

THREE METAL BOWLS

Clelia Mora*

1. Ali and Belkıs Dinçol have published a large quantity of small archaeological finds, particularly seals, which have yielded much valuable information for research and history. They teach us that even small objects can provide important contributions to historical reconstruction, especially if they bear inscriptions. This brief study, presented as a tribute to the two scholars, examines objects which come from different backgrounds that can only partially be reconstructed. However, they share similar aspects, most importantly in the hieroglyphic inscriptions they all carry¹.

2. Bowls made of gold, silver and other metals are often cited in near-eastern documents from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. They were mostly small to medium sized objects corresponding to standardised weight-measures (Zaccagnini 1991). Obviously these prerequisites mean that the cups are mainly cited in texts referring to the exchange of gifts or to requests for tributes (letters, treaties) or to goods being imported or exported (inventories, lists of religious offerings). In the Hittite Anatolian Late Bronze Age too, there is rich documentation about the metal bowls and cups: they were frequently used as tributes, gifts and as votive offerings. In the following section, I list a brief set of samples taken from a variety of texts.

- From the agreement between the Hittite Great King Šuppiluliuma I and King Niqmadu of Ugarit (Nougayrol 1956: 40 ff.; Dietrich-Loretz 1964-66; Liverani 1990: 269 ff.; Beckman 1996: 151 ff.; Singer 1999: 636 ff.): golden and silver bowls/cups, together with other luxury goods, are requested for the Majesty, the Queen, the crown prince and other Hittite officials and courtiers.
- From the treaty between Sattiwaza of Mittani and Šuppiluliuma I of Hatti (CTH 52), § 4: *And the Great King took pity on me and gave me chariots*

mounted with gold Two vessels of [silver] and gold, together with their cups of silver and gold, (translation Beckman 1996: 46).

- From inventory texts: metal vessels, mainly made of gold and silver, are cited in large quantities in this type of text (s. Košák 1982, Siegelová 1986).
- From reports of legal trials: in KUB 40.91 the theft of 2 silver cups is reported (Floreano 2001: 228).

Staying in the sphere of Hittite influence, but moving to the North Syrian area, there is an interesting testimony originating in Emar about the use of cups/ bowls as votive offerings. The document Msk 73.112 (Arnaud 1986: 57-58, nr. 42) shows three golden cup/ bowl dedications to the ^DU divinity by two kings of Emar (one dedication is presented by one king, the other two by another, father of the former²). The layout of the texts is very simple: name of the offerer, dedication of one 30 shekel (golden) cup to the divinity, name of the scribe. The layout of the second inscription is modified and includes a brief summary of the historical event which prompted the offering. Some scholars (see Zaccagnini 1990: 51; Fales 1991: 82 ff.) have interpreted this document as a scholastic exercise due to the appearance of the name of the scribe on all three dedications and to the difference in structure of this second dedication, thought to be too long for an inscription on a small object. Arnaud (1982) however, believes that they are copies of inscriptions engraved on golden cups. According to Durand (Durand-Marti 2003: 150) “les trois rédactions avaient-elles été vite faites pour que le roi décide de celle qui lui conviendrait”.

Archaeological documentation from the Late Bronze Age is also rich in similar testimonies: vessels and in particular cups made from various types of metal,

* Prof. Dr. Clelia Mora, Dipartimento Scienze dell’ Antichità, Università di Pavia, Strada Nuova, 65, 27100 Pavia / ITALY.

¹ I am indebted for comments and suggestions to Anna Morpurgo Davies, J.David Hawkins, Lorenzo d’Alfonso and Federico Giusfredi.

² Cf. Fales 1991; cf. moreover Durand (Durand-Marti 2003 : 149 ff.), for a discussion about the writing of the names and previous interpretations.

were found during excavations on different sites. Similar material however, housed in museums and private collections, which can be attributed to the late part of the Bronze Age or to the early part of the Iron Age, shows no indication of its origin. Unfortunately the most interesting examples of pieces from the Hittite culture come from accidental findings or simply do not have any indication to show the area or the period of production.

This brief contribution is an investigation into three bowls of different origin and location, but which all bear inscriptions in Anatolian hieroglyphs.

The first bowl was dedicated by Taprammi, a high official of the Hittite kingdom during the time of Tuthaliya IV. It is not difficult to identify the period of production or to decipher the inscription. Therefore it will be dealt with briefly, despite the very rich and interesting decoration (for analytical studies about this bowl: Hawkins 1993, Emre-Çinaroglu 1993, Czichon 1995).

The second bowl/cup too will only be dealt with briefly but for opposite reasons: we have no evidence about its origin or the place where it was used, there is no complete reproduction of the object and the inscription is short and difficult to decipher.

The third bowl, on the other hand, deserves a closer examination. This is not only because it bears an inscription of medium length but also because of the dating that has been suggested. According to this hypothesis, the cup originates in a period from which hitherto the only objects to have been recorded bearing hieroglyphic inscriptions were seals.

The KASTAMONU bowl (Taprammi's bowl)

The so-called "KASTAMONU bowl" was discovered with many other vases and metal objects (Emre-Çinaroglu 1993) in 1990, during an accidental discovery near Kastamonu (Northern Turkey). It is a bronze

bowl, 18.7cm in diameter, 6.4cm high, which is housed in the Kastamonu Museum (Inv. Nr. 946). The bowl has a finely embossed decoration which is subdivided into four concentric friezes: one rosette at the bottom, immediately above this there is a register with griffins on the side of a tree of life and two further registers which depict hunting scenes. Above the highest register, in a otherwise undecorated band, there is a brief dedication in hieroglyphs engraved into the metal. Hawkins (1993) suggests the following reading

*zi/a CAELUM-pi DEUS.SCRIBA BONUS₂. VIR₂. *254 LEPUS+RA/I-mi BONUS₂. VIR₂. *254 PONERE*

"This bowl (to?) God-Scribe the good-man, the *254 (title)³, Taprammi place(d)"⁴

The dedicator is clearly identifiable: his name is Taprammi, a high Hittite official who was active not only in Anatolia but also in Northern Syria at the time of Tuthaliya IV. The bowl can also be assigned chronologically to the same period of time. For a detailed discussion of this individual and documents relating to him, see the previous studies (recently d'Alfonso 2005: 169 ff., Mora 2006). Here we simply mention two other interesting pieces of evidence which bear Taprammi's name: a tablet, found at Hattuša (KUB 25.32+), which describes religious celebrations in the city of Karahna and is sealed with a Taprammi seal (it is important to note that there are very few tablets found in Anatolia, from the Imperial Hittite period, which bear seal impressions); the base of a stele/statue (BOĞAZKÖY 1) on which Taprammi is indicated in hieroglyphic script as being its dedicator.

The ŞARKIŞLA bowl (cup?)

Another accidental finding at Şarkışla (Eastern Cappadocia, between Kayseri and Sivas) led to the discovery of numerous bronze objects dating back to the Hittite period (Bittel 1976: 19 ff.). The pieces are now housed in a private collection. Bittel (1976: 19

ff.) gave some information about them with photos of some of the pieces.

Two short hieroglyphic inscriptions are scratched on the inside of a bowl/cup, immediately under the rim. Bittel presents two good photographs of the inscriptions but does not give any information on how the object was found⁵ or where it is kept. Poetto (1978) subsequently gave his interpretation of the inscriptions. He suggests that the first (Bittel fig. 6b) shows the name of the object's owner and that the second ("despite some uncertainty", see Poetto p. 5) shows the title of the owner. As Poetto remarked, the hieroglyphic signs in both inscriptions are different from the standard signs. This may be due to the difficulty in engraving on metal.

Poetto suggests reading the "name" as follows: *Ka-n-266c-x(= zi?)*. However, the possible reading *-zi* of the last sign makes the reading ZITI of the penultimate sign more plausible (this was another of Poetto's hypotheses).

The second inscription has two signs in columns in the central part (AURIGA and below a symbol which Poetto reads L 39, but which should most probably be read *-ni*), framed at the sides by the symbols BONUS₂ VIR₂. Recently Hawkins (2005b) suggested reading this inscription as a personal name too. The suggested reading is Tarupasani, for which cf. Laroche 1966: nr.1292 (with Suppl.); this reading is based on some inscriptions on seal impressions found at Nişantepe (in particular nn. 443-445, 105-107 and 612 in Herbordt 2005; Tarupasani is also a divinity name: see recently Lebrun 2004). A further example of a name written with the sign AURIGA is provided by a seal found in the same area⁶.

The ANKARA bowl

The Museum of the Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara (Toker 1992: 166, fig. 144) houses a silver bowl

which bears two hieroglyphic inscriptions positioned on opposite sides of the external surface, just below the rim. Its dimensions are: D. (rim) 20.2 cm., H. 7.3 cm. There is no information to indicate where the bowl originates⁷.

The two inscriptions, which differ in length, were studied by Hawkins, who presented and discussed them in various works (Hawkins 1997, 2003, 2005a). His suggested reading and translation is as follows (cf. Hawkins 2005a: 194):

Inscription 1

§ 1 *zi/a-wa/i-ti CAELUM-pi *a-sa-ma-i(a) REGIO. HATTI VIR₂ *273 i(a)-sa₅-zi/a-tá REX ma-zi/a-kar-hu-ha REX PRAE-na*

§ 2 *tara/i-wa/i-zi/a-wa/i (REGIO) REL+ra/i MONS.[tu] LABARNA+la hu-la-i(a)- tá*

§ 3 **a-wa/i-na *a-pa-ti-i(a) ANNUS-i(a) i(a)-zi/a-tà⁸*

§1 This bowl Asmaya, the man of the land Hattusa, dedicated(?) for himself before the king Maza-Karhuha, §2 when Tudhaliya labarna smote the land of Tarwiza- §3 it in that year he made.

Inscription 2

*zi/a CAELUM-pi SCRIBA 2 pi²-t[i²]-x[...] *414 [...*

This bowl the second(-rank) scribe Benti?-[...], the *414 [...inscribed(?)]

Despite being relatively legible, the text is difficult to interpret at certain points (for these parts, see the discussion by the editor). The main problems are in identifying the people cited in the inscription and in determining the date and place of production of the bowl. Hawkins' accurate examination (1997, 2005a) very clearly brought to light the principal problems, which are summarised as follows:

— one problem is the identification of the 'king' Mazi/a-Karhuha, to whom there is no other reference

³ To read the title as EUNUCHUS₂ see Hawkins 2002: 225 ff.

⁴ Hawkins says that "the reading presents certain problems, but a comparison with the Late Hittite epigraph on the Babylon stone bowl, BABYLON 3, suggests that this bronze bowl epigraph may be interpreted by reference to the later inscription". Hawkins' reading of BABYLON 3 is the following (cf. Hawkins 2000: 396 s.):

za-ia-wa/i - ("SCALPRUM") *ka-ti-na CERVUS₂-ti-ia-sa TONITRUS.HALPA-pa-ni (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-ti PRAE-na [PON]ERE-wa/i-ta*

"These Bowls Runtiyas placed before Halabeen Tarhunzas".

⁵ Cf. Bittel 1976: 19 ("Ob es sich um einen sogenannten Depotfund, einen Siedlungs- oder einen Grabfund handelt, ist leider nicht überliefert").

⁶ Cf. Mora 1987, VIb 1.34, published by A. and B. Dinçol (1981, Nr. 1); cfr. also Hawkins 2005b: 274.

⁷ Toker talks about "provenance unknown" and attributes the find to the 1st millennium B.C.; Laroche (1960: XXX) probably refers to this cup quoting a "coupe en argent, provenant de Kargamis(?)", housed in the Ankara Museum. On this topic, see also Hawkins 1997: 8.

⁸ For the terms **a-sa-ma-i(a)*, **a-wa/i-na*, **a-pa-ti-i(a)* cf. Hawkins 2005a, p. 194: "This is a curious graphic phenomenon recently observed in Empire Hieroglyphic inscriptions, in which the sign *a-* belonging properly at the beginning of a word is frequently written at the end".

in any other source⁹. According to Hawkins, if this name really identifies a king of Karkemiš, this hypothetical king could only be placed during the Pre-Imperial period (Hawkins 2005a: 200). In any case, both the use of the sign *kar* and the divinity name Karhuha point to the Karkemiš environment¹⁰;

- the chronological reference (“when Tudhaliya”), which mentions the land of *tarali-wa/i-zi/a*, in contrast with other epigraphical clues, seems to refer to the victorious Assuwa campaign of Tudhaliya I/II¹¹. This would give us an unexpected early dating for a hieroglyphic inscription of such a length (hieroglyphic inscriptions not engraved on seals, are usually dated to the Late Imperial Age);
- although the hypothesis that this hieroglyphic inscription dates back to such an early period seems unusual, hypothesising a late dating would make it difficult to explain the presence of the place name “Tarwiza”. According to Hawkins 2005a: 199, the early dating is also backed up by the cuneiform inscription of Tudhaliya I/II on the bronze sword¹²: “When Tudhaliya the Great King destroyed the land of Assuwa”.

Even though he considers the elements in favour of a late dating important, Hawkins (2005a: 200) leans towards the early hypothesis which, at present, would make the document unique.

In my opinion the production date of this object is actually later, because the arguments listed below, in part already noted by Hawkins himself, appear to be decisive according to our current knowledge.

- a) As already mentioned, there is no documentation of any hieroglyphic inscription on anything other than a seal dating back to before the end of the 14th-

beginning of the 13th Century BC (see Hawkins 2005a: 197).

- b) The prevailing use of syllabograms brings the inscription closer to the evidence of the late period, even Post-Imperial.
- c) The sign used to indicate the syllable *kar*, as Hawkins observes (2005a: 196), is only used in documentation originating in Karkemiš, and therefore is testified to start from a much later period than Tudhaliya I/II.
- d) Also the *LABARNA*/IUDEX-*la* sign is only found in documents from a period later than the reign of Tudhaliya I/II.
- e) A similar name to that of the offerer, in the form *Aš-mi-ia*, is cited as the name of a witness in the text of a contract which comes from the Emar area (Arnaud 1987, nr. 11; see Pruzsinszky 2003: 156, 227)¹³.
- f) The aphaeresis phenomenon relating to the sign *à/L* 450 (cf. Hawkins 2005a: 194, 196, “initial-*a*-final”) is found in the long Anatolian inscriptions of the Late Imperial period and on the impressions of the Emar seals.
- g) The phrase “man of Hatti” in the text seems to point to an area outside Anatolia as the place of production: why would this expression be used if the text had been written in Anatolia? For a fairly frequent use of this expression see, again, the Emar texts (e.g. Arnaud 1986, nr. 112, 115, 221; Fales 1989, C19; Beckman 1995: 28-29).
- h) If the bowl was produced in the Karkemiš area, as also hypothesized by Hawkins (2005a: 196, 200), it would be difficult to explain the use of a dating formula which refers to such a distant place.

Furthermore, it would be even more difficult to explain the origin of the inscription in a North Syrian area in a period in which such inscriptions had not been found even in Anatolia¹⁴.

- i) As far as the comparison with the sword and the conquests of Tudhaliya I/II is concerned: the campaign is noted as being the campaign of Assuwa (cf. the inscription on the bronze sword, cited as a comparison by Hawkins, 2005a: 199). Therefore it is reasonable to believe that, if the scribe had wanted to refer to that conquest, he would have chosen the traditional place name¹⁵. As far as the land of Tarwiza is concerned, with reference to the hypothesis of the late-dating of the bowl and of the production in the North-Syrian area, we could connect the place name quoted in the inscription with the *TAR-WI?/(WU?/PI?YU?)* troops cited in some texts from Emar (see recently Durand in Durand-Marti 2003: 158). In any case, the name Tarwiza could refer to another place than that of the Assuwa campaign.
- l) A parallel to the chronological reference in the bowl inscription (“when Tudhaliya...”) is found in the *KARAHÖYÜK* (ELBISTAN) inscription (§ 2: “when Ir-Tešub, the Great King, came to ...”), which dates from the 12th century B.C.¹⁶

In any case, as Hawkins rightly observes, the “late” solution is not without problems. Above all the problems relating to the identification of the two kings cited in this inscription (Tudhaliya *LABARNA*/IUDEX-*la* and Maza-Karhuha) are yet to be resolved. According to a late dating, as proposed here, the name of the king Tudhaliya can only refer to Tudhaliya IV or to a later king from the Post-Imperial period. Therefore we can reconstruct two possible scenarios:

- 1) In the Late-Imperial Hittite period, a well-off individual of Anatolian origin, but active in Northern

Syria, offers a precious bowl to a “very small” local king of unknown origin. The bowl had been made to celebrate an important event, “when Tudhaliya (IV) smote(?) the land of Tarwiza...”;.

- 2) The same situation, in a different political context, could have happened in a later period. At least three hieroglyphic inscriptions from Karkemiš or nearby have been preserved in which a Great King Tudhaliya is cited (in one inscription only “king”): *KARKEMIŠ* A16c (Hawkins 2000: 82), *KARKEMIŠ* frags. a/b (Hawkins 2000: 590 f.), *KELEKLİ* (Hawkins 2000: 92 ff.). The third inscription is definitely datable to the Suhis II period and so probably to the 10th Century (see Hawkins 2000: 78 e 93). According to Hawkins, a connection between the three inscriptions on the basis of the name Tudhaliya can be hypothesized (even though the simultaneous presence of “king” and “country-lords” is a difficult problem to resolve (see Hawkins 1995)). However, a date in the 10th Century for the two inscriptions from Karkemiš would seem particularly late, especially because of the presence of the title Great King and the reference in the genealogy to Pijaššili which would go back many generations if he was the founder of the Hittite dynasty of Karkemiš.

Both for palaeographic reasons (no element, in the inscriptions on the bowl, is a sure clue to such a late period), and for the reference to the “man of Hatti” it seems preferable to hypothesise that the bowl comes from the late 13th Century BC. However a dating to the (first half of the?) 11th Century is not out of the question¹⁷.

Finally it should be noted that the presence of the name of the scribe, engraved on the bowl, supports the hypothesis that the Emar texts, cited above (in § 1), were actually preparatory drafts for cup engravings.

⁹ As there are two other inscribed cups (*KASTAMONU*, see above, and *BABYLON* 3) which are offered to the divinity, Hawkins (1997: 10-11) asks himself if it is also possible in this case to interpret the name as that of a divinity (but Hawkins himself does not consider this type of interpretation very plausible).

¹⁰ For references to the god Karhuha in cuneiform texts from II millennium cf. Singer 2001.

¹¹ In actual fact, as Hawkins observes (1997, n. 24; 2005a, n. 45), there are some problems with the comparison between the hieroglyphics *tarali-wa/i-zi/a* and the cuneiform *ta-ru-(ú)-ji-ša*; nevertheless according to Hawkins it seems to be the only possible comparison. According to Starke on the other hand, the identification of the two place names is not possible and the mention of a western area of Anatolia on an object made in North Syria is strange (cf. Starke 1997: 474, n. 86a; Starke does not exclude the possibility of a dating in the 15th Century however).

¹² Cf. Ünal – Ertekin – Ediz 1990-91, Ertekin – Ediz 1993, Ünal 1993; cf. Hawkins 2005a, n. 55 p. 202 for the reference to the historical context of the destruction of Assuwa (with bibliographical references).

¹³ The presence of the name Mazi-^{DU} in the same text could be of particular interest.

¹⁴ On the diffusion of the hieroglyphic writing in Karkemiš and in northern Syria, see Mora 1998 (with previous bibliography). All the currently available documented evidence seems to support the hypothesis that the writing is widespread from the reign of Pijaššili, following the Anatolian “colonisation”.

¹⁵ Hawkins’ observations on this subject do not seem convincing (1997 n. 33; 2005b, n. 55). Instead cf. Starke (1997), reported here in note 11.

¹⁶ Cf. Hawkins 2000: 288 ff.

¹⁷ As David Hawkins has suggested to me, the signs on the bowl resemble the signs incised on some stone fragments of the *KARKAMIŠ* A 19 group (cf. the *n* series defined as “archaic” by Hawkins 2000: 205). This comparison could be very important for a late dating of the ANKARA bowl and for confirmation of its provenance from the Karkemiš area.

Bibliographical references

Arnaud, D.
1982 “Les textes suméro-accadiens: un florilège”, D. Beyer (ed.) *Meskéné-Emar : dix ans de travaux 1972-1982*, Paris : 43-51.

1986 *Emar VI.3, Textes sumériens et accadiens*, Paris.

1987 “La Syrie du Moyen Euphrate sous le protectorat hittite : contracts de droit privé”, *AuOr* 5: 211-241.

Beckman, G.
1995 “Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Mašat and Emar”, O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri, C. Mora (eds.) *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia: 19-37.

1996 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta

Bittel, K.
1976 *Beitrag zur Kenntnis hethitischer Bildkunst*, Heidelberg.

Czichon, R.M.
1995 “Zur Komposition der Taprammi-Schale”, *IM* 45: 5-12.

d’Alfonso, L.
2005 *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a.C.)*, Pavia

Dietrich, M. – O. Loretz
1964-66 “Der Vertrag zwischen Šuppiluliuma und Niqmandu. Eine philologische und kulturhistorische Studie”, *WO* 3: 206-245.

Diñçol, A.M. – B. Diñçol
1981 *Hethitische Hieroglyphensiegel im Museum für Anatolische Zivilisationen*, Ankara.

Durand, J.-M. – L. Marti
2003 “Chronique du Moyen-Euphrate 2. Relecture de documents d’Ekalte, Emar et Tuttul”, *RA* 97: 141-180.

Emre, K. – A. Çınaroğlu
1993 “A Group of metal Hittite vessels from Kınık-Kastamonu”, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors* (Fs. N. Özgüç), Ankara: 675-713.

Ertekin, A. – I. Ediz
1993 “The Unique Sword from Boğazköy/Hattuša”, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors* (Fs. N. Özgüç), Ankara: 719-726.

Fales, F.M.
1989 *Prima dell’alfabeto*, Venezia.

1991 “Notes on the Royal Family of Emar”, *Marchands, diplomats, empereurs* (Fs. P. Garelli), Paris: 81-90.

Floreano, E.
2001 “The Role of Silver in the Domestic Economic System of the Hittite Empire”, *AoF* 28: 209-235.

Hawkins, J.D.
1993 “A Bowl Epigraph of the official Taprammi”, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors* (Fs. N. Özgüç), Ankara: 715-717.

1995 “‘Great Kings’ and ‘Country-Lords’ at Malatya and Karkamiš”, *Studio Historiae Ardens* (Fs. Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate), Istanbul-Leiden: 73-85.

1997 “A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara”, *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi, 1996 yillığı*, Ankara: 7-24.

2000 *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Vol. I, Parts 1-3. *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin-New York.

2002 “Eunuchs among the Hittites”, S. Parpola – R.M. Whiting (eds.), *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East* (CRRAl 47), Helsinki: 217-233.

2003 “Scripts and Texts”, H.C. Melchert (ed.) *The Luwians*, Leiden-Boston: 128-169.

2005a “A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl”, *Studia Troica* 15: 193-204.

2005b “Commentaries on the Readings”, in: Herbordt 2005: 248 ff.

Herbordt, S.
2005 *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegeln der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe Archiv in Hattusa*, Mainz.

Košak, S.
1982 *Hittite Inventory Texts* (THeth 10), Heidelberg.

Laroche, E.
1966 *Les noms des Hittites*, Paris.

Lebrun, R.
2004 “Le dieu Taruppašani”, D. Groddek – S. Rössle (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an E.O. Forrer*, Dresden: 409-414.

Liverani, M.
1990 *Prestige and Interest. International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C.*, Padova.

Mora, C.
1987 *La glittica anatolica del II millennio a.C.: classificazione tipologica. I. I sigilli a iscrizione geroglifica* (= StMed 6), Pavia.

1998 “Osservazioni sull’uso del ‘geroglifico anatolico’ in Siria nel II millennio a.C.”, M. Marazzi (ed.), *Il Geroglifico anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca a venti anni dalla sua ‘ridecifrazione’*, Napoli: 195-218.

2006 “Riscossione dei tributi e accumulo dei beni nell’impero ittita”, M. Perna (ed.), *Atti del Convegno Fiscality in Mycenaean and near Eastern Archives*, Napoli: 133-146.

Nougayrol, J.
1956 *Le palais royal d’Ugarit IV* (= PRU IV), Paris.

Poetto, M.
1978 “Spigolature di luvio geroglifico”, *Rivista degli studi orientali* 52: 1-5.

Pruzsinszky, R.
2003 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*, Bethesda.

Siegelová, J.
1986 *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*, Praha.

Singer, I.
1999 “A Political History of Ugarit”, W.G.E. Watson – N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (HdO I/39), Leiden-Boston-Köln: 603-733.

2001 “The Treaties between Karkamiš and Hatti”, *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie* (StBoT 45, G. Wilhelm ed.), Wiesbaden: 635-641.

Starke, F.
1997 “Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend”, *Studia Troica* 7: 447-487.

Toker, A.
1992 “Metal Vessels”, *Museum of Anatolian Civilization*, Ankara.

Ünal, A.
1993 “Boğazköy Kılıcının Üzerindeki Akadca Adak Yazısı Hakkında Yeni Gözlemler”, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors* (Fs. N. Özgüç), Ankara: 727-730.

Ünal, A. – A. Ertekin – I. Ediz
91-91 “The Hittite Sword from Boğazköy-Hattuša, Found 1991, and Its Akkadian Inscription”, *Müze-Museum* 4: 50-52.

Zaccagnini, C.
1990 “Golden Cups Offered to the Gods at Emar”, *Or* 59: 518-520.

1991 “Ancora sulle coppe d’oro e d’argento nel vicino Oriente del Tardo Bronzo”, *Scienze dell’Antichità* 5: 369-379.