

# Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient

Beiträge zu Sprache, Religion, Kultur  
und Gesellschaft

Nach Vorarbeiten von Joost Hazenbos  
und Annette Zgoll  
herausgegeben von Claus Wilcke

2007

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

## Inhalt

Statt eines Vorwortes	
Altorientalistische Jubiläen in Leipzig .....	7
SPRACHE	
<i>Dietz Otto Edzard†</i>	
Die altmesopotamischen lexikalischen Listen – verkannte Kunstwerke? .....	17
<i>Hans-W. Fischer-Elfert</i>	
Wort – Vers – Text	
Bausteine einer altägyptischen Textologie .....	27
<i>Manfred Krebernik</i>	
Zur Entwicklung des Sprachbewusstseins im Alten Orient .....	39
<i>Walther Sallaberger</i>	
Benno Landsbergers „Eigenbegrifflichkeit“	
in wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Perspektive .....	63
<i>Annette Zgoll</i>	
Wort-Bedeutung und Bedeutung des Wortes.	
Von den Leipziger Semitistischen Studien zur modernen Akkadistik .....	83
RELIGION	
<i>Joost Hazenbos</i>	
Der Mensch denkt, Gott lenkt	
Betrachtungen zum hethitischen Orakelpersonal .....	95
<i>Silvin Košak</i>	
Ein Blick in die Bibliothek des Großen Tempels in Hattuša .....	111
<i>Doris Prechel</i>	
Heinrich Zimmers Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion .....	117
<i>Frans A.M. Wiggermann</i>	
The Four Winds and the Origins of Pazuzu.....	125

## GESELLSCHAFT UND POLITIK

- Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum*,  
„Menschen ohne König ...“  
Zur Wahrnehmung des Königtums in sumerischen und akkadischen Texten .. 167

- Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate*  
The Hittite Usage of the Concepts of ‘Great Kingship’, the Mutual  
Guarantee of Royal Succession, the Personal Unswerving Loyalty of  
the Vassal to his Lord and the ‘Chain of Command’ in Vassal Treaties  
from the 13th Century B.C.E. .... 191

- Claus Wilcke*  
Das Recht: Grundlage des sozialen und politischen Diskurses im Alten Orient 209

## RECHT

- Eva Dombradi*  
Das altbabylonische Urteil: Mediation oder res iudicata?  
Zur Stellung des Keilschriftrechts zwischen Rechtsanthropologie und  
Rechtsgeschichte..... 245

- Hans Neumann*  
„Gib mir mein Geld zurück!“  
Zur rechts- und wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung keilschriftlicher  
Privatarchive des 3. Jahrtausends v.Chr. .... 281

## MATHEMATIK

- Joachim Oelsner*  
Zur Mathematik des alten Mesopotamien ..... 301

## INSTITUTSGESCHICHTE

- Joachim Oelsner*  
Leipziger Altorientalistik: 1936-1993 ..... 315

## SCHLUSSWORT

- Gernot Wilhelm*  
Bemerkungen zum Selbstverständnis der Altorientalistik als Nachwort zum  
Leipziger Kolloquium ..... 331

- Abkürzungen ..... 341  
Indices ..... 349

—

The Hittite Usage of the Concepts of ‘Great Kingship’,  
the Mutual Guarantee of Royal Succession, the Personal Unswerving  
Loyalty of the Vassal to his Lord and the ‘Chain of Command’ in  
Vassal Treaties from the 13th Century B.C.E.<sup>1</sup>

Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate  
*Amsterdam*

1.

From their earliest publications onwards the Hittitologists with a strong Assyriological background, E. Forrer and A. Götze, treated LUGAL.GAL as a compound, while others considered the two to be separated from one another. That latter treatment was preferred by both J. Friedrich and F. Sommer. J. Friedrich did not refer to LUGAL.GAL in his treatment of LUGAL in the listing of Sumerograms in his ‘Hethitisches Wörterbuch’ (1952) 284; both parts of the compound are separate entities in HAB (1938), the political testament of Ḫattušiliš I, as well in the Akkadian (A. Falkenstein) as in the Hittite (F. Sommer) columns of the text. Naturally, the proficiency of the German language in forming compounds will have played a major role in the process of recognition of the concept of ‘Great King’, ‘Great Queen’, ‘Great Kingship’, by German Hittitologists. C. Rüster and E. Neu in HZL (1989) 146-147, sign 115, duly treat LUGAL.GAL under LUGAL. But perhaps I may add that also in Hittite and Luwian hieroglyphic writing, the sign for ‘Great King’, HH no. 1,8, constitutes a ligature described by E. Laroche as “‘ROI’ (now REX) surmonté du signe ‘GRAND’ (now MAGNUS)”, thus consisting of the signs ‘King’ and ‘Great’, no. 363 above no. 17. Partly because F. Starke remarked in his review (1977, p. 288) concerning E. Edel’s manner of wording „der akkadische Titel der Großkönige, ‚Großkönig, König des Landes X‘“, in his brilliant monograph *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof* (1976) 17:

Anstelle von einem ‚akkadischen‘ Großkönigstitel wäre es wohl besser, von einem hethitischen Großkönigstitel zu sprechen, da LUGAL.GAL doch vermutlich eine hethitische Wortschöpfung ist.

---

1 The abbreviations used are those of the CHD volume P 3 (1997), VII-XXVI, see also below, p. 339ff. In the time-consuming process of getting this paper into its final shape I received generous assistance from both A.M. de Bruin-Cousins M.A. and Drs. A.M. Edens.

I would like to raise the question, whether it may turn out to be rather a Hittitological word creation (Wortschöpfung?) than a Hittite one, or, to phrase it differently, more a convention between Hittitologists than a Hittite word creation. It struck me that J. Hawkins, *Inscription* (1995) 27-28, proposed – admittedly with an added question mark – *šalli-ḫaššu-* as the phonetical Hittite rendering of MAGNUS.REX = LUGAL.GAL and *ura-ḫantawati-* as the corresponding Luwian replica. Moreover, in her thesis, H. Gonnet, *Titulature* (1979) 18, rightly claimed that Anittaš and Ḫattušiliš I were the first and second 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium kings to use the title LUGAL.GAL for themselves in order to proclaim their high status, referring on p. 95 (in the note in question, p. 18 note 23) to M.-J. Seux, *Épithètes* (1967) 298 together with note 183. However, according to the treatment as a whole (Seux, o.c., 298-300 together with the notes 183-195) ‘Great King’ would seem to have been used with respect to the king of Aleppo in a text from Alalakh and also in a letter addressed to Šamši-Adad I by a servant of the king of Mari<sup>2</sup>. The author also remarks that, with respect to the latter, the usage was fully justified, because his two sons exercised their royal powers under the guidance of their father, and, with respect to the former, since the king of Alalakh was a vassal of the king of Aleppo. Thus this Anatolian ‘first’ may not yet be fully secured, cf. Starke’s „vermutlich“ in the passage of his review quoted above. During the discussion, G. Wilhelm brought to my attention that the report of one of Zimrilim’s correspondents should have been quoted in this respect:

No king is powerful by himself: ten to fifteen kings follow Ḫammurabi, king of Babylon, as many follow Rim-Sin, king of Larsa, as many follow Ibalpiel, king of Eshnunna, as many follow Amutpiel, king of Qatna, twenty follow Iarimlim, king of Iamkhad.<sup>3</sup>

He rightly remarked that, for a later period, Kültepe Ib, and concerning Anatolia itself, this also applies to the general political situation presupposed by the Letter of king Anum-Ḫirbi of Mama to the king Warshama of Kanish, as concluded by K. Balkan from the letter itself:

The country (*mātum*) of Mama and that of Kanish are neighbours, both ruled by a *rubā’um*. They consist of the capitals with their hinterland and several other cities, ruled by kings (*šarrū*), which are vassals (*urdū, kalbū*) of the *rubā’us*.<sup>4</sup>

It would seem to follow from the preceding evidence that the Hittite scribes rightly claimed that during the reigns of Ḫattušiliš I and Muršiliš I – according to the esti-

2 Cf. H. Gonnet, *Titulature* (1979); M.-J. Seux, *Épithètes* (1967).

3 J.-R. Kupper, *Northern Mesopotamia* (1973) 10, 17 and 18.

4 K. Balkan, *Letter* (1957) 30-31.

mate of Professor Güterbock (oral information in the past) less than a century after Piṭḫanaš and Anittaš of Kaneš/Neša – the Hittites managed to let their „Great Kingship” succeed to that of Aleppo, the capital of Yamḥad<sup>5</sup>.

The opposite of LUGAL.GAL would seem to be LUGAL.TUR or LUGAL *ŠEḪHIR*, cf. the apologetic rhetorical question in Ḫattušiliš III’s Apology: „Hätte er mit mir den Streit nicht irgendwie begonnen, hätten sie (die Götter) dann wirklich den Großkönig einem Kleinkönig unterliegen lassen?!”<sup>6</sup>

Two diplomatic letters (KBo 18, 24 obv. I 10 and II 8 [partly restored] = A. Hagenbuchner, *Korrespondenz* [1989] no. 188 and KBo 18, 28 obv. 11, 12 = o.c., no. 305) and one oracle inquiry (KUB 49, 66: 11’ and 13’) use the Hittite replica *dān* (= 2-*an*) *taparant-*: „Da du ein Großkönig bist und nicht ein zweitrangiger Regent“ (translation of S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Eroberungen* [1988] 100), while A. Hagenbuchner, *Korrespondenz* (1989) 242, translates „kein Zweitbefehlender“. The second letter, clearly belonging to the diplomatic correspondence, is unfortunately badly preserved. The letter refers to <sup>D</sup>UTU-ŠĪ, ‘His Majesty’. It was sent by a ‚zweitrangiger Regent‘, a ‘ruler of second rank’, who claims the title ‘King’ (Obv. 10’, 16’), to a vassal of his (Obv. 14’), who not only had cursed him in the presence of his messenger (Obv. 6’) but had also abused him (Obv. 12’, 14’, 15’ 20’ and 21’). The sender he remarks to the addressee that “the countries which the God gave him”, were ruled by him in his capacity of ‘ruler of second rank’ (Obv. 11’-12’). It is a highly emotional letter. The ‘ruler of second rank’ comes to a more concrete reproach at the end of the preserved part of the reverse: the vassal had apparently not yet fortified certain towns, as ordered by ‘His Majesty’ in a “tablet of the oath” (Rev. 14’-18’, as dealt with in the first fascicle of the CHD, L-N, 65b-66a). The fragment of an oracle inquiry mentioned above indicates that a presumably different ‘ruler of second rank’ was involved in a matter concerning a “border” or “border district” of Šeḫa River Land (6’, 12’) in the northwest of Anatolia, while the next question deals with the possibility of a related “insurrection” (11’, 14’ [?]) in combination with this matter concerning the “border” or the “border district” of Šeḫa River Land. In my opinion, A. Hagenbuchner rightly remarked in her treatment of the second letter in which she also mentioned the oracle inquiry, the third source, that the ‘sphere of influence’ of the sender of the letter (Hittite scribes use ŠU, *QĀTUM* “Machtbereich” for the notion ‘sphere of influence’, cf. J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge* [1926] 29<sup>1</sup>) is reminiscent of the position of the kings of Carchemish in Syria and Tarhuntašša on the south coast of Anatolia during the 13<sup>th</sup> century. This means that *dān taparant-* would have been the Hittite title for those rather independ-

5 E.F. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente* (1923) 82-83, obv. 11-14 = G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 88-89 and 173-174.

6 H. Otten, *Apologie*, 22-23, §10 c. III 76-77; the CHD L-N, 142a preferred ‘petty king’ for LUGAL.TUR.

ently functioning kings, which in this ‘line of command’, merely were subordinated to the  ${}^{\text{LU}}\text{tul}(u)\text{kanti} = {}^{\text{LU}}\text{TARTEN}(N)U = \text{šinahila}$  in case a prince had already been chosen and appointed by the ‘Great King’, cf. *sub* 2.a and c. I may perhaps repeat here in this context what has already been argued for by T.P.J. van den Hout at the occasion of the IV<sup>th</sup> ICH (4.-8. Oktober 1999), viz. that the passage RS 17.365 + 18.06 = PRU IV, 137-138: 20’-21’ does not offer secure evidence for the usage of the title ‘Great King’ with respect to a king of Carchemish. The seal impressions of Kuzi-Teššub, the son of Talmi-Teššub, earlier the last known king of the Empire Dynasty of Carchemish, do not show that title either, although he, Kuzi-Teššub, may have done so after the fall of the Hittite Empire, cf. J.D. Hawkins, „Great Kings” (1995) 73 and 76. As indicated above, the Hittites consistently used this concept from the Anittaš text onwards. One might even say that they appropriated it. Nevertheless  ${}^{\text{D}}\text{UTU-š}$ , ‘My, Your’ and ‘His Majesty’, replacing the  ${}^{\text{D}}\text{UTU-šummi-}$  which can be translated as ‘Our, Your’ and ‘Their Majesty’, was in Anatolia itself far more important. F. Sommer stressed already in AU (1932) 33<sup>(1)</sup> that, for the local population, this was the title with which they addressed ‘their (contemporary) reigning king’. In that same impressive volume (AU [1932] 89-90), Sommer also remarked that in diplomatic correspondence – but this also applies to the vassal or family treaties, very aptly renamed by R.H. Beal, Organisation (1992) 320-327, as appanage treaties – the treaty partner can be visualized as being actually present. This may lead to a rapid succession of changes concerning the usage of personal forms. When the partner is addressed as if he were present, the personal pronouns become 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular forms for him and 1<sup>st</sup> person singular for the ‘Great King’. Naturally, also the verbal forms are adapted to this change. Treaties on equal terms in the Late Old Hittite Period – but this also holds good for the ‘treaty on equal terms’ (1259 B.C.E.) between Ramses II of Egypt and Ḫattušiliš III of Ḫatti Land<sup>7</sup> – are more consistently phrased in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular in respect of both the subject and the predicate. Thus they are more formal than these later treaties with either vassals or members of different branches of the ‘Great Clan’, the *šalli haššatar*, viz. the Royal Family, i.e., R.H. Beal’s appanage kings who ruled in important towns like Kizzuwatna or Aleppo, Carchemish or Tarḫuntašša, cf. below *sub* 2.c.

Perhaps I should still add that in those passages from vassal treaties, to which G. Beckman, *Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 206<sup>8</sup>, in his very useful index of topics, refers as

7 The late Professor E. Edel, *Vertrag* (1997). See, too, D. Sürenhagen, *Staatsverträge* (1985) 65-88.

8 G. Beckman’s book *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) contains a highly representative collection of well-preserved treaties, diplomatic letters from and to other major powers, and a group of miscellaneous texts consisting of ‘simple agreements’, edicts or protocols, and legal decisions concerning a broad spectrum of subjects (tribute, frontiers, divorces

passages which deal with ‘the relations among subordinates’, the more formal 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular style of the treaties on equal terms is sometimes imitated in a rather consistent manner, although the direct 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular approach is maintained. In the treaty between Muršiliš II and Manapa-Tarḫundaš of Šeḫa River Land dating to the last quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> Century B.C.E., the section dealing with “the relations among subordinates” (as restored by S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa* [1977] 89, 134-135 and 294-295, and by G.F. del Monte, *Bruchstücke* [1980] 60-61, 63 and 64-65) clearly shows that direct conflicts between Manapa-Tarḫundaš and Mašḫuiluwaš of Mira-Kuwaliya would seem to have been foreseen and feared by Muršiliš II. To illustrate this, two paragraphs:

Now you, Manapa-Tarḫundaš, shall not take anything away from Mašḫuiluwaš, and Mašḫuiluwaš shall not take [anything] away from you. You, Manapa-Tarḫundaš, shall not quarrel with Mašḫuiluwaš, and Mašḫuiluwaš [shall not] quarrel with [you].

And in the next paragraph:

[Now you shall be] favored [by Mašḫuiluwaš], and Mašḫuiluwaš shall be favored [by you]. If [some] legal dispute comes up, you shall place [it] before My Majesty, and I, [My Majesty], will decide it.<sup>9</sup>

This entails that in four cases of Arzawa treaties, one of which stems from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, a section seemingly on equal terms can be found in what remains a group of four interrelated vassal treaties. A manner, or perhaps rather ‘one’ manner of characterizing a treaty or passage on equal terms, is “from the one side, from the other side” since the most important sentences of the sententia, or the declaration of intent just in front of the God list, in both, the Kupanta-<sup>D</sup>LAMMA treaty and the Alaksanduš treaty, from the reigns of Muršiliš II and Muwattalliš II respectively, are formulated as follows: “These words are by no means ‘from the one side, from the other side’; they are from Ḫatti Land”; in Beckman’s translation (p. 76, 86) this is rendered as: “They are by no means reciprocal. They issue from Ḫatti.”

Indeed, it was a dictate on the part of the Hittite ‘Great King’ and his scribes. My data concerning the mutual guarantee of royal succession, the personal unswerving loyalty of the vassal to his lord and the ‘chain of command’ can best be dealt with by means of a succinct treatment of a number of passages from vassal treaties.

---

within the royal families of various vassal states) mainly stemming from the period between ca. 1325 B.C.E. and the end of the Empire Period.

9 Cf. G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* [1996] 79, §§ 8-9: B iii 20-27 for this translation.



## 2.

Already some time ago, A. Hagenbuchner dealt in a highly detailed article entitled *Schutz- und Loyalitätsverpflichtungen in hethitischen Staatsverträgen* (1993) with the manner in which the main obligations of both treaty partners, the duty to protect one another, are phrased. It goes without saying that these objectives are common to all three types of treaties, the treaties on equal terms, the so-called family or appanage and the purely vassal treaties, the latter of which still can be subdivided in group and state treaties depending on the question whether the people or region of the treaty partner was ruled by a king or not. Her title suggests, and her first note specifies, that her treatise grew out of her cooperation in G. Wilhelm's major project, a new and practically all-comprehensive edition of the Hittite state treaties. My short historical remarks need to be read and reviewed against the background of this excellent article.

Of the six treaties and the single instruction which are of considerable relevance to the political history of the Hittite Dynasty during the period between ca. 1300 and approximately 1220 B.C.E., only one text, the treaty between Muwattalliš II and Alakšanduš of Wiluša<sup>10</sup>, falls totally outside the scope of either essentially appanage kingdom treaties, or of that subgroup of vassal kingdoms in important border provinces, Amurru with respect to Egypt, or Išuwa to Assyria, with dynastic marriages with the kings or princes of which either envisaged or already effectuated. I am referring to, on the one hand, Tarḫuntašša – treaties between Tudḫaliyaš and Kurunt(iy)aš<sup>11</sup> and Ulmi-Teššub – and on the other to Amurru – treaties between Ḫattušiliš III and Bentešina and between Tudḫaliyaš IV and Šaušga-muwaš, respectively – and to Išuwa, the likely instruction KBo 4, 14 presumably forwarded by Tudḫaliyaš IV to Ari-Šarrumaš, the King of Išuwa and the father of Eḫli-Šarrumaš<sup>12</sup>. However, in a historical evaluation of the data of state treaties one should take into account that 'drafts' may have been revised in making the final copy: this applies to two treaties concluded by Tudḫaliyaš IV, his treaties with Ulmi-Teššub, KBo 4, 10+ (actually a rough draft, cf. F. Pecchioli Daddi, Review [1997] 171-172), and with

---

10 J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge* 2 (1930) 42-102 = G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 82-88 and 173.

11 J.D. Hawkins, *Inscription* (1995) 62<sup>251</sup>.

12 For the treaty between Tudḫaliyaš IV and Kurunt(iy)aš, see H. Otten, *Bronzetafel* (1988) = G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 108-117, 175; for Tudḫaliyaš IV and Ulmi-Teššub, see T.P.J. van den Hout, *Ulmitešub-Vertrag* (1995) 22-73 = G. Beckman, o.c., 104-108 and 174-175; for Ḫattušiliš III and Bentešina, see E.F. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente* (1923) 124-135 = G.F. del Monte, *Trattato* (1986) 178-187 = G. Beckman, o.c., 95-98 and 174; for Tudḫaliyaš IV and Šaušga-muwaš, see C. Kühne, H. Otten, *Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag* (1971) 6-21 = G. Beckman, o.c., 98-102 and 174; for KBo 4, 14, see R. Stefanini, *KBo IV 14* (1965) 39-79 and idem, *Attribuzione* (1966) 107-111.

Šaušga-muwaš, as far as copy A, KUB 23, 1+ is concerned, while copy B, KUB 8, 82+, from the viewpoint of its contents far less rewarding, forms part of a Hittite final copy, cf. H. Klengel, *Kommentar* (1995) 159.

## 2a.

The mutual guarantee of royal succession: Generally, in the state treaties both the ‘Great King’ and the vassal were free in the choice of a successor, although, from the Edict of Telibinuš onwards, the ‘Great Kings’ of the dynasty in Ḫattuša had been obliged to adhere to the well-known ordering of their options which implied (§ 28) that after “sons of first rank” (sons of the reigning Queen), “sons of second rank” (sons of concubines) should be considered, and that in the final resort the husband of a “daughter of first rank” and thus a “son-in-law” should be chosen. This system could be enlarged and thus actually be circumvented through the adoption by the king of a nephew or a grandson. Muwattalliš II’s treaty with Alakšanduš of Wiluša still maintains the evenly divided treatment of the succession on both sides in the paragraphs 5-6. However, the treaty concluded by Ḫattušiliš III with Bentešina of Amurru already shows a different approach in more than one aspect. Paragraph 6, the first of four notable paragraphs, emphasizes that the initiative to conclude this new treaty – it is one of a series of treaties – had in fact been taken by Bentešina instead of by the Hittite ‘Great King’. In the sequel, paragraph 7, Ḫattušiliš states that this new treaty had been based on the earliest treaty between Ḫatti Land and Amurru by his grandfather Šuppiluliumaš I with Aziru, the founder of the royal family of Amurru. Ḫattušiliš III confirms in a short but firm declaration that the son born from the planned, but not yet consummated dynastic marriage between Gaššul(iy)awiyaš, one of his own “daughters of first rank”, and Bentešina, and later one of their grandsons, would in the future receive full support from the Hittite treaty partner for their succession in Amurru (cf. § 7). In a short intermediary paragraph, Ḫattušiliš III then offers a special solution for the short term, the period during which the as yet unborn son would have reached the age at which he might be eligible for kingship. This solution entailed that Bentešina might choose anyone whom he thought fit, “either a prince of the land of Amurru, or his brother, or his nephew, or any citizen of the land.”

The final paragraph 9, contains a very sternly formulated warning that Bentešina should always protect Ḫattušiliš and Puduḫepa and should later demonstrate a similar loyalty to his son and his grandson, if anyone “be he my [...], or my brother, or my nephew, or my son-in-law, or another man” would undertake actions against this son or this grandson in Ḫattuša. Curiously enough, it would seem that, in the long run, the *ad hoc* solution (§ 8) prevailed, since both Bentešina, the king of the land of

Amurru (iv 36) and Šaušga-muwaš, the brother-in-law of the king (iv 32), are still mentioned in the list of human witnesses at the end of the Bronze Tablet. On account of the Anatolian character of the name of Šaušga-muwaš and the name of the deity on which this *muwa* name was built, H. Klengel, *Tuthaliya IV*. (1991) 234, suggested, that this prince and successor of Bentešina as king of Amurru might have been born during the period of his father's exile at the court of Hattušiliš (III) in Hapīšša. In that case he would have been born from an earlier marriage of Bentešina with a or the preceding "principal wife" of this king of Amurru. The apposition to the name of Šaušga-muwaš in the list of human witnesses of the Bronze Tablet confirmed a fact which was already known for a very long time because it is twice (ii 1-3 and 8) mentioned in the long section devoted to his obligation to be loyal to the Hittite Dynasty (ii 1 - iii 18 after which a break follows) as one of the two reasons why Šaušga-muwaš was strongly indebted to his overlord, Tudhaliyaš IV, i.e., his marriage to a Hittite princess, the sister of Tudhaliyaš, and his kingship.

Fortunately, the evidence of the two appanage kingdom treaties concerning Tarhuntašša on the subject treated in this subsection is in general the same. Nevertheless, I must warn the reader that their chronological ordering still constitutes a moot problem among Hittitologists. They all agree that the famous Bronze Tablet, the first retrieved original of a Hittite state treaty, containing the agreement between Tudhaliyaš IV and Kurunt(iy)aš of Tarhuntašša, should be dated shortly after Tudhaliyaš IV's succession to the throne, cf. H. Otten, *Bronzetafel* (1988). A majority of Hittitologists favours the viewpoint that KBo 4, 10+ was concluded before the Bronze Tablet and should thus be dated to a late phase of the reign of Hattušiliš III, when an unnamed "older brother" was deposed from the office of <sup>LÜ</sup>*tuḫ(u)kanti-* (for some: "crown prince"; for others: rather a conflation of "second in command" [Hurrian *šīnahila* = Hittite Akkadogram <sup>LÜ</sup>*TARTEN(N)U*] and the originally presumably Hattic <sup>LÜ</sup>*tuḫ(u)kanti-* itself, "heir presumptive" or even "heir designate"), being replaced by Hattušiliš III with Tudhaliyaš (IV), as described in the Bronze Tablet, § 14: ii 43-52<sup>13</sup>. A minority of Hittitologists prefers the opposite

13 Not too long ago (1997) F. Pecchioli Daddi and I. Singer published important review articles on T.P.J. van den Hout, *Ulmitešub-Vertrag* (1995). In the bibliographic postscript to his book (p. 326), van den Hout described the status quo of the discussion at the beginning of 1994 in the following manner: "Beckman, Heinhold-Krahmer, Houwink ten Cate und Imparati-Pecchioli Daddi neigen dazu, KBo 4, 10+ Tudhaliya IV. zuzuweisen, während Beal, Gurney, Hagenbuchner und Sürenhagen für Hattušili III. plädieren." After the appearance of O.R. Gurney, *Treaty* (1993), J.D. Hawkins, *Inscription* (1995) 61-62<sup>(248,249)</sup>, G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 8, 102-103, 104-108 and 174-175, I. Singer, *Review* (1997) 417 and 422<sup>(19)</sup>, S. Alp, *Datierung* (1998) 54-55, A.M. Dinçol, *Entdeckung* (1998) 32 and V. Parker, *Reflexions* (1999) 277<sup>27</sup> and 286<sup>(56-58)</sup>, all chose for the 'double name' option which implies that Ulmi-Teššub would have been the birth name and Kurunt(iy)aš the throne name of one and the same 'son of second rank' of

point of view, arguing that KBo 4, 10+ should be dated to an either slightly or an even considerably later phase of the reign of Tudḫaliyaš IV<sup>14</sup>. In both treaties allusions are made to the succession ruling of the Edict of Telibinuš which has been paraphrased in the beginning of this section. In my opinion, it is striking that while the name Muwattalliš II is mentioned in the short historical prologue (i 3, 7), his name reoccurs in the long section devoted to the succession of the vassal king (ii 84-iii 31):

Or concerning the problem of the land of Tarḫuntašša, because it is hereby stipulated subsequently (viz. to my father’s treaty tablet), as follows: ‘For all time no-one shall take the kingship of the land of Tarḫuntašša away from the progeny of Muwattalliš – if someone does do that, and gives it to another descendant of Muwattalliš, taking it away from the progeny of Kurunt(iy)aš, the Storm God of Ḫatti and the Sun Goddess of Arinna shall eradicate whoever should commit that deed. For all time only a descendant of Kurunt(iy)aš shall hold the kingship of the land of Tarḫuntašša.’<sup>15</sup>

I feel inclined to view this point as an admittedly minor indication that KBo 4, 10+, the Ulmi-Teššub Treaty, may have been younger, rather than older than the Bronze Tablet, since in KBo 4, 10+ the name of Muwattalliš is merely mentioned in that part of the treaty which is devoted to his military and religious obligations. That part is, at the very least, strongly influenced by, and possibly even based on ABoT 57 or another copy of that ‘simple agreement’<sup>16</sup> (Obv. 40’-41’ = ABoT 57 7-9) which, according to the large majority of Hittitologists, should be dated to the reign of Ḫattušiliš III. References to Muwattalliš II are lacking from the corresponding passage, as defined by T.P.J. van den Hout, *Chronology* (1989) 112, and *idem*, *Ulmitešup-Vertrag* (1995) 24-25 (Obv. 11’). Whatever the final outcome of the discussion about the chronological order of the two treaties may turn out to be, in both Tarḫuntašša treaties the choice of his successor was still left in the hands of the appanage king.

---

Muwattalliš II and that the treaty KBo 4, 10+ should be dated to a late phase of the reign of Ḫattušiliš III.

14 This remark applies to a difference of opinion between on the one hand the late Professor F. Imparati and her pupil F. Pecchioli-Daddi (rather early) and T.P.J. van den Hout (during a later phase of the reign of Tudḫaliyaš IV) on the other.

15 iii 2-10; translated by Beckman with a minor adaption; the name of Muwattalliš in iii 4 and 6.

16 For the concept ‘simple agreement’, actually a loan translation of the French ‘convention simple’, as used by G. Kestemont, see my remark in ZA 82 (1992) 236-237 together with note 5.

## 2b.

The personal unswerving loyalty of the vassal to his lord: It may of course be due to chance, but, at the same time, it can also be of some significance that the treaty concluded between Tudḫaliyaš IV and Šaušga-muwaš of Amurru offers, in the preserved parts of its draft A and its final copy (B), no trace whatsoever of either the counter obligations on the part of the Hittite ‘Great King’ to offer military support to his vassal Šaušga-muwaš or to protect his, Šaušga-muwaš’s, choice of an eventual successor during the subsequent generations. In a highly interesting article H. Klengel, *Kommentar* (1995) 166, has already made, and in the sequel, 166-172 forcefully argued, for the proposition that

Ein Vergleich des Textumfangs von Tafel A und B dürfte anzeigen, daß der vollständige Text von A auf B, das außerdem noch die Liste der göttlichen Zeugen bietet, nicht erhalten sein kann.

He did so before he embarked on an analysis of the famous ‘warning example’ devoted to the behaviour of Mašduriš, the king of Šeḫa River Land at the time of the coup d’état of Ḫattušiliš III against Urḫi-Teššub (ii 16-30), and after raising the question, „vielleicht ist in das endgültige Vertragsexemplar dieses Beispiel nicht aufgenommen?“

Draft A of the Šaušga-muwaš treaty, KUB 26, 1+, merely stresses the obligation of the vassal to protect his overlord and later his descendants in the Hittite capital, placing this obligation against the background of the boons which Šaušga-muwaš had received from his lord:

And I, ‘My Majesty’, ‘Great King’, have taken you, Šaušga-muwaš, by the hand [and] have made you my brother-in-law, and I have given you my sister in marriage and have made you king in the land of Amurru. Protect ‘My Majesty’ as overlord. And later protect the sons, the grandsons, and the progeny of ‘My Majesty’ as overlords. You shall not desire some other overlord for yourself!<sup>17</sup>

The next paragraph 7 starts out with an abbreviated repetition of the same purport as ii 1-5, but then the paragraph continues with an elaboration of line 6, the prohibition to long for another Ruler:

You shall not desire anyone as overlord among those who are legitimate (viz. eligible for Kingship) brothers of ‘My Majesty’, sons of the concubines (viz. ‘sons of 2nd rank’) of the father of ‘My Majesty’, and which other Royal progeny (may) still (be

---

17 Beckman’s translation § 6, ii 1-6.

there), (those) who are to you (viz. in your opinion) bastards: you shall not act like Mašduriš!<sup>18</sup>

The ‘warning example’ begins with a rather factual description of the events leading up to the incident and culminates in a scathing condemnation of the behaviour of Mašduriš.

According to the scribe, Muwattalliš had given his sister Maššana-IR-iš in marriage to Mašduriš, in this manner making him his brother-in-law and had made him king in Šeḫa River Land (viz. had accepted Manapa-Tarḫundaš’s choice for Mašduriš just as later Tudḫaliyaš IV had also agreed to the similar choice of Šaušga-muwaš by Bentešina). Muwattalliš had been succeeded by Urḫi-Teššub (ii 16-21). Then follows the kernel of this ‘example’ which I shall again give in Beckman’s translation:

[My father] wrested the kingship away from Urḫi-Teššub” (a later addition over erasure). „Mašduriš contrived treachery. Although it was Muwattalliš who had taken him up and had made him his brother-in-law, he did not protect his (viz. Muwattalliš II’s) son and contrived treachery” (erased at a later moment) „and he went over to the side of my father” (saying [?]): ‘Will I protect even a bastard? Why shall I take action upon (what proceeds from [?]) a bastard (type of) son?’ Will you, too, perhaps act in the manner of Mašduriš?<sup>19</sup>

It is a rhetorical question, but it shows the character of an unconcealed threat. H. Klengel, *Kommentar* (1995) 168 together with note 44, already mentioned the name of Kurunt(iy)aš in this respect as a political figure for whom Tudḫaliyaš IV might have feared in such a vehement manner that other vassals might have been warned against him or at least might have been advised to shun contact with him. In his paper for the IV<sup>th</sup> ICH (4.-8. Oktober 1999), T.P.J. van den Hout argued that the striking parallelism between on one hand Šaušga-muwaš and Mašduriš on the other – both were connected through a dynastic marriage with a legitimately ruling ‘Great King’ – might have triggered the choice of Mašduriš for this ‘warning example’. He also contended that, at the time the Šaušga-muwaš treaty was concluded,

---

18 Beckman’s translation with some minor adaptations; ii 10-15.

19 Beckman’s translation with a minor adaptation; part of § 8; ii 22-30. — In T.P.J. van den Hout’s treatment of the ‘warning example’, to which I shall refer below, a number of explanations for its usage by Tudḫaliyaš IV have already been mentioned. I would like to add the explanation given by T.R. Bryce, *Kingdom* (1998) 333-334: “What was most alarming was that a vassal ruler should have seen fit to decide for himself whether or not he would support a particular successor to the Hittite throne. This was in breach of the standard treaty regulations whereby a vassal ruler was bound to give allegiance to his overlord’s duly appointed heir. Urḫi-Teššub clearly fulfilled that criterion.” This is precisely what the whole context of column II, before and after the story about Mašduriš, tries to impress upon the mind of Šaušga-muwaš.

Kurunt(iy)aš could still have fostered political aspirations which might have constituted a threat to the reign of Tudḫaliyaš IV. Within the context of this paper it can be added or recalled that, in the curse and the blessing at the end of the Bronze Tablet, after the list of gods, Kurunt(iy)aš was warned that he should not „desire the kingship of Ḫatti Land for himself” and was admonished to “desire ‘His Majesty’” and later in each specific case the “progeny of ‘His Majesty’ for overlordship” (Beckman’s translation; § 25, iv 7 and 13).

After the ‘warning example’ paragraph 8 continues as follows:

And if someone brings difficulties upon ‘My Majesty’, or upon his sons, grandsons, or progeny of ‘My Majesty’, and you, Šaušga-muwaš, together with [your] wives, [your] sons, your infantry, and your chariotry, do not help wholeheartedly, and are not ready to die for him, together with [your] wives and [your] sons — this shall be placed under oath for you.<sup>20</sup>

In the sequel, paragraph 9 continues with yet another exhortation “to protect ‘My Majesty’ as overlord and later the progeny of [‘My Majesty’] as overlords” and “not to desire [anyone] else as overlord! (ii 39-41).”

The obligation for the whole royal family of the land of Amurru to demonstrate an unswerving loyalty with death as its limit is not a unique characteristic of this treaty passage. *šer ak-*, in the meaning “to be willing to die for someone”, in all likelihood reoccurs in iii 25 of the same treaty, but is also attested in the Bronze Tablet in ii 53-56 regarding Kurunt(iy)aš in the description of the mutual loyalty between Kurunt(iy)aš and Tudḫaliyaš IV:

And when my father died, because lands entered into secession – also at that time Kurunt(iy)aš would have died for me. He protected me and in no way broke the oaths which he had sworn.

as well as in iii 21-24 regarding a successor of Kurunt(iy)aš and again concerning a crisis situation which might arise in the future:

If some descendant of Tudḫaliyaš occupies the kingship in Ḫatti Land, and something becomes difficult for him, whatever descendant of Kurunt(iy)aš occupies the kingship of the land Tarḫuntašša shall die for him.<sup>21</sup>

KBo 4, 14, either an instruction or a type of indictment, but not a treaty, which was rightly updated by I. Singer, Battle (1985) 109-119, to the reign of Tudḫaliyaš IV, abounds in similar examples consisting of three types, “to be willing to die for the king” (ii 16, 25, cf., too, iii 37-38), “Let death be the limit for you!” (ii 23, 29, 61,

---

<sup>20</sup> Beckman’s translation; ii 31-37.

<sup>21</sup> In both cases Beckman’s translation.

81) and “to be willing to die at the side of the king” (ii 65, 72), cf., too, H. Klengel, *Kommentar* (1995) 168 notes 41-43.

From a historical point of view, it is an unexpected boon that in the case of the Šaušga-muwaš treaty we possess in the draft A — with numerous erasures and additions in some of its most interesting passages — a source for the early beginnings of the conflict with Assyria (iv 12-13),

Like [or possibly, “Since”; as preferred by Beckman] “the king of Assyria is ‘My Majesty’s enemy, in that manner he shall be your enemy, too. ... (iv 19) Because I, ‘My Majesty’, have begun war with the king of Assyria,

(followed by instructions concerning the military contingent to be contributed by Šaušga-muwaš). In the Lackenbacher Letter<sup>22</sup>, sent by an Assyrian king from Syria (?) to Ugarit, we possess a report from the Assyrian side on the development of the conflict, and, finally, in KBo 4, 14 a source for both, the conflict itself and its aftermath, as experienced by Tudḫaliyaš IV.

## 2c.

The ‘chain of command’: Piyaššiliš, elder brother of Muršiliš II, bore the Hurrian ‘throne name’ Šarri-Kušuḫ in Carchemish from the time of his installation by Šuppiluliumaš I onwards and died in the ninth year of the reign of Muršiliš II. The ‘simple agreement’ with which Muršiliš II elevated the place of his elder brother Piyaššiliš in the Hittite hierarchy during the final quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, would seem to have had no immediate effects for the position of his presumably second eldest brother Telebinuš, who had first, holding the title of „Priest”, ruled in the town of Kizzuwatna, but was later transferred by his father to Aleppo where he kept this title. Syrian rulers, possibly (according to Beckman) both, vassal kings and Hittite authorities, are told in a legal text (called by Beckman „arbitration of Syrian disputes”) from the reign of, again, Muršiliš II (column iii 27-33):

If there is some dispute, then the priest shall intervene in the dispute. However, if some dispute is too important and you are unable to dispose of it, then refer it here to ‘My Majesty’ so that ‘My Majesty’ can dispose of it.<sup>23</sup>

---

22 RS.34.165: Ugaritica VII pl. XLIV-XLV = S. Lackenbacher, *Nouveaux Documents* (1982) 141-156 and eadem, *Lettres* (1991) 90-100; I. Singer, *Battle* (1985) 100-103 and 107-109.

23 Cf. H. Klengel, *Schiedsspruch* (1963) 33-35, and G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 155 and 157.



## 2c-1)

The passage of the ‘simple agreement’ through which the honour of being ‘the third man’ in the ranking system within the Empire was conferred on Piyaššiliš, KBo 1, 28 (CTH 57) Obv. 6-19 is phrased (with a highly significant omission of ‘His Majesty’, the ‘Great King’, in the description of the ‘chain of command’ itself) as follows:

I have made this agreement for Piyaššiliš, my dear brother, for his elevation, and for [his] sons and his grandsons in the future. Whatever son or grandson of Piyaššiliš, or whatever descendant of Piyaššiliš should ascend (?) the throne (*šalli pedan*, for which also the translations “capital” and “(place of) residence” have been preferred) in the land of Carchemish – whoever is ‘His Majesty’s’ <sup>LU</sup>*tuh(u)kanti-* – merely the [<sup>LU</sup>*tuh(u)kan*]*ti-* alone shall be [superior] to (lit., greater than) the king of the land of Carchemish.<sup>24</sup>

The famous Aleppo treaty between Muršiliš II and Talmi-Šarrumaš, king of Aleppo, and son of Telebinuš who had died at a later date in the same ninth year of the reign of Muršiliš II, clearly shows the characteristics of an appanage kingdom treaty where it says:

For we are all the progeny (lit., the sons) of Šuppiluliumaš, the ‘Great King’. So let our house be one. The Gods of Ḫatti Land and the Gods of the land of Aleppo shall be witnesses in this matter.<sup>25</sup>

However, the next paragraph begins with the following words: “In the future the kingship of Aleppo shall not surpass the king of Ḫatti Land.”<sup>26</sup>

Thus either with unerring precision, or more bluntly, the system as such was kept intact, while a considerable measure of delegation was at the same time put in place, certainly, if one considers that at least during part of the reign of Muršiliš II the military matters may have been entrusted to Piyaššiliš and legal matters in the land of Aleppo itself and in its direct vicinity may have been assigned to „the Priest”. The two following treaty passages suggest that later Aleppo gradually lost ground to Carchemish and that, after Urḫi-Teššub = Muršiliš III had again transferred the capital back from Tarḫuntašša to Ḫattuša – Tarḫuntašša together with the adjacent Ḫulaya River Land, actually a border province which was of equal importance regarding enemies of the Hittites in Southwestern Anatolia as Carchemish was with

24 For the final solution of the enigmatic lines, KBo 1, 28 obv. 17-19, see D. Sörenhagen, *Untersuchungen* (1992) 345<sup>12</sup>; C. Mora, *Status* (1993) 70, and G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 154 and 177.

25 Referring to the mutual assurances of assistance in the preceding passage.

26 Rev. 6’-12’; cf. above *sub* 1, note 5.

respect to the Assyrian aspirations to extend their Empire in the direction of Išuwa and Malatya – the initial tripartition was in fact restored.

From these points in time onwards (viz. the dynasties of the ‘simple agreements’ 1, 2 and 3) the semi autonomous dynasties of Carchemish and Tarḫuntašša began to develop self-assured confidence or even provocative behaviour during the two final decades of the second millennium B.C.E. and the remainder of the history of the Hittite Empire in the beginning of the first millennium<sup>27</sup>.

## 2c-2)

The Bronze Tablet ii 79-83:

Concerning the Great Throne of (Ḫatti Land), his protocol shall be the same as that of the king of the land of Carchemish. Only the <sup>LU</sup>*tuh(u)kanti-* shall be greater than the king of the land of Tarḫuntašša; no one else shall be greater than he. Whatever royal regulation (concerning his position) is allowed to the king of the land of Carchemish shall also be allowed to the king of the land of Tarḫuntašša (viz. Kurunt(iy)aš)."

## 2c-3)

And at the end of the section devoted to the border description of KBo 4, 10 + one only finds a quotation of the last sentence:

[Whatever] royal regulation (concerning his position) is allowed to the king of the land of Tarhantassa, no one else shall be greater than he. Whatever royal regulation (concerning his position) is allowed to the king of the land of Carchemish shall also be allowed to the king of the land of Tarhantassa (viz. Kurunt(iy)as).

The three passages clearly belong together in a consecutive series, the second being dependent on the first and the third again on the second. Regarding this, admittedly, minor detail I feel rather confident that it points to the likelihood that KBo 4, 10 + rather than preceding, must have followed on the Bronze Tablet. But undoubtedly it is of greater importance that in all three passages the ‘chain of command’ does not lead upwards to ‘His Majesty’, the ‘Great King’, himself; apparently on all three occasions, the perfectly obvious did not need to be specified; until, at the very earliest, the final decades of the Empire Period there merely ruled a single ‘Great King’ over the whole territory of the Confederacy of Ḫatti Land, the land of Carchemish and the land of Tarḫuntašša.

---

27 Cf. H Klengel, *Kommentar* (1995) 169, together with the notes 45-49; see, too, Klengel, *Geschichte* (1990) 296; 313-316.

### Bibliography

- Alp, S.: Zur Datierung des Ulmitešup-Vertrages, in: *AoF* 25 (1998) 54-60.
- Balkan, K.: Letter of King Anum-Hirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish. *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından VII. Seri No. 31a*, Ankara (1957).
- Beal, R.H.: The Organisation of the Hittite Military. *THeth* 20, Heidelberg (1992).
- Beckman, G.: Hittite Diplomatic Texts. *WAW* 7, Atlanta (1996).
- Bryce, T.R.: The Kingdom of the Hittites, Oxford (1998).
- Del Monte, G.F.: Neue Bruchstücke zum Manapa-<sup>d</sup>U-Vertrag, in: *Or* 49 (1980) 58-66.
- Il Trattato fra Muršiliš II di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa' di Ugarit. *Orientis antiqui collectio* 18, Roma (1986).
- Diñçol, A.: Die Entdeckung des Felsenmonuments in Hatip und ihre Auswirkungen über die historischen und geographischen Fragen des Hethiterreiches, in: *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi* I (1998) 27-35.
- Edel, E.: Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof. Neue Funde von Keilschriftbriefen Ramses' II. aus Bogazköy. Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vorträge G 205, Göttingen (1976).
- Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Ḫattušili III. von Ḫatti. *WVDOG* 95, Berlin (1997).
- Friedrich, J.: Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 1. Teil. *MVAeG* 31/1, Leipzig (1926).
- Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 2. Teil. *MVAeG* 34/1, Leipzig (1930).
- Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter, Heidelberg (1952).
- Gonnet, H.: La titulature royale hittite au II<sup>e</sup> millénaire avant J.-C., in: *Hethitica* 3 (1979) 3-108.
- Gurney, O.R.: The Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, in: *AnSt* 43 (1993) 13-28.
- Hagenbuchner, A.: Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 2. Teil: Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar. *THeth* 16, Heidelberg (1989).
- Schutz- und Loyalitätsverpflichtungen in hethitischen Staatsverträgen, in: *BMECCJ* 7 (1993) 99-118.
- Hawkins, J.D.: The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Ḫattuša (SÜD-BURG). *StBoT Beiheft* 3, Wiesbaden (1995).
- "Great Kings" and "Country-Lords" at Malatya and Karkamiš, in: T.P.J. van den Hout, J. de Roos (ed.s), *Studio Historiae Ardens* (1995) 73-85.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S.: Arzawa. Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen. *THeth* 8, Heidelberg (1977).
- Zu Salmanassars I. Eroberungen im Hurritergebiet, in: *AfO* 35 (1988) 79-104.
- Zur Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy und ihrem historischen Inhalt, in: *AfO* 38-39 (1991-1992), 138-158.
- Hout, T.P.J. van den: A Chronology of the Tarḫuntašša Treaties, in: *JCS* 41 (1989) 100-114.
- Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung. *StBoT* 38, Wiesbaden (1995).
- Zur Geschichte des jüngeren hethitischen Reiches, in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Actes du IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. *StBoT* 45, Wiesbaden (2001) 213-223.
- Hout, T.P.J. van den, Roos, J. de (ed.s): *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. *PIHANS* 74, Istanbul (1995).

- Houwink ten Cate, P.H.J.: The Bronze Tablet of Tudhaliyas IV and its Geographical and Historical Relations, in: ZA 82 (1992) 233-270.
- Klengel, H.: Der Schiedsspruch des Muršili II. hinsichtlich Barga und seine Übereinkunft mit Duppi-Tešub von Amurru (KBo III 3 +), in: Or 32 (1963) 32-55.
- Geschichte des Hethitischen Reichs, Leiden et al. (1990).
- Tuthalija IV. von Hatti: Prolegomena zu einer Biographie, in: AoF 18 (1991) 224-238.
- Historischer Kommentar zum Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag, in: T.P.J. van den Hout, J. de Roos, ed.s, *Studio Historiae Ardens. PIHANS 174*, Istanbul (1995) 159-172.
- Kühne, C., Otten, H.: Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag. Eine Untersuchung zu Sprache und Graphik. StBoT 16, Wiesbaden (1971).
- Kupper, J.-R.: Northern Mesopotamia and Syria, in: CAH II, Part I, Cambridge (1973) 1-41.
- Lackenbacher, S.: Nouveaux Documents d’Ugarit, in: RA 76 (1982) 141-156.
- Chapitre VI. Lettres et Fragments (n° 39 - 47), in: P. Bordreuil, ed., *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville. Les Textes de la 34<sup>e</sup> Campagne* (1973). Ras Shamra-Ougarit 7, Paris (1991) 83-104.
- Mora, C.: Lo “status” del re di Kargamiš, in: Or 62 (1993) 67-70.
- Otten, H.: Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung. StBoT 24, Wiesbaden (1981).
- Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. StBoT Bh. 1, Wiesbaden (1988).
- Parker, V.: Reflexions on the Career of Hattušiliš III until the Time of this Coup d’État, in: AoF 26 (1999) 269-290.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F.: Review of T.P.J. van den Hout, Der Ulmitešup-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung, in: OLZ 92 (1997) 169-181.
- Rüster, C., Neu, E.: Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten. StBoT Bh. 2, Wiesbaden (1989).
- Seux, M.-J.: *Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes*, Paris (1967).
- Singer, I.: The Battle of Nihriya and the End of the Hittite Empire, in: ZA 75 (1985) 100-123.
- Review of T.P.J. van den Hout, Der Ulmitešup-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung, in: BiOr 54 (1997) 416-423.
- Sommer, F.: Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden. ABAW NF 6, München (1932).
- Sommer, F., Falkenstein, A.: Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II.). ABAW 16 (1938).
- Starke, F.: Review of E. Edel, Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof. Neue Funde von Keilschriftbriefen Ramses’ II. aus Bogazköy, in: ZA 67 (1977) 286-289.
- Stefanini, R.: KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049, in: *Rendiconti dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 20 (1965) 39-79.
- Ancora sull’Attribuzione di KBo 4 14, in: *Atti e Memori dell’Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere. La Colombaria* 31 (1966) 107-111.
- Sürenhagen, D.: Paritätische Staatsverträge aus hethitischer Sicht. Zu historischen Aussagen und literarischer Stellung des Textes CTH 379. *Studia Mediterranea* 5, Pavia (1985).
- Untersuchungen zur Bronzetafel und weiteren Verträgen mit der Sekundogenitur in Tarḫuntašša, in: OLZ 87 (1992) 342-371.
- Weidner, E.F.: Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien. Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi. *Boghazköi-Studien* 8-9, Leipzig (1923), Reprografischer Nachdruck, Hildesheim/New York (1970).