *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, the King, heard (of it), they brought Tanuwa, Tahurwaili [and] Taruhs[u] and the Council 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(?)]."*<sup>31</sup>

His mildness was apparently pleasing to the gods who gave him success, and he consequently issued a proclamation stating the rules of succession for the future, with the proclaimed intention that nobody should "do evil to a son of the family and draw a dagger on him" (§27 ii 31-35).<sup>32</sup>

This is the first preserved justification of usurpation in Hittite history. The predecessors of Telepinu surely also had to justify their acts but no information on this has survived. Telepinu however followed a twofold strategy. On the one hand, he concealed the fact of usurpation which obviously must have been common knowledge at the time, presenting himself instead as the rightful pretender to his "father's" throne. A similar argument could also have been used by his predecessors who all came from the narrow ruling circle and in most cases had blood or family relations with some previous ruler. They might, therefore, have presented themselves as the just avengers of previous killings inside the family, as a sort of agent of divine wrath. Telepinu, however, did not accept this particular strategy. He instead not only condemned the previous murders but also emphasised his own mercifulness, even if in reality he worked towards murdering his predecessor. The godless murderers of the previous generations were, in his

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 232.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 232

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 232.

presentation, replaced by a merciful king restoring peace in the land and establishing benevolent and sensible principles of good order for the future.<sup>33</sup>

### Šuppiluliuma I: the usurper evoking punishment by the gods of Ḫatti

Šuppiluliuma I, one of the greatest kings of the New Hittite period,<sup>34</sup> was a usurper.<sup>35</sup> He became a king violently, deposing his brother Tudḫaliya the Younger.<sup>36</sup> We do not know how Šuppiluliuma justified his usurpation, which could have been rather easy for him as the gods granted him success in his wars when he had assumed the kingship. He added new territories to the kingdom, conquering the lands of Mitanni and invading the Egyptian territories in Syria and the Levant. During the latter part of his reign, however, his kingdom was affected by a terrible disease which eventually caused the death of the king himself. The consequences of the plague had to be faced by his son and successor Muršili II.<sup>37</sup> Muršili II was sure that the gods had punished his father, and were punishing his brother Arnuwanda II (1322–1321 BC) and him, thus avenging Šuppiluliuma's killing of his brother and the violent seizure of power in Ḫattuša.

In his *First Plague Prayer* composed in order to placate the wrath of the gods Muršili described the punishment of the gods and their curse, which continued for several generations and affected the whole land. The reason for this divine wrath was quite clear to the king:<sup>38</sup>

§ 2. *O Gods, [my] lords, [i]n Hatti-Land a plague has risen: Hatti-Land is being oppressed by the plague and it is being severely punished. This is (already)the twentieth year! And since dying continues in [Hatti] - Land on a large scale, the affair of Tudhaliya the Younger, son of Tudhaliya, started to weight on [m]e and I conducted an oracle investigation through the god [and] the affair of the Tudhaliya the Younger was confirmed also by the god.*<sup>39</sup>

Muršili II thus had to accept that his father had committed a crime which had hard consequences. On the other hand, as Muršili was the legal descendant of Šuppiluliuma, his legitimacy depended on the legitimacy of the position of his father. He therefore had to apologize for his father's acts and find justification for his seizure of power. This involved an admittedly vague incrimination of his father's predecessor:

§ 2. *...Since for Hatti-Land Tudḫ[aliya] the Younger was their lord, [Ḫat]tusa's princes, commanders, chiefs-of-thousands, officers (and) [officials] as well as [troops] and chariots, everybody had sworn an oath to him. My father too [had] sworn an oath to him.*

<sup>33</sup> For the purpose and the ideological message of the proclamation see BECKMAN 2009, 242.

<sup>34</sup> See about New Kingdom, especially its early period, DE MARTINO 2010, 186–197.

<sup>35</sup> For Šuppiluliuma I see KEMPINSKI 1993, 81–91; STAVI 2011, 226–239; HAZENBOS 2006.

<sup>36</sup> HAZENBOS 2006, 235.

<sup>37</sup> HOUWINK TEN CATE 1995–1996, 51–72; NEMIROVSKI 2005.

<sup>38</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2006, 259–260.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 261.

§ 3. [But when m]y [father] punished Tudhaliya, Ḫattusa's [princes, commander]s, chiefs-of-thousands (and) officers, all of [them joine]d my father and the Oath [Deities seized] Tudhaliya [and they kil]led [Tudhaliya]!....<sup>40</sup>

The attitude expressed in this passage is obviously controversial. On the one hand Muršili accepts that Tudhaliya the Younger was a legitimate ruler and that all in Ḫatti, even his father Šuppiluliuma, had sworn loyalty to him. On the other hand, when Šuppiluliuma broke this oath he received wide support (among the people? the nobles?) and the Oath Deities were also on his side. Muršili does not state anything about the reason why the Oath Deities turned against Tudhaliya, simply implying that guilt must have been lying with the king. This, however, could not have been a true justification for his murderers who were consequently affected by divine wrath:

§ 4. ... Then the moment came that you, o Gods, after [the fact], sought revenge for that matter of Tudhaliya the Younger from my father: my father [died] because of the bloodshed of Tudhaliya, and the princes, commanders, chiefs-of-thousands (and) officials who joined [my father], th[ose too] died for [that] reason.<sup>41</sup>

As van den Hout has pointed out: “The gist of the passage is that Tudhaliya was killed by the Oath Deities, implying that he had broken a certain oath himself. This, however, did not justify the murder by Suppiluliuma and his fellow conspirators: not only did they break their oath to him, but killing one’s own relative is one of the severest taboos in Hittite society, which inevitably will lead to divine repercussions.”<sup>42</sup> Although the way how Šuppiluliuma himself had justified his usurpation is unknown, we can suppose that the incrimination of his predecessor Tudhaliya played an important part in this, and the involvement of the Oath Deities referred to by Muršili II were thus taken across from his father’s strategy. The subsequent history, however, had patently demonstrated the discontent of the gods and thereby the gravity of Šuppiluliuma’s crime. There was no way of ignoring this, which compelled Muršili to accept his father’s guilt. As in the case of the predecessors of Telepinu, an usurpation and the murder of the previous king were likely to displease the gods and evoke divine vengeance. No seizure of power could lead to a successful reign if the ruler could not earn the benevolence and support of the gods.

### **Ḫattušili III: the glorious and merciful favourite of the Goddess Ištar**

Divine support for the rising ruler is however strongly indicated in the *Apology of Ḫattušili III*<sup>43</sup> which stands out as our best example of justification of a successful usurpation.<sup>44</sup> Ḫattušili

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 261.

<sup>43</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 199–204. See about Hattušili III IMPARATI 1995.

<sup>44</sup> OTTEN 1981; ÜNAL 1974; IMPARATI 1995, 143–157.

(1267–1237) was, as he himself expressly admits, the youngest son of Muršili II<sup>45</sup> and had therefore very little right to the throne. He nevertheless succeeded in becoming the king, dethroning his predecessor Urḫitešub (Muršili III) (1272–1267), the son of his elder brother the king Muwattali II (1295–1272) who had inherited the reign from their father Muršili II. The apology presents an ideologically biased description of Ḫattušili's successful career.

Ḫattušili III admitted a complex strategy of justification. On the one hand he tried to discredit his predecessor Urḫitešub, emphasising that he was an illegitimate son of Muwattali II, and it was only thanks to Ḫattušili that he had become king:

§10b (3:31-54) *[When] my [bro]ther became [go]d - because I [co]mmanded [Ḫatt]uša and (because) he had [...] me in lordship, I di[d] not [do] anything (evil) out of regard for [the love] for [m]y br[other]. Therefore, sin[ce] my brother did not have a [legitimate son, I took up Urḫitešub, son of a concubine. [I put] him into lordship over [Ḫatti Land and laid all of [Ḫattuša] in (his) hand, ...*<sup>46</sup>

Ḫattušili thus gave the impression that Urḫitešub owed his position solely to him,<sup>47</sup> at the same time questioning the legitimacy of Urḫitešub's kingship, implicitly referring to the statement of the proclamation of Telepinu that *king shall become a son (who is) a prince of the first rank only*, which Urḫi-Tešub obviously was not. This was however a rather weak point since the proclamation made clear that *if there is no first rank prince, he who is a second rank son, he shall become king*.<sup>48</sup> This was now exactly the case, which means that the accession of Urḫitešub was legitimate according to the proclamation.

On the other hand, Ḫattušili III described Urḫitešub as an evil-doer, and himself as an unjust sufferer. As noted above, it was Ḫattušili who had installed Urḫitešub to power, but the latter tried to take away all the honours and possessions which Muwattali had given to Ḫattušili III for his service:

§10c (3:54-79) *However, when Urḫitešub thus saw the benevolence [of] the goddess towards me, he became envious of me, he [beg]an to harm me: he took away from me all those in my service, and (all) the desolate countries which I had resettled, those too he took away from me. He humiliated me, but at the behest of the goddess he did not take away Ḫakpis from me. Be[cau]se I was priest to the Stormgod of Nerik, he therefore did not take that (city) away from me (either). Out of regard for the love for my brother I did not react at all and during seven years I complied. He, however, sought my destruction at divine and human behest and he took away from me Ḫakpis and Nerik. Now I no longer complied and I became hostile to him.*<sup>49</sup>

<sup>45</sup> My father Muršili had four children: (three sons) Ḫalpašulupi, Muwatalli and Ḫattušili, and a daughter Maššanauzzi. Of all these I was the youngest child (HOFFNER 2006, 267).

<sup>46</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 202. See also about Urḫitešub HOUWINK TEN CATE 1994.

<sup>47</sup> HAWKINS 2001, 176.

<sup>48</sup> BECKMAN 2006, 232.

<sup>49</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 202–203.

Ḫattušili is indeed described here as thankful to Muwattali and observing his will, and extremely patient towards the unjust acts of Urḫitešub. Only when the latter had made his situation absolutely intolerable did he decide to resist. The whole guilt apparently lay on Urḫitešub, for which he was indeed eventually justly punished. Ḫattušili even considered it appropriate to mock Urḫi-Tešub, comparing him to a pig:

§11 (4:7-40) *When she<sup>50</sup> had left Urhitesub no other way whatsoever, she locked him up in Samuha like a pig in a sty.*<sup>51</sup>

Ḫattušili thus described Urḫi-Tešub as an unjust and ungrateful villain with dubious legitimacy to the throne, and therefore he wholly deserved to be removed from the kingship. Above all, however, Ḫattušili pointed out the constant support of the goddess Ištar.<sup>52</sup> The whole apology was presented as a glorification of the goddess, and a statement of the close relations between her and the king. This was made clear in the very Prooemium:

§2 (1:5-8) *Ištar's divine providence I will proclaim. Let man hear it! And may in future His Majesty's son, his grandson (and further) offspring of His Majesty be respectful among the gods towards Ištar!*<sup>53</sup>

The relationship between the goddess and Ḫattušili began when he was still a boy, and Ištar asked him to her service as the priest. This granted Ḫattušili the support of the goddess for the whole of his life:

§3 (1:9-21) *(Now), Ištar, my lady, sent Muwatalli, my brother to Muršili, my father, through a dream (saying): "For Ḫattušili the years (are) short few, he is not to live (long) but hand him over to me, and let him be my priest, and he will live." Hand him over to me, and let him be my priest, so he (will) live." My father took me up, (while still) a boy, and handed me (over) to the service of the goddess, and as a priest I brought offerings to the goddess. At the hand of Ištar, My Lady, I experienced prosperity, and Ištar, My Lady, took me by the hand and provided for me.*<sup>54</sup>

The support of the goddess is pervasively emphasised in the apology. Ištar never left Ḫattušili's side; she supported him in everything that he did and helped him to overcome all possible troubles. One example of the plentiful passages should suffice to demonstrate this:

<sup>50</sup> Ištar

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*: 199.

<sup>52</sup> The choice of Ištar as patron was not accidental by Ḫattušili III. – see more about it TARACHA (2013, 378) who argues „The choice of the ruler's divine patron(s), as seen already in the case of Hattusili's predecessors, was a political decision, rather than an act of personal piety, even if he did experience personal devotion to these deities." See more on Ištar and Šauška of Samuha as patron deity of Ḫattušili. Ḫattušili chose her for political purposes – TARACHA (2009: 264): "This was undoubtedly a purely political decision and it must not be considered as an act of personal deity." P. TARACHA pointed out (2013, 378): "It seems therefore that Ḫattusili had chosen his patron deities long before his accession to the Great Kingship of Ḫatti. The choice of the ruler's divine patron(s), as seen already in the case of Ḫattusili's predecessors, was a political decision, rather than an act of personal piety, even if he did experience personal devotion to these deities. As I have argued elsewhere (TARACHA 2009b), it was Ḫattusili's entire political career that decided about Šauška of Samuha and the Storm-god of Nerik becoming his patron deities".

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 199, see also HOFFNER 2006, 268.

§4 (1:22-60) *Since the goddess, My Lady, held me by the hand, she never exposed me to an evil deity (nor) to an evil lawsuit, never did she let an enemy weapon sway over me: Istar, My Lady, took me to her in every respect. Whenever illness befell me, sick as I was, I looked on (it) as the goddess' providence. The goddess, My Lady, held me by the hand in every respect.*<sup>55</sup>

Moreover, it was Ištar who kept Ḫattušili from committing any unjust act which, we may guess, avoided any divine vengeance that could otherwise have befallen him:

§4 (1:22-60) *But, since I was a man divinely provided for, since I walked before the gods in divine providence, I never did an evil thing against man.*<sup>56</sup>

Ḫattušili was consequently lenient towards enemies who had harmed him. First he refrained from taking vengeance on a certain Armatarhunta, his relative who had previously more than once unjustly blamed him before Muwattali the king:

§10a (3:14-30) *So, because my brother had made me triumph over [Arma]tarhunta through the process, I did not fall back into further evil against him, and [be]cause Armatarhunta was a blood relative of mine, (and because) moreover, he was an old man, he provoked (feelings of) pity in me [a]nd I let him go. Sippaziti, to[o], his [son], I let go.' I did not harm them in any way.*<sup>57</sup>

Later, when the crimes of Urḫitešub made Ḫattušili rise against him, he did not plot the murder of his predecessor but called him to an open contest on the battlefield so that the divinities could decide the issue:

§10c (3:54-79) *But when I became hostile to him, I did not commit a moral offence by revolting against him on the chariot or by revolting against him within (his) house. (No,) in a manly way I declared to him: "You opposed me. You (are) Great King, whereas I (am) king of the single fortress that you left me. So come! Istar of Samuha and the Stormgod of Nerik will judge us."*<sup>58</sup>

And when Ištar had eventually led him to the final triumph he was merciful towards Urḫitešub, giving him worthy possessions. Even when the latter revolted and was defeated again Ḫattušili did not kill him but sent him and his son Sippaziti into exile. Their property, however, Ḫattušili piously dedicated to Ištar:

§11 (4:7-40) *I went back down to Urḫitešub and brought him down like a prisoner. I gave him fortified cities in the country of Nuhasse and there he lived. When he plotted another plot against me, and wanted to ride to Babylon — when I heard the matter, I seized him and sent him alongside the sea. They made Sippaziti cross the border as well, while I took away his property and gave it to Istar, My Lady.*<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 200.

<sup>56</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003a, 200.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 202.

<sup>58</sup> HOFFNER 2006, 268–269: "Rather in a manly way I declared to him: "You have disrespected me. You are a Great King, whereas I am king of the single fortress town that you have left to me. come! let Ištar of Samuha and the storm-god of Nerik judge our case (in the ordeal battle)"".

<sup>59</sup> VAN DEN HOUT 2003b, 203.



Thus, besides hinting at the illegitimacy of Urḫitešub, pointing out his own role by installing his predecessor to power, and the ingratitude and injustice of the latter, Ḫattušili pervasively emphasised the benevolence and support of Ištar, making him appear almost as a human agent of the divine. Any injustice was consequently absent from his deeds and his own acts could be seen as a promotion of divine justice. Such a close connection between goddess and the ruler obviously resembles the relationship between Ištar and Sargon of Akkad, an exemplary ruler for the whole cuneiform world and also held in high esteem by the Hittite kings.<sup>60</sup>

Sargon emphasised the support of Ištar in his inscriptions,<sup>61</sup> and the close connection between the goddess and the king preserved its crucial significance in the later literary compositions, both the Sumerian legend “*Sargon and Ur-Zababa*” from the Old-Babylonian period<sup>62</sup> and the still later “*Sargon legend*” preserved on the tablets recovered from the Library of Aššurbanipal.<sup>63</sup> The likelihood that Ḫattušili followed the example of Sargon is considerable.

Moreover, it is notable how closely the narrative structure of the *Apology of Ḫattušili* resembles the Sargon legend. Sargon appears in the legend as being of illegitimate or humble descent—either of unknown paternity or the son of a gardener<sup>64</sup>—and Ḫattušili expressly states that he was the youngest descendant of Muršili, thus the least legitimate successor to the throne. Sargon was indeed exposed by his mother and thereby condemned to death, and Ḫattušili pointed out his weak health in childhood and poor chances of survival if Ištar had not taken care of him. Both Sargon and Ḫattušili became favourites of the goddess at an early stage in their lives; both had their trials when they were young men; and both got through them successfully thanks to the constant support of Ištar. Sargon was, according to Sumerian legend “*Sargon and Ur-Zababa*”, first threatened by Ur-Zababa the king of Kiš,<sup>65</sup> and Ḫattušili III had to face the evil plans first of Armatarhunta and finally of Urḫi-Tešub. Both indeed triumphed with the help of Ištar and replaced their principal opponents on the throne; Sargon took the kingship of Kiš from Ur-Zababa and Ḫattušili the Hittite kingship from Urḫi-Tešub.

This similarity seems too close to be coincidental, suggesting that Ḫattušili intentionally followed the ‘biography’ of Sargon as a prototype. Sargon was indeed a paradigmatic usurper of power. The narrative pattern, however, had a much wider spread and broader significance. There are indeed numerous examples of a child of marginal descent, threatened with death in infancy or childhood, favoured by some divine power, and persecuted by their predecessor whom he eventually overthrows to become the ruler himself. This was indeed a fairly usual way of describing the rise of the founder of a new dynasty or state, for which Sargon himself,

---

<sup>60</sup> About mentioning Sargon by Ḫattušili I, see GÜTERBOCK, 1964, 1–6; BECKMAN, 2001, 85–91.

<sup>61</sup> See, e.g., RIME 2, Sargon E2.1.1.6, lines 4–5.

<sup>62</sup> COOPER, HEIMPEL 1983.

<sup>63</sup> ALSTER 1987, 169–173.

<sup>64</sup> NEMET-NEJAT 1998, 22.

<sup>65</sup> COOPER, HEIMPEL 1983.

Cyrus the Great, Moses and Romulus serve as perhaps the best-known examples.<sup>66</sup> It is however remarkable that Ḫattušili used this pattern to justify his usurpation of power inside the family.

## Conclusions

The often bloody fighting for power inside the ruling dynasty in the Hittite kingdom made patricide and fratricide a relatively common practice, more of a rule than an exception, and there were few rulers who had not resorted to such measures for attaining or confirming their power. On the other hand, however, the ruler was expected to be just responsible for his people—and an unjust ruler committing crimes against his subjects therefore should not have deserved the position of king. This was both a curse and an opportunity for the Hittite kings. It was always possible to blame a predecessor for some murders, and it was always equally necessary to justify the killing of the opponents that the present ruler had committed himself. This is exactly what we see in all three cases considered here. Telepinu and Ḫattušili certainly, and Šuppiluliuma very probably, described their predecessors as guilty of certain crimes. We can only guess how Šuppiluliuma compared himself to the predecessor whom he killed, but in the cases of Telepinu and Ḫattušili we can clearly see that the kings emphasised their mercifulness towards their opponents, although the reality of this seems doubtful, and thereby purposefully contrasted themselves with their vicious forerunners. According to their own view, both Telepinu and Ḫattušili must surely have deserved the benevolence of the gods. Telepinu, however, did not emphasise this aspect. He only pointed out the divine vengeance that had befallen his predecessors, while preferring to present himself as the wise reformer stopping the intrafamily murders and restoring good order to the land. Ḫattušili, on the other hand, chose to emphasise, besides his justice and mercifulness, the divine support he received in all his actions. He appeared as almost a human agent of Ištar, the traditional supporter of the Near Eastern kings. This made him comparable to Sargon, to such an extent that even his own “biography” was shaped to conform to the legendary pattern of the life of the great Akkadian king. In this way the usurper inside the family, as Ḫattušili surely was, was raised to almost equal status to the greatest empire-founder known in these times.

Such strategies of justifying the violent seizure of power are of course fairly universal in history. A paradigmatic example is given by Cyrus the Great, founder of the Persian empire, who incriminated his predecessor Nabonaidus, pointed out the divine support of Marduk,<sup>67</sup> and very soon received the typical “biography” of a hero with all the necessary elements from the birth story to the seizure of the kingship, as was presented by Herodotos.<sup>68</sup> Success was indeed bestowed by the gods and a successful king must thus have been divinely supported, while the predecessor whom he removed from power must have been hateful to the gods and surely

---

<sup>66</sup> See, e.g., LEWIS 1980; KÖIV 2018, especially 627–633.

<sup>67</sup> VAN DER SPEK 2014, 260.

<sup>68</sup> Hdt. I 109–127.

deserved this fate. The Hittite cases discussed here show how this deeply-rooted way of thinking produced variable justifications of usurpations by particular kings.

## Bibliography

- ALSTER, B. 1987. A Note on the Uriah Letter in the Sumerian Sargon Legend, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 77, 169-173.
- BADALI, E. 1987. Eine neue Lesung im Anfang des Annita-Texts. *Die Welt des Orients* 18, 43-44.
- BECKMAN, G. 2001. Sargon and Naram-Sin in Hatti: Reflections of Mesopotamian Antiquity among the Hittites. In: D. Kuhn, H. Stahl (eds.): *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt*, 85-91. Heidelberg.
- BECKMAN, G. 2006. = Beckman, G.; Goedegebuure, P.; Hazenbos, J.; Cohen, Y. Hittite Historical Texts I. In: M. W. Chavalas (ed.). *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, 215-252. USA, UK, Australia.
- Beckman, G. 2009. Hittite Literature. In C. S. Ehrlich (Ed.), *From an Antique Land. An Introduction To Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, 215-254. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- BIN-NUN, S.R. 1975. The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom. *Texte der Hethiter* 5. Heidelberg.
- BRISCH, N. 2012. History and Chronology. In: H. Crawford (ed.). *The Sumerian World*. Routledge, London and New York, 111-127.
- CARRUBA, O. 2001. Anitta res gestae: paralipomena I. In: G. Wilhelm (ed.). *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. (Studien zu Boğazköy Texten 45), 51-72. Wiesbaden.
- COOPER, J. S., HEIMPEL, W. 1983. The Sumerian Sargon Legend. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 67-82.
- GOEDEGEBUURE, P. 2006. The Proclamation of Telipinu. In: Chavalas (ed.), *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, 228-235. Malden.
- GÜTERBOCK, H. G. 1964. Sargon of Akkad Mentioned by Ḫattušili I of Ḫatti. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 18, 1-6.
- HEINZ, M. 2007. Sargon of Akkad: rebel and usurper in Kish 2007, In: M. Heinz, M. H. Feldman. *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories From Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East*, 67-86. Eisenbrauns.
- HAASE, R. 2005. Darf man den sog. Telipinu-Erlass eine Verfassung nennen? *Die Welt des Orients* 35, 56-61.
- HAZENBOS, J. 2006. CTH 40: Manly Deeds of Shuppiluliuma. In: M.W. Chavalas (ed.). *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, 235-239. Malden.
- HOFFMANN, I. 1984. *Der Erlass Telipinus*. C. Winter.

- HOFFNER, H. A. 1975. Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography. In: H. Goedicke & J. J. M. Roberts (eds.), *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. 49–62. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- HOFFNER, H. A. 2003. Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar. In: Hallo, W.H. & Younger, K. L. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Vol. I, 182–184. Leiden.
- HOFFNER, H. A. 1997. Hittite Canonical Compositions – Historiography. Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar. In: W. W. Hallo (ed.), *The Contexts of Scripture, vol. 1. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, 182–204. Leiden, New York-Cologne.
- HAWKINS, D. J. 2001. Urhi-Tešub, tuhkanti. In: Wilhelm, G. (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, 167–179. Harrassowitz.
- HOUWINK TEN CATE, Ph.H. J. 1994. Urhi-Tessub Revisited. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 51, 233–259.
- HOUWINK TEN CATE, Ph. H. J. 1995–1996. The Genealogy of Mursilis II. The Difference Between a Legalistic and a Genealogical Approach to the Descent of Suppiluliumas I. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"* 34, 51–72.
- IMPARATI, F. 1995. Apology of Ḫattušili III or Designation of his Successor? In: T. van den Hout & J. de Roos (eds.), *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, 143–157. Leiden.
- KEMPINSKI, A. 1993. Suppiluliuma I: The Early Years of his Career. In: A. F. Rainey (ed.), *kinattutu ša darâti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, Tel Aviv, 81–91. Tel Aviv.
- KÖIV, M. 2018. The hero and the villain: famous dynasties in ancient Near Eastern and Greek narrative traditions. In: R. Rollinger – S. Fink (eds.), *Conceptualizing Past, Present, and Future* (Melammu Symposia 9), 609–645. Münster.
- KÜMMEL, H. M. 2005. Der Thronfolgerlaß des Telipinu. In: Manfred, et al. (eds.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* Vol. I:5, 464–469. Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- LEWIS, B. 1980. *The Sargon Legend: A Study of the Akkadian Text and the Tale of the Hero Who was Exposed at Birth*. Cambridge.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2010. Some Questions on the Political History and Chronology of the Early Hittite Empire. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 37 (2), 186–197.
- MELCHERT, H.C., 1978. The Acts of Ḫattušili I. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37, 1–22.
- MLADJOV, I. 2016. Ammuna, Ḫuzziya, and Telipinu Reconsidered. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2000 (1), 21–24.
- NEMIROVSKI, A. A. 2005 = Немировский, А.А. «Пространные анналы» Мурсила II – текстологическая условность? *Вестник Древней Истории* 1 (2005), 3–14.
- NEMET-NEJAT, K. R. 1998. *Daily Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Peabody, Massachusetts.
- NEU, E. 1974. *Der Anitta-Texts*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 18. Wiesbaden.
- OTTEN, H. 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*. Wiesbaden.
- RIEMSCHEIDER, K. K. 1971. Die Thronfolgeordnung im althethitischen Reich. In: H. Klengel (ed.), *Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des alten Vorderasien*, 79–102. Berlin.

- SAZONOV, V. 2008. Akkadi kuningavõim kui arhetüüp (Akkadian kingship as archetype in history). *Ajalooline Ajakiri* 2008, 3 (125), 195–214.
- SAZONOV, V. 2017. Some Notes on Text of King Anitta. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 4, 179–182.
- SAZONOV, V. 2019. Some Notes on the Evolution of the Hittite Royal Annals. In: R. Da Riva, M. Lang, S. Fink (eds.). *Proceedings of Melammu Workshops 2 & 3*, 57–88. Zaphon.
- SHELESTIN, V. 2014. The Foreign Policy of the Late Old Hittite Kingdom – the Case of Ammuna. In: P. Taracha & M. Kapelúš (eds.). *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology*, 800–826. Wydawnictwo Agade.
- SCHMID, G. 1985. Religiöse Geschichtsdeutung und politische Propaganda im Großen Text des Hattušili III. *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 37, 1–21.
- SINGER, I. 2002. Danuḥepa and Kurunta. In: de Martino, S. & Pecchioli Daddi, F. (eds.). *Anatolia antica: studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati I-II*, 739–752. LoGisma.
- STAVI, B. 2011. The Genealogy of Suppiluliuma I. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38 (2), 226–239.
- STARKE, F. 1985. Der Erlaß Telipinus: Zur Beurteilung der Sprache des Textes anlässlich eines kürzlich erschienenen Buches. *Die Welt des Orients* 16, 100–113.
- STARKE, F. 1979. Halmašuit im Anitta-Text und die hethitische Ideologie vom Königtum. *ZA* 69, 47–120.
- TARACHA, P. 2009. Why Hattušili Chose the Storm-god of Nerik and Šauška of Šamuha. In: O. Drewnowska (ed.), *Here & There Across the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of Krystyna Łyczkowska*, 261–270. Warsaw.
- TARACHA, P. 2013. Political Religion and Religious Policy: How the Hittite King Chose His Patron Gods. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40 (2), 373–384.
- ÜNAL, A. 1974. *Ḫattušili III. Teil II*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- VAN DEN HOUT, Th.P. J. 2003a. Apology of Ḫattušili III. In: Hallo, W.H. & Younger, K. L. (Eeds.). *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Vol. I, 199–204. Leiden.
- VAN DEN HOUT, Th. P. J. 2003b. The Proclamation of Telipinu. In: Hallo, W.H. & Younger, K. L. (eds.). *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Vol. I., 194–198. Leiden.
- VAN DEN HOUT, Th. P. J. 2006 = Mineck, K. R.; van den Hout, Th. P. J.; Hoffner, H. A. Jr. Hittite Historical Texts II. In: M. W. Chavalas (ed.). *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*, 253–279, USA, UK, Australia.
- VAN DER SPEK, R. J. 2014. Cyrus the Great, Exiles and Foreign Gods, A Comparison of Assyrian and Persian Policies on Subject Nations. Extraction and Control. In: W. Henkelman et al (eds.). *Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*, 233–264. Chicago.
- WILHELMI, L. 2016. Materiality and Presence of the Anitta Text in Original and Secondary Context: Considerations on the Original Nature of the Proclamation of Anitta (CTH 1) and its

Transmission as Part of Hittite Traditional Literature. In: Th. E. Balke, Ch. Tsouparopoulou (eds.). *Materiality of Writing in Early Mesopotamia*, 223-239. Berlin-Boston.



© 2022 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).