

The History of Kizzuwatna and the Date of the Šunaššura Treaty*

Richard H. BEAL

A number of scholars have dealt with the history of Kizzuwatna¹, usually tangentially while discussing the history of Hatti, from which come most of the primary sources. As a result of their work, most of the outline of the history of Kizzuwatna is now known. However there remain a number of problems, particularly with the placement of kings about whom nothing is known or whose treaties with Hatti do not preserve the name of the Hittite treaty partner. This article will attempt to present a new solution to these problems.

What is known about Kizzuwatnan history may be summarized as follows. During the Hittite Old Kingdom, what was later known as Kizzuwatna would appear to have been a part of Hatti known as the province of Adaniya². An Old Hittite land grant with an Old Hittite royal seal,

*I wish to thank H. G. Güterbock and S. Košak for reading this paper and making many valuable suggestions. I wish to stress that they bear no responsibility for any mistakes that may remain.

The abbreviations used will conform to those used by *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*.

¹ Goetze, *Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography* (New Haven 1940), with bibliography of previous works; Otten *JCS* 5 (1951) 129-132; Meyer, *MIO* 1 (1953) 108-123; Wiseman, *The Alalah Tablets* (London 1953) 5-10; Goetze, *JCS* 11 (1957) 71-73; Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (Istanbul 1970) 56-79; Kammenhuber, *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient* (Heidelberg 1968) 87-109; Liverani, *OA* 12 (1972) 267-297; Gurney, *CAH* II/1 (Cambridge 1973) Chapters 6, 15; Drower, *CAH* II/1 Chapter 10, esp. 434ff.; Otten, *MDOG* 103 (1971) 59-68; Oller, *The Autobiography of Idrimi: A new text edition with philological and historical commentary* (PhD dissertation, Univ. of Pennsylvania 1977; University Microfilm No. 78-6628) 148-173; Kümmel, *RLA* 5 (1980) 628-629; Del Monte, *OA* 20 (1981) 203-221; Kühne, *RAI* 25 (1978) = *BBVO* 1 (1982) 203-264; Wilhelm, *Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurriter* (Grundzüge 45; Darmstadt 1982); Korošec, *RAI* 28 (1981) = *AfO Beiheft* 19 (1982) 168-172.

² There is no reason to believe with Del Monte, *OA* 20, 204, that Adaniya should not be considered an integral part of Kizzuwatna, simply because Adaniya is mentioned in the Šunaššura treaty in the context of the laying out of the boundaries of Kizzuwatna. In fact, the text would seem to indicate that Adaniya *should* be considered an integral part, if not the primary part, of Kizzuwatna. One sentence (KBo 1.5 iv 56-57) reads: "Whatever is on the side of the land of Hatti, let the Great King keep; whatever is on the side of the country of Adaniya, let Šunaššura keep." The other passages iv 53-55, iv 59-61 and iv 63-66 are similar (all ed. Goetze, *Kizz.* 50-51). Thus the Great King is to Hatti as Šunaššura is to Adaniya. Whether or not this section is paraphrased from an earlier treaty, it thus seems that in the time of Šunaššura, Adaniya was more or less synony-

which was found at Tarsus on the plain of Adana, and which mentions a number of villagers, at least one of whom has a Hurrian name³, appears to testify to the fact that an Old Hittite king was able to make land grants in Adaniya and hence ruled it directly.

When the Hittites acquired Adaniya/Kizzuwatna can only be conjectured. Adaniya may have already been Hittite at the time of Hattušili I's first campaign into Syria⁴. In this campaign, Hattusili's first target was Alalah. From Alalah he went against Uršu, Ikakali, and Tašhiniya. The sub-kingdom of Alalah guarded the eastern end of the Beilan Pass/Syrian Gates for its overlord kingdom, Yamhad; the western end of this pass is in Adaniya/Kizzuwatna⁵. Thus for a Hittite king in possession of Kizzuwatna, Alalah would have been a logical first target for a Syrian campaign. With the Beilan Pass opened by the elimination of Alalah, Hattušili could then have proceeded north, knowing that he could easily reach friendly territory either by going back through the Beilan Pass or by going across

mous with Kizzuwatna. (Cf. the opinion of Gurney, *CAH* II/1 661, "The country of Adaniya [= Adana], the central part of Kizzuwatna".) There is no reason to assume that in the time of Ammuna it was any different. See also n. 10. For a discussion of Del Monte's argument concerning Lawazantiya, see n. 15.

³ Goetze, *JAOS* 59 (1939) 2ff. (= LS 28). The names in question are [Ḫ]dahakap, Mantiya and Ka'za[...]. Mantiya is considered Hurrian by Laroche, *GLH* 166. Hurrians constituted a considerable percentage of the population of Kizzuwatna. See Goetze, *Kizz.* 5ff., and more recently Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 629ff. The seal impression on this text was made by the same seal (*SBo* 1.88) that sealed landgrant LS 7 and fragment 835/b, both found on Büyükkale at Boğazköy (see H. G. Güterbock, *SBo* 1, 52). These three seal impressions now form Easton's "group C" (D. F. Easton, *JCS* 33 [1981] 3-43). "Group C" cannot be onomastically related to the other OH groups of seals, but on stylistic grounds Easton would place it between the seal type of Muršili I and those of Alluwamna/Tahurwaili. In attempting to narrow down the range of possibilities, he notes that although *SBo* 1.88 is more closely related to the seals which he dates to Muršili I than to those of Alluwamna, Tahurwaili and Huzziya (II), it most closely resembles the seal of Išputahšu of Kizzuwatna. He then reasons that since Ammuna lost Adaniya (and thus Tarsus) he is an unlikely candidate for the owner of the seal, and that since Huzziya I is closer in time to Išputahšu, he should be preferred.

However, I do not see in the loss of Adaniya by Ammuna and the similarity between the Tarsus seal and that of Išputahšu sufficient evidence for attributing this seal to Huzziya. Since the revolted province of Adaniya probably became the independent Kizzuwatna (see text below), and since there is no reason to suppose that the Hittites regained it at any point between the loss of this province under Ammuna, and the recognition of its independence by Telipinu, Huzziya I seems a much less likely candidate to be the owner of the Tarsus seal than Ammuna. Ammuna at least held Adaniya at the beginning of his reign. Moreover, the similarity between the Tarsus seal and that of Išputahšu may readily be explained by making the assumption that when Kizzuwatna gained its independence under Ammuna its kings adopted the current Hittite royal seal type for their own use, and that they continued to use this style into the next generation. Thus without altering Easton's overall scheme, I would suggest that the Tarsus seal should be dated to either Zidanta I or Ammuna, before the Hittites lost Adaniya/Kizzuwatna.

⁴ KBo 10.2 i 15-21 || KBo 10.1 obv. 6-10.

⁵ For the Beilan Pass route see *A Handbook of Asia Minor prepared on behalf of the Admiralty and War Office [of Great Britain]* (1919) IV/2, 32 and route (52+)(102), and outline map showing routes.

the Bahçe Pass/Amanus Gates⁶. He then could have cleared the north-western approaches to Yamhad (Uršu⁷ and vicinity) before returning home, presumably via Lawazantiya⁸ and the road through the Taurus. Had Adaniya/Kizzuwatna been hostile to Hattušili, he could not have crossed its territory, and therefore he would have needed to take a route by-passing Kizzuwatna. The roads from Hatti that by-pass Kizzuwatna debouch into Syria from Maraš toward Gaziantep or Islâhiye⁹, on or near what would have been the northwest corner of Yamhad, and in or near the region of Uršu. In order to attack Alalah under these circumstances, Hattušili would have had to proceed south with hostile territory on both sides (Yamhad to the east, and Adaniya across the Amanus to the west), and Uršu and Aleppo threatening his rear — this in order to hit the southwest corner of Yamhad. Then he would have had to double back to hit the cities near to the place where he first supposedly entered Syria. This does not seem likely. Moreover, with a hostile or neutral Adaniya on the west end of the Beilan Pass, what purpose would the elimination of Alalah have had? Since we know that Alalah was the first target and since Alalah would only have been a natural first target in Syria for a Hittite king holding Adaniya/Kizzuwatna, Hattušili's first Syrian campaign makes the most sense when one assumes that he was controlling Adaniya/Kizzuwatna at that time.

Adaniya seems to have successfully revolted and become the independent country of Kizzuwatna in the dark days of Ammuna. "The lands revolted against him (Ammuna). (These included) ... the city of Galmiyaš, the land of Adaniya, the land of Arzawiya, the city of Šallapa (etc.)"¹⁰. The leader of the Adaniyan revolt and the first king of Kizzuwatna may have been Pariyawatri, father of the Išputahšu who was king of Kizzuwatna¹¹ one generation later. Pariyawatri is not yet attested with the

⁶ For this pass see *ibid.* 32 and route 91. For the nearby Hasan Beyli Pass see route 92. See also Alkim, *JKF* 4 (1965) 1-41 with map 1.

⁷ For the location of Uršu west of the Euphrates and north of Karkemiš see Garstang and Gurney, *Geogr.* 55f. For further discussion see Del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, 476.

⁸ This city was used by Hattušili I as a headquarters during his siege of Uršu. (See KBo 1.11 obv. 21 = *CTH* 7, ed. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 [1938] 116-117.) Cf. Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 628.

⁹ In *A Handbook of Asia Minor* see for example the roads from Kayseri to Göksun or Elbistan, whence to Maraš, then route 139 to Gaziantep (Aintab) or route 140 to Islâhiye.

¹⁰ [(KUR-e-ma-aš-ši ku-u-ru-ri-e-et URU) ...]x-la-aš URUGal-mi-ya-aš KUR.URU A-da-ni-ya-aš (KUR.URU Ar-za-u-i-ya URUSal-la-pa-aš ...) KUB 11.5 obv. 14-15 restored from KBo 3.1 ii 1-2, KUB 11.1 ii 7-8 (= BoTU 23 D,A,B) = Telipinu § 21 ii 1-2; see Gurney, *CAH* 11/1 661, 670; Carruba, *Fs Güterbock* 87ff.; Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 128; Kühne, *RAI* 25, 210. See also below note 15.

¹¹ Goetze, *Kizz.* 73; Goetze *AJA* 39 (1935) 535ff.; *AJA* 40 (1936) 210ff. The tiny fragment KBo 18.61 mentions "Pal-[i-ya? ...] in line i 3 and "Pariyawatra ...] in line

title of king nor yet associated with the revolt, so this suggestion must remain hypothetical. His son Išputahšu is attested from a seal found at Tarsus¹². On this seal Išputahšu claims the title Great King. He is also firmly tied to the Hittite chronology by an equality¹³ treaty he made with Telipinu¹⁴. Presumably Telipinu was forced by unsettled conditions at home and abroad to recognize the independence of this erstwhile Hittite province in return for peace and friendship¹⁵.

i 5. Kammenhuber suggests (*Arier* 107) that this fragment might be evidence for a succession of kings: Pilliya (contemporary with Zidanta I), Pariyawatri (contemporary with Ammuna/Huzziya I) and Išputahšu (contemporary with Telipinu). Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 628, rightly doubts this construction. KBo 18.61 is in NS, so ductus is of no help in determining who is being referred to. It preserves virtually no context except two direct speech particles. Who is speaking or what is being quoted is entirely unclear. As there is at least one later Pariyawatri known, any reconstruction posited from this tiny fragment will have to be conjectural. Moreover, even if one were to accept this text as evidence for a succession Pilliya—Pariyawatri in Kizzuwatna, one need not accept Kammenhuber's assertion that this Pilliya reigned contemporaneously with Zidanta I, thus rejecting the evidence that the province of Adaniya became independent Kizzuwatna in the reign of Ammuna. If Ammuna lost Adaniya/Kizzuwatna, then this Pilliya and Pariyawatri could only have reigned during Ammuna's, Huzziya I's and perhaps part of Telipinu's reigns. (For this construct see Kühne, *RAI* 25, 212.) Only about one generation of time is involved, so perhaps this Pilliya, if he existed, was aged when he revolted, or perhaps he and Pariyawatri were brothers. In sum, a Pilliya I rather than Pariyawatri could have been the first king of Kizzuwatna, but the evidence is very shaky, and does not, in any case, imply that Pilliya was on the throne before the reign of Ammuna. Note: the Idrimi-Piliya treaty should not be taken as evidence for this earlier Pilliya, see below n. 29.

¹² Goetze, *Kizz.* 73, *AJA* 39, 535ff.

¹³ See below n. 41.

¹⁴ KUB 4.76, KUB 31.82 (both Akkadian), KUB 31.81, KBo 19.36, KBo 19.37 (Hittite) = *CTH* 21. On KBo 19.37 see the comment of Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 628.

¹⁵ It should be noted that Lawazantiya, which Lahha incited to revolt (*waggariyat*) in an attempt to block Telipinu's return to Hatti from a Syrian campaign (BoTU 23A ii 20-21, see also KBo 12.8, KBo 12.9) may, if one takes *waggariya*—literally, have still (see above n. 8) been part of, or a tributary of, Hatti during Telipinu's reign (Landsberger, *JCS* 8 [1954] 50 and Carruba, *Fs Güterbock* 78f., 87). Against Landsberger and Carruba, however, this does not mean that Kizzuwatna was not an independent country in the period between Ammuna and Telipinu or that it was, like Lawazantiya, also a Hittite tributary in that period. The name "Kizzuwatna" is not attested before Telipinu, but given the scarcity of information it is rather dangerous to conclude from this argument *ex silentio* that Kizzuwatna did not exist. Moreover, there is no compelling reason to connect this Lawazantiya incident with Kizzuwatna. That Lawazantiya lay "im Herzen des Landes Kizwadna" is an unproven assumption by Landsberger. See Kühne, *RAI* 25, 212 with n. 84. See also the opinions of Kammenhuber, *Arier* 94 n. 288, and Del Monte, *OA* 20, 204.

That Lawazantiya is an important city in Kizzuwatna later on is undoubted, but Lawazantiya need not have been a part of Kizzuwatna in the time of Telipinu and Išputahšu. Lawazantiya is first attested with Kizzuwatna in the time of Pilliya (KUB 7.20 obv. 5). Perhaps Telipinu's suppression of Lahha's revolt in Lawazantiya ("[The gods] placed it/him in my hands" Tel. pr. ii 21-22 and *CTH* 20) was not as complete as he implied. Perhaps he only succeeded in doing what needed to be done to force his way through the road-block, and then on his departure, the area was again lost to the Hittites to be eventually annexed by Kizzuwatna. Alternatively, Telipinu did reestablish Hittite control, but when Pilliya broke with Hatti (and aligned himself with Mittanni, see below) perhaps he also seized from Hatti this outlying and strategic piece of territory in the Anti-Taurus. For the location of Lawazantiya, see Garstang and Gurney, *Geogr.* 52-53,

Tahurwaili apparently succeeded Telipinu¹⁶ and he continued Telipinu's policy toward Hatti's southern neighbor by making a parity¹⁷ treaty with Eheyia of Kizzuwatna¹⁸.

In Hatti, after the reigns of Tahurwaili and Telipinu's son-in-law Alluwamna, there follow the ill-attested reigns of Hantili II, Zidanta II, and Huzziya II, who occur together in an offering list¹⁹. As the Telipinu proclamation mentions three predecessors of Telipinu with these same names, a number of scholars have argued that the offering lists are out of order and that therefore Hantili II, Zidanta II and Huzziya II do not exist²⁰. However, their existence is assured by the fact that the wife of the Zidanta of the offering lists is named Iyaya, whereas the name of the wife of the Zidanta in the Telipinu Proclamation ends in *-ša* or *-ta*²¹. A parity²² treaty exists between a Zidanta and Pilliya of Kizzuwatna²³. The Zidanta can only be Zidanta II²⁴ for, as already mentioned, Kizzuwatna (called Adaniya) was part of Hatti until the reign of Ammuna, son of Zidanta I. There is also some question of the identity of this Pilliya who is contemporary with Zidanta II. A Pilliya, presumably of Kizzuwatna, has a treaty with

and Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962) 51f. n. 19. For other opinions see the compilation by Del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, 238.

¹⁶ Carruba, *Fs Güterbock* 73-93, Bin-Nun, *JCS* 26 (1974) 112-120. Note that D. F. Easton, *JCS* 33, 24-30, has now argued that the order of kings Tahurwaili and Alluwamna should be reversed.

¹⁷ See below n. 41.

¹⁸ Otten, *MDOG* 103, 65.

¹⁹ KUB 11.9 ii, translit. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 67; 1307/z, copied and translit. Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie* (Wiesbaden 1968) 125.

²⁰ Their existence was first denied by Cavaignac, *RHA* 3 (1936) 239, followed by Hardy, *AJSL* 58 (1941) 216, Laroche, *Anadolu* 2 (1955) 5, Cornelius, *JCS* 12 (1958) 103f. with n. 17, Kammenhuber, *Arier* 40. For a summary of their views see Oller, *Idrimi* 163 n. 37.

²¹ Bin-Nun, *THeth* 5, 93 n. 145. The existence of these kings was first suggested by Forrer, *2BoTU* 13*-29*. For further arguments in their favor see Landsberger, *JCS* 8, 49f., Goetze, *JCS* 11, 54-55, Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen* 8-9, Riemerschneider, *RLA* 4 (1975) 536, Oller, *Idrimi* 163ff. with n. 37, Kühne, *RAI* 25, 212 with n. 86, and Easton, *JCS* 33, 33. For evidence tending to confirm the existence of Huzziya II see now D. F. Easton, *JCS* 33, 24-29, 33.

²² See below n. 41.

²³ KUB 36.108, ed. Otten, *JCS* 5, 129 (as 629/c).

²⁴ Against Meyer, *MIO* 1, 108f., 123, Laroche, *Anadolu* 2, 12, Kammenhuber, *Arier* 97f., Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 33, 141 see Landsberger, *JCS* 8, 49, Goetze, *JCS* 11, 72f., Tadmor, in *World History of the Jewish People II* (ed. B. Mazar) (1961 [Heb.] = 1970 [Eng.]) 98f., Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens* 1 227, Otten in *Fischer Weltgeschichte* 3 (1966) 127f., Garelli, *Nouvelle Clio: L'histoire et ses problèmes* 2 (1969) 308f., Gurney, in *CAH* II/1 661, Carruba, *Fs Güterbock* 87ff., Oller, *Idrimi* 159ff., 163ff., Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 628, Klengel, *UF* 13 (1981) 270 n. 5, Kühne, *RAI* 25, 211f. The ductus of the treaty is inconclusive as to which Zidanta is responsible for the treaty. See Rüster, *StBoT* 20 p. VIII and the comments by Oller, *Idrimi* 162-163. Del Monte (*OA* 20, 203f.) admits: "L'attribuzione del trattato al primo [Zidanta] o ad un secondo sovrano di questo nome, posteriore a Telipinu, dipende in ultima analisi esclusivamente dall'accertamento dell'effettiva esistenza di un Zidanza II." However, the existence of Zidanta II now seems firmly established.

his neighbor across the Amanus, Idrimi of Alalah²⁵. As the treaty is signed under the aegis of Baratarna of Mittanni, both Pilliya and Idrimi are presumably his tributaries²⁶. Several scholars²⁷ call Idrimi's contemporary Pilliya I, and Zidanta's contemporary Pilliya II. Their reason for doing this involves the lack of references to Egypt in the archives from Alalah IV. These archives date to the time of Idrimi and his successors. This is a time when these scholars suppose that there was major Egyptian interference in this area. This reasoning has been convincingly refuted by Oller; there is no evidence that the Egyptians ever occupied Alalah²⁸.

²⁵ AT 3. For the date of Idrimi and all matters concerning him see Oller, *Idrimi*.

²⁶ So Drower, *CAH* II/1 434 and accepted most recently by Kühne, *RAI* 25, 211 with n. 72. Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 36, however, assumes exactly the opposite: the treaty proves that while Idrimi is subject to Baratarna, Pilliya is not. If Wilhelm were correct, then one would have a case of a tributary making a treaty with a foreign power. This is highly unlikely: if a treaty needed to be made with a foreign power, Baratarna would have made it in his own name. The crux of the problem is the statement in the Pilliya-Idrimi treaty that it becomes operative when Baratarna swears the oath with Idrimi. Contrary to Oller, *Idrimi* 160, the clause is phrased to indicate that it is the swearing of an oath between Baratarna and Idrimi, rather than Baratarna's permission, that is required. Contrary to Wilhelm's conclusion the phrase clearly shows that it is Idrimi who is not yet a tributary. What seems to have happened is that after Idrimi had conquered the Alalahian portion of his patrimony from Mittanni, he and Baratarna agreed to make peace. Before this was formalized, Baratarna ordered treaties drawn up between his new tributary and his previous tributaries in order to see to it that they all would get along. However, Baratarna would not have wanted these treaties to be valid in the event that something went wrong and that he and Idrimi did not commit themselves to each other before the gods. Therefore these intra-empire treaties only became operative when the main treaty tying Idrimi to the Mittannian empire had been sworn. Thus Idrimi and Alalah were becoming part of the Mittannian Empire, of which Pilliya and Kizzuwatna were already part. For the primary-point of this discussion see Klengel, *GS* 1, 245 n. 58. For the opinions of others see the discussion of Oller, *Idrimi* 160 n. 27. Baratarna is not attested as "King of Mittanni" only as King of the Hurrians. However, he rules a territory that is known as Mittanni a reign or so later. He is attested as king at Nuzi (HSS 13.165:2-3) as is Šauštatar (HSS 9.1) and at Alalah (the Idrimi inscr. and AT 3) as is Šauštatar (AT 13-14).

²⁷ Garelli, *Nouvelle Clio: L'histoire et ses problèmes* 2, 308f., Gurney, in *CAH* II/1 670f. with n. 6, Kühne, *RAI* 25, 212f.

²⁸ Oller, *Idrimi* 167-173. The "Campaigns" of the Egyptian king Thutmose III into the area north of modern Hamath were no more than extended raids. They began in his 33rd year when he reached the Euphrates via the area of Aleppo. Several times thereafter he plundered Nuhašše, once interfering in the succession there. These are admittedly neighbors of Alalah (located at Tell Atchana, near modern Antakya). After the campaign of Thutmose's 38th year, Alalah even thought it wise to send friendly gifts to Thutmose. Its gifts, like those of Babylonia and Assyria, were regarded as tribute by the Egyptians. It is possible that Alalah and the other cities of Mukiš were included in some of Thutmose's conquest lists, but there is no particular reason to believe that he actually went through, let alone attempted to hold, any of Mukiš. By Thutmose's 42nd year, however, he had lost control even of the coastal town of Irgata, near modern Tripoli, well to the south of Alalah. After retaking Irgata, he turned inland and ravaged the country side around Tunip, without taking the city. Even further south, three small cities near Qadeš had to be captured from Mittannian garrisons. With the Mittannians disputing possession of this area so far south of Alalah, a mere four years after Alalah's "payment of tribute", it can be seen that Egyptian influence in the north was at best ephemeral. See *CAH* II/1 444-449 with further bibliography and Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens* I 235, III 189.

Nor do we have the correspondence of the kings of Alalah, which might have mentioned Egyptian military or diplomatic activities. Moreover, it is not unthinkable that Pilliya at some point in his reign saw fit to be allied with Hatti, while at another time to become a tributary of Mittanni. Thus this is no real reason to posit two Pilliyas and to deny that the Pilliya could have been a contemporary of Zidanta II²⁹.

There remains the question of when Pilliya subjected himself to Mittanni. This might have preceded his treaty with Zidanta II, as this treaty states that cities that each has taken from the other are to be returned³⁰. It seems more likely, however, that Hatti and Kizzuwatna had a major rupture at some point after this treaty, for in the next generation at Alal-

²⁹ With Landsberger, *JCS* 8, 49, Tadmor, in *World History of the Jewish People* II 98f., Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens* I 227, Otten in *Fischer Weltgeschichte* 3, 127f., Oller, *Idrimi* 159ff., 163ff., Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 628, Klengel, *UF* 13, 270 n. 5.

The possibility of the existence of an earlier Pilliya, contemporary with Ammuna, has been noted above, n. 11. Even if one accepts the existence of this Pilliya I, one should not make Idrimi of Alalah his contemporary. For the problems with chronologies which do this, see below n. 49.

³⁰ KUB 36.108 obv. 3-5, ed. Otten, *JCS* 5, 129, Del Monte, *OA* 20, 205. Kühne, *RAI* 25, 216f., 221 with n. 195, attempts to support the position that Kizzuwatna was a Mittannian tributary in the period preceding the Zidanta-Pilliya treaty and that Kizzuwatna's Mittannian overlordship and defection to Hatti can be given approximate dates based on Egyptian chronology. He notes that Thutmose III in his 23rd year fought, among others Naharina (Mittanni): Hurrians and QDJ. The latter Mittannian ally has been assumed to be Kizzuwatna. In his 33rd and 41st year, Thutmose III received presents from Hatti. Kühne assumes that until Hatti had acquired a friendly power in Kizzuwatna, it would have been effectively cut off from access to Egypt. With Kizzuwatna in Hittite hands, however, the embassy could have traveled from a Kizzuwatnan port to a port in the Egyptian empire avoiding the intervening Mittannian controlled North Syria. Kühne therefore suggests that Hatti's embassies to Egypt could only have gotten through if between Year 23 and Year 33, Kizzuwatna had defected from Mittanni to Hatti. Thus, in summary, Kühne reasons that Kizzuwatna went from the Hittite side in the time of Telipinu and Tahirwaili, to the Mittannian side by the 23rd year of Thutmose III. Sometime after Year 23 and before Year 33, Kizzuwatna returned to the Hittite fold and the Zidanta II-Pilliya treaty was concluded. Kizzuwatna was (still?) in the Hittite fold in Thutmose's Year 41.

Unfortunately for Kühne's argument, the dates of the Hittite embassies to Thutmose III are of relevance to Hittite-Kizzuwatnan relations only if Hittite messengers could not have gotten from the Anatolian plateau to the Mediterranean without going through Kizzuwatna. However, according to the Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty, the western border of Kizzuwatna meets the sea at Lamiya. Lamiya is identified with classical Lamos, modern Lamas, halfway between Tarsus and Silifke. (See Goetze, *Kizz.* 50f., 58 and Del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, 242.) Thus the road from the Plateau from modern Karaman via the Gök Su (Calycadnus) valley to Silifke would have been outside Kizzuwatnan control. If the Hittites controlled, or were at peace with those who controlled this road, then they would have been able to get an embassy to Egypt, by sea, without going through Kizzuwatna. Thus, the two dates of the Hittite embassies to Egypt need not be relevant to Hittite-Kizzuwatnan relations. This leaves the Year 23 date for a supposed Mittannian domination of Kizzuwatna (QDJ) standing in chronological isolation, and as such it could refer to a domination either before or after the Zidanta II-Pilliya treaty. Moreover, as Kühne himself notes (p. 217 with n. 144), there are good reasons to doubt even the equation of QDJ with Kizzuwatna. Unless this can be established, the Year 23 date like the other two, is of no use for a reconstruction of Hittite-Kizzuwatnan relations. Kühne's theory is ingenious, but very weakly grounded.

ah, we find Niqmepa³¹, younger son of Pilliya's treaty partner Idrimi, bringing suit in a boundary dispute against a Šunaššura³², presumed to be a king of neighboring Kizzuwatna, since a king by this name is attested there³³. Both are then tributaries of Mittanni, as the case is heard before Šauštatar³⁴, much as the kings of Hatti and Karkemiš later hear disputes between their various Syrian tributaries³⁵.

In addition to Išputahšu, Eheya, and Pilliya, there are three attested kings of Kizzuwatna whose exact placement is not known. A king Paddatiššu is attested from the fragmentary Akkadian version of a parity³⁶ treaty that he made with a Hittite king³⁷. Unfortunately the name of this Hittite king is not preserved. This Akkadian language treaty is stylistically quite similar to the Akkadian language Išputahšu and Eheya treaties³⁸. Thus these three kings should probably be grouped together. As Kizzuwatnan kings are already attested for the generations Ammuna, Huzziya I/Telipinu, Tahirwaili/Alluwamna as well as for Zidanta II, it seems most likely, then, that Paddatiššu reigned immediately after Išputahšu and Eheya, in which case his Hittite treaty partner would probably have been Hantili II. Pilliya's treaty, being in Hittite, cannot be closely compared stylistically to the three Akkadian language treaty fragments. However, Zidanta II follows Hantili II, so Pilliya probably follows Paddatiššu.

³¹ AT 15, AT 17. Idrimi's son and intended successor as king of Mukiš was Addunirari (Idrimi inscription lines 88-91, tr. *ANET* 558). As he is never attested as king, the question remains whether he briefly ruled or not. See AT 6-7, Drower, *CAH*³ II/1 435f., Oller, *Idrimi* 154-155.

³² AT 14.

³³ Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna is attested in KBo 1.5 and duplicates = *CTH* 41, ed. Weidner, *PD* (1923) 88ff. and Goetze, *Kizz.* 36ff. Kammenhuber, *Arier* 65, followed by Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 68, consider AT 14 text as evidence too weak on which to postulate a king Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna, contemporary with Niqmepa of Alalah and Šauštatar of Mittanni, since in this text Šunaššura is not called king or associated with Kizzuwatna. However, it should be noted that the other party in the law case, Niqmepa, who is known to be king of Alalah, is also referred to without title. Moreover, the case was settled by the overlord king Šauštatar, and thus the case presumably involved two different tributary-states. As the case concerns a city, it was probably a border dispute (see Wiseman, *AT* 39). Kizzuwatna and Alalah share a common border and "Šunaššura" is a name known to belong to a king of Kizzuwatna. Therefore, while definitive proof for the Šunaššura of AT 14 being the king of Kizzuwatna is lacking, the preponderance of evidence presently available points to the conclusion that he was.

³⁴ Šauštatar's father was Parsatatar, who is as of yet not attested as king. This may be luck of the find, however, as Baratarna and Šauštatar are but rarely attested. Thus it is unclear whether there is a king between Baratarna and Šauštatar. However, Šauštatar is probably contemporary with the generation of the businessman Tehiptilla at Nuzi, while Baratarna is contemporary with the generation of his mother Winnerke; see H. Lewy, *AIPHOS* 13 (1953) 284 n. 4, E. Cassin, *JESHO* 5 (1962) 114, Oller, *Idrimi* 165-167. But see also Wilhelm, *AcAn* 24 (1976 appeared 1979) 149-161.

³⁵ Eg. RS 17.237 (PRU 4.63-65), RS 17.396 (PRU 4.127-128), RS 17.341 (PRU 4.161-163), RS 19.81 (PRU 4.291).

³⁶ See below n. 41.

³⁷ KUB 34.1 + 1815/c + 1818/c = *CTH* 26, ed. Meyer, *MIO* 1, 112ff.

³⁸ See Del Monte, *OA* 20, 209-213.

Even more problematical is another Kizzuwatnean king, Talzu, who is known from a land grant mentioning Kizzuwatnan place names, which is later reconfirmed by a King Šunaššura, and still later by an unnamed Hittite king³⁹. No treaty between Talzu and the Hittites has yet been found. All that seems certain is that he precedes a Šunaššura.

The most difficult problem concerns the identity of a ruler or rulers named Šunaššura attested at Boğazköy in a number of treaty fragments, some in Hittite, some in Akkadian⁴⁰. Neither the Akkadian nor the Hittite treaties are full parity treaties, that is, while many of the clauses are paritetical others show that Hatti was the dominant partner⁴¹. Unfortunately, in all of these treaties the name of the Hittite king involved is broken. The well preserved Akkadian version was dated by Weidner and others to Muwatalli or Muršili II⁴², but this was soon rejected in favor of Šuppiluliuma I⁴³. The treaty shows a pattern of strength under the current

³⁹ KUB 40.2 (= Bo 4889) = CTH 641, ed. Goetze, *Kizz.* 60ff. As Talzu is mentioned first (obv. 12) and Šunaššura afterwards (rev. 15), Goetze fairly safely assumes that Talzu is a predecessor of Šunaššura. For the placement of Talzu see below n. 85. As neither Talzu, nor Šunaššura, nor the author of KUB 40.2 has had his title preserved and as the language of the text is younger than that of the Hittite Šunaššura treaties, Kammenhuber (*Arier* 99) doubts Goetze's conclusion that this Talzu and Šunaššura are kings of Kizzuwatna. However, the acts of granting large tracts of land and revenues and the making of statues of the gods seem very much like royal acts. (See Goetze, *Kizz.* 70 n. 272: "Hardly anybody will doubt that the document is a royal inscription.") As Šunaššura is a known king of Kizzuwatna, it seems very likely that Talzu, Šunaššura, and the text's author were kings ruling Kizzuwatna. That the language of a text written by a successor of Šunaššura is later than that of the treaties made by Šunaššura himself is to be expected. The magnitude of the difference in the relative ages of the texts can be explained by assuming that some time elapsed before it was felt necessary to reconfirm the grants or that our text is a later copy.

⁴⁰ KBo 1.5, KUB 3.4 (both Akkadian), KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.39 and KUB 36.127 (both Hittite), = CTH 41.IA-B, CTH 41.II, CTH 131, Akk. ed. Weidner, *PD* 88ff. and Goetze, *Kizz.* 36-42, 50-51; Hittite ed. Del Monte, *OA* 20, 214ff. See also Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 43f., 60, 81, and Oettinger, *StBoT* 22, 69.

⁴¹ See Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 629a "auf annähernd paritätischer Grundlage". For instance, in the Akkadian treaty Šunaššura or his son must come, when he is summoned, to pay homage to the Hittite king, but he is to be treated as an honored guest and need not bring tribute. The Hittite king, on the other hand, does not appear to have to come to pay homage to Šunaššura. For a full discussion of the nature of these treaties see Liverani, *OA* 12, 267-297, Del Monte, *OA* 20, 216ff., and Korošec, *RAI* 28, 168-172. The latter sees the Akkadian language treaty as preserving an original parity treaty (ii 49 - iii 36) with a section added somewhat later in which Šunaššura is only a Hittite tributary, albeit an extraordinarily privileged one.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the Šunaššura treaties are less paritetical than the earlier Hittite-Kizzuwatnan treaties, due to the fragmentary nature of the earlier treaties. It may be merely a fortuitous accident that all preserved clauses in the earlier treaties are paritetical.

⁴² Weidner, *PD* 88 n. 8. Forrer had suggested Muwatalli in *SPAW* 1919, 1036.

⁴³ Forrer, *Forsch.* 2 (1929) 39, "aus historischen Gründen dem Suppilulijama". Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 43, dates the Akkadian Šunaššura treaty to Tudhaliya III. This is apparently based on the similarity of the Išuwa incidents mentioned in the Šunaššura treaty (= *PD* No. 6) obv. 8ff. to the Išuwa incidents that occurred in the time of Šuppiluliuma's father and that are related in the Šattiwaza treaty (= *PD* No. 1) obv. 10f. Those dating

king's grandfather, weakness under his father, and strength again under the current king. "Formerly, in the time of my grandfather, Kizzuwatna was (on the side) of Hatti. Later, Kizzuwatna released itself from Hatti and turned toward Hurri. . . . Now Kizzuwatna is on the side of Hatti."⁴⁴ This pattern was believed to fit the time of Šuppiluliuma quite well⁴⁵. Additionally the dispute between the current Hittite king and the Hurrians over Išuwa can be nicely paralleled from Šuppiluliuma's time⁴⁶.

However, Šuppiluliuma I is contemporary with Tušratta of Mittanni, whereas the Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna known from the suit brought against him by Niqmepa of Alalah⁴⁷ is contemporary with Šauštatar of Mittanni, who reigned about three generations before Tušratta, that is in the time of Tudhaliya II of Hatti⁴⁸. To solve this chronological problem, two Šunaššuras have been postulated, Šunaššura I contemporary with Šauštatar and Šunaššura II contemporary with Šuppiluliuma I. The Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty is then placed in the reign of Šunaššura II while the Hittite language fragments of a Šunaššura treaty, which do not visibly

the Šunaššura treaty to Šuppiluliuma I can point to Šuppiluliuma's own campaigns into Išuwa mentioned in the Šattiwaza treaty (= *PD* No. 1) obv. 14-24.

⁴⁴ KBo 1.5 i 5-7, 30 *panānum ana paṇi aḫbi abiya* KURURUKizzuwatni ša KURURUHatti[i] ḫbbaši arkānum KURURUKizzu[w]atni ana KURURUHatti[i] iptur an[ša] KURURUHurri ishur . . . inanna KURURUKizzuwatni ša URUHatti. Note: Weidner, *PD* 91, translated "(Ein Teil) des Landes Hatti", and Goetze, *Kizz.* 37, "(Part) of Hatti Country". But when a predicate is a genitive it means "To belong to" not "to be part of". Compare IBoT 1.30 obv. 2-3: KUR-e 10-aš-pāt nepeš tekanna ERIN.MEŠ-az 10-aš-pāt "The land belongs to the Storm-god alone. Heaven, earth and the people belong to the Stormgod alone". "Part of" simply makes no sense here. Thus I would suggest that the treaty indicates not that Kizzuwatna had been reduced and incorporated as a province, but that it was an autonomous tributary or allied client state, thus it "belonged to the Land of Hatti", as Gurney translated in *CAH* II/1 676 and 679.

⁴⁵ Strength under Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I, collapse under Tudhaliya III, strength again under Šuppiluliuma I. See *CAH* II/1 676-682.

⁴⁶ KBo 1.1. obv. 3-24 and duplicates = *PD* No. 1 (CTH 51) Šattiwaza treaty.

⁴⁷ For the Šunaššura-Niqmepa dispute see above n. 32.

⁴⁸ Tušratta's father was Šuttarna II (EA 29:18f.) and his grandfather was Artatama I (EA 29:16). According to KBo 1.3 + KUB 3.17 (*PD* No. 2) obv. 8 Šauštatar is Šattiwaza's great-grandfather, i.e. Tušratta's grandfather. However, it is likely that at least one generation has been omitted (Weidner, *PD* 38 n. 3) and that Šauštatar is Šattiwaza's great-grandfather, i.e. Tušratta's great-grandfather. The small fragment KUB 23.14 (ed. Carruba, *SMEA* 18 [1977] 172) seems to supply independent evidence linking Šauštatar with Tudhaliya II. It is a text of Arnuwanda I: "to me (that is) to Ar[nuwanda]" (iii 3). Column ii, however, refers to events in the time of his father Tudhaliya II: *attašmiš* IŠME "my father heard" (ii 7), and mentions several of the places it is known that Tudhaliya II campaigned: Išuwa (ii 8) and Aššuwā (ii 9). In line ii 1 Carruba reads "Ša-uš-[ta-tar]". This restoration seems sound. The 'uš' sign preserves all but the final vertical and the shape can be paralleled just below in line ii 2 and in iii 8. Other signs such as *iš*, *pi*, and *ka* cannot of course be ruled out. However, as line ii 3 reads *apel* ŠA KURURUHurri "of him, of the land of Hurri", the reading in ii 1, "Šauš[atar]", while not the only possibility, seems likely. Thus, the counting back of generations in Mittanni and Hatti and this unfortunately broken text both point to the contemporaneity of Tudhaliya II and Šauštatar.

translate any sections of this Akkadian treaty and are in Middle Hittite with Middle Script, have been placed in the reign of Šunaššura I⁴⁹.

⁴⁹ First put forward by Meyer, *MIO* 1, 122ff. The problem of the placement of Šunaššura "I" is tied to the problem of the placement of Pilliya. The placement of these kings has been the subject of considerable speculation.

Those who (like this author and those cited above n. 29) accept the synchronism Zidanta II–Pilliya–Idrimi–Baratarna usually put Šunaššura "I" a generation or so after Zidanta II, that is three or four generations before Šuppiluliuma I, in or around the reign of Tudhaliya II. This gives the synchronism Tudhaliya II–Šunaššura "I"–Niqmepa, son of Idrimi–Šauštatar.

Meyer, *MIO* 1, 122ff., who did not accept the existence of Zidanta II and who believed in a synchronism Zidanta (I)–Pilliya–Idrimi–Baratarna, put the Hittite language Šunaššura treaty of Šunaššura "I" one generation after Zidanta (I) in the reign of Ammuna. This maintains the synchronism Šunaššura "I"–Niqmepa (son of Idrimi)–Šauštatar. However, subsequent research was to show that the Hittite language Šunaššura treaties are written in Middle Hittite, whereas the Telipinu edict, written, according to Meyer's scheme, one generation later, is in Old Hittite. This does not bode well for Meyer's placement of the Hittite Šunaššura treaties.

Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 33, 36, 43, follows Meyer in disbelieving in the existence of Hantili II, Zidanta II and Huzziya II and in seeing a synchronism Zidanta (I)–Pilliya–Idrimi–Baratarna. However, he places Šunaššura "I" contemporary with a Tudhaliya "I", two generations before Šunaššura "II", whom he makes to be a contemporary with a Tudhaliya who is a composite of my Tudhaliya II and Tudhaliya III (father of Šuppiluliuma I). (For further discussion of Wilhelm's chronology see below n. 85.) Wilhelm suggests that the two Šunaššuras could be the same if Šunaššura had an extremely long reign. In any event, Šunaššura is on the throne three generations before Šuppiluliuma I, safely within the Middle Hittite period. However, even after Wilhelm has eliminated Hantili II, Zidanta II and Huzziya II, he is left with four Hittite kings (Ammuna, Huzziya I, Telipinu, Tahirwaili, Alluwamna), not all of whom can be considered negligible, between the king whom he considers to be contemporary with Idrimi (Zidanta II) and the king whom he considers to be contemporary with his son Niqmepa Tudhaliya "I".

Gurney, *CAH* II/1 670 with n. 5, and Kühne, *RAI* 25, 220f., 228, improve upon the above schemes by accepting the evidence for the existence of Hantili II, Zidanta II, and Huzziya II and the evidence that Kizzuwatna only became independent during the reign of Ammuna. However, in using the synchronisms (Ammuna)–Pilliya–Idrimi–Baratarna and Zidanta II–Pilliya II, they have much the same chronological problems as Meyer and Wilhelm. Gurney, like Meyer, places Šunaššura "I" around the time of Telipinu. The Hittite treaty fragments he assigns to Šunaššura "I", arguing that since Šunaššura "I" was a tributary of Mittanni, he could not have had a treaty with Hatti. Gurney forgets that countries can change alliances. Furthermore, Gurney overlooks the evidence showing the contemporaneity of Šauštatar and Tudhaliya II, which would cause difficulties for his scheme. (See n. 43.) Kühne chooses to put Šunaššura "I" three or four generations before Šuppiluliuma I and roughly contemporary with Tudhaliya II. However, he is left with the unlikely scenario of five kings of Kizzuwatna (Pariyawatri, Išputahšu, Ehey, Pilliya II, and Paddatiššu) or seven kings of Hatti (Huzziya I, Telipinu, Tahirwaili, Alluwamna, Hantili II, Zidanta II, Huzziya II) ruling between the kings whom he considers to be contemporary with Idrimi of Alalah (Pilliya I and Ammuna) and the kings whom he considers to be contemporary with his son Niqmepa (Šunaššura I and Tudhaliya II).

A solution to this "dilemma" was come up with by Kestemont, *Diplomatique et droit international en Asie occidentale (1600-1200 av. J.C.)* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1974) 428 with n. 304. Kestemont postulates three Šunaššura: the first is contemporary with Niqmepa of Alalah, the second is the treaty partner in the Middle Hittite dialect treaty fragments and the third is the treaty partner of Tudhaliya III or Šuppiluliuma I in the Akkadian language treaty.

Kammenhuber, *Arier* 65, 98 with n. 298 (followed by Otten, *Fischer Weltgeschichte* 3, 142f.; and Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 128f.), considers the "archaisch-junghethitische Fragmente" to be insufficient evidence to postulate a Šunaššura other than the one contemporary with Šuppiluliuma I. Nor does she consider AT 14 as evidence for a Middle Hittite

It is my contention that one should not create a second king of the same name unless the evidence demands it. Can the Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty be moved back to Tudhaliya II's reign? There is no linguistic reason not to date it to Tudhaliya II instead of Šuppiluliuma I. In fact, in a recent study of Boğazköy Akkadian, Durham concludes that the treaty *should* be redated to the period before Šuppiluliuma I⁵⁰. Thus the problem is mainly a historical one. The treaty seems to show a series of autonomous Kizzuwatnan kings, in a position to choose which side of the fence they are on. Does this situation really fit the time of Šuppiluliuma and his immediate predecessors? I think not.

There is evidence that Kizzuwatna was not an independent or even a semi-independent country in the time of Šuppiluliuma. During the reign of Šuppiluliuma's second queen, Henti, that is fairly early in his reign, Šuppiluliuma installed his son Telipinu as "priest of Kizzuwatna". That this is no ordinary priesthood may be seen from the fact that the decree installing him reads like a "vassal" treaty⁵¹. Telipinu must acknowledge only crown Prince Arnuwanda for lordship in Hatti and is to support him and do good things for him⁵². The king's and queen's friends are to be "The Priest"'s friends and their enemies are to be his enemies⁵³. Furthermore, he is not to conceal anyone who slanders the king or his rule⁵⁴. These do not read like instructions for temple personnel but like terms of a "vassal" treaty. Additionally during Šuppiluliuma's Syrian campaigns, one would expect a king of Kizzuwatna, if he existed, to be leading his armies into Syria in support of the Hittite army. No king of Kizzuwatna is ever seen. Instead one sees Telipinu the "Priest" (of Kizzuwatna) leading armies in support of Hittite causes in Syria⁵⁵. It seems likely, then, that Telipinu's title "Priest of Kizzuwatna" was more or less equivalent to that of "king" of other Hittite appanage states⁵⁶.

It has been suggested by Goetze⁵⁷ and Houwink ten Cate⁵⁸ that Teli-

Šunaššura (see above n. 29), so she posits but one Šunaššura contemporary with Šuppiluliuma I.

Del Monte, *OA* 20, 215-220, leaves it open whether the Hittite Šunaššura treaty fragments date to Šuppiluliuma I or to Tudhaliya the conqueror of Aleppo.

⁵⁰ Durham, *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian* (Harvard PhD diss., 1976) 71-72 as quoted in Melchert, *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite* (Harvard PhD diss. 1977) 100.

⁵¹ KUB 19.25, KUB 19.26 = *CTH* 44, ed. Goetze, *Kizz.* 12-16.

⁵² KUB 19.25:10-14 cf. KBo 5.3 i 9 (Huqqana § 2) *SV* 2, 106-107.

⁵³ KUB 19.26:7-18 cf. KBo 1.4 ii 6-7 (Tette) *PD* 60-61.

⁵⁴ KUB 19.26:19-26 cf. KBo 5.3 ii 32ff. (Huqqana § 15) *SV* 2, 116-117.

⁵⁵ KBo 5.6 ii 10 (DŠ). See Goetze, *Kizz.* 16, though note, even tributary kings are subject to the king's jurisdiction in quarrels with each other, see above n. 35.

⁵⁶ Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 629a and Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 45 agree that these references indicate that the kingship of Kizzuwatna had been abolished and that Kizzuwatna had been annexed by Hatti. See, however, below n. 85.

⁵⁷ *Kizz.* 12 n. 52.

⁵⁸ *Records* 69.

pinu was not the first Hittite "Priest of Kizzuwatna", but rather that he had a predecessor, another Hittite royal prince named Kantuzili. Unfortunately the evidence for this is rather weak⁵⁹. If, however, Goetze and Houwink ten Cate are correct, then this would show that Kizzuwatna was incorporated into Hatti even earlier than Telipinu's installation.

There is, in fact, further evidence that Kizzuwatna was already incorporated in the reign of Šuppiluliuma's father, Tudhaliya III. We have from the reign of Hattušili III a text that relates how bad things were for the empire in the period preceding the accession of Šuppiluliuma I and how the empire was stripped of this or that territory⁶⁰. This text, however, does not mention that Kizzuwatna had been lost; in fact it implies exactly the opposite. The relevant section of the text is in the following form: enemy x invaded, devastated territory y and made Hittite city z the border⁶¹. One paragraph⁶² reads, "From this direction the Armatanan enemy [came] and devastated Hatti-Land. They made the city of Kizzuwatna the border". Goetze admitted⁶³: "The text under discussion counts

⁵⁹ There is a Kantuzzili who is seen as an army commander (as Telipinu was to be later) in a MH text (KUB 23.16 iii 5, 7) and in text fragments considered by Güterbock to belong to the beginning of the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (DŠ Frag. 2 = BoTU 31 = Bo 2984+KUB 14.23 and DŠ Frag. 3 = BoTU 32 = KUB 14.22, both ed. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 [1956] 59-60). These texts unfortunately do not preserve a title "Priest of Kizzuwatna" or any other title for this Kantuzzili. He is probably a royal prince, however: DŠ Frag. 2 i 20 reads "Kantu(zzili x mD)udhaliya where x could be either DUMU (so Güterbock) or ŠEŠ, "Kantuzzili [son/brother] of Tudhaliya". Goetze and Houwink ten Cate (see above notes 57-58) suggest that the installation of Kantuzili as "Priest of Kizzuwatna" may be reflected in KUB 17.22 iv 1-5 "[X] tablet not finished. The words of Kantuzzili, when they make [someone] the priest of Tešub and Hepat [in Kizzuwatna], they do the priest-ship-ritual [as follows]" (Restorations that differ from those in Goetze, *Kizz.* 12 n. 52 and Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 69 n. 83, courtesy of H. G. Güterbock). Goetze and Houwink ten Cate must, however, assume that Kantuzzili wrote the ritual for his own and his successors' enthronements. This seems unlikely at first glance, though it is of course possible that these are the words which Kantuzzili as first(?) officeholder in a new office wrote (or had ghost-written) and spoke at his, the first(?), enthronization. Royal authors of rituals are known: "When Palliya, King of Kizzuwatna, set up the Stormgod of Kizzuwatna, he recited (to) him thus" (KUB 7.20 obv. 1-3). More importantly, there is a library catalogue entry that begins "The words of Kantuzzili, the [Chief] Priest (and) royal prince" (KUB 30.56 iii 7, ed. Laroche, *CTH* 181f., noted in Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 69 with n. 83). Thus we have a King Pilliya and a prince Kantuzzili authoring rituals — ordinary ones to be sure and not their enthronement rituals — and we have a Kantuzzili who is prince, priest and author of a ritual. There is some evidence, albeit circumstantial, linking this Kantuzzili to a MH Kantuzzili (as opposed to the later general Kantuzzili in the Annals of Muṣili II, see *AM* 86). A certain MH prince Pariyawatri is sometimes associated with a prince Kantuzzili (KUB 36.118:3, ed. Carruba, *SMEA* 18, 192f.) and sometimes with a prince-priest (KUB 45.47 i 40ff., ii 4ff., iii 24ff., KBo 20.62 i 10f.). Perhaps this MH Kantuzzili is to be identified with the priest and prince who is the author of the rituals. This MH prince and priest Kantuzzili can then perhaps be equated with the prince and general Kantuzzili who was active during Šuppiluliuma's father's reign.

⁶⁰ KBo 6.28 (= *CTH* 88 = Hekur Pirwa decree), ed. Goetze, *Kizz.* 21-22.

⁶¹ Lines 6-15.

⁶² Lines 13-14.

⁶³ Goetze, *Kizz.* 26.

Kizzuwatna as a city in Hittite territory." He must assume that the reference is an anachronism, introduced due to Kizzuwatna's position as a Hittite province at the time the text was written (Hattušili III). Must one assume a mistake by the Hittite scribe? The *only* reason for assuming that Kizzuwatna was again independent under Šuppiluliuma I is the Šunaššura treaty, and this treaty does not even mention Šuppiluliuma⁶⁴.

There is, moreover, evidence that Kizzuwatna was incorporated even earlier than Šuppiluliuma's father's reign. In the Išmirika Protocol, the men of Išmirika swear an oath of loyalty to Arnuwanda I of Hatti and to his family⁶⁵. These men of Išmirika are stationed in various cities in Kizzuwatna⁶⁶ by the king of Hatti and their function is to act as a royal gendarmarie: "If in the land a single city is treasonous, you men of Išmirika should arrive there ... and kill the men [of that city], and send (the rest of) the transplantees to His Majesty (the king of Hatti). You may take the cattle and sheep for yourselves. But if a single household in a city is treasonous, kill the men of that house, and send the servants to [His Majesty] and take the cattle and sheep for yourselves. If a single man is treasonous, [kill h]im."⁶⁷ They are to report all sedition that they hear, whether it is from the mouth of the highest official or the lowest man. It is interesting that the highest ranking official in Kizzuwatna who might speak sedition is the margrave (*BĒL MADGALTI*), a Hittite provincial governor⁶⁸. There is no mention of a tributary king, whom one might expect to be the highest ranking authority in Kizzuwatna. In fact the very important problem of the relationship between these Hittite gendarmes stationed in Kizzuwatna and the tributary king of Kizzuwatna is nowhere mentioned in the preserved instructions. Thus this text, too, points to a

⁶⁴ That this text shows Kizzuwatna to be part of Hatti is accepted by Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 44. See, however, below n. 85.

⁶⁵ KUB 26.41 obv. and KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 rev. 7-10, 25-28 (*CTH* 133), ed. Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5 (1970) 192ff. For the date, see *ibid.* p. 215, and also Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 61, contra Gurney's conclusion *CAH* II/1 680.

⁶⁶ KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 rev. 1-24. Na'aman, *UF* 6 (1974) 270, following the tentative suggestion of Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5, 216, suggests that the Išmirika protocol's signatories were "persons connected with Waššukanni who had received estates in Išmeriga and Kizzuwatna, most probably from the ruler of Mitanni". However, the signatories are called LÚ.MEŠ KUR URU⁶⁷Išmirika, "men of Išmirika". Since LÚ.MEŠ KUR URU⁶⁸Hatti means "Hittites", LÚ.MEŠ URU⁶⁹Hurri means "Hurrians", and LÚ.MEŠ KUR URU⁷⁰Miṣri means "Egyptians", this must mean that these people are ethnically Išmirikans. "In Kizzuwatna his city is GN" probably indicates that when stationed in Kizzuwatna, they were in that city. These people are never called Waššukkannians (LÚ.MEŠ URU⁷¹Waššukkanni). Nor is there evidence that these men are all Hurrians (LÚ.MEŠ Hurri). In fact only two of the names might be Hurrian, the remainder being Luwian (Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5, 212-213).

⁶⁷ KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 obv. 25-28.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* obv. 21-22.

Kizzuwatna already incorporated into Hatti before Šuppiluliuma I and, in fact, as early as the time of Arnuwanda I⁶⁹.

Moreover, this protocol may give still further evidence for this incorporation. The signatories of the protocol are described with the following formula "PN, the Išmirikan, his city is GN₁, but in Kizzuwatna his city is GN₂". For several of the Išmirikans their "city in Kizzuwatna is Waššukkanni". Waššukkanni is well known as the capital of the Mittannian Empire and its appearance as a city in Kizzuwatna has caused great consternation. It has been suggested that at this time Mittanni had annexed Kizzuwatna and "Politisch interessant ist, dass der hethitische König späterhin den Bund Mittanni-Kizzuwatna lediglich als Kizzuwatna bezeichnet"⁷⁰. After a Mittannian annexation of Kizzuwatna, one could understand Adana or Kummanni being called a city in Mittanni, but that Waššukkanni would be called a city in Kizzuwatna is unlikely in the extreme. Between 1941 and 1945 was Berlin ever called a city in Austria, Poland or France, or was Paris ever called a city in Algeria? One could of course postulate that there was a city with the homophonous name Waššukkanni that was located in Kizzuwatna. It would, however, be otherwise unattested. Moreover, in the Išmirika Treaty Waššukkanni occurs beside Irridi and Urušša⁷¹, which are also known as Mittannian cities, both admittedly on or near the western borders. If one rejects the idea of two homophonous Waššukkanni's, there remains the possibility suggested by Goetze⁷², namely that Kizzuwatna had expanded into what was Mittanni, engulfing Mittannian territory at least as far as the Mittannian capital Waššukkanni. (Vienna in 1939-45 could have been said to be a city in Germany, or Algiers in France). It is generally agreed that a Hittite war against Mittanni would have made the supposed Kizzuwatnan expansion possible, assuming that Kizzuwatna was an ally of Hatti. Then, however, Kizzuwatnan territory would have lain between Hatti and her North Sy-

⁶⁹ This point is accepted by Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 44. See, however, below n. 85.

⁷⁰ Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5, 216.

⁷¹ Urušša was part of Hurri in the period just preceding the Šunaššura Treaty: "Whoever of the land of H[urri, be they] merchants or be they men of the city of Urušša ..." (KBo 1.5 iv 5-6). By the time of Hattušili III, the city may well have been part of Kizzuwatna if one can trust the inference that proximity in the list of towns in the Šahurunuwa decree indicates geographical proximity (KUB 26.43 obv. 40-41 with dupl. KUB 26.50 obv. 35, ed. Imparati, *RHA* 32, 28f., cf. Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5, 213f.). Whether Urušša is or is not to be equated with Uršu (Goetze, *Kizz.* 42ff.) is irrelevant to the Išmirika Protocol, as Urušša on independent evidence can be placed on or near the border between Mittanni and Kizzuwatna. It should be noted that Garstang and Gurney, *Geogr.* 55f. reject the identification of Uršu with modern Urfā (see Goetze, *Kizz.* 42ff. with bibliography, and instead suggest somewhere west of the Euphrates, north of Karkemīs, i.e. a region between Mittanni and Kizzuwatna.

⁷² Goetze, *Kizz.* 47-48, 76; Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 61, disbelieved by Kümmel, *RLA* 5, 627b.

rian possessions such as Aleppo⁷³. Would even an allied power be trusted with such a huge chunk of territory that so separated two parts of the empire⁷⁴? I suggest not. Rather, I would suggest that if Goetze's theory is correct, then this would further illustrate that in Arnuwanda's reign Kizzuwatna was not a tributary state, but a fully incorporated part of the empire, to which the Hittites had simply added their recently conquered territory.

There remains the problem of when this Hittite annexation of Kizzuwatna took place. From a ritual⁷⁵ securely dated to Muršili II, we know that a Tudhaliya moved DINGIR.GE₆ from the City of Kizzuwatna to Šamuha in Hatti. Since Muršili II, having just called himself the son of Šuppiluliuma (I), refers to this Tudhaliya not as his grandfather (*ABI-ABIYA*), but as his ancestor (*ABBĀYA*), it is probable that he meant to refer not to his grandfather Tudhaliya III, but to the earlier Tudhaliya II, his great-great-grandfather⁷⁷. It seems unlikely that a tributary king of Kizzuwatna would have allowed his overlord to move Kizzuwatnan gods out of Kizzuwatna. Nor does the admittedly sparse ritual context mention such a tributary king. One country can carry away its neighbor's gods only when it has absolute control over it. Thus it would appear likely that there was no Kizzuwatnan tributary king to forbid the move or that it occurred during a Hittite conquest of the country⁷⁸. Thus it ap-

⁷³ The Aleppo Treaty seems to indicate that Aleppo was taken by a Tudhaliya and continued in the possession of Hattušili II, and that no change took place in its status between Hattušili II and the accession of Šuppiluliuma I (see below pp. 440ff., with n. 86). Therefore in the time of Arnuwanda I when this alleged expansion of Kizzuwatna took place, Aleppo would have been a Hittite possession.

⁷⁴ Goetze, *Kizz.* 76f.

⁷⁵ *UMMA* "UTU-ŠI" "Muršili LUGAL.GAL DUMU "Šuppiluliuma LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG ABBĀ-YA-zakan kuwapi "Tudhaliyaš LUGAL.GAL DINGIR.GE₆ IŠTU É.DINGIR.GE₆ URU Kizzuwatni arha šarriēt nanzan INA URUŠamuha É.DINGIR.GE₆ hanti iyat "Thus His Majesty, Muršili, the Great King, son of Šuppiluliuma the Great King, the hero, when my forefather Tudhaliya, the Great King, separated the DINGIR.GE₆ from the temple of DINGIR.GE₆ in the City of Kizzuwatna and made her a separate temple in the city of Šamuha (a city in eastern Hatti)" KUB 32.133 i 1-4 (= *CTH* 482).

⁷⁶ For a discussion of whether to translate DINGIR.GE₆ as "The Black Goddess", Ištar/Šaušga, "the Moongod(dess)", or "the Deity of the Night" see Goetze, *JCS* 20 (1966) 51, Lebrun, *Samuha* (1976) 28-31, Wegner, *AOAT* 36 (1981) 163-165.

⁷⁷ I owe thanks to H. G. Güterbock for pointing this out to me. That it was Tudhaliya III who moved the deity (Lebrun, *Samuha* 31), either for cultic reasons or to protect it from one of his innumerable enemies (e.g. Armatama), cannot definitively be ruled out. However, contrary to Kempinski and Košak, *WO* 5, 214 with n. 83, one should not associate this removal of the deity from Kizzuwatna to Hatti with Kizzuwatna's defection from Hatti to Mittanni as reported in the Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty, even if one continues to date this treaty to Šuppiluliuma I. It seems hardly likely that a tributary king of Kizzuwatna would have allowed his former ally to remove a deity of Kizzuwatna from the country to protect this deity from his new ally! It is to be remembered that the Šunaššura treaty does not say that Kizzuwatna was conquered by Mittanni, but that it defected (voluntarily) to Mittanni (Akk. *šahāru* for Hitt. *mai-*).

⁷⁸ Kühne, *RAI* 25, 264 n. 233.

pears that Tudhaliya II, whether for reasons of war or for purposes of the cult, moved the deity from one portion of his kingdom to another. Therefore this text, I would cautiously suggest, shows that Kizzuwatna was or became an incorporated part of Hatti in the time of Tudhaliya II⁷⁹.

Possibly this incorporation was described in an unfortunately poorly preserved section of the joint annals of Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I (KUB 23.21 obv. 2-11)⁸⁰. One of the chief cities of Kizzuwatna, Adaniya, is mentioned together with a bridge⁸¹. (Adaniya [Adana] is the place where from time immemorial the main East-West road has crossed the Seyhan [Saros] river.) Two other Kizzuwatnan towns are also mentioned⁸². The verb *wetenun* "I built" or "I fortified" is preserved twice. While building and fortifying do not necessarily indicate that a territory is to be directly ruled by the Hittites⁸³, it does indicate that an extra effort has been made to prevent its loss. The territory cannot simply switch sides. The garrisons must first be eliminated. This text indicates a reduced Kizzuwatna with or without a tributary king, and does not show the virtually autonomous Kizzuwatna seen in the Šunaššura treaty⁸⁴.

If the Šunaššura treaty were dated to Šuppiluliuma I, then it would show a kingdom of Kizzuwatna defecting to the Hurrians in the period preceding Šuppiluliuma's reign. However, the above examples cumulatively show a Kizzuwatna already reduced to a Hittite province during the period of the joint reigns of Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I⁸⁵. Moreover,

⁷⁹ This point is accepted by Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 44. See, however, below n. 85.

⁸⁰ KUB 23.21 obv. 2-11 (= CTH 143), ed. Carruba, *SMEA* 18, 166-167.

⁸¹ Ibid. obv. 5.

⁸² [URU]Zu[nnahara] (line 4) is mentioned with Adaniya, Tarsus and Kummani in the Hišwa Festival KUB 20.52 i 13 (see Garstang and Gurney, *Geogr.* 61), thus it too is presumably in Kizzuwatna. [URU]Šin[uwanda] (line 6) is restored from BoTU 17B3 = KBo 3.54: 16-17 where it occurs with Zunnahara. It adjoins the border of the Hulaya-River Land in KBo 4.10 obv. 26, tr. Garstang and Gurney, *Geogr.* 67. See Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 59 with n. 10-12.

⁸³ See AM 72-73 where Muršili reorganizes Mira, builds garrisons and installs Mašhuiluwa as king.

⁸⁴ Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 44 agrees that this annals passage may refer to the incorporation of Kizzuwatna. See however below n. 85. See also Kühne, *RAI* 25, 223f.

⁸⁵ Wilhelm, *Hurriter* 43ff., accepts that Kizzuwatna was reduced to a Hittite province in the time of the joint reigns of Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I. (See above nn. 56, 64, 69, 79, 84.) He also accepts that the Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty dates to somewhat earlier in the reign of Tudhaliya II. Wilhelm, however, does not take the obvious next step of saying that since documents from the reigns of both Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I are written in Middle Hittite dialect, therefore the MH Hittite language Šunaššura treaty fragments should also be dated to Tudhaliya II. This is because Wilhelm equates the father of Šuppiluliuma I (my Tudhaliya III), with Tudhaliya II, the father of Arnuwanda I (following Kammenhuber, see Carruba, *SMEA* 18, 140 scheme B, with bibliography). Thus he dates the Akkadian language Šunaššura treaty one generation before Šuppiluliuma I. There is, however, a Šunaššura contemporary with Šauštatar, who ruled about three generations before Šuppiluliuma I. It is to this Šunaššura that Wilhelm dates the Hittite language Šunaššura treaty-fragments, i.e., he places them two generations before the Akkadian language treaty and shortly before Kizzuwatna defected

the text of Hattušili III indicates that the province of Kizzuwatna was not lost to the Hittites, but remained Hittite, even in the Empire's darkest days. Support for this text comes from a fragmentary section of the Aleppo Treaty⁸⁶. This text reads in summary: Aleppo was conquered and burned by Tudhaliya (I or II). Afterward, Aleppo, in an unspecified manner, "sinned against" Mittanni. The King of Mittanni then gave some cities and territory belonging to Aleppo to Aštata and Nuhašše as a reward for their support. He also gave them a sealed deed to the territory (23-27). Then, however, Aleppo "sinned against" Hattušili II of Hatti in an also unspecified manner. The people of Aštata and Nuhašše again must have taken the side opposite Aleppo, this time siding with Hatti, for Hattušili gave them the same (or more) cities and territory belonging to Aleppo "as a gift", and he too gave them a sealed deed to the territory (28-32). This is the situation until the accession of Šuppiluliuma I (33). For Kizzuwatna to have been in a position to become a tributary of Mittanni, as it was before the Šunaššura treaty, its territory must have been contiguous with that of the Mittannian Empire, that is, it is unlikely that there was a corridor of states who were not Mittannian tributaries separating Mittanni from its tributary Kizzuwatna. If the Mittannian Empire included Kizzuwatna and was hostile to Hatti, then Hattušili could not have gotten his army down from the Anatolian plateau, let alone detached pieces from the far side of the kingdom of Aleppo in order to reward Aštata and Nuhašše. Moreover, it seems unlikely that even the most foolhardy Syrian state would have agreed to side with Hatti against Mittanni no matter what it was promised, if the nearest Hittite army which could

to Mittanni according to the Akkadian language treaty. (He suggests, however, that the Šunaššura who made the treaty with Tudhaliya II and the Šunaššura who made a treaty with Tudhaliya II's grandfather might be the same person, if this Šunaššura had an exceptionally long reign.)

The main problem with Wilhelm's reconstruction is equation of Tudhaliya II with the father of Šuppiluliuma I. This equation does not square well with the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma. Arnuwanda I, who was coregent and a leading general for his father Tudhaliya II, would have been by Wilhelm's reconstruction, Šuppiluliuma's senior brother. Yet he is never mentioned in the Deeds. Nor does it seem likely that the death of Tudhaliya, the events of the not inconsiderable independent reign of Arnuwanda I, as well as the events surrounding the irregular succession of Šuppiluliuma could have been described in the missing ca. 11 lines of the Deeds (see Güterbock, *JCS* 10, 43, and Carruba, *SMEA* 18, 143). Moreover, as we have seen, there is reason to believe that Tudhaliya II, father of Arnuwanda I, was contemporary with Šauštatar and thus should be placed not one but three generations before Šuppiluliuma I. Thus Tudhaliya II, father of Arnuwanda, is to be distinguished from Tudhaliya III father of Šuppiluliuma I. The references to the annexation of Kizzuwatna would then date to Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I, two and three generations before Šuppiluliuma respectively, and Šunaššura, a contemporary of Tudhaliya II, would date about three generations before Šuppiluliuma and thus would be contemporary with Šauštatar.

⁸⁶ KBo 1.6 obv. 19-32 (= CTH 75) ed. Weidner, *PD* 82-85; see the new edition of the lines in question by Na'aman, *JCS* 32 (1980) 34ff.

Išūwa would cause no problem, for Tudhaliya's badly broken annals inform us that he too fought the Hurrians there⁸⁸. The pattern of Hittite strength-weakness-strength vis-à-vis Kizzuwatna laid out in the Šunaššura treaty for the current Hittite king and the preceding two generations would not conflict with what we know for sure about Tudhaliya II and his predecessors. We know that Tudhaliya himself was a mighty king. About Huzziya II, his predecessor, however, we know nothing. No treaty between Huzziya II and a king of Kizzuwatna has yet been found. We do know however that Huzziya's predecessor Zidanta II had a treaty with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna⁸⁹, who at another point in his reign became a tributary of Baratarna of Mittanni⁹⁰. If the filiation of these three kings is normal, that is father to son (for which there is no evidence pro or con)⁹¹, one would have a reconstruction as follows. Under Tudhaliya's grandfather (Zidanta II) Kizzuwatna under Pilliya had a treaty with the Hittites. Later Pilliya led Kizzuwatna into the Mittannian camp, becoming a tributary of Baratarna. During the father's generation (Huzziya II and Talzu(?)) Kizzuwatna remained in the Mittannian camp, and there was no treaty with the Hittites⁹². When Šunaššura came to the throne he was a tributary of

struction involves leaving the placement of Hattušili II as an unsolved problem. It remains to be seen whether there is some other solution to the Hattušili II problem which does not create difficulties with synchronisms between the Hittites and their neighbors. I plan to discuss these matters in a future article.

In any case, the acceptance of Gurney and Košak's reconstruction does not invalidate my argument that there is but one Šunaššura, who is a contemporary of Šauštatar. Moreover, the redating of the Šunaššura treaty does not create any more synchronistic difficulties for the reconstruction than were already inherent in it.

⁸⁸ KUB 23.11 rev. iii 27ff.; "[...] the land began hostilities / [...] he seized and to/against him the king of Hurri [...] I went to fight [in?] Išūwa...". Meyer's objection (*MIO* 1, 122) that the Akkadian Šunaššura treaty mentions a king of the Hurrians, while the Hittite treaty speaks of a King of Mittanni, is no reason for not moving the Akkadian language treaty back to Tudhaliya II's reign, for Tudhaliya's annals also speak of fighting the King of the Hurrians KUB 23.11 rev. iii 28).

The fact that the Šunaššura treaty mentions that Šunaššura must supply troops to the Hittites for campaigns against Mittanni and Arzawa (KBo 1.5 iv 19ff.) in no way proves that Kizzuwatna was contiguous to either of these countries. These two were probably two of the more formidable enemies of both Šuppiluliuma and Tudhaliya II. Against such enemies the Hittite Great King normally seems to have mobilized as many of his allies as he could, regardless of strict geographic proximity. For example the King of Karkemiš came with troops to aid Muṣili against Arzawa, and troops from various Hittite tributaries in Anatolia (e.g. Maša, Pedaša and Luqqa) sent troops to aid Muwatalli at Qadeš. Thus this clause in the Šunaššura treaty does not necessitate dating the treaty to a time when it might be theorized that Kizzuwatna was bordered by both Mittanni and Arzawa.

⁸⁹ See above n. 23.

⁹⁰ See above n. 26. Note there may have been a short lived king between Baratarna and Šauštatar in Mittanni (see above n. 34) as well as a short lived king between Idrimi and Niqmepa at Alalah (see above n. 31).

⁹¹ For an alternative to the theory that Tudhaliya II founded a new Hurrian Dynasty in Hatti, see my forthcoming article.

⁹² Kümmel, *RLA* 5 629: "Talzu müßte jedenfalls in die Zeit der Abhängigkeit von Mittanni gehören".

Šauštatar. After a while, however, he returned Kizzuwatna to the Hittite fold. Thus the relations between Hatti and Kizzuwatna under kings Zidanta II to Tudhaliya II would mirror the pattern of Kizzuwatna being Hittite under the current king's grandfather, being subsequently lost to Mittanni, and being regained by Hatti under the current king that one sees in the Šunaššura treaty.

The redating of the Šunaššura treaty also has the advantage of pairing a known Kizzuwatnan king with almost every known generation of Hittite king⁹³. Thus Ammuna pairs with Pariyawatri; Huzziya I and Telipinu (one generation) pair with Išputahšu; Tahirwaili and Alluwamna (also probably one generation) pair with Eheya, Hantili II with Paddatiššu, Zidanta II with Pilliya, Huzziya II with Talzu, and Tudhaliya II with Šunaššura. At that point Kizzuwatna was incorporated and ruled by "Priests" Kantuzzili, possibly the son of Arnuwanda, and Telipinu the son of Šuppiluliuma I (see chart). Importantly, in addition, the redating eliminates the necessity of creating a second otherwise unattested Šunaššura. Equally importantly, no readjustment of Near Eastern chronology is required except the elimination of Šunaššura II⁹⁴.

In summary, Kizzuwatna was a Hittite province until the time of Ammuna when it rebelled and gained its independence. It was allied with the Hittites from the time of Telipinu and Išputahšu until that of Zidanta II and Pilliya. At that time it switched sides to become a tributary of Mittanni. Šunaššura part way through his reign returned it to the Hittite fold. As Kizzuwatna was an important state, not greatly inferior to Hatti, that had joined Hatti voluntarily, it was able to negotiate a near-parity treaty⁹⁵ with Hatti. Sometime after Šunaššura joined Hatti, perhaps during the joint reigns of Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I, something happened causing Hatti to annex Kizzuwatna. Subsequently it was ruled by Hittite princelings having the title "Priest of Kizzuwatna". How Kizzuwatna was ruled after Šuppiluliuma I made the "Priest" Telipinu king of Aleppo is unknown, but Kizzuwatna remained Hittite down to the end of the empire.

The Oriental Institute
1155 East 58th Street
Chicago, Ill. 60637

⁹³ See chart. This would of course not work as neatly if one accepts Gurney and Košak's insertion of a "Tudhaliya I" and Hattušili II into the kinglist, but see above note 87.

⁹⁴ Tadmor, in *The World History of the Jewish People* II 98-99.

⁹⁵ See above n. 41.