

Araştırma Makalesi

Some Observations on the Exiled Members of the Royal Family during the Old Hittite Period

Gülgüney Masalçı Şahin*

(ORCID: 0000-0003-2692-874X)

Makale Gönderim Tarihi
25.01.2023

Makale Kabul Tarihi
30.01.2023

Atıf Bilgisi/Reference Information

Chicago: Masalçı Şahin, G., "Some Observations on the Exiled Members of the Royal Family during the Old Hittite Period", *Vakanüvis-Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8/1 (Mart 2023): 676-692.

APA: Masalçı Şahin, G. (2023). Some Observations on the Exiled Members of the Royal Family during the Old Hittite Period. *Vakanüvis-Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8 (1) , 676-692.

Abstract

Exile, which means sending a person or a community from one place to another as a punishment or forced migration, has been recorded in almost every historical period. Various policies were applied for exile in the Hittites, who lived in the second millennium BC. There were differences between the exiles brought as prisoners from military campaigns and the exiles from the royal family. This study will focus on the people who were exiled from the royal family during the Old Hittite period by analysing the royal records. The kings, who recorded the people they had exiled, tried to show themselves legitimate and just by mentioning the reasons for the issue. It is understood that certain living standards are provided for the people sent from the capital.

Keywords: Exile, Old Hittite Period, internal turmoils, edicts.

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Türkiye, ggmasalci@gmail.com.

Assist. Prof. Dr., Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of History, Republic of Türkiye.

Eski Hitit Döneminde Kraliyet Ailesinden Sürgün Edilenler Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler

Öz

Bir kimsenin ya da topluluğun ceza olarak, bulunduğu yerden başka bir yere gönderilmesi, belli bir yerin dışında oturtulması, zorunlu göç ettirilmesi olarak bilinen sürgün, tarihin hemen her döneminde yaşanmış ve kayıtlara geçmiştir. MÖ ikinci bin yılda yaşamış Hititler’de de sürgün için çeşitli politikalar uygulanmıştır. Askeri seferlerden esir olarak getirilen sürgünler ile kraliyet ailesinden sürgün edilen kişilerin sürgün şartları farklılık göstermektedir. Eski Hitit Dönemi örnekleri ile ele alınan kraliyet ailesinden gerçekleştirilen sürgünlerde, gönderilen kişiler için belirli yaşam standartlarının sağlandığı anlaşılmaktadır. Sürgün ettirdikleri kişileri kayda alan krallar, meselenin sebeplerinden söz ederek kendilerini meşru ve adil göstermeye çalışmışlardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sürgün, Eski Hitit Dönemi, iç karışıklıklar, fermanlar.

Introduction

Exile, which means sending a person or a community from one place to another as a punishment, being placed outside a certain place, or forced migration, has been recorded in almost every historical period. All people expelled from their territory or area of residence by a particular state can be considered exiles.¹ The act of exiling an individual, which was justified on a variety of political, social, religious and moral grounds, had diverse effects on the psychology of those exiled.² The process has a variety of stages, from locating a suitable place, collectively deporting individuals to that place, and the adaptive process undergone by those exiled.

In the Ancient Near East the exiles were recorded. Therefore the traces of them can be followed on the regarding documents. In particular, mass deportations are known to have occurred frequently.³

¹ Heike Drotbohm and Ines Hasselberg, “Deportation, Crisis and Social Change” in Menjívar, Cecilia, Marie Ruiz, and Immanuel Ness (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Migration Crises*, Oxford Handbooks 2019, p. 572.

² Kemal Timur, “Bilinmez Diyarın Garib Misafiri: Sürgün ve Bireye Etkisi”, *Hikmet Akademik Edebiyat Dergisi* 7 (2017), p. 27; A. Tuba Ökse, “Eski İnsanın Duygularının Arkeolojik Verilere Ve Yazılı Belgelere Yansıması”, *TÜBA-AR* 29 (2021), p. 168.

³ See. İrfan Albayrak (Ed.), *Eski Yakındağu’da Sürgünler*, Ankara 2020.

It is understood that most of these expulsions were made in order to break regional resistance after a military conquest or a failed rebellion.⁴ Apart from mass expulsions, there are also records of the expulsion of individuals, which were applied in a variety of ways. Exiled persons were barred from both their geographical and social environments.⁵ Research has established that different policies were applied for mass and individual expulsions in the Hittite State.

The Sumerian word NAM.RA (Akkadian *ŠALLATU*, Hittite *arnuwala*) was used in Hittite documents to refer to “communities who were expelled from their homelands and forced to reside elsewhere”.⁶ Exiles were counted among the trophies of military campaigns.⁷ These deportees were under the command of the king, the royal family, and the officials appointed by the king. In terms of status, Alp noted that these people were among the slaves and the free.⁸ On the other hand, these people, having been expelled from their native regions, could be assigned to the army, temples and agricultural activities.⁹ They could also be employed as workers both in the lands offered to the gods and in houses where the royal tax was charged, to compensate for gaps in the labor force.¹⁰

While the labor force used was beneficial to the Hittite state, it should have been aimed to weaken the region they came from.¹¹ They

⁴ İrfan Albayrak, “Eski Yakındoğu’nun Sürgün Politikasına Genel Bir Bakış”, İ. Albayrak (Ed.), *Eski Yakındoğu’da Sürgünler*, Ankara 2020, p. 9.

⁵ Raymond Westbrook, “Personal Exile in the Ancient Near East”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 128, No. 2 (2008), p. 317.

⁶ Mark Weeden, *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship (StBoT 54)* Wiesbaden 2011, pp. 587-588.

⁷ Trevor Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, New York 2002, p. 105; Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New York 2005, 217.

⁸ Sedat Alp, “Hititlerde Sosyal Sınıf NAM.RA’lar ve İdeogramın Hititçe Karşılığı”, *Bellekten* 13 (1949), p. 251

⁹ Trevor Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, New York 2002, p. 105; Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New York 2005, 51 ff.; Ali Osman Tiro, “Hititlerde Nüfus Aktarımı ve NAM.RA’lar Konusu” *Eski Yakındoğu’da Sürgünler*, Ankara 2020 pp. 105-128.

¹⁰ Fatma Sevinç, “Hititlerin Anadolu’da Kurdukları Ekonomik ve Sosyal Sistem”, *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi*

Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 17 (2008), p.19.

¹¹ Sevinç, *ibid.* p. 27.

were not allowed to go anywhere other than the area where they worked. A list of those people who were relocated to farms was kept. In this regard, researchers have suggested that these people could be slaves.¹² When the lords in the fields did not fulfill their duties, it is recorded in the Hittite laws that the king appointed NAM.RAs whom he trusted as fiefholders.¹³ According to Article 112 of the Hittite Laws, when field and wheat are given to NAM.RAs for this purpose, they will be exempted from the *šahhan*¹⁴ responsibility for three years, but will also fulfill the *šahhan* after three years.¹⁵

It has been noted that the number of NAM.RAs exceeded tens of thousands, although the specific number remains controversial. It is mentioned that Muršili returned with 66,000 NAM.RA after the Arzawa expedition¹⁶, indicating significant population transfers.

Expulsion from society and being barred from serving in various capacities constitutes a kind of exile, and it is known that, according to Hittite laws this punishment was sometimes faced by those found to have ill-treated animals. In addition, it is known that the penalty for sexual crimes related to animals was death¹⁷, which was also a punishment for crimes such as "not appearing before the king, not being a religious official".¹⁸

¹² Trevor Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, New York 2002, p. 105; Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New York 2005, p. 51; Ahmet Ünal, *Hitit Başkenti Hattuša'da Otuz Bin Koyunlu, On Bin Boğalı ve Bol İçkili Büyük Şölen, Eski Anadolu'nun 3500 Yıllık Yemek ve İçkileri*, Ankara 2019, pp. 187-188.

¹³ Ünal, *ibid.* p. 179.

¹⁴ It is one of the obligations specified by laws in the Hittite administrative system. (Esmâ Reyhan, "Hititlerde Devlet Gelirleri, Depolama ve Yeniden Dağıtım" *Akademik Bakış* 2/4 (2009), p. 159.

¹⁵ *Imparati*, *ibid.* pp. 126-127.

¹⁶ KBo 3.4 ay. III 32-34; Albrecht Goetze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, Leipzig 1933, pp. 76-77; Metin Alparslan, *II. Muršili ve Dönemi*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul 2006, p. 67, note 87.

¹⁷ Law 187, 188: Fiorello *Imparati*, *Hitit Yasaları [Le Leggi Ittite]*, çev. Erendiz Özbayoğlu, Ankara 1992, p. 173; Özlem Sir Gavaz, "Hitit Kanunlarında Hayvanlarla İlgili Maddeler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Ekonomik Yaklaşım Dergisi*, 23/ 83, Ankara (2012), p.102.

¹⁸ Law 200: *Imparati ibid.* p. 183.

Exiles in the Hittite Royal Family

Records also exist of people who were exiled on an individual basis throughout Hittite history. Such people were either royals, those with influence over the throne, or those attempting to disrupt the existing order. These exiles, which will be discussed here with examples from the Old Hittite Period, were related to the royal family or those close to the royal family. These included the tawanannas, those who could succeed the king, or deposed kings.

Hattušili I, one of the Hittite kings, is known as the first king to have his actions recorded during his rule. In the records of this king, the pains of the establishment period are demonstrated in terms of both the expeditions he undertook abroad and political movements within the country. The revolts of the members of the royal family and their aspirations to seize power are reflected in the documents of the period. According to the bilingual testament of Hattušili I, he sent his son Huzziya to the city of Tapašanda as an administrator, but his son rebelled against him from this city. His revolt was suppressed by the king.¹⁹ It is recorded that after this uprising, they provoked the king's daughter and made them hostile to the king, and the brother killed his brother in the war in Hattuša.²⁰ Thereupon, the king first wanted to seize the economic power of his daughter. However, upon her daughter's objection, the king returned some of her property²¹, but after her daughter's repeated objection, king explained why he did not give more: if he had given more property, he would have sucked the country's blood.²² After this incident, Hattušili, who realized that

¹⁹ ¹⁹ CTH 6, KUB I 16 II 63-68 , Ferdinand Sommer – Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II)* (HAB), München 1938, pp. 8-9; Turgut Yiğit, "Hitit Krallığı'nın Kuruluş Dönemindeki İç Olayların Sırası", *Archivum Anatolicum* 6/2, (2003), p. 145.

²⁰ CTH 6 HAB II 69-82.

²¹ CTH 6 HAB III 6-10.

²² CTH 6 HAB III 11-12; Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitische Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1967, p. 63.

economic sanctions would alone not be enough, exiled her daughter from the country.²³

14 [te-íp-ša-nu-ut LUGAL-ša DUMU.MUNUS-in da-]ah-hu-un
ki-e-it-ta^{URU}Ha-at-tu-ša-az

15 [a-pu-u-un kat-ta ú-wa-te-nu-un] nu-uš-ša-an KUR-e še-ir
KUR-e te-eh-hu-un

16 [GU₄-i-ma še-ir GU₄- un te-eh-hu-u]n at-ta-aš ut-tar pí-e-
eš-ši-e-it

17 [na-aš A-NA DUMU^{MEŠ URU}Ha-at-ti e-eš-]har-ši-mi-it e-ku-ut-
ta ki-nu-na-aš

18 [URU-az kat-ta u-i-ya an-za ma-]a-na-aš pár-nam-ma ú-iz-
zi nu-kán É-ir-me-it

19 [wa-ah-nu-uz-zi ma-a-na-aš^{URU}]UHa-at-tu-ši-ma ú-iz-zi

20 [nu a-pu-u-un da-a-an e-d]i na-a-i ut-ne-e-še

21 [É-ir tág-ga-aš-š]a-an nu az-zi-ik-ki-id-du

22 [ak-ku-uš-ki-id-] du

23 [š-u-me-eš-ma-an i-da-a-lu lí-]e i-ya-at-te-ni a-pa-a-aš i-da-
a-lu i-e-it

24 [ú-ug i-da-a-lu a-ap-]pa Ú-UL i-ya-am-mi a-pa-a-aš i-da-
a-lu i-e-it

25 [Ú-UL hal-za-iš] ú-ga-an-za DUMU.MUNUS^{TI} Ú-UL hal-zi-
ih-hi

14-15 [... I, the king, took] (my) daughter and brought her
down] here from Hattuša. And I replaced land for land

16 [cattle for cattle I repla]ced. (She) has rejected (her) father's
word

17 [and has drunk [the life's blood of sons of Hatti]. Now she

18 [has been banished from the city]. If she were to come to my
household,

19 [she would disrupt] (my household). [If] she were to come
to Hattusa,

20 she would turn [it (cause it to revolt) once mor]e. In the
country

21 [A house has been allo]tted (to her). She shall eat

22 [(and) dri]nk.

²³ CTH 6 HAB III 14-25; Gary Beckman, "Bilingual Edict of Hattusili", *The Context of Scripture, Vol. II, Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, William W. Hallo and K. LawsonYounger (eds), 2003, p. 80-81 (Nr. 2.15).

23 [You] shall not do [her any harm]. She did (me) harm,

24 [I shall not do (her) [harm in return].

25 She [would not call] me father, so I shall not call her daughter.

It is understood that the daughter of the king, who was economically strong, behaved with power and greed. Initially, her financial power was reduced, but this did not sufficiently diminish her strength. As a result, the king exiled his daughter. The king stated that if she returned, he would face rebellions and political confusion. To reduce the likelihood of this happening, he provided land and property for his exiled daughter, believing that she must live in a certain level of prosperity to remain in exile.

Hattušili's troubles did not end with his children. He appointed his sister's son as heir, but did not find the loyalty he hoped for from both his sister and her son. In his testament, written on his deathbed, the king stated that he brought his sister's son to his deathbed and asked him to account for the situation, arguing that no one else should raise his sister's son. The king, angry at the situation, sent his heir, too, into exile, on the advice of mother, who was a "snake".²⁴ The king, who stated that the heir to the words of his mother and brothers, would seek revenge and start to shed blood, without any fear of reprisal, said that these things should not happen, insisting that the peace of his country should not be disturbed.²⁵

Thinking of Hattuša's interests, namely order and peace, the king sent Labarna into exile, but he did not expel him in a violent way:

KUB 1.16 II²⁶

30 *ki-nu-na li-e li-e [ku-wa-at-qa] qar-ši k[at²-ta pa-iz-zi ka-a-ša]*

31 *DUMU-mi la-ba-ar-ni É²[-ir²] pí-ih-hu-[un A.ŠÀ^{HI.A}-še me-i]k-ki*

32 *pí-ih-hu-un GU⁴ ^{HI.A}-še me-i[k-k]i pí-ih-hu-u[n UDU^{HI.A}-še me-ik-k]i pí-ih-hu-un*

²⁴ CTH 6 KUB 1.16 ii14-19; HAB ii 8-13

²⁵ CTH 6 KUB 1.16 ii 20-29; HAB ii 20-25

²⁶ CTH 6 KUB 1.16 ii 30-36; HAB ii 30-36; Beckman, Bilingual Edict of Hattusili, pp. 79-80.

33 *nu az-zi-ik-ki-id-du [a]k-[k]u-uš-ki-[i]-d[ū ma-a-na-aš aš-šu-uš]*

34 *na-aš-ta ša-ra-a ú-iš-ki-[i]t-ta-ru ma-a-a[n-ma-aš pu-ug-ga-a]n-za*

35 *ti-i-e-iz-zi na-aš-ma ku-uš-du[-wa-a-t]a ku-it-ki[na-aš-ma har-nam-]ma ku-it-ki*

36 *na-aš-kán ša-ra-a li-e ú-iš-[k]i-it-ta n[a-aš É-ri-iš-ši e-eš]-du*

30 [He] shall now in no way go down freely. Hereby

31 I have now giv[en] my son Labarna a house. I have given him [arable land] in plenty.

32 I have given him cattle in pl[en]ty. I have given [him sheep in plenty].

33 He shall continue to eat and drink. [As long as he is on his best behavior],

34 he shall come up from time to time (to Hattusa to visit). But if he begins [to

35 cause trouble(?)], or (if he spreads) any slander, [or] and [...], he will not be

36 permitted to come up (again), but [shall remain on his own estate].

The king, who was especially sensitive about his own sister and Labarna's mother, described the as a "snake".²⁷ Document number KBo 3.27 (CTH 5) outlines the measures taken for an unclear tawananna, and the actions to be taken for those who disobey the king's word. In this document it was mentioned that if the power of the *tawananna* is not dominated, the snake will entwine Hattuša.²⁸ While considering his daughter²⁹ and sister³⁰ among the possibilities related to the mentioned

²⁷ CTH 6 HAB ii 10, 20.

²⁸ CTH 5 KBo 3. 27 26-27. Stefano de Martino, "Alcune osservazioni su KBo III 27", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18/1 (1991), pp. 55-56.

²⁹ Shoshana R. Bin-Nun, *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom*, Heidelberg, 1975, p. 74; Stefano de Martino- Fiorello Imparati, "Sifting Through Edicts and Proclamations of the Hittite Kings", Sedat Alp, Aygül Süel (Eds), *Acts of III rd International Congress of Hittitology*, Ankara (1998), p. 395.

³⁰ Trevor Bryce "Hattusili and the Problems of the Royal Succession in the Hittite Kingdom," *Anatolian Studies* 31 (1981), p. 16; Turgut Yiğit, "Eski Hitit Dönemine Ait Bir Ferman" *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26/41 (2007), p. 6.

tawananna, it has been suggested by some researchers that Haštayar, who was accepted as the wife of the king, was among the "suspects".³¹ In addition, the abolition of the expression tawannanna as an authority was emphasized.³²

After the revolt of the king's children and the exile of his nephew, whom he had appointed heir, Muršili I was declared heir. The king advised both the dignitaries of the country and Muršili in this regard.³³ The documents indicate that the king's sister had a role in the realization of this change. In the aforementioned document, numbered KBo 3.27, it is emphasized that Muršili was re-elected as heir. This suggests that the document may have been written after Hattušili's testament. When evaluated together with the testament, it suggests that the tawananna mentioned may be the king's sister. The ban applied to tawannana, who is understood to have been exiled in the document, is described as follows³⁴:

6' UR-RA-AM ŠE-RA-AM MUNUS^{ta-wa-na-an-na-aš} [ŠUM-ŠU]
 7' le-e ku-iš-ki te-ez-zi ŠA DUMU^{MEŠ}-ŠU [DUMU.MUNUS^{MEŠ}-ŠU]
 8' ŠUM-ŠU-NU le-e ku-iš-ki te-ez-zi ták-ku DUMU^{ME}[Š ŠUM-ŠU-
 NU ku-iš-ki te-ez-zi]
 9' kap-ru-uš-še-et ha-at-ta-an-ta-ru na-an a-aš-k[i-iš-š]
 10' kán-kán-du ták-ku ARAD^{MEŠ}-am-ma-an iš-tar-na ŠUM-Š[U-
 NU]
 11' ku-iě-ki te-ez-zi ARAD-mi-iš le-e kap-ru-u[š-š-et]
 12' ha-at-ta-an-ta-ru na-an a-aš-ki-ši-iš-ši kán-kán[-du]

6' In the future, no one will [name ...] of Tawananna.
 7' won't tell. His sons [(and) his daughters]
 8' No one will say their name. If anyone of [Hatti's] sons [say their name]
 9' his throat must be slit and at [his] door
 10' should be hung. If one of my slaves [their] name
 11' if anyone says it, he is not my slave. his throat

³¹ Richard H. Beal; "Studies in Hittite History", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1/2 (1983), pp. 122-124.; de Martino *ibid.* pp. 59-60.

³² Yiğit, *ibid.* p. 7.

³³ Turgut Yiğit, "Hitit Krallığı'nın Kuruluş Dönemindeki İç Olayların Sırası", *Archivum Anatolicum* 6/2, (2003), p. 144.

³⁴ CTH 5 KBo 3.27 Bo 2423 = 2 BoTU 10 β, de Martino *ibid.* pp. 55-56.

12' should be cut and hung on his door.

Regardless of who Tawananna was, it is understood that she was evaluated differently from other exiles and perceived as a great threat. This is evident from the fact that even mentioning her name was punishable by death.

During the reign of Hattušili in the Old Hittite Period, the above-mentioned documents reveal that he and his relatives in the royal family struggled to contain revolts and disturbances they caused. In this context, Hattušili left the throne to Mursili I. After returning from the Babylonian campaign, Muršili became the victim of these ongoing internal conflicts. After Muršili was killed by his wife's brother, the bloody process in the Hittite palace did not stop, and the death of those who ascended the throne continued to be the norm. The document which reveals this is the Edict of Telipinu.³⁵ Telipinu begins his edict with a historical narrative which covers the period from King Labarna I's rule to his own time, in which he enacted a rule of enthronement. The prosperity of the country, mentioned in the Labarna I period, and victories over enemies³⁶ were repeated in the Hattušili and Muršili periods.³⁷ This edict, however, does not mention the disturbances in the Hattušili period.³⁸ The bloody period that started with Muršili's murder is expressed as a period of turmoil³⁹, and Telipinu claims that it was him who ended this period. It is known that the historiographical function of the records the Hittite kings made was to record past events in line with their interests and to justify their decisions.⁴⁰ Telipinu, in this edict, ended bloodshed and aimed to protect his interests, namely reign and progeny. It is interesting to note, however, that his ascension to the

³⁵ CTH 19, Hoffman, I. *Der Erlaß Telipinu*, Heidelberg 1984.

³⁶ CTH 19 i 1-12, Hoffman *ibid.* pp. 12-15.

³⁷ CTH 19 i 13-31, Hoffman *ibid.* pp. 13-18.

³⁸ Mario Liverani, *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*, London 2004, p. 33.

³⁹ Liverani *ibid.* pp. 37-38; Koç, İlker, "Eski Hitit Kralı Telipinu, Dönemi ve Fermanı", *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi Karefad* 10/1 (2022), p. 87

⁴⁰ Metin Alparslan, "Geçmiş Kaydetmek: Hitit Tarih Yazıcılığı/Recording the Past: Hittite Historiography", *Hititler: Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu/ Hittites: An Anatolian Empire*, Meltem Doğan Alparslan, Metin Alparslan (Eds), İstanbul 2013, p. 61

throne took place by breaking these rules.⁴¹ When he sat on the throne, he used the classic expression "(I, Telipinu) when I sat on my father's throne".⁴² However, his father's identity is not known. Scholars have reached different conclusions regarding whether Telipinu was the son⁴³ or son-in-law⁴⁴ of Ammuna. Before Telipinu ascended to the throne, Huzziya was on the throne. Telipinu came to the throne by dethroning Huzziya. Just because Telipinu believed Huzziya wanted to kill him and his wife. In his edict, he tried to justify and legitimize his actions.

He stated that he did not kill the king he dethroned, but exiled him. The relevant part of the text is as follows:⁴⁵

11 *ma-a-nu-uš-kán* ^m*Hu-uz-zi-ya-aš ku-en-ta nu ut-tar iš-du-wa-*
a-ti

12 *nu-uš* ^m*Te-li-pi-nu-uš ar-ḫa pár-aḫ-ta*

13 V Š[E]Š ^{MEŠ} -ŠU *nu-uš-ma-aš* ^É^{MEŠ} *tág-ga-aš-ta pa-a-an-du-*
wa-az a-ša-an-du

⁴¹ Ahmet Ünal, *Eski Anadolu Siyasi Tarihi*, Ankara 2018, p. 444.

⁴² CTH 19 KBo 3.1 ii 16'. Hoffman, *Der Erlaß Telipinu*, pp. 28-29.

⁴³ Kaspar K. Riemschneider, "Die Thronfolgeordnung im althethitischen Reich," *Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des Alten Vorderasien*, ed. Horst Klengel, Berlin, Boston, (1971) pp. 93–95; Oliver Gurney, "Anatolia c. 1600–1380 B.C.," I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond, E. Sollberger (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 2 Part II*: 1973, pp. 663–664; Dietrich Sürenhagen, "Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen und Erbrecht im althethitischen Königshaus vor Telipinu – ein erneuter Erklärungsversuch", *AoF*, 25 (1) (1998), pp. 76, 90-91; Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. New York 2005: pp.103, 417–418, note 35; Andrew Knapp, *Royal Apogetic in the Ancient Near East*, Atlanta 2015, pp. 103-104

⁴⁴ Albrecht Goetze, "On the Chronology of the Second Millennium BC." *JCS*, 11 (2) (1957), pp. 56–57; Harry A. Hoffner, "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography", Hans Goedicke, J. J. M. Roberts (Eds.), *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. Baltimore 1975, pp. 51–53; Gary Beckman, "Inheritance and Royal Succession among the Hittites" G. Beckman- H. Hoffner (Eds.), *Kaniššuwat: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Chicago 1986, p. 22; David Atkins, "An Alternative Principle of Succession in the Hittite Monarchy," K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Washington, D.C. (2000) p. 160; Ian Miladjev, *N.A.B.U.* 2016/1, p. 23; Esmâ Reyhan, *Hitit Devletinde Siyaset ve Yönetim Direktif, Yemin ve Sadakat*, Ankara 2017, p. 42.

⁴⁵ CTH 19 KBo 3.1 ii 11-15; Hoffman *ibid.* pp. 26-29.

14 *nu-wa-[z]a az-zi-ik-kán-du ak-ku-uš-kán-du i-da-a-lu-ma-aš-
ma-aš-kán li-e*

15 *tág-ga-na-aš nu tar-ši-ki-mi a-pí-e-wa-mu i-da-lu i-e-er ú-ga-
wa-ru-uš HUL- lu [Ú-UL i-ya-mi]*

11 When Huzziya wanted to kill them,
12 the matter came to light and Telipinu chased them away.

13 He (Huzziya) [had] five brot[he]rs. (Telipinu) distributed
houses to them (and said): “Let them go! Let them be (at there)!

14 Let them eat and drink! But let no one (evil) attempt them!

15 And he said: “They have mistreated me. I will not [treat]
them badly.”

However, it is understood that the bloody process did not end with this exile. Learning that Huzziya and his brothers were killed in exile, Telipinu claimed that he was not aware of this situation and did not want to apply the death penalty sentenced by the *panku* assembly to the people named Tanuwa, Tahirwaili and Tarušu, who were responsible for the incident.⁴⁶

29 *[ku-wa-a]t-wa-ri ak-kán-zi nu-wa-ru-uš IGI^{HI.A}-wa mu-un-
na-an-zi nu-uš LUGAL-uš kar-š[a-uš]*

30 *[^{LÚ.M}]EŠ APIN.LAL i-ya-nu-un GIŠ^{TUKUL}HI.A-uš-šu-uš-ta
ZAG.UDU.za da-ah-hu-un nu-uš-ma-aš maš-du[-uš?] pí-ih-hu-un*

29 Wh]y do they die? They will hide (their) eyes concerning
them! I, the King, made them into tru[e]

30 farmers: I have taken their weapons from the shoulder and
have given them a yok[e(?)].

Telipinu reported that he only took the weapons of those three people to humiliate them. But the bloody process had not ended yet. According to Telipinu edict, Queen Ištapariya and prince Ammuna were killed.⁴⁷

Afterwards, the king sought to end this troubling situation by determining the rules of enthronement. According to the that rule, if

⁴⁶ CTH 19 KBo 3.1 ii 26-28; Hoffman *Der Erlaß Telipinu*, pp.30-31.

⁴⁷ CTH 19 KBo 3.1 ii 31-32; Hoffman *ibid.* pp.30-31.

there is no first-degree prince, the husband of the princess is legitimized as heir. It can be inferred that Telipinu made this amendment to enthrone Alluwamna, who was thought to be his son-in-law, since he had no viable heir.

The events that took place after Telipinu's death are not clearly known. In the text of KUB 26.77, the exile Alluwamna and his wife, who was expected to ascend to the throne, is mentioned:⁴⁸

10]ta šu-ma-ša^m Al-lu-wa-am-na^{MUNUS} Ha-ra-[ap-ši-ki
 11]x QA-DU DUMU^{MEŠ}-KU-NU ar-ha šu-e-[nu-un
 12]x A-NA^{URU} Ma-al-li-ta-aš-ku-ri
 13 ma-ni-a-a]h-hi-iš pa-a-an-tu-wa-ri a-pi-a a-š[a-an-du

10] you Alluwamna and Harap[šiki
 11] with your sons [I have] banished you
 12] to Malitaškur.
 13 he comman]ded. "Let them go (and) be there

There have been different interpretations for the period after Telipinu, with the inscription "Tabarna Tahurwaili the Great King" found on the seal- impression discovered in Boğazkale in 1969. According to the view that the Tahurwaili mentioned in the seal impression is the same Tahurwaili in the Telipinu Edict, Tahurwaili took the throne by exiling Alluwamna and Harapšeki, but after some time passed, Alluwamna retook the throne and became king.⁴⁹ Bin-Nun claimed that Huzziya, Telipinu and Tahurwaili were three successive kings and belonged to the same generation.⁵⁰ The text of KUB 26.77 must have been dictated by someone hostile to Tahurwaili, because the expression DUMU^{MUNUS}KAR.KID⁵¹ "son of a prostitute" was used for him.⁵²

⁴⁸ Bin-Nun, Who was Tahurwaili?, pp. 117-118.

⁴⁹ S. R. Bin-Nun, "Who was Tahurwaili, The Great King?" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 26/2, 1974: 112-120, Onofrio Carruba, "Tahurwaili von Hatti und die Hethitische Geschichte um 1500 chr." K. Bittel, Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, E. Reiner (eds.) *Fs Güterbock*, Istanbul 1974, pp. 73-93; Ali Dinçol, "Hititler", *Anadolu Uygarlıkları Ansiklopedisi*, Görsel Yayınlar, Ankara 1982: 32.

⁵⁰ Bin- Nun ibid, p.120.

⁵¹ See. Turgut Yiğit, "Hititçe Çivi Yazılı Metinlerde^{MUNUS(.MEŠ)}KAR.KID", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19/30, 1997: 289-297.

⁵² KUB 26.77 i 18; Bin-Nun, Who was Tahurwaili?, pp. 117-118.

Conclusion

The frequent exile of royals in the Old Hittite Period reveals the internal turmoil in the early periods of the state. It is clear from the documents that such exiles were not limited to the Old Hittite Period and tawanannas or dethroned kings were exiled also during the imperial period, which led the diplomatic crises.

There were two different practices in the exile policy of the Hittites. The principles of the two practices, namely mass exiles and individual exiles of royalty, were quite distinctive. It is evident that those exiled en masse were used as slaves, and were not allowed to travel from where they were settled.

A remarkable point regarding these political exiles of the Hittite state is that those sent in exile were not left in complete deprivation. While these exiles were being recorded, the king, who was the owner of the record, made an effort to justify his actions. On the other hand, by providing various opportunities to those exiled and thought to have a certain political power, it was intended to allow them to live at a certain standard and, therefore, not return to Hattuša. It is also interesting to note that exiles were occasionally allowed to return the capital on condition that they showed good intention. Mostly, though, the opposite occurred. When a person perceived as a threat was exiled with his/her children, even his/her name was forbidden to be mentioned, and sometimes such people were killed in exile.

It can be concluded that the kings created these records to justify and legitimize themselves, and intimidate their rivals, simultaneously.

Bibliography

Albayrak, İrfan, "Eski Yakındoğu'nun Sürgün Politikasına Genel Bir Bakış", İ. Albayrak (Ed.), *Eski Yakındoğu'da Sürgünler*, Ankara 2020, pp. 1-14.

Alp, Sedat, "Hititlerde Sosyal Sınıf NAM.RA'lar ve İdeogramın Hititçe Karşılığı", *Bellekten* 13, (1949) pp. 245-270.

Alparslan, Metin, *II. Muṣṣili ve Dönemi*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul 2006.

Alparslan Metin, "Geçmiş Kaydetmek: Hitit Tarih Yazıcılığı/Recording the Past: Hittite Historiography", *Hititler: Bir Anadolu İmparatorluğu/ Hittites: An*

Anatolian Empire, Meltem Doğan Alparslan, Metin Alparslan (Eds), İstanbul 2013, pp. 48-61.

Atkins, David, "An Alternative Principle of Succession in the Hittite Monarchy," K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Washington, D.C. (2000) pp. 151-171

Beal, Richard H. "Studies in Hittite History", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1/2 (1983), pp. 115-126.

Beckman, Gary, "Inheritance and Royal Succession among the Hittites" G. Beckman- H. Hoffner (Eds.), *Kaniššuwar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Chicago 1986, pp. 13–31.

Beckman, Gary, "Bilingual Edict of Hattusili" in: *The Context of Scripture, Vol. II, Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (eds), Leiden- Boston 2003, p. 79-81

Bin-Nun Shoshana R., "Who was Tahirwaili, The Great King?" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 26/2, (1974), pp. 112-120.

Bin-Nun Shoshana R., *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom, (TH 5)* Heidelberg, 1975.

Bryce, Trevor "Hattusili and the Problems of the Royal Succession in the Hittite Kingdom," *Anatolian Studies* 31 (1981), pp. 9-17.

Bryce, Trevor, *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, New York 2002.

Bryce, Trevor, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, New York 2005.

Carruba, Onofrio, "Tahirwaili von Hatti und die Hethitische Geschichte um 1500 chr.," K. Bittel, Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, E. Reiner (eds.) *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, İstanbul 1974, pp. 73-93.

Dinçol, "Hititler", *Anadolu Uygarlıkları Ansiklopedisi*, Görsel Yayınlar, Ankara 1982, pp. 18-120.

Drotbohm, Heike, and Ines Hasselberg, "Deportation, Crisis, and Social Change", in Cecilia Menjivar, Marie Ruiz, and Immanuel Ness (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Migration Crises*, Oxford Handbooks 2019, pp. 571–586.

Friedrich, Johannes, *Hethitische Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1967.

Goetze, Albrecht, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, Leipzig 1933.

Goetze, Albrecht. "On the Chronology of the Second Millennium BC." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 11 (2), (1957) pp. 53–61.

Gurney, Oliver, "Anatolia c. 1600–1380 B.C.," I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond, E. Sollberger (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 2 Part II: The Middle East and the Aegean Region, c 1380-1000 BC*, Cambridge University Press 1973, pp. 659-585.

Hoffman, I. *Der Erlaß Telipinu*, (Texte der Hethiter 11), Heidelberg 1984.

Hoffner, Harry A., "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography", Hans Goedicke, J. J. M. Roberts (Eds.), *Unity and Diversity:*

Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East. Baltimore 1975, pp. 49–62.

van den Hout, Theo P. J. , “Biography And Autobiography The Proclamation of Telipinu, *Context of Scripture I*, W.W: Hallo- K. L. Younger, (eds), Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997, pp.194-198.

İmparati, Fiorello, *Hitit Yasaları* [Le leggi ittite], Ankara 1992.

Knapp, Andrew, *Royal Apologetic in the Ancient Near East*, Atlanta 2015.

Koç, İlker, “Eski Hitit Kralı Telipinu, Dönemi ve Fermanı”, *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi Karefad* 10/1 (2022), pp. 83-98.

Liverani, Mario, *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*, London 2004.

Martino, Stefano de, “Alcune osservazioni su KBo III 27”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 18/1 (1991), pp. 54-66.

Martino Stefano de - Fiorello İmparati, “Sifting Through Edicts and Proclamations of the Hittite Kings”, Sedat Alp, Aygöl Süel (Eds), *Acts of III rd International Congress of Hittitology*, Ankara (1998), pp.391-400

Mladjov, Ian , “Ammuna, Huzziya, and Telipinu reconsidered”, *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2016/1 (2016) pp. 21-24.

Ökse, A. Tuba, “Eski İnsanın Duygularının Arkeolojik Verilere Ve Yazılı Belgelere Yansımaları”, *TÜBA-AR* 29 (2021), pp. 153-176.

Reyhan, Esmâ “Hititlerde Devlet Gelirleri, Depolama ve Yeniden Dağıtım” *Akademik Bakış* 2/4 (2009), pp. 157-174.

Reyhan, Esmâ, *Hitit Devletinde Siyaset ve Yönetim Direktif, Yemin ve Sadakat*, Ankara 2017.

Riemschneider, Kaspar K. "Die Thronfolgeordnung im althethitischen Reich," *Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des Alten Vorderasien*, ed. Horst Klengel, Berlin, Boston, (1971) pp. 79-102.

Sevinç, Fatma “Hititlerin Anadolu’da Kurdukları Ekonomik ve Sosyal Sistem”, *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 17 (2008), pp.11-32.

Sir Gavaz, Özlem, “Hitit Kanunlarında Hayvanlarla İlgili Maddeler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Ekonomik Yaklaşım Dergisi*, 23/ 83, Ankara (2012), pp. 93-106.

Sommer, Ferdinand – Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II)*, Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 1938.

Sürenhagen, Dietrich, “Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen und Erbrecht im althethitischen Königshaus vor Telipinu – ein erneuter Erklärungsversuch”, *AoF*, 25 (1) (1998), pp. 75–94

Timur, Kemal “Bilinmez Diyarın Garîb Misafiri: Sürgün ve Bireye Etkisi”, *Hikmet Akademik Edebiyat Dergisi* 7 (2017), pp. 26-34.

Tiro, Ali Osman, “Hititlerde Nüfus Aktarımı ve NAM.RA’lar Konusu”, İ. Albayrak (Ed.), *Eski Yakındoğu’da Sürgünler*, Ankara 2020, pp. 105-128.

Weeden, Mark, *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship (StBoT 54)* Wiesbaden 2011.

Westbrook, Raymond , “Personal Exile in the Ancient Near East”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 128, No. 2 (2008), pp. 317-323

Ünal, Ahmet, *Eski Anadolu Siyasi Tarihi, Kitap 1 Eski Taş Devrinden Hitit Devletinin Yıkılışına Kadar (MÖ 60.000-1180)*, Ankara 2018.

Ünal, Ahmet *Hitit Başkenti Hattuša’da Otuz Bin Koyunlu, On Bin Boğalı ve Bol İçkili Büyük Şölen, Eski Anadolu’nun 3500 Yıllık Yemek ve İçkileri*, Ankara 2019.

Yiğit, Turgut, “Hititçe Çivi Yazılı Metinlerde ^{MUNUS(MEŞ)}KAR.KID”, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19/30 (1997), pp. 289-297.

Yiğit, Turgut, “Hitit Krallığı'nın Kuruluş Dönemindeki İç Olayların Sırası”, *Archivum Anatolicum* 6/2, (2003), pp. 143-154.

Yiğit, Turgut, “Eski Hitit Dönemine Ait Bir Ferman” *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26/41 (2007), pp. 1-8.