

ITAMAR SINGER

Ships Bound for Lukka: A New Interpretation of the Companion Letters RS 94.2530 and RS 94.2523*

Time and time again, the publication of new texts from the ‘house of Urtenu’ in the south-central area of Ras Shamra (Calvet *apud* Al-Maqdisi 2004: 94) has shown this archive to be the most important corpus pertaining to the very end of the Late Bronze Age. At a time when other centres of scribal activity become increasingly sparse and introspective, the Akkadian letters of this exciting corpus cover an ‘international’ orbit extending from Hatti to Egypt and from Aššur to (Ah)hiyawa, passing by Alašia, Lukka and the ships of the Šikila-people. Whereas some 100 tablets unearthed in 1973 (Bordreuil et al. 1991) and some 50 tablets found between 1986 and 1992 (Arnaud et al. 2001) have been published, more than 400 tablets discovered in 1994 and thereafter still await full publication.¹ To the credit of the Akkadian epigraphists of Ugarit it should be said that they have been referring to the most important texts in general overviews and specific studies, sometimes providing lengthy quotations, but this piecemeal method of publication lacks the necessary scientific apparatus of hand copies, photographs and complete transliterations. Anyone familiar with the unrivalled expertise of the Ugarit team knows that these partial transliterations can be trusted, but at the same time, all philologists know that even the smallest detail may count in the correct interpretation of a text. One can only hope that those responsible for the publication policy of the Ras Shamra finds will accelerate the final publication of this invaluable epigraphic treasure to the benefit of the entire scholarly community. Meanwhile, scholars without access to the texts will have to rely on these preliminary publications, taking the risk of occasionally reaching a flawed conclusion based on incomplete information.

The two tablets forming the centrepiece of the recent article by Sylvie Lackenbacher and Florence Malbran-Labat (henceforth simply ‘the authors’)² have already been mentioned in preliminary discussions (Malbran-Labat 1995: 106 with n. 6; Malbran-Labat/ Lacken-

* This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 671-061). Abbreviations follow The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, vol. P/3 (1997), pp. vii–xxix. I wish to thank Dr. Jared Miller for his valuable comments.

¹ Y. Calvet/M. Yon in Yon/Arnaud 2001: 8. On the Akkadian tablets found in 1994, see Malbran-Labat 1995; Malbran-Labat/Lackenbacher 2001.

² Ugarit et les Hittites dans les archives de la “Maison d’Urtenu”, SMEA 47 (2005), 227–40.

bacher 2001: 242), were presented in a lecture held at the Louvre in November 2004, and were preceded by two preliminary notes (*NABU* 2005: pp. 9, 95–97) which treat the author of RS 94.2523, the Great Scribe Penti-Šarruma.

The letters RS 94.2530 and RS 94.2523 were sent to Ammurapi of Ugarit by the Great King of Hatti and by Penti-Šarruma, respectively. As stated by the authors (2005a: 230, n. 27), the Hittite king in this very late period, when Ammurapi already had grown-up sons who could be sent to Hatti, could only be Šuppiluliuma II.³ The two missives are companion letters covering exactly the same subjects and in the same order, though the letter of His Majesty is longer and more detailed. A neat handwriting and careful formulation is common to both tablets, which might suggest that they were written by the same scribe, perhaps Penti-Šarruma himself (Lackenbacher/Malbran-Labat 2005: 97). Following the introduction, the letters are divided into four thematic paragraphs, wisely proceeding from positive and consensual topics to the ‘bottom line’ in which the irreversibility of His Majesty’s treaty and its priority over all other considerations is categorically underlined. The purpose of the present study is to examine the various subjects raised in these letters within the broader historical context, with due attention given to the Hittite perspective. Obviously, the most intriguing topic is the one dealt with in the last section of the letters, the ships to be sent to Lukka, concerning which a different interpretation will be put forward.

Penti-Šarruma

In preliminary notes on these important tablets, only the titles of the author of RS 94.2523, “*tuppanura huburtinura*, Great, noble of Hatti”, were indicated, but not his name (Malbran-Labat 1995: 106). I therefore assumed that his name was nowhere mentioned in the tablet and was led by a prosopographical investigation to identify him with Taki-Šarruma (Singer 2003: 345f.). Now, his name turns out to be Penti-Šarruma, a previously unknown official⁴, whose titles have been discussed by the authors in two complementary notes.⁵ Meanwhile, Herbordt’s monumental study of the Nišantepe bullae has been published, with Penti-Šarruma appearing on six of them (Herbordt 2005: nos. 322–327). The juxtaposition of Penti-Šarruma’s cuneiform and hieroglyphic titles is indeed suggestive, but some inaccuracies have crept into Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat’s discussion.

When I suggested the equation of *tuppa(la)nuri* (with the Hittite/Luwian(!) suffix *ura/i-*) GAL.DUB.SAR(.GIŠ) and MAGNUS.SCRIBA (Singer 2003: 347), I pointed out (following Laroche) that hieroglyphic Luwian does not seem to distinguish between the Chief Scribe

³ For other late letters from Hatti and Karkamiš to Ammurapi, see Singer 1999: 707ff.

⁴ The name *Pi-in-ṭi-* in the tiny fragment KBo 22.21, 2’, which also mentions a certain Palla (van den Hout 1995: 218), may perhaps be restored as Penti-Šarruma.

⁵ Malbran-Labat/Lackenbacher 2005; Lackenbacher/Malbran-Labat 2005. I assume that the article of Malbran-Labat 2004 went to press before the publication of Singer 2003 (submitted in 1999), where I dealt in detail with the title *tuppa(la)nura* and its bearers (see already Singer 1999: 708). The general conclusions are still valid, but the references must of course be reclassified.

(GAL.DUB.SAR) and the Chief Scribe on Wood (GAL.DUB.SAR.GIŠ). The authors state, however, that “aucun MAGNUS.SCRIBA n’apparaît comme GAL.DUB.SAR” (2005: 96), which is not entirely accurate.⁶ The reconditioned tablet RS 17.403 (Malbran-Labat 1995b: 37f.) is stamped with Taki-Šarruma’s seal showing MAGNUS.SCRIBA, while GAL L[Ú xx(x)], which must be restored as GAL L[Ú.MEŠ DUB.SAR], is found in the text (Singer 1999: 640, n. 111; Malbran-Labat 2004: 79). Also Šahurunuwa, who is not represented in the Nišantepe corpus, appears on seals as MAGNUS.SCRIBA and in the Tarhuntašša treaties as GAL.LÚ.MEŠ.DUB.SAR.GIŠ (Singer 2003: 347, n. 40; Herbordt 2005: 269).

With regard to the equation of *huburtanuri* and MAGNUS.AURIGA, the evidence is less clear than suggested by the authors (2005: 96). Prince Penti(*Pi-ti*)-Šarruma appears on one bulla (323) with the title MAGNUS.SCRIBA, on another with the title MAGNUS.AURIGA (327), and on three (324–326) with two titles, MAGNUS.SCRIBA and MAGNUS.DOMUS.FILIUS. On the face of it, this would seem to speak rather for an equation of the compositum LÚ *tuppinura huburtinura* and the titles MAGNUS.SCRIBA and MAGNUS.DOMUS.FILIUS which appear on the same seal. MAGNUS.DOMUS.FILIUS equates to cuneiform DUMU.É.GAL and it cannot be the equivalent of “grand (et) dignitaire du Hatti” (LÚ GAL-ú DUGUD ša KUR *Ha-at-ti*) which is simply an honorific title. Either the seals belong to several persons named Penti-Šarruma, or, as seems more likely, to the same person at various stages of his career. In any case, these seals can hardly be used as conclusive proof for equating MAGNUS.AURIGA with *huburtanuri* (= *rab qartappi*). This chain of equations is further complicated by the fact that in one of the inventories cataloguing tribute to be sent to Hatti the two *huburtanuris* and the *rab kartappi* are listed separately (RS 11.732 = PRU IV: 181; Beckman 1999: 168; Lackenbacher 2002: 76). In general, the equation of hieroglyphic titles and cuneiform titles (written phonetically, logographically or Akkadographically) is not always as straightforward as it might seem, but obviously this subject can not be elaborated here.

The new evidence on Penti-Šarruma and his titles necessitates a reclassification of the unnamed references to *tuppa(la)nuri* in the texts from Ugarit and to the Chief Scribe (on Wood) in the texts from Hatti. It is indeed possible, as suggested by the authors, that Penti-Šarruma replaced Taki-Šarruma in his important post, and that his name should also be restored in the loyalty oath sworn to Šuppiluliuma II (CTH 124).⁷ The unusually high status assumed by this official at the end of the Hittite Empire finds its full confirmation in RS 94.2523.

⁶ The reference to Hawkins *apud* Herbordt 2005: p. 308 is inaccurate, as his remark refers only to the Nišantepe bullae, not other attestations of this title.

⁷ The space at the beginning of line KUB 26.32 i 2 seems rather small for the restoration of three signs (plus the determinative), but the name might perhaps have been written with the logogram ZAG, as in ^mZAG.ŠEŠ = Pentišina.

lapis lazuli

The first subject raised in the letters is the *lapis lazuli* (^{NA4}ZA.GÌN) sent as present to Hatti. This prestige item was highly valued at the Hittite court, as it was elsewhere in the Near East. One is reminded of the incident in which Takuhlinu, an important official at Ugarit, was accused of sending imitation gems to Hatti instead of the genuine stones (Singer 1983: 7, with refs.). In contrast to that embarrassing incident, here His Majesty is very pleased with the quality of the stones sent to him, but Penti-Šarruma laments bitterly about not getting his own share of *lapis lazuli*. This complaint strongly recalls RS 34.136 = RSO 7, no. 7, a letter from the king of Karkamiš in which he threatens the king of Ugarit, no doubt Ammurapi, that he might suffer the same fate as his father, who was humiliated in Hatti for a similar offence. This well-known letter – which also provided the solution to the problem of to which king of Ugarit the Hittite princess was married (Singer 1999: 702, 707) – shows that the viceroy of Karkamiš was ultimately responsible for the regular shipment of tribute to Hatti, and that he was the one with whom Hittite nobles filed their complaints when dissatisfied with their share of tribute.⁸ Therefore, I wonder whether ‘the king’ in His Majesty’s letter (RS 94.2530: 6–10) really refers to the Great King himself, as assumed by the authors (2005a: 232, n. 44), or rather to the king of Karkamiš who administered the tribute sent to Hatti. In any case, the *lapis lazuli* reached the Great King and he was very content, as we learn from Penti-Šarruma’s letter (RS 94.2523: 12–20).

Amurru

The second topic concerns some discord or dispute between Ugarit and Amurru in which the Great King had been asked to intervene (RS 94.2530: 11–16; RS 94.2523: 26–31). The nature of the problem is not disclosed, but only referred to as the matter of “your peace (SILIM-*mi*) and your ...” (or vice versa). The authors hesitate between *NÍŠ* (‘oath’) and *RIM* (‘mercy’) as the reading of the second substantive in this hendiadys (written with a sign resembling GIŠ), eventually preferring the former (‘*serment de paix/réconciliation*’). The association between ‘peace’ (Hit. *takšul*) and ‘oath’ (Hit. *lingai*-, Akk. *NÍŠ* DINGIR-LIM or *MĀMĒTU*) is indeed found in Hittite treaties and loyalty oaths.⁹ No doubt, the king of Ugarit had asked his master to intercede on his behalf in order to restore the traditional peace and good relations with his southern neighbour.

What could have been the issue between the two Levantine kingdoms that was in need of being ironed out by their Hittite suzerain? We know that the notorious divorce scandal be-

⁸ As noted by Malbran-Labat *apud* Bordreuil 1991: 30 n. 7, the reference to the ‘wooden tablet’ (GIŠ.HUR) sent from Hatti to Karkamiš is remarkable. In which language and in which script was it written? The king of Karkamiš suggests that this tablet of complaint, perhaps written by Penti-Šarruma himself, should be read out in the presence of Ammurapi. That would either mean that it was written in Akkadian, or that the scribe who brought it to Ugarit was able to read Hittite and translate it into Akkadian or Ugaritic.

⁹ Though the combination *riksu u māmītu*, ‘treaty and oath’, is more common; see refs. in CHD, L: 64 ff. s.v. *lingai*- and Zaccagnini 1990: 64 ff.

tween Ammištamru II and the Amurrite princess, 'the daughter of the Great Lady', lingered on for a long while (Singer 1999: 680f., with refs.), but it is hard to believe that it could still have preoccupied the two courts at this point. Other issues appearing in the correspondence between Ugarit and Amurru include a verdict over *umman manda* troops and the exchange of precious stones and building materials.¹⁰ None of these issues would seem to justify the involvement of the Great King. What might be more relevant, both thematically and chronologically, is the letter of a certain Paršu (RS 20.162 = Ug. 5, no. 37), in which he solicits information on the enemy and promises to place the ships of Amurru at Ugarit's disposal.¹¹ The imminent danger posed by the sea-borne enemy might indeed have motivated Ammurapi to strengthen his cooperation with Amurru and even to ask for military aid, under the auspices of the Hittite king.¹²

As it happens, the Hittite king replies that the king of Amurru is staying at his court, regrettably without disclosing his name. Could this information be in any way helpful in elucidating the poorly known late history of Amurru? In attempting to address this question, it must be noted that there is another document in which a visit of an Amurrite king to Hatti is documented. KUB 3.56 is a fragmentary Akkadian letter to an unknown vassal, probably sent by a Hittite king. The last paragraph preserves: "Now Šaušgamuwa (^mDĪSTAR-muwa) has come to me. The presents that he took are very good. Thus (he said): "Present the giving(?) that you have created(?)." Thus (I/he said): *You have exceeded(?) the freedom of service.*"¹³ Whatever the meaning of the obscure last phrases, it is clear that Šaušgamuwa's visit is somehow connected with the presentation of gifts or tribute and with some kind of exemption from duties (*šubarrûtu*). This sounds suspiciously similar to matters discussed in the final paragraphs of RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530 (see below). The coincidence becomes even more striking when one considers the partly preserved first paragraph, KUB 3.56 obv. 2'-4': "... and those words with regard to the service (*ilku*) that I sent to you, whether they are a command (*qîbu*) or whether they are not a command, you should be *content*."¹⁴

Who could be the addressee of this intriguing letter found at Boğazköy, which is thus either a copy or for some reason was never sent to its destination? Most commentators

¹⁰ For the correspondence between Ugarit and Amurru, see Singer 1999: 642f., 666f.; Lackenbacher 2002: 183 ff.; Freu 2006: 181 ff.

¹¹ Singer 1999: 721; Lackenbacher 2002: 185; Lackenbacher/Malbran-Labat 2006: 8, n. 35.

¹² With all due caution it may perhaps be suggested that the fragmentary letter RS 18.54 A = PRU 4: p. 228f., sent to the king of Ugarit by his 'brother', also belongs to the Amurru correspondence. It deals with the animosity of the king of Ugarit towards his correspondent, caused by a certain "son of Badunu, the dog, who committed a great crime against me here" (ll. 7'-13'). The sender, who could be a king of Amurru, is trying his best to appease the angry king of Ugarit in a manner which resembles the phraseology of Paršu's letter. For an attempt at translating this document, see Ahl 1973: 289 ff.

¹³ CTH 208.4 (Hagenbuchner 1989: no. 267) rev. (12') *a-nu-ma* ^mDĪSTAR-mu-u-wa *muh-hi-ia ik-ta-ša-ad* (13') *šul-ma-na-ti ša il-te-qâ bâ-na-a dan-niš* (14') *um-ma-a na-da-nu ša te-bé-ni-[i] te-qâ-aš* (15') *um-ma-a šu-bâ-ru-ut-ta-ma [al?]-te-kam*. The last two phrases are very difficult to interpret. The translation suggested above (for which I wish to thank Shlomo Izre'el) can only be regarded as a very tentative approximation. For *šubarrûtu*, 'status of freedom of service', see CAD, Š III: 170.

¹⁴ (2') *ú a-ma-ta ša-a-šu aš-šum ilš-ki al-tap-ra-ak-ku* (3') *šum-ma a-ma-ta qî-bu šum-ma la-a qî-bu* (4') *at-ta lu-ú na-i-ra-ta*

have suggested Pentišina, mainly on account of the reference to Egypt, to Zulapa and to "the enemy of His Majesty", who is thought to be Urhi-Teššub.¹⁵ If this be the case, Šaušgamuwa in this letter would still be the crown-prince during the reign of his father. Although this still seems to be the best interpretation, I would not entirely exclude another. His Majesty must have had other enemies as well, and Egypt was relevant to Hittite Syria until the very end of the Hittite Empire (Singer 1999: 708 ff.). Could this letter have been written to Ugarit and be related to the reconciliation efforts between Amurru and Ugarit? If so, Šaušgamuwa would be here an old king on a visit to his nephew, Šuppiluliuma II. The mention of the *ilku* and the *šubarrûtu* (regrettably in fragmentary and obscure context), might perhaps support such a late dating of the letter (see below). On the other hand, my suggestion that Mahhaza in RS 10.046 was the king of Amurru who succeeded Šaušgamuwa, if valid¹⁶, would weaken the argument.

A Visit to His Majesty

The regular visit of the vassal to the court of his overlord is a well-known stipulation of vassal treaties. The striking contrast between Penti-Šarruma's laconic directive and His Majesty's polite and circuitous reassurances has duly been emphasized by the authors. Perhaps Penti-Šarruma was more realistic in his approach, anticipating that Ammurapi would not want to go himself to Hatti in such exacting times, but would rather send one of his sons. From His Majesty's letter we learn that a son of Ammurapi had already been in Hatti and now another visit (of another son?) was solicited. One gets the impression that the Hittite king sought to have around him at all times sons of his vassals, probably as a guarantee for the good conduct of their fathers. He pledges to treat the Ugaritian prince at his court with all due respect, which leads one to think of the hardships suffered by another royal visitor in Hatti, probably Niqmaddu III (RS 34.136 = RSO 7, no. 7). Niqmaddu's visit is also recorded in several Ugaritic letters of Talmiyanu to his mother Šarelli (Singer 1999: 695 f.).

LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki* and the treaty (*rikiltu*) of Ugarit

As indicated by the authors, the last and the longest section of the letters is the most intriguing and is bound to arouse the continuous interest of the ancient Near Eastern scholarly community. First, a comment is in order on the structure of this long section, RS 94.2530: 30-45 and RS 94.2523: 34-45, which follows the last paragraph divider. I have the impression that the entire passage is dependent on the initial relative clause concerning the '*ilku*-troops'. In other words, the following issues, which concern the mission of Šatalli, the Hiyawa in Lukka, and the irreversibility of the 'treaty tablet' (*tuppi rikiltu*), must all be

¹⁵ Singer 2006: 33 (with further refs. in n. 31).

¹⁶ Singer, forthcoming (submitted April 2002); Lackenbacher 2002: 181, n. 599; Freu 2006: 183.

interrelated somehow, constituting a coherent chain of thought. I fail to identify such a linkage between the various issues in the interpretation offered by the authors.

The authors hesitate, with good reason, about the interpretation of LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki*. There is plenty of documentation on the *ilku* itself, less on the 'men of the *ilku*' (LÚ.MEŠ *ilki*)¹⁷, but LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki*, literally 'the troops of the *ilku*', do not seem to be attested elsewhere. Were these people subordinate to the Hittite king, or, as the authors deem more likely, to the king of Ugarit? In the latter case, the king of Ugarit was simply trying to reclaim his men, but his request was categorically denied by the Great King who reminded him of his treaty obligations. The authors conclude that, whoever these LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki* might have been, they seem to have played a central role in the treaty (*rikiltu*) written by His Majesty, whether it was an accord of limited capacity covering this issue only, or rather a full-fledged treaty replacing the one concluded between Muršili II and Niqmepa.

The significance of this late treaty, including its relation to the matter of the LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki*, may be elucidated, in my view, by tracking down the various changes in the conditions of Ugarit's vassalage to Hatti. It is true, as the authors say, that no comprehensive treaties between Hatti and Ugarit have been found later than the one concluded between Muršili II and Niqmepa in the late 14th century. However, as I pointed out some years ago, "the standard comprehensive type of treaty was partially replaced by a series of more specialized decrees" (Singer 1999: 682).¹⁸ Such decrees were periodically issued by the courts of Hattuša and Karkamiš throughout the 13th century and they had a direct bearing upon Ugarit's obligations towards its Hittite overlords.

One of these *ad hoc* decrees is RS 17.059 = PRU 4, 150f., ratified by Ini-Teššub.¹⁹ Through this important document Ugarit was released from sending its infantry and chariotry to support the Hittites in their war against Assyria. This basic vassal obligation was waived in return for the massive sum of 50 minas of gold, to be paid in ten instalments. When the war reaches its end, the decree says, Ugarit would resume all its vassal duties, including the military ones.²⁰

A closely related document is the well-known letter RS 20.212 = Ug. 5, no. 33.²¹ The incipit is missing, but from its contents it is clear that the sender is a high-ranking Hittite official, perhaps the Great King himself, and that the addressee is a king of Ugarit. In the second part of the letter it is demanded of the king of Ugarit that he provide a large ship

¹⁷ To the refs. provided by the authors in n. 66, add Beal 1988: 300, n. 162 on the *ILKU*-men in Hatti. For the *ilku* in Ugarit see, recently, Sanmartín 1995: 137; Marquez Rowe 1993; 1995; 1999. Marquez Rowe has convincingly demonstrated that the laws concerning royal grants and the corresponding obligations had the same evolution in the Hittite Laws and in the legal praxis of Ugarit.

¹⁸ The possible reasons for this change in Hittite policy towards Ugarit are discussed there.

¹⁹ For a new translation see Lackenbacher 1999: 64; 2002: 101f. The king of Ugarit, whose name is not preserved, could be either Ammištamru III or Ibiranu (Singer 1999: 682, n. 257; Lackenbacher 2002: 102, n. 304).

²⁰ So according to Lackenbacher's new restoration of lines 9–16.

²¹ Singer 1999: 716f.; Lackenbacher 2002: 103f.

with crew for the transportation of food rations from Mukiš to Ura.²² Two Hittite envoys, Aliziti SAG.LUGAL and Kunni, are sent to supervise the transaction.²³

In the first part of the letter the sender harshly reprimands the king of Ugarit for disobeying his obligations (ll. 5'–11'): "The king has released (lit.: purified) you from the *ilku* service, but when he sealed and gave you the tablets, was it not said in this regard: 'Whatever they will write him, he will listen and do it.' And now, why don't you do what you were asked to do?"

It is very likely that the release from *ilku* referred to in this letter is the very decree recorded in the above-mentioned text RS 17.059. The significant fact that the vassal duties of Ugarit are defined here as an *ilku*, a term usually referring to land tenure obligations, is perfectly comprehensible within the context of the Hittite legal conception. The *ilku* relationship between sovereign and vassal has pointedly been defined by Marquez Rowe (1999: 176): "First, according to the vassal-treaties, the conquered territories were absorbed by the Hittite empire and therefore formed part of its domain and jurisdiction; it was next that the king of Hatti granted them back to the local rulers who were constantly bound to certain services (which are significantly called *ilku* as far as Ugarit is concerned in the letter RS 20.212: 5')." In other words, all the vassal duties of Ugarit, including military assistance in case of war, are included within its *ilku* service. If the Great King decided, for his own interest, to temporarily remit the military component of the *ilku*, Ugarit was demanded to provide instead other crucial services, such as maritime transportation.

The Assyrian war ended with a crushing defeat of the Hittite armies, but soon afterwards Hittite-Assyrian diplomatic and commercial relations were resumed. Ugarit's temporary exemption from military duties was adjourned, and its king was given a new treaty, probably the one referred to in RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530, which stipulated the full resumption of the *ilku* obligations, including the military ones.²⁴ It is now evident who the '*ilku* troops' (LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ *ilki*) are, and what their connection is to the new and irreversible treaty tablet: They were the troops supplied to Hatti as part of Ugarit's *ilku* obligations.²⁵ Ammurapi was trying to obtain their release in order to deploy them in the defence of his own country, but the king of Hatti kept them back as leverage to obtain from Ugarit the ships needed for the transportation of PAD.MEŠ to Lukka. This is, in my view, the sense of the implicit threat "My Majesty will not repeat (this) for a second time, and I will not send

²² 'Food rations' is spelled out phonetically: *ku-ru-um-ma-ta* (l. 18'). See below on this term and its logographic writing.

²³ If Ali-zi[ti] SAG.LUGAL in RS 20.212: 27' is indeed the same person as the 'chief palace attendant' (Ali-ziti GAL.DUMU.É.GAL) in the Ulmi-Teššub Treaty (KBo 4.10 rev. 31), dated to Hattušili III, this would suggest that RS 20.212 would be roughly contemporary with RS 17.059. For the title LÚ.SAG and its hieroglyphic equivalent, see Hawkins *apud* Herbordt 2005: 303, with refs. to previous literature on the subject.

²⁴ RS 94.2530, 42–45: "The treaty tablet (*tuppi rikilti*) which My Majesty has written for you, nobody can subsequently change your accord."; RS 94.2523, 41–45: "The treaty tablet that His Majesty has made for you, this is indeed your treaty and nobody can change the treaty."

²⁵ Compare the military obligations of Ugarit in the Mursili II – Niqmepa treaty, § 2 (Beckman 1999: 65).

you back the *ilku*-troops”²⁶ (unless, of course, Ugarit would fully comply with her other obligations, notably, to provide full support for Šatalli’s mission).

This brief survey of Ugarit’s vassal obligations in the late 13th century provides, I think, the logical connection between the ‘*ilku*-troops’ in the opening of the passage and the ‘treaty tablet’ at its end, with Šatalli’s mission in between as the main objective of the companion letters.

Assuming that the requested ships of Ugarit were eventually supplied and that they actually sailed to Lukka, one cannot refrain from recalling the well-known passage in RS 20.238 = Ug. 5, no. 24²⁷, in which the king of Ugarit, probably Ammurapi, deplores his situation to the king of Alašia: “Doesn’t my father know that all of my infantry [...]”²⁸ is stationed in Hatti, and that all of my ships are stationed in the land of Lukka? They haven’t arrived back yet, and the land is thus prostrate.” This missive to Alašia and the companion letters RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530 are the only documents from Ugarit which mention the distant land of Lukka²⁹, and both do so in the same context, the destination of Ugaritian ships. Can this be an extraordinary coincidence, or might these contemporary letters, as would seem apparent, refer to the same event? RS 20.238 may well relate the dire results of the mission that Ugarit was demanded to perform in RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530.

Shipments for the Hiyawa in Lukka

Finally, the unique reference to the Hiyawa-men will be reconsidered, focusing particularly on the shipments sent to them in Lukka. Let us first reproduce the two parallel passages, following the rendering provided by the authors. His Majesty’s letter says:³⁰ “This time, didn’t I send you Šatalli? Now, I’ve been told (that) ‘the Hiyawa-man is in the [land] of Lukka and there are no *rations* for him.’ Concerning this matter, don’t tell me that there is nothing to do. Provide ships to Šatalli and let them take the *rations* for the Hiyawa-men.” The much shorter version from Penti-Šarruma has only:³¹ “This time you have ...”³² Šatalli from taking the *rations* to the Hiyawa-man in Lukka.”

²⁶ RS 94.2530: 39–41 (paralleled by RS 94.2523: 38–40), following the authors’ preference for the rendering “ne te renverra pas” (2005a: 238).

²⁷ Beckman 1996: 27; Singer 1999: 720f.; Lackenbacher 2002: 193f.

²⁸ Beckman (op. cit.) restores ‘[chariotry]’ after ÉRIN.MEŠ, but the traces do not seem to correspond either to ANŠE.KUR.RA(.MEŠ) or to ^{GIŠ}GIGIR(.MEŠ). Lackenbacher 2002: 194, n. 652 suggests *h[urādu]* or *h[urādu]*, rebutting other restoration attempts. I examined the possibility of restoring *ilki*, but the traces do not seem to support this restoration either.

²⁹ The spelling *Lu-uk-ka-a* is common to all three documents.

³⁰ RS 94.2530:31–38: *i-na KASKAL an-ni-ti Ša-ta-al-li ul āš-pu-ra-ma-ku e-nin-na iq-ta-bu-ū-ni um-ma-a LÚ Hi-ia-a-ū i-[na KUR] Lu-uk-ka-a a-ši-ib ù PAD.MEŠ-šu ia-nu a-ki a-ma-ti an-ni-ti ia-nu na-tù la ta-qa-ab-ba-a GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ a-na Ša-ta-al-li i-din-ma PAD.MEŠ a-na LÚ.MEŠ Hi-a-ū-wi-i lil-qu-ū.*

³¹ RS 94.2523: 35–37 *i-na 1-et KASKAL an-ni-ti Ša-ta-al-li tu-še-er-si-ma PAD.MEŠ a-na LÚ Hi-ia-ū-wi-i a-na KUR Lu-uk-ka-a il-qi.*

³² The authors (2005a: 236, n. 72) hesitate about the grammatical analysis of the hapax verb *tu-še-er-si*, probably derived from *ersû* ‘ready, prepared’. Comparison with the parallel text and the general context probably require some negative meaning, such as “you have *not* prepared”, “you have *prevented* Šatalli from taking...”, or the like.

This categorical order addressed to Ammurapi raises several important questions: 1) Who is Šatalli? 2) Who are the Hiyawa-men in Lukka? 3) What is the cargo to be shipped to them? The first question can be answered succinctly: Šatalli, as far as I can see, is not attested in other documents. He was obviously an important envoy sent from the Hittite court to accelerate the dispatch of the ships and probably to accompany them to Lukka.

The second and the third questions are obviously interconnected. As recognized by the authors, the gentilicon *Hiyau(wi)* is no doubt Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts, attested here for the first time in a text written in Akkadian. This surprising new attestation shows that the typical aphaeresis in certain Luwian dialects developed already in the second millennium, long before the Çineköy bilingual in which hieroglyphic Luwian *Hiya(wa)* is equated with Phoenician *Adana*.³³ What were these (Ah)hiyawans doing in Lukka?³⁴ The authors propose that they were some kind of mercenaries or workforce of Ahhiyawan origin employed by the Hittite administration. They assume that the food rations (‘rations alimentaires’) sent to them came either from Ugarit itself or from some other region of the empire, drawing a parallel with the Ugaritian ships that transported grains from Mukiš to Ura (RS 20.212 = Ug. 5, no 33). On the face of it, the context of the great famine that ravaged the Hittite Empire in the last decades of its existence could indeed serve as the background for Šatalli’s mission. However, upon closer examination this interpretation raises several difficulties, and an entirely different interpretation will be suggested instead.

The documentary evidence for the last king of Hatti, Šuppiluliuma II, is notoriously sparse, in particular with regard to his involvement in western Anatolia and his relations with Ahhiyawa.³⁵ Although both he and his father Tudhaliya IV include Lukka among the ‘subjected’ or ‘destroyed’ lands in their hieroglyphic inscriptions³⁶, the historical reality behind these boasting declarations was quite different. From Tudhaliya’s treaty with Kurunta of Tarhuntašša we know that the southwestern border of the kingdom ran along the Kaštaraya/Kestros river near Antalya (Beckman 1999: 115, § 8). The same paragraph adds that the king of Hatti may occasionally campaign beyond this line and seize the land of Parha (Perge), but does not refer to any permanent occupation, and in any case, it only touches the eastern fringes of the Lukka lands. There were probably deeper incursions as well, such as the one in which the Hittites took prisoners from Awarna and Pina (i.e. Xanthos and Pinara in the Xanthos Valley), which they sought to exchange for their own

³³ Tekoğlu/Lemaire 2000: 980ff. The evolution of this term into *Qawe/Que* and the problem of the Akhaean migrations to Pamphylia and Cilicia are beyond the scope of this article. See, e.g. Brixhe 2002: 50ff.; Forlanini 2005: 111–114; Oettinger, forthcoming.

³⁴ The remark of Freu (2006: 215) concerning the Ahhiyawans who visited the land of Ugarit in the reign of Ammurapi must be rectified.

³⁵ Singer 1983: 217; 1985: 119ff.; Otten 1993; Giorgieri & Mora 1996: 61ff. The last references to Ahhiyawa in Hittite texts are from the reign of Tudhaliya IV (in the Šaušgamuwa treaty and indirectly in the Milawatta letter) and they seem to betray a hostile disposition. There is no evidence, however, concerning the nature of Hittite-Ahhiyawan relations during the reign of Šuppiluliuma II.

³⁶ For the relevant references in the Südburg inscription of Šuppiluliuma and the Yalburt inscription of Tudhaliya, see Hawkins 1995: 23f., 68f.

hostages.³⁷ This indicates that the Lands of Lukka, i.e. the southwestern corner of Anatolia (which comprised more than classical Lycia), were not part of the lasting jurisdiction of the Hittite kings, and were normally regarded as enemy territory.³⁸ In other words, the ships of Ugarit that were about to sail to Lukka did not expect to harbour in a Hittite-controlled territory. Quite to the contrary, this notoriously rebellious region must have been in this period under the hegemony of the Ahhiyawans who operated from Milawata/Miletos, their main base on Anatolian soil.

That the purpose of this complex maritime operation would be the provisioning of some Mycenaean mercenaries is not impossible *per se*, but is not very likely. The supposition that there were also Ahhiyawan elements among the displaced bands that operated in this period in the eastern Mediterranean rests primarily on the identification of one of the Sea Peoples mentioned in Egyptian texts, the *ʾIq3w3š*, with the Ahhiyawans.³⁹ This identification is open to criticism, and in any case, I see no concrete support for the supposition that Ahhiyawans were serving in the Hittite army or in any other capacity for the Hittite crown.⁴⁰ Of course, there is almost no scenario that can definitely be ruled out, especially in periods of great upheavals such as the one under consideration. That said, the probability of a scenario in which the Hittites sent grain, desperately needed in Hatti itself, to some Ahhiyawan mercenaries in the far west of Anatolia, seems to me rather farfetched. The outstanding question is thus what exactly was the cargo carried by these Ugaritian ships, in other words, what are PAD.MEŠ in this context?

PAD.MEŠ

The sign MesZL 746 has the values PAD, 'break', and ŠUG/KURUM₆, 'ration'⁴¹, corresponding to Akkadian *kusāpu* and *kurummatu*, respectively. The basic meaning of the verb is 'to chip, to break off a piece, to trim', from which the nouns *kusāpu*, 'a bite, (a piece of) bread, a bread cake' (CAD, K, 583f.; AHw, 514; CDA, 169) and *kurummatu*, '(food) portion, ration' (CAD, K, 573ff.; AHw, 513; CDA, 169) are derived. In most passages cited in the Akkadian dictionaries PAD refers to bread and food allocations.⁴²

³⁷ For the so-called 'Milawata letter', see Bryce 2005: 306ff. (with refs.). For Awarina and Pinara, see Hawkins 1995: 80f. (with refs.).

³⁸ In an instruction text of Tudhaliya IV Lukka is listed together with Azzi and Kaška as enemy territory (KUB 26.12+ ii 15'). Lukka appears in two inventory texts as the supplier or receiver of silver and gold (Siegelová 1986: 282f., 402f.), but these references are inconsequential for establishing Lukka's geo-political status.

³⁹ Stadelmann 1984: 815 and n. 14 (with further refs.).

⁴⁰ There were certainly mercenaries in the Hittite army, but as I suggested in 2005: 448ff., they were probably of western Anatolian (Luwian) origin, rather than Ahhiyawan Greeks. Should the hypothesis of (Ah)hiyawan mercenaries in the service of the Hittites turn out to be valid after all, I would still doubt that PAD.MEŠ refers to food rations. I would then suggest that the 'ingots' or 'scrap metal' (see below on the meaning of PAD.MEŠ) was employed as payment for mercenaries.

⁴¹ Labat, *Manuel*, 469; Borger, *MesZL*, no. 746; Rüster/Neu, *HZL*, no. 295.

⁴² Cf. also Mes ZL 579, ŠE-PAD-MEŠ. At Ugarit only the value ŠUG/*kurummatu*, 'food ration', seems to be attested, either logographically (Ug. 5, no. 101: 1; PRU 6, no. 152: 3), or written phonetically

There are, however, other materials associated with the logogram PAD/ŠUG, including fields, wood, wool and metals. When *kurummatu* refers to silver, it is usually in the context of wages paid to various employees, including military men.⁴³ A related logographic compound is KÙ.PAD.DU/DA, Akkadian *še/ibirtum*, which originally denoted lumps or broken pieces of silver, and then evolved into the concept of an ingot that had been formed from "broken" silver.⁴⁴ In most references cited in the dictionaries, *še/ibirtu* indeed refers to silver, but other metals (gold, copper, tin, bronze) are also attested.

A glance at the Boğazköy material immediately reveals that in Hatti the logogram PAD is attested only in connection with metals, designating a metal block or ingot.⁴⁵ Most occurrences come from inventory texts (Kořak 1982; Siegelová 1986), a few from court cases (Werner 1967). For the latter see, e.g., KUB 13.35+ iii 3f., from a testimony: "Of the valuable items in the storehouse I received two linen (garments), two ingots of copper (2 PAD URUDU), six bows, one hundred arrows, two bronze bands, one veil and one copper *dammuri*."⁴⁶

The PAD mentioned in inventories are made of various metals: copper (KBo 31.50 iii 2', 3'; KUB 40.95 ii 9), bronze (KBo 9.91 rev.B, 6), iron (KUB 42.76 obv. 1) and mainly silver (KBo 18.155, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11; KBo 18.156, 3; KBo 18.157, 4). In KBo 18.155, a list of tribute (*MANDATTU*) provided by various persons and towns, the overall weight of silver ingots is specified. Dividing the weight by the number of ingots shows that they do not keep a unified standard, the average weight fluctuating between 2.29 and 1.5 mina to an ingot, i.e., about 1175 to 770 grams.⁴⁷ Another text refers to a 'small silver ingot', but its weight is not

(Ug. 5, no. 33: 18'); the latter is a letter sent to the king of Ugarit, probably by the Hittite king. In the published texts from Ugarit (except for RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530), the value PAD/*kusāpu* is apparently not attested (Huehnergard 1989: 403).

⁴³ CAD, K, 575: mng. 1.2'.b'. e.g.: 5 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR PAD.HI.A-su-nu "five minas of silver is their payment" (YOS 3 21:30); *kaspu ša PAD.HI.A ana šābē ša ūti šarri* "silver of the payment for the army which is with the king" (YOS 3 153:24).

⁴⁴ CAD, Š II, 379ff.; Powell 1978; 1996: 237ff., with reference to other Akkadian words that may denote some form of "ingot"; some of them (e.g. *akalu*, *kakkaru*, *kurummatu*) can refer to loaves of bread or metal bars, presumably because they would have been similarly shaped. *kù-pad/šibirtum* already appears in an Early Dynastic proverb from Abu Salabikh: "The silver pieces that are therein – you do not return what you have taken" (Civil / Biggs 1966: 6; Alster 1991–92: 10, 20; Reiter 1997: 85f.). For the equation *kù-pad-rá* = *šibirtum* in Old Babylonian, see Reiter 1997:90, with n. 61; cf. also *kù.babbar pad.da* in a lexical text (Limet 1960: 49).

⁴⁵ HZL, no. 295: 'Brocken, Stück, (Metall)barren'. The Hittite reading of PAD (never with the plural determinative) is not known. Cf. also HZL, no. 109: URUDU.PAD or ^{URUDU}PAD, 'Kupferbarren'. This PAD should be kept apart from ^{TUG}PAD-*imi*-, which designates an unidentified type of garment (Kořak 1982: 134, 270; Siegelová 1986: 338, n. 1, 667).

⁴⁶ Werner 1967: 8f.; Hoffner 2002: 59. Cf. also KUB 31.76+ vi 7': [nu?]-wa-aš-ši EGIR-pa ŠA PAD *pī-tah-hu*-[un "I have paid him back <the price?> of the ingot" (Werner ib.: 26); KBo 16.64, 2': 2 PAD KÙ.BABBAR, "two silver ingots" (ib.: 28).

⁴⁷ Siegelová 1986: 186, n. 1 (*contra* Werner 1967: 18), calculating on the basis of the silver ingots listed in KBo 18.155 l. 7: 17 PAD weighing 39 mina (2.294 gr. per PAD); ll. 3, 11: 18 ingots weighing 38 mina (2.111); l. 9: 8 PAD weighing 14 mina (1.75); l. 5: 12 PAD weighing 18 mina (1.5). For the Hittite mina, see Th. van den Hout 1990: 526.

preserved.⁴⁸ With one exception, the form of the ingots is not indicated. KUB 42.21, a list of chests containing various metal objects, includes the item 6 PAD TA-YA-AR-TÛ (obv. 10). The basic meaning of *tayyartu(m)* is 'return, repetition' (CDA, 402), which may perhaps refer to a crescent-shaped ingot (Siegelová 1986: 139). Copper sickles (^{URUDU}KIN) or scimitars are mentioned as rewards or prizes for various participants in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival (KBo 9.91 rev.B, 2–5; Siegelová 1986: 334). Siegelová (ib.: 330) suggests that these objects are not intended here as serving their original function, but rather as a means of payment. The next line mentions "2 bronze ingots (for) a bathtub of the *zintuhi*-women" (2 PAD ZABAR ANA ^{SAL.MEŠ}*zintuhiaš* 1 ^{URUDU}*warpuas*). Another entry in the same text (obv. 12–14) lists 3 daggers given to the men of Arauna who serve in the garrison of Nerik.

In short, all the Boğazköy attestations of PAD, without exception, refer to metal ingots used as a form of payment or remuneration (Siegelová 1993–97: 114).⁴⁹ There is not a single attestation of PAD in the sense of food rations, which is the standard meaning in Mesopotamian texts.⁵⁰ Whatever the explanation for this restricted semantic field for PAD in Hittite sources might be⁵¹, the intriguing question in the present context is, what does PAD.MEŠ in RS 94.2530/RS 94.2523 mean? The authors followed the most common *interpretatio Mesopotamica* for this logogram, rendering it accordingly as 'rations alimentaires'. I would argue that, unless there is some conclusive evidence to the contrary, a letter sent from the Hittite court should be understood according to an *interpretatio Hethitica*. It is unlikely, in my view, that the scribes of Boğazköy would have used PAD in one sense in inventories and legal texts, and in a different sense in letters written to Ugarit, irrespective of the document's language. I would therefore assert that the cargo of the ships destined to set sail for Lukka consisted of metal ingots rather than food rations! One could perhaps raise the objection that the texts do not specify the metal composition of these ingots, but then, this information must have been obvious to both correspondents, either from previous contacts and/or from common practice. Another reason could be the variegated nature of the cargo, in which case PAD.MEŠ could be an inclusive designation for all kinds of metal bars. The far-reaching implications of this tentative suggestion are quite obvious, and will be briefly addressed further below. But first, the documents from Ugarit must be scrutinized for possible parallels to this interpretation.

⁴⁸ KBo 18.157, 4' x+]4 PAD KÛ.BABBAR ŠA.BA 1 TUR (5') [x MA.NA] KIL.LÁ-ŠU. Siegelová 1986: 192.

⁴⁹ The number of occurrences of PAD may appear to be low, but ingots must be implied also in the numerous cases in which the quantity is followed directly by the metal type, without explicit reference to an object or an ingot, e.g., KUB 40.95 ii 1, 5, 6, 13: 1 URUDU GUN, "one (ingot of) copper (of) one talent" (Kempinski/Košak 1977: 89). This frequent designation (to be rendered simply as 'a copper talent') corresponds to the average weight of the so-called 'oxhide-ingots' (between 25 and 30 kg.). The copper ingots on the Uluburun shipwreck weigh on the average only 24 kg., probably due to corrosion in seawater (Pulak 2001: 18).

⁵⁰ I wish to thank Silvin Košak and Jared Miller for checking out the PAD entries in the Boğazköy-Archiv in Mainz.

⁵¹ It is well known that some Sumerograms (or 'pseudo-Sumerograms') have an idiosyncratic usage at Boğazköy, although this phenomenon has not been systematically researched as yet. See, e.g., A. Kammenhuber 1976: 198 ff. ("BoSpezBed").

There are numerous references in the Ras Shamra and Ras Ibn Hani texts to ships and maritime transportation, both in Akkadian and in Ugaritic.⁵² Many of them are fragmentary or poorly understood. From the better preserved texts, mainly in Akkadian, it appears that most of them refer to the vital food shipments sent to relieve the famine in Hatti.⁵³ The circuit of these ships is well known – from Egypt to the ports of Cilicia (mainly Ura), passing through the port towns of 'Phoenicia', Ugarit and Mukiš. Noticeably, Alašia does not seem to be involved in this trade in grain, at least not according to the texts discovered so far (Malbran-Labat 1999; Singer 1999: 677).

Alongside this well-documented transportation of food from the south to the north, another commercial track is gradually emerging from the texts of Ugarit, the one in copper, naturally centred at Alašia/Cyprus. The huge quantities of copper exported to Egypt in the 14th century are well known from the Amarna letters⁵⁴, but we now have growing evidence for Alašia's exports of copper to Ugarit and Hatti in the late 13th century as well.

A new letter from the Urtenu archive, RS 94.2475, written by Kušmešusa king of Alašia to Niqmaddu III king of Ugarit, records the shipment of 33 (ingots) of copper weighing 30 talents and 6500 shekels, i.e., approximately one talent per ingot, corresponding to the average weight of an oxhide ingot (see n. 49).⁵⁵ An Ugaritic text, RS 18.119 = KTU 4.390, mentions a ship of Ala[šia] carrying a cargo of "15 talents of co[ppe]" (Singer 1999: 676). These quantities may not appear to be very large in comparison to those from Amarna, but one must take into account the fact that these are merely fortuitous references to a trade which probably remained mostly unrecorded.⁵⁶ Ugarit had a considerable metallurgical industry based on Cypriote copper, as shown by the texts⁵⁷ and by a stone mould for casting oxhide-ingots from the coastal site of Ras Ibn Hani near Ugarit, the only one of its kind so far discovered (Lagarce et al. 1983: 278, fig. 15). A fragment of an oxhide-ingot was also found at Ras Shamra itself (Al-Maqdissi et al. 2004: 123, no. 101). The products of this metallurgical industry presumably supplied local consumption and the needs of Ugarit's foreign trade⁵⁸, but some of the copper must have been transferred to her Hittite overlords. Of course Anatolia had sufficient metal sources of its own, but the accumulation of additional capital could well have served the Hittites' growing needs for imports from distant lands. Alašia also shipped copper and gold directly to Hatti as part of her yearly tribute (Güterbock 1967).

⁵² For the navy of Ugarit, see, e.g., Knapp 1983; Vita 1995: 157–177; Singer 1999: 677 f.

⁵³ For references and discussion see Singer 1999: 715 ff.

⁵⁴ EA 33: 16–18 (2 *me* URUDU.MEŠ; 10 GÛ.UN URUDU [DÛG]); EA 34: 18 (1 *me* GÛ.UN URUDU.MEŠ); EA 35: 10 (5 *me-at* URUDU). For refs. see Cochavi-Rainey 2003.

⁵⁵ Malbran-Labat 1999: 122; id. *apud* Al-Maqdissi et al. 2004: 188, no. 177 (with a photograph of the obverse). Since 'lingots' is placed by Malbran-Labat (1999: 122) in parentheses, I assume that the text has simply "33 URUDU.MEŠ", like the Amarna references, without an explicit reference to ingots.

⁵⁶ One wonders what the contexts of the yet undeciphered Cypro-Minoan inscriptions found at Ras Shamra might be; it would not come as a surprise if copper shipments were mentioned in them.

⁵⁷ For metalworking in Ugarit, see Zaccagnini 1970; Heltzer 1999: 451 f.

⁵⁸ See, e.g., RS 20.16 = Ug. 5, no. 38, which records a consignment of 20 talents of bronze/copper, 8 talents of tin, and a bronze/copper basin sent from Ugarit to Qadeš; see Zaccagnini, ib.: 322 ff.

One document from Ugarit may be directly related to metal shipments to Hatti, but regrettably the relevant part is badly damaged. RS 20.255 A = Ug. 5, no. 30 is a late letter whose incipit is missing. From its contents it is clear that it was sent from the Hittite court to a king of Ugarit. After the customary greetings, the sender refers to a repeated request for the dispatch of precious stones⁵⁹ and to a visit of the addressee to Hatti on board one of his ships (ll. 13' – left edge 2). There follows a declaration by His Majesty, which unfortunately is almost entirely lost. In the remaining traces (in the first two lines on the left edge) mention is made of a certain amount of “gold and [silver? sh]ekels” and of some “broken pieces” (*še-bi-ra še-bi-r[a]*). J. Nougayrol (Ug. 5, p. 101 with n. 5, 102) rendered this expression with ‘pièce à pièce’ or ‘morceaux’, referring to the mode of payment in ‘espèces sonnantes’. Perhaps this *šebiru* is a variant of *šebirtu* or *šibru*, which denotes a broken piece of metal or ‘scrap silver’.⁶⁰ Perhaps this fragmentary reference to metal ‘pieces’ is insufficient to establish a clear connection with the PAD.MEŠ in RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530, but it is worth noting that three out of four issues dealt with in these companion letters are also taken up in RS 20.255 A, i.e.: the dispatch of stones⁶¹, the request for ships, and a visit of the king of Ugarit in Hatti. Could this letter be an earlier missive of Penti-Šarruma, or, if sent by a different Hittite official, could it nevertheless be assigned to the same dossier?

Along with these sparse but suggestive references to metal trade in the Ugaritic sources, the archaeological evidence should be mentioned briefly, especially with regard to metals as a means of currency and to the metal trade along the Anatolian coast.

From the earliest of times metals – primarily gold, silver, copper and tin – served as a principal means of exchange and payment, either as scrap metal traded by weight, or cast as standard objects and ingots from which pieces could be cut off (‘Hacksilber’).⁶² Silver was the standard currency in most of the Near East⁶³, but other metals also served as payment in specific regions or periods (Müller 1982).

The spectacular discovery of the Cape Gelidonya and Uluburun shipwrecks off the Mediterranean coast of Lycia has supplied invaluable information on the maritime transportation of metals and on the shapes and compositions of the ingots.⁶⁴ The Uluburun ship

⁵⁹ Ll. 4'–11'; left edge 3–5. For the possible identification of the “dark stone, *alkabašu*” and the “white stone, *kabdum*”, see Ug. 5, p. 101, n. 1. Cf. also RS 34.135 (= RSO 7, no. 17), where *algamišu* stone is requested from Ugarit by the king of Amurru.

⁶⁰ Powell 1978: 223; CAD, ŠII, 379ff. (*šibirtu*), 382 (*šibru* B).

⁶¹ While the pair of letters RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530 refer to lapis lazuli, the author of RS 20.255A was mainly interested in receiving his presents in precious stones, their kind being of secondary importance.

⁶² For the textual evidence, mainly from Mesopotamia, see Oppenheim 1947; Limet 1960; Powell 1978; 1996; Reiter 1997; Joannès 1993–1997; Milano 2003; Pomponio 2003. For the archaeological evidence see Moorey 1985: 110f., 116ff.; Muhly 1993–97; and the articles collected in Pare 2000.

⁶³ See, e.g., from 8th century Zincirli the complete silver ‘cake-ingot’ weighing 497.37 g., roughly corresponding to one mina (Lassen 2000: 243). Two silver ingots found at Pyla-Kokkinokremos in Cyprus weigh 1332 and 1296 g., respectively (Karageorghis et al. 1983).

⁶⁴ See, most recently, the articles collected for the exhibition catalog *Das Schiff von Uluburun* (Yalçın et al. 2005) and the extensive bibliography cited in them. It is generally accepted that most of the metal cargo on these ships was controlled at the highest official level (e.g., Bass 1991: 76; Snodgrass 1991: 18; and the refs. cited in Bachhuber 2006, 351, n. 61; but cf. Sherratt 2000: 87). For the anticlockwise

transported around 1300 BCE a precious cargo which included nearly 10 tons of copper and one ton of tin in oxhide- and bun-shaped ingots (Pulak 2000a; 2001: 18; 2005: 59ff.). Lumps of gold and silver and pieces of finished objects were also found in some quantity in the Uluburun shipwreck, probably used as bullion in trade or payments (Pulak 2000b: 263; 2001: 24f.; 2005: 66). About a century later, the much smaller cargo of the Cape Gelidonya ship consisted of fully or partly preserved copper ingots (weighing more than one ton) and powdery tin oxide (Bass 1967). Bass (ib.: 82) calls attention to the 19 slab ingots of copper found in the area of the ‘captain’s cabin’, which most likely served as currency. Most of these weigh about 1.0 kg., which more or less corresponds to the average weight of an ingot (PAD) in KBo 18.155 (see n. 47).

Recent metallurgical studies have established that due to their porous composition the ingots were brittle and could easily be broken up into small pieces by a sharp blow of a hammer or simply by dropping them on a hard surface (Hauptmann et al. 2002: 19). Many oxhide ingots and ingot fragments suitable for melting down in a crucible have turned up all around the Mediterranean basin.⁶⁵ The ‘breaking’ of a copper ingot weighing one talent is also attested in Hittite texts.⁶⁶ In other words, all the metal cargo aboard these ships, whether gold and silver or copper and tin, could easily be broken up into small pieces suitable for payments or for retail trade.⁶⁷

A lot has been written on the provenance of the metals and the technologies involved in the preparation of the various types of ingots.⁶⁸ Although many problems remain, all archaeometallurgical authorities seem to agree that the copper ingots from Cape Gelidonya and the majority of those from Uluburun are made from Cypriote ores.⁶⁹ Of course, the origin of the ores does not necessarily imply that all the ingots were made in Cyprus itself, but Cyprus was no doubt the hub of this lucrative maritime trade. The easternmost segment of this traffic in metals, with transshipments from Alašia to Ugarit and to Cilicia, is reasonably well documented in the texts from Ugarit and Hattuša. I would tentatively suggest that RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530 now provide textual evidence for the westbound transportation of these metals to south-western Anatolia.

The Ahhiyawan(s)⁷⁰ mentioned in these letters were probably merchants and/or representatives of Ahhiyawa awaiting the ingot-laden Ugaritian ships in some port of Lukka.

itinerary of the Cape Gelidonya and Uluburun ships (from a home port in the Levant to the Aegean and/or Crete, thence directly to Egypt and back to the Levant) see, e.g., Lambrou-Phillipson 1991; Pulak 2001: 14, 48.

⁶⁵ For refs. see Gale/Stos-Gale 1986; Budd et al. 1995; Hauptmann et al. 2002; Pulak 2001: 18ff.; 2005: 61f.

⁶⁶ KUB 40.95 ii 13: 1 URUDU GUN *arḥa duwarnir* “they broke up a copper (ingot one) talent (in weight)” (Kempinski/Košak 1977: 89; Siegelová 1986: 270f.); see also KBo 31.50 iii 4'f. (Siegelová 1986: 274). This usage of Hittite *duwarnai-* is paralleled by Akkadian *šebērum*, *šebirtum*, etc. (for refs. see Reiter 1997: 98ff.).

⁶⁷ Nearly all the tin ingots on the Uluburun ship had been cut into halves and quarters before they were taken on board (Pulak 2001: 22).

⁶⁸ See, e.g. Gale/Stos-Gale 1986; Hauptmann et al. 2002; Muhly 2003.

⁶⁹ Muhly 2003: 145; Gale/Stos-Gale 2005: 119, 122; Pulak 2001: 21; 2005: 61. The provenance of the other metals on the ships seems to be less unequivocal. The scrap silver from Uluburun probably originates from Taurus Mountains ores (Pulak 2001: 24; Gale/Stos-Gale 2005: 129).

⁷⁰ In both letters the first mention of the gentilicon is in the singular LÚ *Hi-ia-a-ú*/LÚ *Hi-ia-ú-wi-i*,

The good harbours of Lycia would have been an ideal meeting point for the Ahhiyawans and the Hittite/Ugaritian delegation, probably headed by Šatalli himself.⁷¹ I deliberately refrain from guessing what the Hittites might have received in return for their ingots, but there were surely plenty of Aegean products that would have been of value to them. I also forbear speculating on the various uses that the Ahhiyawans may have had for the purchased metals, whether as payment to designated recipients, allocations to craftsmen, or exports to regions further northwards and westwards. All this would require a comprehensive discussion of Mediterranean metallurgy and trade at the turn of the 13th century BCE, which is beyond the scope of this article.⁷² Also, the philological merit of my novel interpretation must first be weighed and evaluated by the scholarly community. I cannot forgo, however, emphasizing the remarkable coincidence between the philological evidence concerning Ugaritian ships sailing to Lukka with a cargo of PAD.MEŠ, and the ships that sank off the Lycian coast with their rich metal cargo, in particular the Cape Gelidonya ship which is roughly contemporary with the companion letters from Ugarit. That it might have been one of the Ugaritian ships that never made it to a port in Lukka is an enticing possibility, but there is no need to stretch the evidence that far. There must have been plenty of ships sailing along the Mediterranean coast of Anatolia in the same period, many of them carrying metal cargoes.⁷³ Suffice it to say that, if my understanding of PAD.MEŠ in RS 94.2523/RS 94.2530 as metal ingots is correct, we may have here the first textual evidence for the shipment of metals to the west at the very end of the Late Bronze Age, for which we presently have only archaeological evidence.

‘the Hiyawan man’; only the second mention in His Majesty’s letter switches to the plural LÚ.MEŠ *Hi-a-ú-wi-i*. This might indicate that the scribes had in mind a certain ‘Ahhiyawan’ person, the head of the delegation, the merchant, or the like. As he presumably would not have been in Lukka exclusively on his own account, the switch to the non-personalized ‘Ahhiyawans’ would have referred to him, to his retinue and to his backers. It is perhaps of interest to mention in this connection, that the ca. one century earlier ship from Uluburun apparently had on board two Mycenaean of rank, who could have been “emissaries representing the recipients of the precious goods carried on the ship, and whose purpose may have been to provide safe passage through unchartered waters that they were familiar with, assure the ship’s safety in hostile seas, and ultimately to oversee the safe delivery of the valuable goods to their final destination at or near their homeland” (Bass 2001: 49).

⁷¹ For Lukka in the 13th century, see Lebrun 1995. The port of Limyra, Lycian Zemuri, could well have been frequented by ships hugging the Mediterranean coast, if the identification with second millennium Zumarri (ib.: 147) is eventually substantiated by the excavations taking place at this site. It should perhaps be added in this connection, that the nearby island of Rhodes was a major Mycenaean entrepôt joining the Aegean to the eastern Mediterranean circuit (Bachhuber 2006: 358, with further refs.).

⁷² For the extensive literature on the subject see, e.g., Gale/Stos-Gale 1986; Cline 1994; Sherratt 2000; Pulak 2001; Muhly 2003; Bachhuber 2006 (with further refs.). For Mycenaean interest in eastern metal resources, see, e.g., Yakar 1976: 125 ff.; Niemeyer 1998: 148 f. For Mycenaean-Anatolian exchanges see recently, Genz 2004; Singer, forthcoming b. See n. 40 above for the remote possibility that the metal shipments may have been employed as payment to the (Ah)hiyawan mercenaries.

⁷³ For other Late Bronze Age ingots pulled from shipwrecks by local divers, see Pulak 2001: 16; Bass 2005: 307.

References

- Ahl, S. W. 1973: Epistolary Texts from Ugarit: Structural and Lexical Correspondences in Epistles in Akkadian and Ugaritic. Ph.D. diss. Brandeis University.
- Al-Maqdisi, M. et al. 2004: Le royaume d'Ougarit. Aux origines de l'alphabet. Paris: Somogy éditions d'art/Lyon: Musée des Beaux-Arts.
- Alster, B. 1991–92: Early Dynastic Proverbs and other Contributions to the Study of Literary Texts from Abu Šalābīkh, AfO 38/39, 1–51.
- Arnaud, D. et al. 2001: Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Textes de la “maison d'Ourtenou” trouvés en 1986, 1988, et 1992, in: Yon – Arnaud (edd.) 2001, 235–415.
- Bachhuber, C. 2006: Aegean Interest on the Uluburun Ship, AJA 110, 345–363.
- Bass, G. F. 1967: Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck. Philadelphia.
- Bass, G. F. 1991: Evidence of Trade from Bronze Age Shipwrecks, in: N. Gale (ed.), Bronze Age Trade in the Mediterranean (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 90), Sweden, 69–82.
- Bass, G. F. 2005: Die Schiffwracks der Bronzezeit im östlichen Mittelmeer, in: Yalçın 2005, 303–308.
- Beal, R. H. 1988: The ^{GIS}TUKUL-institution in Second Millennium Hatti, AoF 15, 269–305.
- Beckman, G. 1996: Akkadian Documents from Ugarit, in: A. B. Knapp (ed.), Sources for the History of Cyprus. Vol. II: Near Eastern and Aegean Texts from the Third to the First Millennia BC. Altamont, NY, 26–28.
- Bordreuil, P. et al. 1991: Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville (Ras Shamra-Ougarit VII), Paris.
- Brixhe, C. 2002: Achéens et Phrygiens en Asie Mineure: approche comparative de quelques données lexicales, in: M. Fritz – S. Zeilfelder (edd.), Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag. Graz, 49–73.
- Bryce, T. 2005: The Kingdom of the Hittites (New Edition). Oxford.
- Budd, P. – A. M. Pollard – B. Scaife – R. G. Thomas, Oxhide ingots, recycling and the Mediterranean metals trade, Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology 8, 1–32, 70–75.
- CDA: J. Black, A. George, N. Postgate, A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian, 2nd (corrected) printing, Wiesbaden 2000.
- Cline, E. 1994: Sailing the Wine Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean. Oxford.
- Forlanini, M. 2005: Un peuple, plusieurs noms: le problème des ethniques au Proche Orient Ancien. Cas connus, cas à découvrir, in: W. H. van Soldt (ed.), Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia. Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Leiden, July 2002). Leiden, 111–119.
- Freu, J. 2006: Histoire politique du royaume d'Ugarit. Paris.
- Civil M. – R. D. Biggs 1966: Notes sur les textes sumériens archaïques, RA 60, 1–16.
- Cochavi-Rainey Z. 2003: The Alashia Texts from the 14th and 13th Centuries BCE. A Textual and Linguistic Study. Münster.
- Gale, N. H. – Z. A. Stos-Gale 1986: Oxhide Copper Ingots in Crete and Cyprus and the Bronze Age Metals Trade, Annual of the British School at Athens 81, 81–100.
- Gale, N. H. – Z. A. Stos-Gale 2005: Zur Herkunft der Kupferbarren aus dem Schiffswrack von Uluburun und der spätbronzezeitliche Metallhandel im Mittelmeerraum, in: Yalçın et al. 2005, 117–131.
- Genz, H. 2004: Eine mykenische Scherbe aus Boğazköy, AA 2004/1, 77–84.
- Giorgieri, M. – C. Mora 1996: Aspetti della regalità nel XIII secolo a.C. Como.
- Güterbock, H. G. 1967: The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered, JNES 26, 73–81.
- Hagenbuchner, A. 1989: Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter. 2. Teil. Heidelberg.
- Hauptmann, A. – R. Maddin – M. Prange 2002: On the Structure and Composition of Copper and Tin Ingots Excavated from the Shipwreck of Uluburun, BASOR 328, 1–30.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1995: The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex (Südburg). Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer, M. 1999: The Economy of Ugarit, in: W. G. E. Watson – N. Wyatt (edd.), Handbook of Ugaritic Studies (HbOr I/39). Leiden, 423–454.
- Herbordt, S. 2005: Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Großreichszeit auf Tonbullien aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Mainz.

- Hoffner, H. A. Jr. 2002: Courtcases, in W. W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture*, vol. III. Leiden, 57–60.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. 1990: Masse und Gewichte, *RIA* 7, 517–527.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. 1995: Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden.
- Huehnergard, J. 1989: *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. Atlanta.
- HZL: Chr. Rüster – E. Neu, *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon*. Wiesbaden, 1989.
- Joannès, F. 1993–97: *Metalle und Metallurgie*. A. I. In *Mesopotamien*, *RIA* 8, 96–112.
- Kammenhuber, A. 1976: *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern* (THeth 7), Heidelberg.
- Karageorghis V., N. Gale – Z. Stos-Gale 1983: Two silver ingots from Cyprus, *Antiquity* 57, 211–214.
- Kempinski, A. – S. Košak 1977: Hittite Metal Inventories (CTH 242) and Their Economic Implications, *Tel Aviv* 4, 87–93.
- Knapp, A. B. 1983: An Alashiyan Merchant at Ugarit, *Tel Aviv* 10, 38–45.
- Košak, S. 1982: *Hittite Inventory Texts* (THeth 10), Heidelberg.
- Labat : R. Labat/F. Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne*, Paris, 2002.
- Lackenbacher, S. 1999: RS 17.59, *NABU* 1999/3, 63f.
- Lackenbacher, S. 2002: *Textes Akkadiens d'Ugarit* (LAPO 20), Paris.
- Lackenbacher, S. – F. Malbran-Labat 2005: *Penti-Šarruma* (suite), *NABU* 2005/4, 95–97.
- Lackenbacher, S. – F. Malbran-Labat 2005a: Ugarit et les Hittites dans les archives de la "Maison d'Urtenu", *SMEA* 47, 227–240.
- Lagarce, J. – E. Lagarce – A. Bounni – N. Saliby 1983: Les fouilles à Ras Ibn Hani en Syrie (campagnes de 1980, 1981 et 1982), *CRAIBL* 1983, 249–290.
- Lambrou-Phillipson, C. 1991: Seafaring in the Bronze Age Mediterranean: The Parameters Involved in Maritime Travel, in: R. Laffineur – L. Basch (edd.), *Thalassa. L'Egée préhistorique et la mer*, Liège, 11–20.
- Lassen, H. 2000: Introduction to weight systems in the Bronze Age East Mediterranean: the case of Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios, in: Pare 2000, 233–246.
- Lebrun, R. 1995: Reflexions sur le Lukka et environs au 13^{ème} s. av. J.-C. in: K. van Lerberghe – A. Schoors (edd.), *Immigration and Emigration within the ancient Near East*. Festschrift E. Lipinski, Leuven, 139–152.
- Limet, H. 1960: *Le travail du métal au pays de Sumer au temps de la III^e dynastie d'Ur*, Paris.
- Malbran-Labat, F. 1995: La découverte épigraphique de 1994 à Ougarit (les textes Akkadiens), *SMEA* 36, 103–111.
- Malbran-Labat, F. 1999: Nouvelles données épigraphiques sur Chypre et Ougarit, *Report of the Department of Antiquities Cyprus* 1999, 121–123.
- Malbran-Labat, F. 2004: Les Hittites et Ougarit, in: M. Mazoyer – O. Casabonne (edd.), *Studia Anatolica et Varia. Mélanges offerts au Professeur René Lebrun* (vol. II), Paris, 69–104.
- Malbran-Labat, F. – S. Lackenbacher 2001: Les textes akkadiens découvertes à Ougarit en 1994, in: K. van Lerberghe – G. Voet (edd.), *Languages and Cultures in Contact* (Proceedings of the 42th RAI, 1995), Leuven, 237–244.
- Malbran-Labat, F. – S. Lackenbacher 2005: Un autre "Grand-Scribe", *NABU* 2005/1, 9.
- Marquez Rowe, I. 1993: KTU 3.7 reconsidered. On the ilku-service in Ugarit, *AuOr* 11, 250–252.
- Marquez Rowe, I. 1995: *El ilku en Ugarit*. PhD diss., University of Barcelona.
- Marquez Rowe, I. 1999: Royal Land Grants and ilku-Service in Ugarit. The Legal Mechanism, in: H. Klengel – J. Renger (edd.), *Landwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, Berlin, 171–178.
- MesZL: R. Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*. Münster, 2003.
- Milano, L. 2003: Sistemi finanziari in Mesopotamia e Siria nel III Millennio A. C., in: L. Milano – N. Parise (edd.), *Il regolamento degli scambi nell'antichità* (III-I millennio a. C.), Roma – Bari, 3–58.
- Moorey, P. R. S. 1985: *Materials and Manufacture in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Evidence of Archaeology and Art*, Oxford.
- Muhly, J. D. 1993–97: *Metalle*. B. *Archäologisch*, *RIA* 8, 119–136.

- Muhly, J. D. 2003: Trade in Metals in the Late Bronze Age and in the Iron Age, in: N. C. Stampolidis – V. Karageorghis (edd.), *Sea Routes ... Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th – 6th c. BC*. Athens, 141–150.
- Müller, M., 1982: Gold, Silber und Blei also Wertmesser in: *Mesopotamien während der zweiten Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. u. Z.* in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East*. Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff. Warminster, 270–278.
- Niemeyer, B./W.-D. 1999: Mycenaeans and Hittites in War in Western Asia Minor, in R. Laffineur (ed.), *Polemos. Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze*, Liège, 141–155.
- Oettinger, N. forthcoming: The Seer Mopsos (Muksas) as a Historical Figure, in: B. J. Collins – M. Bachvarova – I. Rutherford (edd.), *Proceedings of the Conference "Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia"*, Atlanta, Sept. 2004.
- Oppenheim, A. L. 1947: A Fiscal Practice of the Ancient Near East, *JNES* 6, 116–120.
- Otten, H. 1993: Das Land Lukka in der hethitischen Topographie, in: J. Borchhardt – G. Dobesch (edd.), *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums* (Wien, Mai 1990), Wien, 117–121.
- Pare, C. F. E. (ed.), 2000: *Metals Make the World Go Round*, Oxford.
- Pomponio, F. 2003: Aspetti monetari e finanziari del periodo Neo-Sumerico e Paleo-Babilonese, in: L. Milano – N. Parise (edd.), *Il regolamento degli scambi nell'antichità* (III-I millennio a. C.), Roma – Bari, 59–108.
- Powell, M. A. Jr. 1978: A Contribution to the History of Money in Mesopotamia prior to the Invention of Coinage, in: B. Hruška – G. Komoróczy (edd.), *Festschrift Lubor Matouš*, Budapest, 211–243.
- Powell, M. A. Jr. 1996: Money in Mesopotamia, *JESHO* 39, 224–242.
- Pulak, C. 2000a: The Copper and Tin Ingots from the Late Bronze Age Shipwreck at Uluburun, in: Ü. Yalçın (ed.), *Anatolian Metal I*, Bochum, 137–57.
- Pulak, C. 2000b: The balance weights from the Late Bronze Age shipwreck at Uluburun, in: Pare 2000, 247–266.
- Pulak, C. 2001: The Cargo of the Uluburun Ship and Evidence for Trade with the Aegean and Beyond, in: L. Bonfante – V. Karageorghis (edd.), *Italy and Cyprus in Antiquity 1500–450 B.C.* Nicosia, 13–60.
- Pulak, C. 2005: *Das Schiffwrack von Uluburun*, in: Yalçın et al. 2005, 55–102.
- Reiter, K. 1997: *Die Metalle im Alten Orient*. Münster.
- Sanmartín, J. 1995: Wirtschaft und Handel in Ugarit: Kulturgrammatische Aspekte, in: M. Dietrich – O. Loretz (ed.), *Ugarit, Ein ostmediterranes Kultzentrum im Alten Orient*, Münster, 131–158.
- Sherratt, S. 2000: Circulation of metals and the end of the Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean, in: Pare 2000, 82–98.
- Siegelová, J. 1986: *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*, Praha.
- Siegelová, J. 1993–97: *Metalle und Metallurgie*. A II. In den heth. Texten, *RIA* 8, 112–119.
- Singer, I. 1983: Western Anatolia in the Thirteenth Century B.C. according to the Hittite Sources, *AnSt* 33, 205–217.
- Singer, I. 1985: The Battle of Niḫriya and the End of the Hittite Empire, *ZA* 75, 100–123.
- Singer, I. 1991: A Concise History of Anturru, in: S. Izre'el, *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study*, vol. 2. Atlanta, 134–195.
- Singer, I. 1999: A Political History of Ugarit, in: W. G. E. Watson – N. Wyatt (edd.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (HbOr I/39), Leiden, 603–733.
- Singer, I. 2005: On Luwians and Hittites (review of H. C. Melchert, ed. *The Luwians*, Leiden 2003), *BiOr* 42, 430–452.
- Singer, I. 2006: The Urḫi-Teššub Affair in the Hittite-Egyptian Correspondence, in: Th. P. J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuḫaliya IV*. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden, 27–38.
- Singer, I. forthcoming a (submitted April 2001): Maḫḫaza, King of Amurru, in: C. Rüster – J. Catsanicos – R. Lebrun (edd.), *la-a-ma-an-te-et na-ak-ki-i*: *Studia Anatolica in Memoriam Erich Neu Scripta* (Hethitica XVI), Louvain-la-Neuve.

PATRIZIA CAMATTA

Die Stadt *Ḫanḫana* und ein Identifizierungsvorschlag¹

In den letzten Jahren fand die historische Geographie des Hethiter-Reiches wieder verstärkt das Interesse der Forschung. Sowohl die Zahl der Surveys als auch der Ausgrabungen haben in den letzten Jahren zugenommen. Zahlreiche neue Höyüks konnten identifiziert werden, die in die Hethiterzeit datiert werden. Gleichwohl bleiben noch viele offene Fragen und ungelöste Probleme, da im Vergleich mit der großen Anzahl von Ortsnamen, die in den hethitischen Texten belegt sind, eindeutig zu wenige historische Siedlungen bisher sicher lokalisiert worden sind.

Seit den Anfängen der Hethitologie als eigenständiger wissenschaftlicher Disziplin haben sich verschiedene Hethitologen speziell mit der historischen Geographie und der Identifikation von einzelnen Orten beschäftigt. Ziel der historischen Topographie ist es, eine detaillierte historische Karte zu erstellen, in der die Lage der Städte, Flüsse und Gebirge festgelegt ist. Trotz großer Anstrengungen in der Vergangenheit fehlt der hethitologischen Forschung nach wie vor eine solche Karte der hethitischen Geographie, die die Lage aller in den Texten genannten hethitischen Siedlungen verzeichnet. Bis dies gelungen ist, ist es notwendig, einerseits alle inschriftlichen Angaben zur Geographie, andererseits so viel wie möglich archäologische Daten zu sammeln, um diese schließlich miteinander zu kombinieren.

Diese Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit der Stadt *Ḫanḫana* und hat zum Ziel, alle verfügbaren Informationen über diese wichtige hethiterzeitliche Stadt zu sammeln und dabei historische, geographische und archäologische Indizien zu kombinieren, um etwas mehr Licht in die Lage und Geschichte dieser Stadt zu bringen.

Von Sedat Alp², der sich bereits mit der Stadt *Ḫanḫana* auseinandergesetzt hat, stammt der Vorschlag für eine Identifizierung des Ortes mit Inandik: in Inandik wurde ein alt-

¹ Die hier vorgelegte Zusammenstellung beruht auf meiner Magisterarbeit, die bei Stefano de Martino an der Universität von Trieste entstand. Ich möchte mich bei Herrn Prof. Stefano de Martino für seine Hilfsbereitschaft und seinen Rat sowie bei Herrn Prof. Jörg Klinger dafür bedanken, daß er mir die Gelegenheit gab, diesen Artikel zu publizieren. Außerdem gilt mein herzlicher Dank Dott. Marco Marizza, der mir manchen nützlichen Hinweis gab, und Ahmet Ünal, der bei mir das Interesse an der hethitische Geographie weckte.

² S. Alp (1979), 13–16.