



Pallavidini, M. (2017) 'The Treaties of Šuppiluliuma II: The Norm and Innovation of the Treaty as Juridical Medium'

Rosetta **19**: 1 – 19

<http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue19/Pallavidini.pdf>

The Treaties of Šuppiluliuma II: The Norm and Innovation of the Treaty as Juridical Medium

Marta Pallavidini

Freie Universität Berlin

Abstract:

Among the treaties issued by the Hittite kings, only two can be attributed to Šuppiluliuma II.* Even though Hittite treaties show a standardised structure, nonetheless, some documents, particularly the two treaties for Tarḫuntašša (CTH¹ 106.II.2 and the Bronze Tablet), have some characteristics that allow them to be identified as particular forms (*Sonderformen*). Since the reign of Šuppiluliuma II faced 'problems like food shortages and massive movements of peoples² that would lead to the end of the Hittite Empire, it is interesting to analyse the treaties issued by this king. The purpose of the analysis is to establish whether the treaty as a juridical medium of diplomacy and subordination is still enforced and, if so, to what extent the texts issued by Šuppiluliuma II are similar to earlier treaties.

Keywords: treaties, diplomacy, end of the Hittite Empire

1. Introduction

There are about twenty treaties dating to the Hittite New Kingdom.³ However, only two of them can be attributed to the last attested Hittite king, Šuppiluliuma II.

They are:

1. A treaty between Šuppiluliuma and a king of Alašiya, whose name is not known (KBo⁴ 12.39 – CTH 141).⁵

* This article is an updated and extended version of a paper presented at the Università degli Studi di Pavia on the occasion of a Symposium in memory of Prof. Itamar Singer ('Before and After the Storm. Crisis Years in Anatolia and Syria between the Fall of the Hittite Empire and the Beginning of a New Era [ca. 1220-1000 BC]', Pavia 12 October 2012).

¹ CTH = Catalogue des textes hittites.

² Bryce 2005, 328.

³ For a list of the treaties, see Devecchi 2015: 20ff.

⁴ KBo = Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy.

⁵ The treaty has been convincingly attributed to Šuppiluliuma II by de Martino (2007: 489). For the attribution to Tuḫaliya IV, see Güterbock (1967: 80) and Beckman (1996: 32). For an updated discussion of the various attributions, see Vigo (2008: 203-211).

2. A treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Talmi-Teššup, King of Karkemiš (KBo 12.41 (+) KUB⁶ 26.33 (+) KBo 13.225 – CTH 122.1.A and KUB 40.37 – CTH 122.1.B).⁷

As has already been recognised by Korošec,⁸ the Hittite treaties present the following constitutive parts: a preamble, with the name and titlature of the Hittite king or of both treaty parties; a so-called ‘historical prologue’ that narrates the events that led to the issue of the document; the disposition clauses; the clause about the disposition and the reading of the text; invocation to the gods; curses and blessings. Although a document needs to include these constitutive parts in order to be considered a treaty, the structure of the treaties themselves is quite flexible, because a treaty should be applicable in many different situations without losing its legal validity.

Due to this flexibility in structure, and because the treaties that we have now do not represent the entire *corpus* of the Hittite Empire treaties, it is difficult to group them based on their constitutive features, with the exception of two major groupings: parity and subordination treaties.

The parity treaties are those stipulated by Hittite kings with rulers who were equal to them in rank (for the Hittite Empire, the treaty between Ḫattušili III and Ramses II – CTH 91 – is the only parity treaty), and they are characterized by the reciprocity of the clauses. Subordinate treaties, also called ‘vassal treaties’,⁹ were instead issued by Hittite kings for rulers who were their vassals.

Among the subordinate treaties, very small groups can be identified that share common features in the sequence of the structural parts, in the clause formulation, and, more generally, in the terminology. The largest of these groups is that of the so-called ‘Syro-Hittite’ treaties¹⁰ (CTH 49 I and II, CTH 53, CTH 62 I and II, CTH 66 and CTH 92),¹¹ that is, the treaties between the Hittite king and those of the small Syrian

⁶ KUB = Keilschrifturkunden aus Boğazköy.

⁷ For the grouping of the fragment, see D’Alfonso 2007: 204 with Footnote 6.

⁸ Korošec 1931: 12ff.

⁹ This label is imprecise, yet it has become traditional. See Devecchi 2015: 12 with Footnote 2.

¹⁰ The definition of ‘siro-hittiti’ was adopted by Del Monte in his edition of CTH 66. See Del Monte 1986: 1.

¹¹ See Weidner and Del Monte for CTH 49 I (respectively, 1923: 71-75 and 1986: 116-127), 53 (1923: 59-71 and 1986: 142-155), 62 I (1923: 77-79 and 1986: 156-159), and 92 (1923: 125-135 and 1986:

reigns.¹² Another group consists of the treaties written for the Arzawaeen kings (CTH 67, 68, and 69, to which CTH 76, written for Alakšandu of Wiluša, can also be added),¹³ and the last group is formed by the two Tarḫuntašša treaties (CTH 106.II.2¹⁴ and the Bronze Tablet).¹⁵ These two last documents have been defined as peculiar forms, since they demonstrate some juridical features that are not present in other treaties; on the one hand, the clauses in the two Tarḫuntašša treaties are not placed under oath, and additionally there is a list of human witnesses.¹⁶ Their peculiarities could be due to the fact that they were issued for members of the Hittite royal family.¹⁷

Since the two treaties from the reign of Šuppiluliuma II were written for two very different state entities – one of which, Karkemiš, was ruled by a descendant of the Hittite royal family – it would be interesting to examine the two documents to see if they are similar to the other, already well-known groups, or if they contain original characteristics.

2.1 CTH 141

The first document that I take into consideration, CTH 141, is the worst preserved of the two.¹⁸

The beginning of the text did not survive, and it is not possible to ascertain the precise size of the initial gap. The first paragraph, the content of which can be vaguely identified, seems to deal with the possibility that a king, equal in rank to Šuppiluliuma, could become an enemy. We are able to read very few signs:¹⁹

2 ...] ŠEŠ-Υ[A
 3 ... k]e-e-da-ni x[-
 4 ...] i-ya-zi ú-x[-

178-187). For CTH 49, see also Freydank (1960: 358-373); for CTH 49 II, see Del Monte (1986: 128-141); for 62 II, see Friedrich (1926: 4-48) and Del Monte (1986: 160-177); for CTH 66, see Nougayrol (1956: 84-95), Kestemont (1974: 94-119), and Del Monte (1986: 14-106).

¹² CTH 105 is not included in this group, because it contains characteristics that are not very similar to those of the other Syro-Hittite treaties: see Del Monte 1986: 1f. Perhaps this is due to the fact that both versions of CTH 105 are drafts, as stated by the editors Kühne and Otten 1971: 1.

¹³ See Friedrich 1926: 49-179 (CTH 67, 68), 1930: 1-102 (CTH 69, 76).

¹⁴ See van den Hout 1995.

¹⁵ See Otten 1988.

¹⁶ For the juridical requisites, see Pallavidini 2016: 130ff., and for the term *Sonderformen* and its characteristics, see von Schuler 1965.

¹⁷ See Balza 2008, with previous literature.

¹⁸ For an overview of the most important studies, see Vigo 2008: 193 with Footnote 4.

¹⁹ For the transliteration, see de Martino 2007: 486.

5 ...^{LÚ}KÚR *ki-ša-ri*

2 m[y] brother

3 to/for this

4 (he/it) makes ...

5 (he) b]ecomes enem[y]

Even though the tablet is damaged, ŠEŠ-YA in Obv. 2 and ^{LÚ}KÚR *kišari* in Obv. 5 are legible. The paragraph may thus contain one of the clauses defined by Beckman as (defensive or offensive) alliance²⁰ that regulates the military support between the two treaty-partners;²¹ alternatively, the paragraph could be part of the ‘historical prologue’²² and thus describe a former military event that involved both treaty parties. However, the form of the verb, *kišari*, is in present tense and thus makes the first interpretation more likely, since the historical prologue, as the name itself suggests, recounts events of the past.²³

The following paragraph (Obv. 6-9) concerns the fugitives (^{LÚ}MUNNABTUM)²⁴ and the obligation of the king of Alašiya to seize them (*ep/ap-*)²⁵ and hand them over (*para pai-*)²⁶ to the Hittite king.

We read in fact:

6 [^{LÚ}MU-UN-NA]B-TUM-*ma-aš* ŠA KUR U[RU

7 [*na-an e-e*]p-te-en pa-ri[a-a pí-iš-tén

8 [*nu(-)* LÚ ^{UR}]H^Ua-at-ti ku-iš

9 [*na-an*] e-ep-tén na-an-kán [*pa-ra-a pí-iš-tén*

6 [a fugiti]ve of the Land of [

²⁰ Beckman 1999.

²¹ Since the paragraph is very badly damaged, a precise parallel to this passage cannot be found in other treaties.

²² Vigo suggests that this part is included in the preamble (Vigo 2008: 201), but the wording is more similar to a military clause or to the description of a military event than to the preamble, in which only the name and titlature of the king(s) are mentioned. For the historical prologue and its function, see Altman 2004; Devecchi 2008, 2015: 35ff.; Pallavidini 2016: 88ff.

²³ Even if it is impossible to ascertain with certainty the length of the initial gap, if the passage analysed belongs to the offensive or to the defensive alliance, we must presume that the gap should contain the preamble and the historical prologue, since the military alliance in the majority of the texts directly follows the historical prologue.

²⁴ This term is used quite often to indicate the fugitives in the Hittite treaties: see, for example, CTH 62.II, Rev. III 12, 30; CTH 67, Obv. 35, 38; CTH 76, Rev. III 64. For the term in general and for its use in other contexts, see CAD M/2, 203ff.

²⁵ For attestations in similar contexts, see Friedrich 1930: 183. For the verb in general and its use in different contexts and in different forms, see HW², Band II:E, 44ff.

²⁶ For an overview of the attestations in the same context, see Friedrich 1930: 202. See also HHw, 131 and CHD P, 113.

7 [s]eize [him] (and) ha[nd (him) over
8 [and a citizen of the Lan]d of Ḫatti, who
9 seize [him] and [hand] him [over]

This is also a typical treaty disposition and displays the very same terminology used in this type of clause in other Hittite treaties.²⁷

The next section of the document (Obv. 10-14) is not easy to interpret. In these lines, we read:²⁸

10 [*ma-a-an-n*]a LÚ URU Ḫa-at-ti x[
11 [A-NA KU]R URU A-la-ši-ya up-pa-aḫ[-ḫ]²⁹
12 ... a-p]u-un UN-an dam-me-e-da[-ni pé-di
13 [nu a-pu-u]n UN-an PAB-aḫ-ḫa-aš-tén ú-u[L
14 [nu-u]š-ma-aš GIM-an wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫ[

10 and [if] a citizen of Ḫatti [³⁰
11 I se[nd to the lan]d of Alašiya
12 that person in ano[ther place ...³¹
13 protect that person!, do not [
14 as I order you[

The primary problem is the translation of the verb PAB (Hittite *paḫš-*).³² De Martino translated it with the very technical meaning of ‘to keep in custody’.³³ The scholar interpreted the paragraph as concerning the obligation of the subordinates of the Hittite king to keep exiled people in Alašiya. This hypothesis is based not only on his translation of the verb PAB, but also on the textual evidence that some people were exiled to Alašiya (for example, the exile of Arma-Tarḫunta to Alašiya, as told in the ‘autobiography’ of Ḫattušili III – CTH 81, Rev. III 25-29).³⁴ This interpretation is

²⁷ The closest parallel is CTH 68.G, Obv. II 9 – Rev. III 10, where the same terminology is employed.

²⁸ For the integrations, see de Martino 2007: 486-487.

²⁹ I choose to reconstruct *uppaḫḫi* as suggested by Vigo 2008: 194; Fuscagni (ed.), *hethiter.net*: CTH 141 (INTR 2014-02-17); Devecchi 2015: 272 and not the one *uppaḫḫun*, as suggested by de Martino 2007: 487, since the present tense is more common in the clauses of the treaties.

³⁰ Alternatively, but not convincingly, Steiner 1962: 134 ‘[Wenn ich aber ein]em Mann von Hatti [zürne]’.

³¹ De Martino 2007: 487 suggests ‘trasferite’, Steiner 1962: 134 [*lasst nicht entkommen!*]. The verb that follows is not possible to reconstruct, since the expression has no parallel in other treaties. Nevertheless, a possible integration is the verb *peda-*, ‘to take (somewhere), carry, transport’ (see CHD P, 354ff.), if we consider a similar expression about moving a person in KBo 18.10:14-17 (see CHD P, 339).

³² For the verb in general, see CHD P, 2ff., on the correspondence between PAP/B and *paḫš-* see HHw, 251.

³³ De Martino 2007: 487. The same translation is given by Steiner 1962: 134; Otten 1963: 12; Vigo 2008: 198.

³⁴ De Martino 2007: 488.

fascinating, but it is not the most appropriate, in my opinion. The most common meaning of PAB is ‘to protect’,³⁵ so that the paragraph is similar to those present in many other treaties dealing with the obligation of a vassal to protect everyone (troops in most cases, but also other citizens)³⁶ from Ḫatti who was in (or was sent to) his territory.³⁷ This interpretation is supported by the presence of the expression LÚ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti, which means, generically, ‘a man/a citizen of Ḫatti’. If the clause concerned a specific person who had already been exiled to Alašiya, then one would expect the individual name of this person to be used, rather than the generic LÚ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti,³⁸ and, as evident in the tablet, there is no space for the individual name before the expression LÚ^{URU}Ḫa-at-ti.³⁹ The clause can therefore be interpreted as a more general disposition that considers the possibility that a citizen of Ḫatti could be exiled for some crime or ‘sin’, then again, it would be an unusual clause if we consider that Alašiya was not the only place where people from Ḫatti could be exiled (as seen again in the ‘autobiography’ of Ḫattušili III, with the fate of Urḫi-Teššup – CTH 81, Rev. IV 35-36).

According to CHD, the meaning ‘to keep in custody’ is very rarely attested and never in the context of a treaty disposition.⁴⁰ Thus, this paragraph could be seen as a more general clause about the obligation of the vassal to protect a specific citizen of Ḫatti, whose name is not known and who, for some reason, is in Alašiya. On the other hand, the clause could be considering the possibility that a citizen from Ḫatti might be in Alašiya in the future, thus binding the king of Alašiya to protect him, rather than a regulation about a certain exiled person, which seems too specific for what we can actually read in the document and very atypical for a treaty. Furthermore, this clause is close to a disposition about fugitives, like the clauses about the ‘Relations of Subordinates to Agent of Great King’.⁴¹ In CTH 141, the clause about the ‘citizen of

³⁵ The sumerogram is attested, with the meaning ‘to protect’, also in CTH 69, Obv. I 13 and in CTH 105, Obv. I 20, 22, 25, 45, II 4, 5, left edge 1.

³⁶ See CTH 49 II, Rev. III 4-16, where the verb used to describe the obligation of Aziru is *paḫš-*(PAP/B); CTH 62 II A Obv. II 30-37; CTH 66 lines 39-44 (the verb is lost in a gap, but Del Monte suggests restoring it to *lū inaššaršunu*. See Del Monte 1986: 20.

³⁷ Beckman calls the clause ‘Relations of Subordinates to Agents of Great King’ (Beckman 1999: 39), a clause similar to that attested in CTH 41 can be found in CTH 67, Rev. 25-49.

³⁸ De Martino proposes, in fact, despite the rendering of PAB, the generic translation ‘un abitante di Ḫatti’ (de Martino 2007: 487).

³⁹ It is possible that the name was postponed, but the sequence LÚ – a geographical name – individual name is extremely rare, and I do not recall any attestation in the treaties.

⁴⁰ See CHD P, 6.

⁴¹ See footnote 37.

Ḫatti' follows the disposition about the fugitives (e.g. as in CTH 67 and 68), whereas, in the other cases, (e.g. CTH 76) the 'Relations of Subordinates to Agent of Great King', to which the clause about the citizen of Ḫatti can be compared, precedes the regulations about the fugitives.

The interpretation of the paragraph as a generic clause is also based on the following section, which concerns another traditional subject of the treaties: the obligation of the vassal to report 'evil' plots against the Hittite king.⁴² In this case the obligation is not generic, but it seems to specifically concern the report of plots of kings equal in rank to Šuppiluliuma (LÚGAB.A.RI, line 16⁴³).

The structure of the obverse is then very similar to those of the majority of the Syro-Hittite treaties, in terms of the sequence of clauses: military support, fugitives, protection of Hittite citizens, and the report of 'evil' plots.

The reverse of the tablet contains a typical structural part common to the treaties as well: in the first preserved paragraph (Rev. 3-11), we can read a blessing formula and an invocation to the gods to be witnesses to 'this matter'⁴⁴ (*kedani INIM-anni*), which also shows a terminology perfectly fitting to that used in the other Hittite treaties.

3 *ma-a-a]n-ma-kán* LUGAL KUR URU[A-la-ši-ya LÚpí-id-du-ri-ya (?)
 4 ... *ke-]e* INIM^{MEŠ} *an-da ḫar-kán-z[i*
 5 ...]*x-za-aš e-eš-du* LÚpí-id-du[-ri(-)
 6 ...]*x-um-ma* URU-ri SIG₅ *e-eš-du* [
 7 ... A-N[A KUR URU A-la-ši-ya SIG₅ *e-eš-du* [
 8 ...] *x a-aš-šu e-ez-za-at-tén mi-e-eš-du* x ['

⁴² 15 [*ma-a-a]n* ḪUL-lu ŠA KUR URUḪaṭ[-ti 'if an evil (word) about the Land of Ḫatti ...'
 16 ... *iš]-TU* KUR LÚGAB.A.RI *iš-dam-m[a-aš-te-ni* 'you he[ar fr]om the Land of an equal in rank'
 17 [*na-at le]-e ša-an-na-at-te-e-ni* A[-NA DUTUŠi 'do no]t conceal [it to His Majesty'
 18 [*ma-a-a]n* LÚ URUḪa-at-ti ['if a citizen of Ḫatti [...'
 19 ...]x KUR URUḪa-at-ti x['... the Land of Ḫatti [...'
 20 ...*a]r-aḫ-zé-n[a(-)* '... n]ighbor[r(s) ...'

For the integration, see de Martino 2007: 487.

⁴³ As far as I know, this is the only treaty in which this form is used to indicate the kings of equal rank to the Hittite king. In general, the sumerogram seems hardly attested (see Weeden 2011: 491; here, the only attestation is that in CTH 141 Rev. 16). Weeden translates LÚGAB.A.RI as 'opponent', but I see no reason why the meaning 'equal in rank' should not fit in the passage of our text.

⁴⁴ I prefer this rendering of the expression *kedani INIM-anni*, because it fits the grammar better (d.-l. sing.), as well as the context. De Martino translates '*queste parole*' (de Martino 2007: 488) and Vigo '*questa parola*' (Vigo 2008: 198), but neither translation seems satisfactory.

9 [nu-uš-ma-aš-]za UDU SIG₅-in ḥa-aš-du DINGIR^{MES} MA-MIT⁴⁵ [
 10 ... š]u-ma-aš-za TI-an-ni ḥa-an-za ḥar-kán[-du
 11 ... ke-]e-da-ni INIM-an-ni DINGIR^{MES} AN-^E ku-ut-ru[(-wa/ú[?])-e-ni-eš a-ša-an-du]

3 but [if] the king of the Land [of Alašiya and the *pidduri* (?)
 4 maintai[n the]se words
 5 ...] be; the *piddu[ri...]*
 6 ...] for the town of x-umma be favourable [
 7 ...fo]r the Land of Alašiya be favourable [
 8 eat well; may there be prosperity ...
 9 may [your] sheep give birth well; the gods of the oath ...
 10 ... [may] keep [y]ou alive ...
 11 for th]is matter may the gods of Heaven be witn[esses]

However, the next section presents unusual features. Firstly, there is no list of deities, secondly, the curses follow the blessings, and thirdly, the latter two formulae are separated by another section (Rev. 12-18) dedicated to the self-celebration of the Hittite king, which has no parallel in the other treaties.⁴⁶

The curse formula (Rev. 19-23) is also unusual, if not unique, because it does not directly involve the vassal, as is usual in most of the other treaties. Rather, it seems to address anyone who tries to alter the tablet or to remove it from its deposition place (which is near the goddess Ištar).⁴⁷ It also contains the clause about the reading of the tablet,⁴⁸ which, when present, is placed among the other dispositions.⁴⁹ Furthermore,

⁴⁵ I find the reading *MA-MIT* made by Vigo 2008: 195 with Footnote 28 for the two last signs of line 9 of the reverse convincing. The expression DINGIR^{MES} *MAMIT* is, in fact, consistent with the genre of the text and with the reference to the oath in most treaties in the context of the invocation to the gods.

⁴⁶ For the transliteration, see de Martino 2007: 487f.

⁴⁷ 19 [ku-iš ke-e TU]P-PU A-NA ^DIŠTAR pé-ra-an ar-ḥ[a da-a-]. For the integrations, see de Martino (2007: 488). A similar curse can be read, for example, in the Bronze Tablet, Rev. III 74-77.

⁴⁸ 21 ...] na-aš-ma-at-kán MU-ti MU-ti [pé-ra-an 3-ŠU Ú-UL ḥal-zi-iš-ša-i. I accept the restoration of *Ú-UL ḥal-zi-iš-ša-i* made by CHD, L-N, 394, because the terminology is consistent with this clause in the other treaties. I also restore *pé-ra-an 3-ŠU*, which is always attested in the treaties in Hittite language, where the reading clause is preserved (see CTH 76, Rev. III 73-83 and CTH 68, Rev. IV 1-8). The reading clause is also present in the treaties for Mittani, but the formulation is more generic than the expression *MU-ti MU-ti*, as it is *e-im-mu-ti e-im-mu-ti*, translated by Weidner as ‘*immer wieder*’ (Weidner 1923: 29 and 48). It is interesting, though, that the clause in the Mittani treaties is directly connected to a curse on anyone who alters the tablet or who takes the tablet away from its deposition place and brings it to a ‘secret place’ (*ašar puzri*: see CTH 51 I, Rev. 38 and CTH 52 II, Rev. 9, even if in this second text the clause is mostly reconstructed on the basis of CTH 51 I). It is surprising that CTH 141 follows both ‘traditions’: the terminology is coherent with that of the treaties in Hittite language, but the clause itself resembles more closely those in the Mittani treaties.

⁴⁹ In CTH 68, the clause (CTH 68.I, Rev. IV 1-8) is between the regulation about the civilian captives and the divine witnesses, while, in CTH 76, it is in a similar position (CTH 76, Rev. III 73-83) between the fugitives and the divine witnesses.

the paragraph inserted between the blessing and the curse formulae (Rev. 12-18) is unique in the treaties and is a sort of self-celebration of the Hittite king.⁵⁰

Summing up, the structure of the reverse of the tablet presents a blessing formula (lines 3-10), then an invocation to the gods (line 11), followed by the self-celebration section (lines 12-18), and finally by the curse formula, which also contains the reading formula (lines 19-23). Normally, the treaties present the invocation of the gods and a list of deities, then the blessings and the curses. The structure in general and the sequence of the single parts may be unusual, but all the necessary structural parts of a treaty are present.

2.2 CTH 122

The treaty with Talmi-Teššup is better preserved than CTH 141, but it poses more complex interpretative problems.

First of all, under number 122 of the Laroche's *Catalogue des textes Hittites*, three different documents are grouped: ⁵¹ KBo 12.41 + KBo 13.255 + KUB 26.33, which is the best preserved text in the treaty with Talmi-Teššup; KUB 40.37, which is probably another copy of the treaty; and KBo 12.30 + KUB 26.25, which shows some features that seem to indicate that it is more an oath than a treaty. I take into consideration here only KBo 12.41++ because only this manuscript can be considered, beyond any doubt, an exemplar of the treaty between Šuppiliuma II and Talmi-Teššup.⁵²

The text shows some of the typical structural parts of the treaties: the preamble with the name and titles of the king (Obv. I 1-7), the 'historical prologue' (probably Obv. I 7 – Obv. II 24, but the sections are badly damaged), some dispositions concerning the

⁵⁰ For the interpretation of this section, see de Martino 2007: 488f. and Vigo 2008: 205-230. In particular, Vigo states that this section substitutes the 'historical prologue' (Vigo 2008: 202). In my opinion, there is no evidence that the text lacks the prologue at all, because it could be at the beginning of the tablet (i.e. in a very common position), which is missing. Furthermore, the 'historical prologue' of the treaties reports events connected with the past relations between the two countries, but the section in Rev. 13-18 does not contain such narration, and it is only centred on the self-celebration of the Hittite king.

⁵¹ See Singer 2001 and D'Alfonso 2007: 203f. for a discussion of the grouping of the joins and the relationship between the documents.

⁵² See already Giorgieri 2002: 299-306.

military intervention (Rev. III 4-9), the report of ‘evil’ plots (Rev. III 10-18), the protection of the Hittite king (Rev. III 19-24), and the list of deities (Rev. IV 1-13).

If we consider only these characteristics, CTH 122.1.A seems to be a very typical treaty. However, every single structural part of the text presents some uncommon features.

Preambles normally contain the name and titlature of the king who issued the document. However, the preamble for CTH 122.1.A lists the names and titles of both Šuppiluliuma and Talmi-Teššup, that is, of the Hittite king and of his vassal. This feature is very rarely attested in treaties,⁵³ and it is difficult to find an explanation for it, mainly because it is difficult to establish whether the relation between the treaty partners was that of parity or of subordination. This is due to the fact that the first signs of the text are missing and the verb *iya-*, which follows the word *išhiul* at the end of the sentence, lacks the last signs, so it is not possible to determine if it was in the third-person singular or plural.⁵⁴ L. D’Alfonso, in his edition of CTH 122.1.A, decided not to restore any sign before ^DUTU^S-za, to restore the conjunction *ù* in line 5 before the names and titles of the king of Karkemiš, and to consequently restore *iēr* in line 7 with the ending of the third person plural, considering the treaty as issued by both kings.⁵⁵

⁵³ The only other treaty that presents the names and titlature of both kings is CTH 25 (most recent edition: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *hethiter.net*: CTH 25), but the titlatures are much shorter than those in CTH 122.1.A, and the terminology used to indicate the stipulation of the treaty is different, since, in CTH 25, we find the word *takšul-*, whereas, in CTH 122.1.A, the term *išhiul-*. Furthermore, CTH 25 surely represents a parity treaty, so that the reconstruction of the conjunction *ù* to connect the names of the treaty parties makes perfect sense; CTH 122.1.A is instead a subordination treaty, in which the reconstruction of *ù* is not fully appropriate (in CTH 25, Obv. 1-2, we read ^DUTU^S LUGAL.GAL ^mZi-da-an-za LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Ha-[at-ti *ù* ^mPil-li-ya] (2) LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-na *ták-šu-ul i-e-e[r* ‘My Majesty, the Great King Zidanta, king of the Land of H[atti and Piliya], the king of the Land of Kizzuwatna have made a treaty’ (Wilhelm (ed.), *hethiter.net*: CTH 25 (INTR 2014-02-25).

⁵⁴ Here, the beginning of the text, as we can read it:

1 [... ^DUTU^S-za ^mŠ[u-up-pi-lu-l(i-ya-ma LUGAL.GAL)] ‘[My] Majesty Š[uppilul(iyama, Great King)]’

2 [(LUG)AL KUR ^{URU}H[a]-at-ti UR.SAG DUMU ^mTu-ut-ḥa-li-ya L[UGAL.GAL] ‘[(Kin)g of the Land of H[atti, Hero, Son of Tutḥaliya, G[reat King]]’

3 [LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Ha]-at-ti UR.SAG DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA ^mGišGIDRU.DINGIR^{L[M]} ‘[King of the Land of H[atti, Hero, nephew of Hattušil[i]]’

4 [(LUGAL.GAL UR.S)]AG ŠÀ.BAL.BAL ŠA ^mMur-ši-DINGIR^{LM} [LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG] ‘[(Great King, He)]ro, descendant of Muršili [Great King, Hero]’

5 [... ^mTal]-mi-^{DU}-up-pa-aš LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš [(DUMU)] ‘[... Tal]mi-Teššup King of the Land of Karkemiš [(son)]’

6 [(^mI-ni-^{DU}-up LUGAL K)]UR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA <^mŠa-ḥu-ru-nu-wa LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-miš DUMU.DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠA> ^mŠar-ri-k[u-šu-uh] ‘[(of Ini-Teššup, King of the L]and of Karkemiš, nephew of <Šaḥurunuwa, king of the Land of Karkemiš, descendant of> Šarri-K[ušuḥ]’

7 [LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Kar-ga-mi]š iš-ḥi-ú-la-aš TUPPU kiš-an i- ‘King of the Land of Karkemiš m(ade) a treaty’.

⁵⁵ D’Alfonso 2007: 207.

However, the scholar also suggested another possibility: the restoration of *ITTI* at the very beginning of the text,⁵⁶ and the completion of *iya-* with the ending of the third-person singular (*iyat*). But, as he noted, the preposition *ITTI* is never attested in similar texts in the Hittite language.⁵⁷ D’Alfonso also rules out the possibility of restoring *UMMA* at the beginning of the text, because it does not fit with the particle *-za*, which completes ^DUTU^{ŠI}.⁵⁸ In addition, the text is written down in the first-person singular, and the speaker is Talmi-Teššup, so, to restore *UMMA* at the beginning of the text would not be coherent, since that would presume Šuppiluliuma as the speaker.

Since the speaker is Talmi-Teššup, it is, in my opinion, possible to restore *ANA PĀNI* at the beginning of the text, which is more common for other document typologies, such as the verdicts,⁵⁹ but which could also fit with the presence of names and titles of both kings and with the speaker as Talmi-Teššup. Consequently, the verb *iya-* should be restored with the suffix of the third-person singular.⁶⁰ With this integration, we cannot restore anything before the name of the king of Karkemiš. However, this would leave too much space before the king’s name, so we would then have to suggest the presence of an erasure at the beginning of line 5⁶¹.

This reconstruction would also fit with the presence of the particle *-za*, which completes ^DUTU^{ŠI}. I found no attestation of the expression *ANA PĀNI* ^DUTU^{ŠI}-*za*, but there is one for *ANA* ^DUTU^{ŠI}-*za* in another text dating to the reign of Šuppiluliuma II, KBo 4.14 Rev. III 9.⁶² In this document, we read ‘[...] *A-NA* ^DUTU^{ŠI}-*za ak-ka-an-na-aš TI-an-na-aš UN-aš e-eš*’ (‘to my Majesty, be the man of life and death’). The context resembles those very typical of the treaties, about the protection that the subordinate must

⁵⁶ This would be based, as noticed by D’Alfonso 2007: 213, on the parallel with CTH 51, Obv. 1-2, but, actually, this document does not begin only with *itti* but with the expression ‘*enūma itti*’, which we also find in the Akkadian version of CTH 41 (treaty between Tuthaliya I/II and Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna), Obv. 2, so we can conclude that the use of the *itti* alone would be an *unicum* in the Hittite treaties (a translation based on the restoration of *itti* is proposed by Devecchi 2015: 239; for the edition of CTH 41, see Weidner 1923: 88-111; for an English translation, see Beckman 1999: 17ff.

⁵⁷ For the few attestations of the expression *ITTI* ^DUTU^{ŠI}, see Weeden 2011: 643ff.

⁵⁸ D’Alfonso 2007: 213f.

⁵⁹ See, for example, RS 17.35.

⁶⁰ The only difficulty in this reconstruction could be the space at the beginning of the tablet, which does not seem to be enough for the restoration of *ANA PĀNI*. D’Alfonso reports that there is just enough space for two signs, but, as implicitly inferred by the scholar (‘there would be space for at least two more signs’), there could be a couple more (D’Alfonso 2007: 213).

⁶¹ Another possibility is that the scribe, probably a pupil of the *scriptorium*, mistakenly wrote down only the word *ANA*. For more about the House on the Slope as *scriptorium*, see Torri 2007-2008.

⁶² Weeden 2011: 646.

guarantee to his overlord.⁶³ Since, according to D'Alfonso every line of CTH 122.1.A contains 16 or 17 signs,⁶⁴ with the integration of *ANA*, the first line would have 16 signs, which would perfectly fit the average length of the lines of the text. It is less possible that the scribe wrote only *PĀNI* or *MAḤAR*, because, even if both are attested with ^DUTU^Š,⁶⁵ they are never employed as introductive formula for a document. We can find an interesting formulation in the catalogue CTH 276.1:⁶⁶ in Rev. 22-24, we read: 'DUB.1.KAM *išḫiukaš* ^m*Išpudaḫšuš=za* (22) LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Kizzuwatna* (23) ^m*Telipinuš=a* LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Hatti* (24) GIM-*an išḫiul iēr QATI*.' The presence of the names and titles of both kings, the use of the particle *-za* directly connected to the king's name at the very beginning of a sentence, the use of the conjunction 'and' to connect the names and title of the two kings, and the formulation *išḫiul iēr* all resemble the characteristics of CTH 122.1.A. However, in order to restore CTH 122.1.A with the same wording as CTH 276.1 Rev. 22-24, we have to integrate GIM-*an* before *išḫiulaš TUPPU* in line 7, for which there is no space. We could also restore GIM-*an* at the very beginning of the text before ^DUTU^Š-*za*, but there are, to my knowledge, no parallels for this kind of formulation at the beginning of a treaty.

The second uncommon feature of the treaty CTH 122.1.A is that the speaker is the vassal instead of the Great King. This is not an *unicum*, because we also see it in CTH 52,⁶⁷ where the speaker is Šattiwaza of Mittani, and it also resembles the type of parity treaty between Ḫattušili III and Ramses II, of which two versions were written down: one where the speaker is the Hittite king and the other (CTH 91, that found in Hittite capital city⁶⁸) where the speaker is the Egyptian Pharaoh. The case of Talmi-Teššup seems to be more similar to that of the king of Mittani than to the parity treaty, because, in the latter, the clauses are reciprocal, while in CTH 122.1.A, there is no disposition to which the Hittite king seems to be bound or to bind himself. Furthermore, the reference to the Hittite King as EN 'Lord' by Talmi-Teššup⁶⁹ is consistent with the

⁶³ For the edition of the text, see Stefanini 1965, and, for the attribution to Šuppiluliuma II, see Bemporad 2002 with a further bibliography.

⁶⁴ D'Alfonso 2007: 204.

⁶⁵ Weeden 2011: 644.

⁶⁶ I thank Elena Devecchi for this suggestion. For the edition of the text see Dardano 2006: 21-37.

⁶⁷ Edition in Weidner 1923: 36-57 and G. Wilhelm: hethiter.net/: CTH 52.I. See also Beckman 1999: 48-54 for the English translation.

⁶⁸ For the most recent edition of the text, see Edel 1997.

⁶⁹ Obv. II 11 EN-YA, as restored by D'Alfonso 2007: 209, 13 EN-*an*. The expression does not refer to Šuppiluliuma, but to some of his relatives, whom Talmi-Teššup could have favoured to become king in

terminology of the subordination treaties, as is the titulature of both Šuppiluliuma and Talmi-Teššup, as the epithets of the former are ‘Great King’ (LUGAL.GAL) and ‘Hero’ (UR.SAG), while the latter is referred to only as ‘King’ (LUGAL).⁷⁰

The exact content of the clauses to which the king of Karkemiš binds himself is not easy to ascertain: there is probably a disposition of military support (Rev. III 4-9), and the following clause (Rev. III 10-18) resembles the obligation (very common in the treaties, as seen for CTH 141) to report ‘evil plots’ against the Hittite king, as suggested by the word [mān] *kuiški* LÚ URU^{URU}Ḫatti ŠA DUTU[ŠI ḪUL-lu šanḫzi] *n=an* UL *munāmi* ‘[if] a citizen of Ḫatti [will seek the evil] against my Majesty, I will not hide him’ (Rev. III 12-14). We can only glimpse some details: Talmi-Teššup seems to promise that he will prevent the ‘men of Ḫatti’ from seeking any evil against Šuppiluliuma.⁷¹ However it is not possible to determine if the clause is generic (like in most treaties), or if it refers to a specific situation that affects the reign of Šuppiluliuma, even if this second interpretation fits better with the complex situation of the reign of Šuppiluliuma II.⁷²

The last section of the document preceding the list of divine witnesses (Rev. III 19-24) is very common in the treaties (even though it is normally placed among the dispositions at the beginning of the texts), and it concerns the vassal’s promise to protect (PAB-*aḫški*, line 22) Šuppiluliuma and his descendants (above all, the one he chooses as his successor). The uncommon feature of this section is that it is preceded by a small invocation to the gods so that they ‘make ... respect the dispositions’⁷³ (Rev. III 19-20). D’Alfonso inserted ‘him’ into the translation of the passage (although with a question mark),⁷⁴ suggesting, therefore, that the gods are invoked to make someone specific respect the pacts. I think it is also possible that Talmi-Teššup

Ḫatti. The fact that this person is referred to as ‘Lord’ indicates, however, that Talmi-Teššup was a subordinate of the Hittite king.

⁷⁰ See Footnote 53.

⁷¹ *ku-iš-ki* LÚ URU^{URU}Ḫat-ti ŠA DUTU[ŠI ḪUL-lu ša-an-aḫ-zī], Rev. III 13. For the restoration, see D’Alfonso 2007: 210.

⁷² For the sources and history of the reign of this king, see Klengel 1999: 300-308, and for more about the end of the Hittite Empire, see Bryce 2005: 295-346.

⁷³ *iš-ḫi-ú-li* PAB-*nu-wa-a[n-du]*, Rev. III 20. I do not agree with the translation of D’Alfonso 2007: 213: ‘respect the treaties’, because the word *išḫiul-* has a quite polyvalent meaning: ‘treaty’ is the most specific one and does not fit the sense of the term in plural.

⁷⁴ D’Alfonso 2007: 213.

invokes the gods upon himself, to make him respects the treaty, in a passage that resembles the section of the self blessings and curses in the Šattiwaza treaty (CTH 52, Rev. 40-62).

The list of deities, which is a typical structural part of every treaty, is followed by a colophon with the scribe's name.⁷⁵ There are several treaty tablets that end with a colophon, but never is the scribe's name attested.⁷⁶ This unique feature may be easy to explain: the text was found in the 'House on the Slope', where it was probably also compiled; the building was probably a *scriptorium*,⁷⁷ where many pupils worked and trained. It is possible that the copy was made as an exercise or something similar.

3. Concluding Remarks

From the analysis of the two treaties dating to the reign of Šuppiluliuma II, some conclusions can be drawn.

First of all, it should be noted that both documents show characteristics in the structure and in the content that are similar to those typical of the treaties issued by the previous Hittite kings. This demonstrates, in my opinion, that the treaty was the specific juridical instrument employed by the Hittite kings to establish and to regulate their relationships with the kings of other countries, and, for this reason, some characteristics remain unchanged from the beginning of (or even from before) to the end of the Hittite Empire. Furthermore, the fact that these features also appear in CTH 122.1.A proves that not all the treaties drawn up for members of the royal family are, at least from a juridical point of view, special forms.⁷⁸ Even the most exceptional feature of CTH 122.1.A, is the use of first-person with the vassal as the subject. It cannot be considered innovative, since there is the previous example of the Šattiwaza treaty, which could have been the direct model for the text of Talmi-Teššup. It is therefore possible to suggest a scenario similar to that involving Šattiwaza, with a proper treaty (in the case

⁷⁵ Rev. IV 15-20 [...] DUMU (16) [...] (17) [...] *IŠ-TUR* (18) [...] x DUB.ŠAR (19) [...] x ŠA *Me-ra-A.A* (20) [...] EN GIŠ.KIN.TI [...] son (16) [...] (17) [...] has written (18) [...] scribe (19) [...] of Meramuwa (20) [...] the Overseer of the implements.'

⁷⁶ For an overview, see Pallavidini 2016: 65ff.

⁷⁷ As suggested by Torri 2007-2008.

⁷⁸ Cf. Footnote 16.

of Talmi-Teššup now lost, in the case of Šattiwaza CTH 51) and a sort of declaration⁷⁹ made by the vassal, that is the text we read in CTH 122.1.A and in CTH 52.⁸⁰

However, it is also remarkable that the treaty CTH 122.1.A shows strong influences from other text genres, like the verdicts (if our reconstruction of the *incipit* is correct) and the oaths (because of the presence of the loyalty-clause and the self-binding of the subordinate to the king). Perhaps because those were more common than treaties in the last decades of the Hittite Empire.

Additionally, CTH 141 certainly contains some uncommon features, especially the insertion of the self-celebration section,⁸¹ even though we have to say that, although the subject is unique in the treaties, many of them do have ad hoc inserts, which have specific purposes.⁸² It is the position in which the section is inserted that is unique, as the blessings and curses are generally not separated by any kind of clause. The fact that the blessing precedes the curse is unusual in the treaties, but this could be justified by the fact that the blessing is directed at the vassal, while the curse involves anyone who alters or removes the tablet, and so it not only deals with the behaviour of the vassal. Therefore, it can represent the most effective *excipit* for the document.⁸³

Concerning the lack of the divine list, it still remains difficult to establish whether this feature can be considered an anomaly or if it is connected to the possibility that this version of the treaty is very likely not the final, official version. This idea is based on the language of the document, which is Hittite and not Akkadian, as expected, and, additionally on the spot the tablet was found, the 'House on the Slope', a possible *scriptorium*.⁸⁴ For this reason, the text could be a copy of the original treaty, or a draft or even a translation from Akkadian into Hittite, possibly as a school exercise.

⁷⁹ For this term describing CTH 52, see Altman 2005 and Wilhelm 2007.

⁸⁰ For this possibility, see also Singer 2001: 640f.

⁸¹ Self-celebration is one of the goals that the king wanted to reach through diplomacy, as is evidently shown by the historical prologue section. See Pallavidini 2016: 241ff.

⁸² See, for example, the so-called Mašduri episode in CTH 105, Obv. II 8-38, or the disposition about the allowance of Kurunta to enter the ^{NA4}*hekur* SAG.UŠ in Bronze Tablet, Obv. I 91-101.

⁸³ A similar formulation involving the possibility of someone altering the tablet can be read, in treaties, in the Bronze Tablet, Rev. III 74-75 (and Rev. IV 19-20) *na-aš-ma-kán ke-e-el (75) tuppí-aš 1-an-na me-mi-ya-an wa-aḫ-nu-zi* 'or (if) he alters a single word of this tablet'.

⁸⁴ See Footnotes 61 and 77.

Nevertheless, generally speaking, the text seems similar to the Syro-Hittite group and, to a certain extent, the Anatolian treaties made up for the Arzawa countries, both in terms of the sequence of the clauses (military support, fugitives, reporting of 'evil plots') and of their content.

Although there is an impression of a greater degree of peculiarity in the document of Talmi-Teššup as compared to CTH 141, this does not alter the general idea of a significant vitality in the use of the treaty genre, even near the end of the Empire. It confirms one of the most important features of the treaties as a genre, that is, that there is a certain degree of flexibility in the structure and in the content,⁸⁵ making them capable of being adapted to different scenarios, but, at the same time, making them not so flexible as to alter the juridical validity of each treaty or the substance of the instrument per se. The peculiarities of both documents, on the other hand, indicate that there were specific instances that Šuppiluliuma II had to deal with. Some of them reflect specific situations (for example, the fear that the 'men of Ḫatti' could seek 'evil plots', which indicates a lack of stability in the king's power in the country), while some others have more general goals (like self-celebration). However, in both cases, they show more or less explicitly the struggle of the last Hittite king to prevent the dissolution of his Empire.

Bibliography

Altman, A. 2004. *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties. An Inquiry into the Concepts of Hittite Intestate Law*, Jerusalem: Bar-Ilan Univ. Press.

Altman, A. 2005. 'Šattiwaza's Declaration (CTH 52) Reconsidered', in Süel (ed.) *V. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 02-08 Eylül 2002 – Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, 2-8 September 2002*, Ankara, 43-48.

Beckman, G. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Writing from the Ancient World 7, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Beckman, G. 1999. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Writing from the Ancient World 7, Atlanta: Scholars Press. Second edition.

⁸⁵ See Pallavidini 2016: 316ff.

- Balza, M.E. 2008. 'I trattati ittiti. Sigillatura, testimoni, collocazione', in Liverani and Mora (eds.), *I diritti nel mondo cuneiforme (Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti, ca. 2500-500 a.C.)*, Pavia: IUSS Press, 313-344.
- Bemporad, A. 2002. 'Per una riattribuzione di KBo 4.14 a Šuppiuliuma II', in de Martino and Pecchioli-Daddi (eds.) *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), 71-86.
- Bryce, T. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (New Edition), Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- D'Alfonso, L. 2007. 'The Treaty Between Talmi-Teššub King of Karkemiš and Šuppiluliyama, Great King of Ḫatti', in Grodek and Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag* (DBH 25) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 203-220.
- Del Monte, G. 1986. *Il trattato tra Muršili II e Niqmepa di Ugarit* (OAC 18), Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente C.A. Nallino, Centro per le Antichità e la Storia dell'Arte del Vicino Oriente.
- De Martino, S. 2007. 'Il trattato tra Ḫatti e Alašiya, KBo XII 39', in Alparslan – Doğan-Alparslan – Peker (eds.), *VITA. Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 483-492.
- Devecchi, E. 2008. 'La funzione del prologo storico nei trattati ittiti. Ipotesi e discussione', in Liverani and Mora (eds.), *I diritti nel mondo cuneiforme (Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti, ca. 2500-500 a.C.)*, Pavia: IUSS Press, 361-385.
- Devecchi, E. 2012 'Treaties and Edicts in the Hittite World', in Wilhelm (ed.), *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20-25 July 2008*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 637-645.
- Devecchi, E. 2015. *Trattati internazionali ittiti*, Brescia: Paideia.
- Edel, E. 1997. *Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Hattušili III. von Hatti* (WVDOG 95), Berlin: Mann.
- Freydank, H. 1960. 'Eine hethitische Fassung des Vertrages zwischen dem Hethiterkönig Šuppiluliuma und Aziru von Amurru', *MIO* 7, 356-381.
- Friedrich, J. 1926. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 1. Teil* (MVAG 31), Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Friedrich, J. 1930. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 2. Teil* (MVAG 34), Leipzig: Hinrichs.

- Giorgieri, M. 2002. 'Birra, acqua ed olio: paralleli siriani e neo-assiri ad un giuramento ittita', in de Martino and Pecchioli-Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11), Firenze: Lo Gisma, 299-320.
- Güterbock, H. G. 1967. 'The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered', *JNES* 26, 73-81.
- Kestemon, G. 1974. 'Le traité entre Mursil de Hatti et Niqmepa d'Ugarit', *UF* 6, 85-128.
- Klengel, H. 1999. *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches* (HdO 34), Leiden: Brill.
- Korošec, V. 1931. *Hethitische Staatsverträge. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung* (Leipziger rechtswissenschaftlichen Studien, 60), Leipzig: Welcher.
- Kühne, C. – Otten, H. 1971. *Der Saušgamuwa-Vertrag (Eine Untersuchung zu Sprache und Graphik)* (StBoT 16), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- McCarthy, D.J. 1978. *Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament* (Analecta Biblica 21), Roma: Biblical Institute Press.
- Nougayrol, J. 1956. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit IV. Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales)*, Paris: Impr. Nationale.
- Otten, H. 1963. 'Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches', *MDOG* 94, 1-23.
- Otten, H. 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tutḫalijas IV* (StBoT Beih. 1), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pallavidini, M. 2016. *Diplomazia e propaganda in epoca imperiale ittita. Forma e prassi* (DBH 48), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schuler, E. von. 1965. 'Sonderformen hethitischer Staatsverträge', *JKF* II/1-2, 445-464.
- Singer, I. 2001. 'The Treaties Between Karkamiš and Hatti', in Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg 4.-8. Oktober 1999* (StBoT 45), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 635-641.
- Stefanini, R. 1965. 'KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049', *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti* 20, 39-79.
- Steiner, G. 1962. 'Neue Alašija-Texte', *Kadmos* 1, 130-138.
- Torri, G. 2007-2008. 'The Scribes of the House in the Slope', in Archi and Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia. Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005* (SMEA 49-50), Roma: CNR, 771-782.

- Van den Hout, Th.P.J. 1995. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung* (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Vigo, M. 2008. 'Tradurre e non tradire: il problema delle integrazioni. Il caso di KBo XII 39', in Bellucci – Jucci – Rizza – Tomassini-Pieri (eds.), *Traduzione di tradizioni e tradizioni di traduzione. Atti del quarto incontro 'Orientalisti' (Pavia, 19-21 aprile 2007)*, Milano, 191-248.
- Weeden, M. 2011. *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship* (StBoT 54), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Weidner, E. 1923. *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien* (BoSt 8-9), Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Wilhelm, G. 2007. Bemerkungen zu der Erklärung Šattiwazzas CTH 52, in Alparslan – Doğan-Alparslan – Peker (eds.), *VITA. Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 777-779.