

Elena Devecchi

6 The Governance of the Subordinated Countries

Abstract: The present chapter aims at highlighting the strategies and mechanisms of governance that the Hittite empire employed at the acme of its territorial expansion and in the best-documented phase of its history, i.e., from the middle of the fourteenth until the end of the thirteenth century BCE, in order to successfully rule and maintain control over a vast and varied territory that encompassed most of Western, Central, and Southern Anatolia and extended eastward just beyond the course of the Euphrates, embracing the Northern Levant and parts of Upper Mesopotamia. The impact, nature, and extent of Hatti's rule will be analyzed mainly on the basis of the textual evidence, in particular with regard to the empire's influence on the political, military, and economic organization of the subordinated countries.

Keywords: International relations; treaties, diplomacy; governance

1 Introductory Remarks

At the apex of its extension in the early thirteenth century BCE, the Hittite empire controlled a vast and varied territory that encompassed most of Western, Central, and Southern Anatolia, reaching eastward just beyond the course of the Euphrates, encompassing the Northern Levant and parts of Upper Mesopotamia. The process that led to the conquest of these regions has its roots and foundations in the military campaigns conducted in the early days of the Old Kingdom by Hattušili I and Muršili I, who succeeded in significantly enlarging Hittite-controlled territory by annexing parts of Anatolia and Northern Syria. However, this first territorial expansion did not immediately produce long-lasting effects, and for most of the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries Hittite hegemony would be con-

Note: I would like to dedicate this essay to the memory of Itamar Singer, whose fundamental contributions to this field of study have always been and remain a great source of inspiration for me; I am grateful that I had the chance to know him personally. I thank several colleagues for their valuable advice during the writing of this chapter and for having shared their publications with me at a time when it was very difficult to access libraries and conduct research: Stefano de Martino, Michele Cammarosano, Yoram Cohen, Jacob Lauinger, Federico Manuelli, Regine Pruzsinszky, and Eva von Dassow.

strained to the core of the kingdom, in Central Anatolia. This situation started to change with Tuthaliya I, whose reign witnessed a resumption of expansionist policies, and was then definitively reversed by Šuppiluliuma I, who strengthened the Hittite presence in Anatolia and, after defeating the kingdom of Mittani, annexed its territories in Northern Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. The final steps of this process would be carried out by Muršili II and Muwatalli II, who further expanded the Hittite domain into Western Anatolia and pushed the borders of the empire to the Aegean coast.¹

In the following decades of the thirteenth century, the Hittites lost control over the territories east of the Euphrates in Syria and southeastern Anatolia, which were absorbed into the sphere of influence of the Assyrian kingdom. On the other hand, the end of hostilities with Egypt, ratified by the Hittite–Egyptian peace treaty and by interdynastic marriages, guaranteed an exceptionally stable and peaceful situation in western Syria and the Levant that lasted until the collapse of the Late Bronze Age regional system at the beginning of the twelfth century BCE.

The present chapter aims at highlighting the structure and mechanisms of governance that informed Hittite imperial organization at the acme of its territorial expansion and in the best-documented phase of its history, i.e., from the middle of the fourteenth until the end of the thirteenth century BCE. Thus, it will not dwell much on imperialism as a process of “empire in the making” and on the multiple factors that led to the creation of the Hittite empire,² but rather on the strategies it developed in order to successfully rule the subordinated polities and maintain control over them across generations. These aspects will be explored by analyzing evidence that can contribute to an assessment of the impact, nature, and extent of Hatti’s rule with a particular focus on the political structures, military, and economy of the subjugated countries.

2 Textual and Material Evidence

The documentary resources available for addressing the topic of Hittite rule consists first and foremost of a rich variety of texts originating from Hattuša and from some Syrian sites that were under Hittite control.

¹ See de Martino’s essay in this book.

² For recent publications that have adopted a diachronic approach to the study of Hittite imperialism and emphasized the importance of early Hittite history as a formative stage for the definition of the Hittite empire, see e.g. Matessi 2016 and Gerçek 2017 (both include reviews of previous literature).

Among the documents from Hattuša, the most important sources for understanding both the organization of Hittite rule over the subjugated territories and its ideological background are the treaties imposed upon Syrian and Anatolian vassals. These were sworn agreements that aimed mainly at defining and regulating Hatti's relationship with its vassals, but could also include provisions about their reciprocal status. They provided the legal basis for the vassals' political dependence on the Hittite kingdom and established their basic duties and rights with regard to a number of issues, such as loyalty toward the Hittite king and his successor, relations toward enemies and neighboring kingdoms, interaction with other vassals, military cooperation, extradition of fugitives and of war prisoners, definition of borders, and the payment of a yearly tribute.

Presently, the texts of 35 such subjugation treaties are preserved, dating from the middle of the fifteenth to the end of the thirteenth century BCE.³ Most of them are known only from clay tablets that preserve either drafts or archival copies of the final, official documents.⁴ Official versions, on the other hand, are very rare: they are characterized by the presence of a seal impression,⁵ could be writ-

³ This figure also includes the subjugation treaty between Muršili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit (CTH 66), the only one recovered at Ugarit rather than in the Hattuša archives. The complete corpus also includes three parity treaties with Kizzuwatna (CTH 21, 26, 29) and two with Egypt (CTH 91, 134). For a discussion of the texts that can be ascribed to this corpus, see Devecchi 2013a and Devecchi 2015a, 20–28. Translations of most treaties, with the relevant literature, can be found in Beckman 1999, 11–124 and Devecchi 2015a, 63–272; many treaties have been edited also at *Staatsverträge der Hethiter* (https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_svh/textindex.php?g=svh&x=x).

⁴ Some treaties are attested by a surprisingly high number of manuscripts (see, for example, the treaty between Muršili II and Kupanta-Kuruntiya of Mira-Kuwaliya, CTH 68), which may be due to their complex redactional history and/or to their reuse as sources for the composition of other texts (van den Hout 2011, 60–61). It is not always possible to distinguish between archival copies and drafts, and the problem is exacerbated by the often fragmentary state of the manuscripts. For an example of an archival copy, see the best-preserved Akkadian manuscript of the treaty between Tuthaliya I and Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna (KBo 1.5, CTH 41.i.2.a), which describes the seal impression on the original tablet; it has been suggested that a manuscript of the treaty between Tuthaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru (KUB 23.1++, CTH 105.a) is a draft because it shows several corrections and insertions (Kühne and Otten 1971, 1).

⁵ See, for example, the sealed clay tablet that records a Middle Hittite treaty with the people of Pahuwa (KUB 31.103, CTH 212.1: see Devecchi 2017, 290–293) and several references to the sealing of the official treaty tablets that are contained in the treaties themselves (Balza 2008; Devecchi 2015a, 53–55). Some authors believe that KBo 28.108+ (CTH 29.A), a manuscript of the parity treaty between Tahiruwalli and Eheyā of Kizzuwatna, might have been another example of a sealed original (see, for example, Otten 1971, 66; Herbordt 2005, 28; Balza 2008; 2012, 91–92; Waal 2015, 45), but this hypothesis has been convincingly called into question by Wilhelm 2013a, 348–349.

ten on metal tablets,⁶ and were usually deposited in the temples of the highest deities of both parties.⁷

Although quite numerous in comparison to other periods of ancient Near Eastern history, the preserved treaties represent only a fraction of the original corpus; in fact, a number of references in the sources suggest that many more treaties were concluded in antiquity by the Hittite kings with their vassals, and also with other Great Kingdoms.⁸ Further relevant documents from Hattuša are royal edicts that bear on international issues,⁹ historical texts recounting the deeds of Hittite kings,¹⁰ and letters from the international and domestic correspondence.¹¹

Among the Syrian sites, the most valuable sources for reconstructing the history of Syria, its political organization, and its administrative structure under Hittite hegemony come from Ugarit (Ras Shamra) on the coast and Emar (Meskene) on the Middle Euphrates. The discovery of the Ugarit archives yielded an exceptional corpus of international letters and official documents issued by the Great Kings and by Hittite authorities in Syria, such as edicts and verdicts, which represent a unicum among the textual evidence from the territories controlled by the Hittite empire.¹² In fact, Ugarit is the only vassal whose archives allow such a detailed and diachronic reconstruction of its relationship with the Hittites from the conquests of Šuppiluliuma I until the collapse of the Late Bronze Age regional system, showing how this relationship evolved and changed over

6 The only preserved example is the famous Bronze Tablet that records the treaty between Tuthaliya IV and Kuruntiya of Tarhuntašša (CTH 106.a.1: Otten 1988), but the ancient sources inform us that tablets made of gold, silver, and iron were used for other treaties (Waal 2015, 136–137).

7 Balza 2008, 414–416; Devecchi 2015a, 57–58.

8 Devecchi 2015b.

9 See, for example, Muršili II's edict recognizing the status of Piyaššili of Karkemiš (CTH 57: Beckman 2019, 34–36; see also below), Muršili II's dictates about disputes among Syrian vassals (CTH 63: Klengel 1963; Beckman 1999, 169–173; Miller 2006, 2007), and the edict issued by Hattušili III and Queen Pudu-Heba about Tarhuntašša's military obligations (CTH 106.B.1: Beckman 1989–1990, 291–293; 1999, 108–109).

10 Especially the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I (CTH 40: del Monte 2008) and the Annals of Muršili II (CTH 61.I and CTH 61.II: Goetze 1933; del Monte 1993, 57–131).

11 The main collections of Hittite correspondence are Hagenbuchner 1989a, 1989b; Hoffner 2009; Marizza 2009; Mora and Giorgieri 2004; Edel 1994; and Cordani 2017.

12 The main findspots of documents that bear on international issues are the royal palace (Nougayrol 1956), the House of Urtenu (Bordreuil 1991; Arnaud 2001; Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016) and the House of Rap'anu (Nougayrol 1968, 65–168); further useful information can be drawn also from legal documents, archival records, and literary texts recovered at the site in these and other archives. For general overviews of the main textual corpora from Ugarit, see Van Soldt 1999; Pitard 1999; and Dietrich and Mayer 1999. A vast repertoire of Akkadian texts from Ugarit in translation is collected by Lackenbacher 2002.

time.¹³ Beside shedding light on the dynamics of power between the Hittite empire and one of its most important Syrian vassals, these documents are also important witnesses to Ugarit's interaction with other vassals and Great Kingdoms as well as the role of Karkemiš in the administration of the Syrian territories.

A different and complementary glimpse into Hittite governance practices in Syria is provided by the epigraphic finds from the city of Emar, which consist mainly of private legal documents but also include scribal exercises, scholarly and religious texts, official correspondence, historical prose, and edicts.¹⁴ As is well known, Emar's rich epigraphic material can be ascribed to two different scribal traditions – Syrian and Syro-Hittite¹⁵ – according to the formal features and formulation of the documents, which can be associated with the activities of different individuals and institutions, thanks to prosopographical studies. It is generally accepted that the earlier Syrian tradition overlapped for some time with the later Syro-Hittite one, which at a certain point replaced the Syrian tradition completely, but the length of this overlap, the date of the replacement, and its connection with the city's political history are still matters of debate.¹⁶

The centrality of the textual finds from Ugarit and Emar in any discourse about Hittite governance in Syria becomes even more apparent if one considers that both cities and their kingdoms appear only rarely in texts from Hattuša, and that these few references are of little use for reconstructing the history of their relationship with Hatti. Conversely, other Syrian and Anatolian vassals are amply represented in documents from the Hittite capital, but we often have no sources from the vassals themselves. Thus, even though the uniqueness of this documentation should warn us against regarding the cases of Ugarit and Emar as representative of the Hittite system as a whole, they unavoidably remain paramount examples of what it meant to be a Hittite vassal in Syria between the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE and they provide a window on the modes and occasions of Hittite intervention in the conquered territories.

13 The main reference work on the history of Ugarit remains Singer 1999, but see also Devecchi 2019, especially on the later period.

14 Most of the texts come from Building M₁, which functioned simultaneously as a private residence, a scribal school, a warehouse, and a location for cultic activities; it was associated with the activities of the diviner Zū-Ba'la and his family, who collaborated closely with the Hittite administration. See most recently Pruzsinszky 2020 and Viano 2020. Convenient surveys of the rich bibliography on Emar are offered by Faist, Sakal, et al. 2009, 2011, 2014, 2016; and Faist, Vita, and Justel et al. 2003, 2005, 2008.

15 Also labeled “conventional format” (Syrian) and “free format” (Syro-Hittite); see Fleming and Démare-Lafont 2009.

16 For recent reappraisals of this issue, see, for example, Démare-Lafont and Fleming 2015 and Cohen 2016, who come to partly different conclusions, and Torrecilla and Cohen 2019.

Other Syrian sites that yielded much smaller groups of texts – sometimes mere stray finds – are Alalah (Tell Atchana),¹⁷ Qatna (Tell Mishrife),¹⁸ Şumur² (Tell Kazel),¹⁹ Qadeš (Tell Nebi Mend),²⁰ Tell Afis,²¹ and Tell Fray.²²

Finally, cuneiform sources from the territories of other Great Kingdoms, such as letters from Middle Assyrian provincial centers²³ and from Levantine polities under Egyptian control,²⁴ can also occasionally contribute pieces of information about the Hittite presence in Syria.

Recent studies have drawn important conclusions also from the analysis of archaeological data.²⁵ Here again one can distinguish between material from the Hittite heartland and from the conquered territories. As far as the first group is concerned, it is well known that very few objects of foreign origin were discovered at Hattuša and in Central Anatolia; most of them probably reached Hatti as diplomatic gifts from other Great Kingdoms, as tribute from subjugated countries, or as war booty, as only a few items could be explained as imports resulting from trade.²⁶

With regard to the evidence from the conquered territories, researchers have highlighted a very heterogeneous situation, which can be explained as the result of a diversified approach to governing specific areas of the empire. In some regions, such as Cilicia and the Upper Euphrates, the archaeological record shows that annexation to the Hittite empire triggered substantial changes in indigenous societies and left important traces also in their material culture, architectural remains, and landscape.²⁷ Elsewhere, however, Hittite dominion is attested almost exclusively by written sources and by a few categories of objects discovered locally, such as seals and sealings of Hittite kings, members of the royal family or officials, that attest to their involvement in different aspects of

17 A recent overview with bibliographical references is provided by von Dassow 2020, 205 – 210.

18 Richter and Lange 2012.

19 Roche 2003.

20 Millard 2010; Singer 2011a.

21 Archi and Venturi 2012.

22 Archi 1980.

23 See the letters from Dür-Katlimmu / Tell Şeḫ Hamad (Cancik-Kirschbaum 1996) and Ḫarbe / Tell Chuera (Jakob 2003, 2009). Interesting new data are expected from the still unpublished texts from the *dummu* at Tell Sabi Abyad; see Akkermans and Wiggermann 2015, 116 – 121.

24 Such as the famous letter from Tel Aphek (Singer 2011b).

25 See, for example, Genz 2006; Glatz 2009, 2013, 2020; Matessi 2016; Manuelli 2017, 2020; Pucci 2020; Brown 2020. This integrated approach has recently witnessed an intensive application with regard to the hegemonic practices of the contemporary Middle Assyrian kingdom: see, for example, several chapters in Düring 2015 and the volume Düring 2020; for a comparative overview, see the essays collected in Düring and Stek 2018.

26 Kozal and Novák 2007; Genz 2011; Lorenz 2020, 440 – 441.

27 See, for example, Genz 2011, 310; Manuelli 2012, 2017; Matessi 2016.

the management of the subjugated territories.²⁸ This is typically the case of Syrian polities such as Ugarit and Emar, whose material culture remained otherwise essentially unaltered after the Hittite conquest.²⁹ Alašiya (Cyprus) is another example of a conquered territory that has yielded almost no material evidence of interaction with Hatti,³⁰ but in this case the lack may be due also to the short-lived and unstable control exercised by the Hittites over the island. Yet another situation can be observed in the Amuq valley, where Hittite hegemony left in general a very light footprint in the archaeological remains,³¹ even though the establishment of the Hittite imperial administration led to new building activities at Alalah, the production of images celebrating a Hittite governor, and the introduction of new rituals in local religious practices (see below).³²

This chapter will draw mainly from the evidence provided by the written sources, which could then serve as a foundation and framework for studies of greater scope that will incorporate analysis of the archaeological data.

3 Political Organization of the Conquered Territories

Both the textual and the archaeological records indicate that the impact of the Hittite empire on the organization of conquered territories varied from place to place, since it was shaped partly by the political structures that pre-existed the Hittite conquest and partly by changes introduced by Hittite administrators in response to the evolving geopolitical situation.

After defeating the kingdom of Mittani and annexing both northern Syria and part of the Levantine coast, Šuppiluliuma I inaugurated a system of governance in Syria that would form the backbone of Hittite rule in this region until the end of the Late Bronze Age.³³ He assigned the kingdoms of Karkemiš and Aleppo to two of his sons (respectively Piyaššili/Šarri-Kušuh and Telipinu),³⁴ thereby creating two viceregal seats in Syria that were direct emanations of

²⁸ Genz 2006; 2011, 311–313; Simon 2013, 297–305.

²⁹ Faist and Finkbeiner 2002; Genz 2006; Glatz 2013, 36–43.

³⁰ de Martino 2008, 252–255.

³¹ Pucci 2020.

³² Yener 2013, 2017; Singer 2017.

³³ For previous studies on Syria's political organization and administrative structures under Hittite rule, see Beckman 1992, 1995; Klengel 2001a; D'Alfonso 2011; for the geography of the Syrian kingdoms, see Cohen 2017.

³⁴ See Klengel 2009 and Wilhelm 2013b, respectively.

the Hittite royal family. As is well known – mainly, but not exclusively thanks to documents recovered in the Ugarit and Emar archives – the kings of Karkemiš gained over time more and more authority and centrality in the governance of the Syrian territories of the empire; their areas of intervention stretched from military to territorial matters, to the resolution of disputes between vassals, the administration of justice,³⁵ the collection of tribute, the organization and safeguarding of trade activities, and even “family issues” at the vassal’s court. This leading role of the king of Karkemiš went hand in hand with his prominent position within the hierarchy of the empire, which was officially recognized and ratified by Muṣili II by an edict establishing that only the Hittite crown prince could surpass him in status.³⁶ As for the kings of Aleppo, their role and function is not as well documented in the ancient sources, suggesting that their involvement in “Syrian matters” was much more limited than that of the rulers of Karkemiš.³⁷ Both Karkemiš and Aleppo were bound to the Hittite suzerain by special subordination treaties, whose content and formulation reflected the exceptional status of the two dynasties, due to their blood ties with the Hittite royal family.³⁸

Toward the middle of the thirteenth century BCE, Hattušili III created another such appanage kingdom in south-central Anatolia when he assigned to his nephew Kuruntiya/Ulmi-Teššub the throne of Tarhuntašša, which had served as a capital of the empire during the reign of Muwatalli II.³⁹ The delicate relationship between Hattušili III and his successor Tuthaliya IV with Kuruntiya/Ulmi-Teššub was likewise regulated by special treaties, which were expanded through sworn declarations and edicts that ruled on specific matters, such as the military contributions expected from Tarhuntašša.⁴⁰ These documents also established that the king of Tarhuntašša would possess the same rank as the king of Karkemiš within the hierarchy of the Hittite empire.

In most cases, though, the vassal states were ruled by descendants of local dynasties who had been appointed to or confirmed in their positions by the Hittites, and whose political dependence on the Great King’s will was accordingly stressed in the subjugation treaties. Formally as well as in practice, the Hittites maintained some distinctions among vassals that reflected differences in their sta-

³⁵ On this aspect in particular, see D’Alfonso 2005 and Faist 2002.

³⁶ CTH 57: see Beckman 2019, 34–36.

³⁷ Klengel 2001b; D’Alfonso 2008; Devecchi 2015c, 123–124.

³⁸ Devecchi 2010a; Beckman 2019.

³⁹ For fairly recent overviews of the history of Tarhuntašša, see van den Hout 2012 and D’Alfonso 2014. See also de Martino’s essay in this book.

⁴⁰ Otten 1988; van den Hout 1995; Beckman 1989–1990, 107–123; Devecchi 2015a, 160–182. See also below, §4.

tus. For instance, a subjugated polity that had previously enjoyed independence and held the same rank as Hatti could be granted a privileged status and exempted from some of the regular vassal duties, as in the case of Kizzuwatna and Mittani.⁴¹ A vassal could also gain a certain prestige by marrying a Hittite princess and thus becoming a member of Hatti's extended royal family,⁴² even though this condition did not guarantee preferential treatment.⁴³ In fact, the Hittite policy of interdynastic marriages with vassals aimed first and foremost to establish direct political control over the foreign court and to ensure that an heir with Hittite ancestry would ascend the throne of strategically important countries. The practice of having princes of the subjugated countries spend time at the Hittite court can be seen as part of the same strategy of building personal bonds with future rulers and instructing them to be loyal servants, although in this case the princes were at the same time a potential instrument of blackmail against their fathers.⁴⁴

The Hittites might also introduce changes in the type of government in the subordinated countries, as shown by the cases of Alalah/Mukiš and Emar/Ašta-ta. Both cities, together with their territories, entered the Hittite sphere of influence at the time of Šuppiluliuma I's conquest of Syria. At Alalah, the local dynas-

41 In the hittitological literature, the special status of Kizzuwatna and Mittani is often described as a “protectorate”; it is associated with the Hittite word *kuriwana/kuirwana*, which is sometimes used with reference to these two countries (see, for example, Korošec 1931, 36, 66; Beckman 1999, 4; 2003, 763; Bryce 2011, 95–96). The same term is also attested with reference to other countries and foreign persons, but its exact meaning remains unclear, as the diametrically opposed interpretations offered by dictionaries show: on the one hand, “unabhängig, nicht lehenspflichtig” (KHW, 118; HEG 1, 647–649), and on the other hand, an “[a]djective describing a foreign person, people or country in relation to a superior potentate or power [...] expresses a status of dependency without actual formal subjection or incorporation (distinct from vassal-dom in diplomatic lip service, although the de facto difference may have been slight)” (HED 4, 265–266; similarly Kloekhorst 2008, 494). Recently, it was proposed that the term *kuriwana/kuirwana* indicates a “general status of equality (not specifically of rank), in connection to the Hittite king or to other kings” (Pallavidini 2017, 8).

42 The kings of Amurru, of Išuwa, and of the Land of the Šeha River summoned as witnesses of the treaties with Tarhuntašša were all in-laws of Hattušili III and of Tuthaliya IV; the Bronze Tablet mentions among the witnesses also Alantalli king of Mira, but it is unknown whether he was an in-law of Tuthaliya IV (van den Hout 1995, 142–147; Hawkins 1998, 17–19). See also n82 below.

43 As demonstrated by the case of Niqmaddu III of Ugarit, whose marriage to a Hittite princess did not exempt him from the frequent reprimands of the Great King (Devecchi 2019, 125–127).

44 See, for example, the injunction to deliver the prince, as well as the sons of the highest dignitaries of the Land of the Šeha River, in Muršili II's treaty with Manapa-Tarhunta (CTH 69.A §6: Devecchi 2015a, 135) and the reassurance about the well-being of Ammurapi's son at the Hittite court in a letter by the Great King found at Ugarit (RSO 23 8: Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 25–27).

ty continued to rule until it was replaced by direct representatives of the Hittites, who were probably appointed during the reign of Muršili II. A series of three Hittite governors has been reconstructed for Tell Atchana, where different phases of Hittite occupation have been linked with various phenomena: new building activities, the production of images celebrating the first Hittite governor, changes in the administrative system, and the introduction of new rituals in local religious practices.⁴⁵ As suggested by the Hittite letters recovered at Tell Afis, the jurisdiction of the Alalah governors might have stretched up to the northwestern Syrian plateau, at least until the time of Hattušili III.⁴⁶ However, the general scarcity of information about Alalah and the kingdom of Mukiš in the thirteenth-century sources, which include only a few cuneiform tablets from the Hittite levels at Tell Atchana, leave ample gray areas and make it difficult to reconstruct a detailed history. Furthermore, archaeological evidence from recent excavations at the site has shown that the town was not settled during the thirteenth century and only the temple continued to function as an important cult place.⁴⁷ Therefore, it has been suggested that sporadic references to Alalah in the texts do not refer to the site of Tell Atchana, but to a newly established Hittite administrative center that might have been located nearby.⁴⁸

A similar shift from indirect control through a local dynasty to a form of direct control through Hittite representatives has been postulated for Emar as well and is associated with the different types of documentation recovered at the site.⁴⁹ In the second phase, which may be dated in the reign of Muršili II as

45 It is generally accepted that a certain Tuthaliya, known as a prince and a great priest from a stone relief found in secondary context at Alalah, was the first Hittite governor of the city; he was followed by Palluwe and Šugur-Teššub, but their relative sequence is not clear. On the epigraphic and archaeological sources, and the partly different reconstructions that have been drawn from them, see, *inter alia*, Niedorf 2002; Marizza 2009, 157–158; de Martino 2010, 93–94; Yener, Dinçol, and Peker 2014; Yener 2013, 2017; Singer 2017; Manuelli 2020, 329–330; von Dassow 2020.

46 Archi and Venturi 2012 and 2013; von Dassow 2020, 214–215.

47 Yener 2013; Yener et al. 2019; see also Fink 2010, 121–123.

48 Yener et al. 2019, 341. If this hypothesis is correct, it would explain why there is no archaeological evidence at Tell Atchana for the construction works that Niqmaddu III of Ugarit was urged to carry out at Alalah by the Great King, by the viceroy of Karkemiš, and by some high Hittite officials, as witnessed by a dossier of letters discovered in the House of Urtenu: see RSO 7 6 (Bordreuil 1991, 27–28) and RSO 23 28–35 (Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 60–73), with discussions by Devecchi (2019, 126–130) and von Dassow (2020, 215–216).

49 See above (§2) for the Syrian and Syro-Hittite scribal traditions attested at Emar. This topic has led to an extensive discussion, with partly different assessments of the role of the local dynasty and different reconstructions of the sequence of Emar kings; see, e.g., Fleming 1992; Skalist 2005; Cohen 2013, 285–286; Yamada 2006; 2013, 125–131; 2014.

well, the king of Karkemiš and his delegates – in particular the “Overseer of the Land” (LÚ.UGULA.KALAM.MA) and the “Son of the King” (DUMU.LUGAL)⁵⁰ – took an active role in the administration of the city, where they acted in close cooperation with members of the local elite, as suggested by legal texts and letters.⁵¹

Hittite hegemony often expressed itself also through the territorial reorganization and redefinition of the conquered countries, a process that is witnessed by several sources that record the Great Kings’ interventions on the borders of Syrian⁵² and Anatolian kingdoms.⁵³ Such reorganizations could arise from the necessity of defining the territories of newly acquired vassals in relation to Hatti – intended as the Hittite heartland *stricto sensu* as well as the Hittite empire in a broad sense – but could also be triggered by territorial disputes between vassals that were decided by the Great King in favor of one or the other litigant. In general, this was a way to define the areas that fell under the direct jurisdiction of one authority or the other, and to establish that movements beyond certain territorial limits would be regarded as transgressions of the agreements and would incur punishment.

4 Military Contributions and Hittite Military Presence in the Subjugated Countries

Defensive and offensive military alliance was the core of the suzerain-vassal relationship, a fact that emerges clearly from different types of sources. Such fealty is one of the matters defined by the regulations of the subjugation treaties, where it is summarized by statements such as “You shall be at peace with my [i.e., the Great King’s] friend and hostile to my enemy.” Accordingly, both Anatolian and Syrian vassals were expected to fight wholeheartedly in support of military campaigns led by the Great King against kingdoms that were located in the vicinity of their territories, and also to provide assistance in case Hatti should be threatened by an external enemy or by an internal revolt. The battle of Qadeš can probably be regarded as the greatest mustering of this military coalition, when the Hittite troops led by Muwatalli II fought against the Egyptian army of Ramesses

⁵⁰ Yamada 2019.

⁵¹ This change probably brought about also some novelties in the local institutions. For instance, it has been hypothesized that the office of the *ḫazannu* ceased to exist and his functions were taken over by the “Overseer of the Land” (Viano 2018).

⁵² Yamada 1994; Cohen 2019; Cohen and Anor 2019; Cohen and Torrecilla 2020; Matessi 2015, 403–404.

⁵³ Bryce 1986; de Martino 1999; Dinçol et al. 2000; Melchert 2007; Novák and Rutishauser 2012.

II with the support of vassals from different regions of the empire. Even though it might seem obvious, since it reflects the Great Kings' own interest in safeguarding the territorial integrity and political stability of the empire, it is worth recalling that the defensive alliance was bilateral and that the Great Kings explicitly promised in the treaties to come to their vassals' aid in case they had to face some external or internal threat.

That becoming a Hittite vassal meant contributing troops to the imperial army is clearly demonstrated also by historiographic texts such as the Extensive Annals of Muršili II, where the surrender of enemies to the Hittite king is described as follows: "They fell at my feet and spoke as follows: 'Our Master! Do not destroy us! Take us and accept us as your subjects! And make us into soldiers (and) charioteers! And we will regularly go out to battle with you!' So I accepted them as subjects and made them into soldiers (and) charioteers."⁵⁴

While the recruitment of troops from Anatolian vassals is known mainly from treaties and historiographic texts, other types of documents from Ugarit provide rich evidence about the military contributions expected from this Syrian vassal.

First of all, one should mention an edict issued by Tuthaliya IV and ratified by Ini-Tešsub of Karkemiš that "released" (*umteššer*) Ugarit from contributing infantry and chariotry to Hatti's war against Assyria; however, this exemption had a price, and Ugarit had to buy its freedom by paying the massive sum of 50 minas of gold.⁵⁵ The name of the king of Ugarit who received the edict is not preserved; he could have been either Ammistamru II or Ibiranu.⁵⁶

On the other hand, there are a number of letters from the last decades of the thirteenth century that record the requisition of troops from Ugarit (see Table 6.1). The earliest datable message was sent from the king of Karkemiš to Ibiranu, announcing the arrival of a *kartappu* who would inspect Ugarit's troops in order to inform His Majesty about their exact number.⁵⁷ Singer connected this letter, which was discovered in the Eastern Archives of Ugarit's royal palace, with oth-

⁵⁴ See, e.g., the episodes narrating the submission of Taptina, Huršama, and Pikurzi in Muršili's ninth year and of Tukama and Azzi in Muršili's tenth year (CTH 61.II: Goetze 1933, 128–139; del Monte 1993, 98–100), which have been discussed by Lorenz and Schrakamp 2014. Other passages refer to the levying of groups of men identified as ÉRIN^{mes}, a term that could refer to military forces, but also to manpower to be employed in different sectors of the Hittite economy.

⁵⁵ RS 17.59 (PRU IV 150–151).

⁵⁶ See, for example, Beckman 1999, 182–183; Singer 1999, 682–683; Lackenbacher 2002, 101–102; D'Alfonso 2005, 174–176. On Ibiranu's supposed, but not provable defection to Assyria, see Devecchi 2019, 124–125.

⁵⁷ RS 17.289 (PRU IV 192).

ers from the so-called House of Urtenu⁵⁸ and proposed that these and also other texts should be set against the background of a renewed “deterioration in the relations with Assyria and the ensuing outburst of hostilities,”⁵⁹ maintaining that “when the Assyrian danger became more acute, the Hittites went back on their agreement and demanded the mobilization of the army of Ugarit.”⁶⁰

However, with the exception of the letter to Ibiranu, the other documents lack any precise chronological anchor, and none of them contains an explicit reference to the occasion that prompted these messages. Now, a new dossier of letters from the House of Urtenu provides a different context for some of these events. These messages from high Hittite officials to Niqmaddu III and to Ugarit’s prefect (*sākinu*) make it clear that the demands for troops from Ugarit were part of a general military mobilization in Syria, involving also the vassal kingdoms of Qadeš, Amurru, and Ušnātu, in response to attacks of Sūtū tribes that threatened the empire’s eastern border along the Middle Euphrates.⁶¹ Thus, it seems more likely that these and the previous letters from the House of Urtenu are all interconnected and refer to this same event,⁶² while the earlier letter to Ibiranu might have been sent on the occasion of another conflict – perhaps with Assyria – that required the recruitment of Ugarit’s troops.

Tab. 6.1: Letters dated to the last decades of the thirteenth century that record requests for troops from Ugarit.

Letter	Sender – addressee	Findspot	Relevant topics
RS 17.289 (PRU IV 192)	king of Karkemiš to Ibiranu	Royal Palace, eastern archives	A <i>kartappu</i> of His Majesty is coming to Ugarit to inspect troops and chariots
RSO 7 8	king of Karkemiš to king of Ugarit	House of Urtenu	A <i>kartappu</i> of His Majesty is coming to Ugarit

⁵⁸ RSO 7 8, RSO 7 10, and RSO 7 19; see the discussion in Singer 1999, 686–690.

⁵⁹ Singer 1999, 688.

⁶⁰ Singer 1999, 683.

⁶¹ RSO 23 25, RSO 23 28, RSO 23 34–36. See Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 60–61. Thus, these new letters confirm a hypothesis that was mentioned in passing by Klengel 1996, 559, long before their publication. On the possible role of the Sūtū and other tribal populations in the crisis that brought the Late Bronze Age system to an end in inner Syria, see Freu 1999.

⁶² Here, one should probably add also RSO 7 13, where a servant of the king of Ugarit replies to a request for information about the Sūtū.

Tab. 6.1: Letters dated to the last decades of the thirteenth century that record requests for troops from Ugarit. (*Continued*)

Letter	Sender – address- see	Findspot	Relevant topics
RSO 7 10	Ewri-Teššub to king of Ugarit	Id.	A messenger of the king of Karkemiš is coming to Ugarit, after having inspected the army of Qadeš; the king of Ugarit is urged not to show him his own troops
RSO 7 13	[...]ri to king of Ugarit	Id.	A servant of the king of Ugarit replies to a request for information about the Sütū
RSO 7 19	Kila'e to queen and king of Ugarit	Id.	The king of Karkemiš will travel to Neirab (near Aleppo); the king of Ugarit and a certain Bin-Kabkamma are invited to join him there
RSO 23 25	Anania to Niq- maddu III	Id.	Ugarit is expected to provide chariots and leather armor, even though it is exempted from providing troops
RSO 23 28	uriyanni to Niq- maddu III	Id.	The <i>uriyanni</i> is in Tuttul; the king of Karkemiš, the king of Ugarit, and the king of Qadeš are mentioned; the king of Ugarit should travel to Aleppo with troops and chariots
RSO 23 34	Ki[n...] to the <i>sākinu</i>	Id.	Problems with the Sütū; exchange of news with Qadeš and Amurru; Ugarit is expected to send troops for the <i>ilku</i> -service
RSO 23 35	not preserved	Id.	Exchange of news with Amurru; Ugarit is expected to send troops for the <i>ilku</i> -service
RSO 23 36	not preserved	Id.	Problems with the Sütū; recruitment of troops from Ušnatu, Qadeš, and Amurru; controversy among vassals(?)

Notably, some of these new letters explicitly refer to Ugarit's military obligations as part of the *ilku*-service, i.e., Ugarit's vassal duties.⁶³ Even though Niqmaddu III

⁶³ RSO 23 34: 28–30, RSO 23 35: 10''–12''. It has been correctly pointed out that the use of a term such as *ilku*, that usually refers to land-tenure obligations, to define the vassal duties reflects the Hittite legal conception that formed the basis of the relationship between sovereign and vassal; thus, “according to the vassal-treaties, the conquered territories were absorbed by the Hittite Empire and therefore formed part of its domain and jurisdiction; it was next that the king of Hatti granted them back to the local rulers who were constantly bound to certain services” (Márquez Rowe 1999, 176); see also Singer 2006a, 249.

claimed that he was “released from the troops and chariots” (KI.KAL.BAD^{hi.a} u^{giš} GIGIR^{hi.a} *umteššira*), he was informed that although His Majesty might well have released him from the obligation of sending troops, he was nonetheless required to provide chariots and leather armor for soldiers and horses.⁶⁴

We find a similar discourse about Ugarit’s *ilku*-service in another Akkadian letter from the Hittite court, discovered in the House of Rap’anu; here, the king of Ugarit is reprimanded for having disobeyed some orders in the matter of a vital grain shipment and is reminded that, even though the king had freed him from the *ilku*-service (LUGAL *ina ilki uzzakkika*), he was nonetheless expected to comply with any other request he might have received.⁶⁵ The nature of the *ilku*-service is not specified, but scholars tend to associate this exemption with Tuthaliya IV’s edict releasing Ugarit from contributing troops to Hatti’s war against Assyria (see above).⁶⁶

Finally, two late parallel letters sent by the Great King – most likely Šuppiliuma II – and by Pendi-Šarruma to Ammurapi of Ugarit deal, among other issues, with troops or men of the *ilku* (^{lū}ÉRIN^{meš} *ilki*), who might have been a military contingent supplied to Hatti as part of Ugarit’s obligations.⁶⁷

Interestingly, these texts stress the importance of a written document that ratifies Ugarit’s obligations and related exemptions,⁶⁸ in line with the well-attested Hittite habit of issuing edicts and decrees that modify the basic regulations governing the suzerain-vassal relationship.⁶⁹ In the matter of military obligations, another such case, this time involving Tarhuntašša, is attested by an edict issued by Hattušili III and Queen Pudu-Heba for Kuruntiya, which reduced the number of soldiers from Tarhuntašša slated to join the Hittite army so that they could perform other duties in the vassal’s country.⁷⁰ The same regulations were then carried over in Tuthaliya’s IV treaty with Kuruntiya (Bronze Tablet §22 and §24).

⁶⁴ RSO 23 25: 6–12.

⁶⁵ RS 20.212 (Ug. 5 33). An ample discussion of this letter in connection with other contemporary documents can be found in Singer 2006a; see also §5.2 below.

⁶⁶ Lackenbacher 2002, 103–104n313; Singer 2006a, 249.

⁶⁷ RSO 23 8–9. See the discussion in Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2005 and Singer 2006a. While it is possible that these references to the *ilku*-service also implied Ugarit’s military duty, it should be recalled that the *ilku*-service could include also other types of contributions, such as the delivery of specialized manufacture (see §5.2 below).

⁶⁸ See RS 20.212: 5’–9’ and RSO 23 8: 42–45 (// RSO 23 9: 41–45).

⁶⁹ Devecchi 2012a, 2013a.

⁷⁰ ABoT 1.57 (CTH 106.B.1); see Beckman 1989–1990, 291–293; 1999, 108–109. The text is probably a draft; see most recently Waal 2015, 234–235.

Vassals were also required to support the troops that the Hittite king could leave in their countries as occupation forces, whose presence often went together with the construction of fortresses in the subjugated territories. This policy is especially well attested for Western Anatolia during the reign of Muršili II. His Extensive Annals record that he rebuilt and fortified several towns in the land of Mira,⁷¹ while the subjugation treaties he imposed upon the kings of the Arzawan countries contain clauses that bound the vassal to protect the Hittite garrison, such as the following: “Furthermore, have regard for the garrison troops which I, My Majesty, have left behind for you, as you, Kupanta-Kuruntiya, treat yourself, your household, and your servants. Sustain them and treat them well. You shall not mistreat them in any way. But if you do mistreat them in any way, then you will thereby have offended before the gods and have transgressed the oath. The oath gods shall pursue you unrelentingly.”⁷²

Hittite garrisons could also be sent specifically to protect the Arzawan kings appointed by Muršili to rule the vassal countries, as suggested by the episode of Mašhuiluwa of Mira in the fourth year of the king’s Extensive Annals.⁷³

As for Syria, the texts speak of only one fortress built by Muršili II in Aštata, which has not yet been identified with certainty on the ground.⁷⁴ A fortress built by the Hittites, which probably dates roughly to the same period, was brought to light at Alalah.⁷⁵ Despite this meager evidence for a permanent Hittite military presence in Syria, one cannot exclude that troops stationed there contributed to the spread of Luwian elements in the region, which then survived the collapse of the Hittite empire.⁷⁶

71 Goetze 1933, 72–73; del Monte 1993, 83.

72 See Muršili II’s treaty with Kupanta-Kuruntiya of Mira-Kuwaliya (CTH 68 §20’: Devecchi 2015a, 147; see §19 in Beckman 1999, 79); see also Muršili II’s treaty with Targašnalli of Hapalla (CTH 67 §13’: Devecchi 2015a, 131; see §12 in Beckman 1999, 72–73).

73 Goetze 1933, 74–75; del Monte 1993, 84.

74 The building of this fortress is recalled in the ninth year of Muršili II’s Extensive Annals (Goetze 1933, 118–121; del Monte 1993, 95); it has been suggested that this fortress should be identified with Tell Faqous near Emar, but opinions diverge on this hypothesis: see Genz 2011, 311 and Simon 2013, 301 with reference to previous literature.

75 This is the building called the “Hittite fortress” by Leonard Woolley and now referred to as the “Northern fortress” by the current excavators of the site. See the recent overviews in Yener et al. 2019 and von Dassow 2020.

76 Simon 2013, 301, 306.

5 Economic Exploitation of the Subjugated Countries

The annexation of new territories always represents an important source of wealth for an empire, and the Hittites were no exception to this rule. Their economic exploitation of the subjugated countries could take different forms.⁷⁷ The most immediate way of profiting from a conquest was through pillage and war booty, as documented by countless, albeit summary references to the deportation of civilian populations, cattle, and sheep, which conclude as a refrain the descriptions of successful military campaigns in the Hittite historiographic texts.⁷⁸

As we saw above, historiographic texts are also quite informative about the contributions that some lands had to give in terms of manpower and military assistance. Conversely, they almost never refer to other forms of long-term economic exploitation, such as the imposition of regular tributes and other kinds of obligations upon the subjugated countries, that are known from treaties, edicts, and letters from the international correspondence.

Letters are also an important source of information on trade, which is rarely the subject of other official documents, even though it is clear that the Hittites were strongly interested in controlling regions that had intense commercial networks, through sea routes as well as land routes.

5.1 Tribute and Gifts

The imposition of a tribute is recorded only for some of the Syrian vassals (i.e., Amurru, Nuhašše, and Ugarit) and for Cyprus;⁷⁹ it is not attested for the Anatolian vassals.

⁷⁷ See also Klinger's essay on the Hittite economy in this volume.

⁷⁸ On the effects of Hittite military campaigns on the conquered territories, see recently Korn and Lorenz 2013 and Lorenz and Schrakamp 2014; on the importance of war booty for the maintenance of the Hittite economy, see also de Martino 2018.

⁷⁹ The terminology used in the Hittite texts does not distinguish between "tribute" from subjugated countries and "taxes" exacted from the core of the kingdom, which are indifferently referred to with the words *arkamma*- (Hitt.) and *argamannu* (Akk.), and with the Akkadian *mandattu*/*MADDATTU* (Siegelová 2014). However artificial and anachronistic it may be, for the purpose of this chapter it was necessary to make this distinction anyway and, therefore, to define "tribute" exclusively as the contributions expected from countries that were bound to the Hittite empire by means of a subjugation treaty.

Amurru's yearly tribute was set at 300 shekels of refined, first-class gold by Šuppiluliuma I in the treaty with Aziru, who according to the ancient sources never failed to deliver it regularly.⁸⁰ The same amount was expected also from Aziru's son, as established in the subjugation treaty issued one generation later by Muṣṣili II for Tuppi-Teššub.⁸¹ The later treaties of Hattušili III for Bentešena and of Tuthaliya IV for Šaušgamuwa do not mention any tribute,⁸² but a fragmentary Akkadian letter, probably sent by a Hittite king to an unknown vassal, refers to gifts brought by Šaušgamuwa on the occasion of a visit to the Hittite court.⁸³ Gifts from Amurru are mentioned also in the Hittite inventory texts.⁸⁴

Šuppiluliuma I imposed the payment of a yearly tribute, whose amount is unfortunately not preserved, also on Tette of Nuḫašše.⁸⁵

These treaties establish that the tribute should be “weighed out with the weights of the merchants of Hatti,” a phrase that can be interpreted as evidence for the official involvement of Hittite merchants in collecting the tribute from the Syrian vassals.⁸⁶

The best documented case is represented by Ugarit's tribute, which is recorded by several documents that allow one to reconstruct how its amount and composition changed over time (see Table 6.2). The relevant sources are as follows:

80 See CTH 49.I §1' and CTH 49.II §1 (Beckman 1999, 37; Devecchi 2015a, 204, 207), and also CTH 62.I §2 and CTH 62.II §2 (Beckman 1999, 59; Devecchi 2015a, 212–214).

81 CTH 62.I §2 and CTH 62.II §2 (Beckman 1999, 59; Devecchi 2015a, 212–214).

82 It is possible that this clause was originally contained in the now lost parts of the normative sections of both documents. This seems particularly likely in the case of Bentešena's treaty (CTH 92), which has a significant gap that corresponds to the section that usually contains the tribute clause; in Šaušgamuwa's treaty (CTH 105), only a few lines are missing between two fragmentary clauses that describe his expected loyalty towards the Hittite overlord. One cannot exclude that Bentešena and Šaušgamuwa were exempted from paying a tribute because of their special status as son-in-law of Hattušili III and brother-in-law of Tuthaliya IV, respectively.

83 KUB 3.56 (CTH 208). The addressee could be identified either with Bentešena of Amurru (Hagenbuchner 1989b, 381; Houwink ten Cate 1994, 245–246; Singer 2006b, 33) or with a king of Ugarit (Singer 2006a, 246). In the first case, Šaušgamuwa would have been acting as a crown-prince; in the second, he would already have become king of Amurru. On this letter, see also below §5.2.

84 CTH 241.1 obv. 2–3 mentions Amorite linen contained in a big, red basket with lion feet as a “gift-payment” (IGI.DU₈.A); see Košak 1982, 4–6; Siegelová 1986, 80–81.

85 CTH 53.A ii 1–3 (Beckman 1999, 55; Devecchi 2015a, 188).

86 Klengel 1979, 79; Klengel 2007, 386.

- an edict of Šuppiluliuma I for Niqmaddu II (CTH 47),⁸⁷ which defines Ugarit's tribute and a list of gifts for the Hittite king, queen, and crown prince, as well as the highest-ranking officials of the Hittite kingdom; the historical prologue and the concluding paragraph of the edict present Niqmaddu's loyalty towards Šuppiluliuma, shown on the occasion of a revolt organized by other north Syrian vassals, as the reason for issuing this edict.
- an edict of Muṣṣili II for Niqmepa (CTH 65), which reduces Ugarit's tribute in order to compensate for the territorial losses it suffered after the kingdom of Siyannu defected to Karkemiš. Notably, Ugarit's tribute is not mentioned in Muṣṣili's subjugation treaty for Niqmepa (CTH 66).
- an inventory of the gifts that accompanied Ugarit's "main tribute" (CTH 48).

While there is no doubt about the dating of CTH 47 and CTH 65 in the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I and Muṣṣili II respectively, CTH 48 does not provide any explicit chronological indication that would place it in the reign of a specific king. Several authors have interpreted it as a revised version of Šuppiluliuma's tribute, which might have been issued in the reign of Ammistamru II.⁸⁸ In this case, CTH 48 would be the latest known version of Ugarit's tribute. However, it seems more likely that CTH 48 should be regarded as the earliest among these three documents.⁸⁹ In fact, the gifts and the number of recipients listed by this tablet are considerably higher than those recorded by CTH 47; this would explain why CTH 47 presents the imposition of a tribute – a measure that can hardly be regarded as preferential treatment – as a reward for Niqmaddu's loyalty: it probably represented the reduction of an earlier, heavier tribute recorded by CTH 48.

As far as one can tell from the surviving sources, out of all the Hittite vassals Ugarit paid the highest tribute to the crown, a fact that reflected the wealth of the coastal kingdom and also high esteem for its specialized manufactures of luxury goods, which were sought by the Hittite elite as symbols of power and prestige.⁹⁰ Disregarding the adjustments to its size and composition introduced over time, Ugarit's tribute (*mandattu*) consisted of a remarkably high amount of gold in

⁸⁷ The text is known from several Akkadian manuscripts (RS 17.227; RS 17.330+RS 17.346+RS 17.347; RS 17.300; RS 17.372B; RS 17.373) and an Ugaritic version (RS 11.772++); for the dating of the Ugaritic version, see Devecchi 2013b, 89–90 with reference to previous literature.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Nougayrol 1956, 40; Beckman 1999, 168; Freu 2000, 30; 2006, 61–62; Gromova 2007, 281–282n19; Bilgin 2018, 461.

⁸⁹ Devecchi 2013b, 87–90.

⁹⁰ See Giorgieri and Mora 2012, discussing in particular the case of Ugarit's tribute; for other examples, see also Mora 2006.

comparison with other Syrian vassals (see above),⁹¹ complemented with personal gifts (*šulmānātu*) in the form of golden and silver cups, linen garments, and purple-dyed wool⁹² destined for the Hittite king, queen, crown prince, and some of the highest dignitaries of the Hittite kingdom.⁹³

Gifts from Ugarit are listed also among the precious goods that were kept in the storehouses of the Hittite capital.⁹⁴

Tab. 6.2 The composition of Ugarit's tribute as recorded on three separate occasions in CTH 48, CTH 47, and CTH 65.

	1st tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 48)	2nd tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 47)	3rd tribute: Muršili – Niq- mepa (CTH 65)
“main” tribute	—	12 minas and 20 shekels of gold 1 golden cup of 1 mina	[...]
king	1 golden cup of 50 shekels 5 linen garments 500 shekels [blue-purple wool] [500 shekels red-purple wool]	4 linen garments 1 large linen garment 500 shekels blue-purple wool 500 shekels red-purple wool	[...]
queen	1 golden cup	1 golden cup of 30 shekels	[...]

91 While the edicts always quantify Ugarit's tribute in gold, archival records show that the king of Ugarit extracted important amounts of silver from villages and professional corporations of his kingdom as contribution for the “tribute of the Sun,” i.e., the Hittite suzerain. See Bordreuil and Pardee 2001, 250–282; Heltzer 2003; Pardee 2003, 25.

92 The Hittite documentation suggests that this wool could have been used by the recipients to make garments for their own wardrobe, but also as offerings for the gods. On purple-dyed wool as an item of elite consumption in the Hittite world, see Singer 2008, which also provides a useful overview on the purple-dye industry in the Late Bronze Age Near East. On the Akkadian and Ugaritic terminology used in these texts to indicate the different shades of purple-dyed wool, see van Soldt 1991; on Ugarit's well-documented textile industry, see, for example, Matoïan and Vita 2009.

93 On the different terms used in these texts to refer to the crown prince, see recently Lebrun 2014, 268–277; for the other dignitaries, see most recently Giorgieri and Mora 2012, 650–653 and the individual entries in Bilgin 2018.

94 The inventory text CTH 242.2.A iv 5 records a “gift of/from Ugarit” (*šulmān* ^{uru}Ugarit), but the broken context does not allow us to determine what the gift comprised (Kořak 1982, 67; Siegelová 1986, 108); garments from Ugarit are mentioned in CTH 247.1 rev. 23–24 (Kořak 1982, 154–156; Siegelová 1986, 128–129).

Tab. 6.2 The composition of Ugarit's tribute as recorded on three separate occasions in CTH 48, CTH 47, and CTH 65. (*Continued*)

	1st tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 48)	2nd tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 47)	3rd tribute: Muršili – Niq- mepa (CTH 65)
	1 silver cup 2 linen garments 200 shekels blue-purple wool 200 shekels red-purple wool	1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	
crown prince	1 golden cup 1 silver cup 2 linen garments 200 shekels blue-purple wool 200 shekels red-purple wool	[1] golden [cup] of 30 shek- els 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	[...]
<i>tuppanuri</i>	1 golden cup 1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup of 30 shekels 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	[...]
(First) <i>huburtanuri</i>	1 golden cup 1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup of 30 shekels 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red- purple wool
(Second) <i>huburtanuri</i>	1 golden cup 1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup of 30 shekels 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red- purple wool
Lord of the storehouse	1 golden cup 1 silver cup [1 linen garment]	–	1 silver cup 1 linen garment

Tab. 6.2 The composition of Ugarit's tribute as recorded on three separate occasions in CTH 48, CTH 47, and CTH 65. (*Continued*)

	1st tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 48)	2nd tribute: Šuppiluliuma – Niqmaddu II (CTH 47)	3rd tribute: Muršili – Niq- mepa (CTH 65)
	[100 shekels] blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool		100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red- purple wool
Commander of the charioteers	1 silver cup [1 linen garment] [100 shekels blue-purple wool] 100 shekels red-purple wool	—	1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels red- purple wool
<i>sukkallu</i>	1 silver cup [1 linen garment] [100 shekels blue-purple wool] [100 shekels red-purple wool]	1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	1 silver cup 1 linen garment 100 shekels red- purple wool
<i>andubsalli</i>	—	1 silver cup of 30 shekels 1 linen garment 100 shekels blue-purple wool 100 shekels red-purple wool	—

As noted by Liverani, the distinction between “tribute” and “gifts” attested by these documents is an artificial one, since gifts in this context have lost their intrinsic feature of being given on a voluntary basis and have become part of the obligation.⁹⁵ In fact, the frequent reprimands and protests addressed by the Hit-

⁹⁵ Liverani 1990, 269–270. Note, however, that Šuppiluliuma's and Muršili's edicts state explicitly that no one else among the Hittite dignitaries and noblemen could demand further gifts from Niqmaddu and Niqmepa, neither on the occasion of the yearly visit paid by the king of Ugarit to the Hittite court in order to deliver his tribute, nor when Hittite representatives would visit the land of Ugarit as part of a diplomatic mission (CTH 47.A, 38–42 and CTH 65, 50–59; see Beckman 1999, 167, 176). Furthermore, these regulations did not preclude the exchange of gifts between high officials of both courts, as witnessed, e.g., by a letter of a Hittite “prince” (DUMU.-LUGAL) to the “prefect” (*sākinu*) of Ugarit (RSO 23 19: 13–16; Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 44–45).

tite kings and functionaries to the last three kings of Ugarit (Ibiranu, Niqmaddu III, and Ammurapi), who are repeatedly scolded for not having sent the expected gifts to the Hittite court,⁹⁶ show that these deliveries were regarded as part of the vassal's basic duties. From these letters it also clearly emerges that the viceroy of Karkemiš was considered the person ultimately responsible for the regular shipment of Ugarit's tribute to Hatti in the thirteenth century, and that the Hittite nobles could turn to him to complain about the inadequacy of their gifts.⁹⁷

Beside the goods explicitly required as tribute and gifts, Ugarit was expected to provide the Great King and the king of Karkemiš with other exotic products that it must have obtained through its international trade networks, such as lapis lazuli⁹⁸ and alum.⁹⁹ None of these texts mentions a price paid by the Hittites to obtain these goods, thus it can be assumed that they were simply expected as part of the vassal's obligations.¹⁰⁰

The imposition of a tribute is attested also for Alašiya (Cyprus), whose conquest dates to the last decades of the Hittite empire. According to the most plausible interpretation of the fragmentary historical text KBo 12.38+ (CTH 121),¹⁰¹ Tu-thaliya IV conquered the island and established a tribute consisting of gold, copper, and another product of elusive nature called *gayyātu*.¹⁰² As with Ugarit, we see that the composition of the tribute naturally reflects the vassal's main ex-

96 On the regular attempts by the last kings of Ugarit to shirk their obligations toward the Hittite suzerains and their representatives in Syria, see Devecchi 2019.

97 Singer 2006a, 245.

98 Compare the two letters sent by Takuḫli(nu), a representative of Ugarit at the court of Karkemiš, complaining to his master about the poor quality of the lapis lazuli he sent to Karkemiš (RS 17.383 and RS 17.422, PRU IV 221–225: see Singer 1999, 653–654; Devecchi 2019, 123), with the two parallel letters by the Great King and by Pendi-Šarruma, a very high-ranking official at the Hittite court, to Ammurapi of Ugarit, praising the excellent quality of his lapis lazuli (RSO 23 8–9; Devecchi 2019, 132).

99 Witnessed in a fragmentary letter of His Majesty to the king of Ugarit (RSO 23 1). Alum was the object of a lively trade between Ugarit and Emar; see, for example, the letters RSO 7 31–33, 36.

100 A possibly different scenario is attested by a letter sent by a private individual to his “brother” (perhaps his business partner), asking for lapis lazuli and linen garments for a messenger who was leaving for the Hittite territory (RSO 7 22): here, it is difficult to decide whether the goods were meant as gifts or as merchandise to be sold in Hatti.

101 Güterbock 1967; de Martino 2008; 2019, 286–287.

102 Perhaps cyperus, used to prepare “some kind of perfumed oil, an unguent or an incense named after one of the ingredients”; see Singer and Gestoso Singer 2014, 321–329, esp. 327–338.

port item, which in the case of Cyprus was copper.¹⁰³ Interestingly enough, the text indicates that the tribute's beneficiaries were the Sun Goddess of Arinna and the Hittite king as her high priest, and that the shipments were presented to four important deities of the kingdom (the Sun Goddess of Arinna herself and the Storm Gods of Zippalanda, Hatti, and Nerik), perhaps suggesting that they were stored in their temples.¹⁰⁴

The poor state of preservation of the only treaty between Hatti and Alašiya, concluded either by Tuthaliya IV or by his successor Šuppiluliuma II,¹⁰⁵ makes it impossible to say whether the agreement included a clause about tribute. A fragment of an Akkadian letter might also witness the request of precious goods from Alašiya in connection with the swearing of an oath, but it is not clear whether this message originated from Hatti or from Alašiya.¹⁰⁶ Finally, the already mentioned inventory texts record also linen fabrics and garments from Alašiya.¹⁰⁷

As mentioned above, the delivery of goods as tribute is never specified in the clauses of treaties with the Anatolian vassals, who were asked to contribute to the maintenance of the “imperial machine” with troops (see above § 4). However, the Extensive Annals of Muṣili II recall that the king imposed a tribute on the cities of Kapperi, Karaššuwa, and Hurna, located in the Kaška region north of Hattuša.¹⁰⁸ Interestingly, these towns were expected to deliver wine as tribute, which adds to the evidence about ancient wine production in this area.¹⁰⁹ The Annals do not indicate the purpose of this wine tribute, but here one should recall that agricultural products were collected from different areas of the empire in order to maintain the temples and cultic activities.¹¹⁰

In this context, one can also recall the text of an oracle that mentions the delivery of the “tribute of all lands” (KUR.KUR^{meš}-aš *arkammuš*) in connection with a festival that took place during the “time of abundance” (*iyataš meḥuni*),

103 The very conquest of Alašiya might have been triggered by the need for direct access to the island in order to ensure a regular supply of copper, despite the turmoil in the eastern Mediterranean Sea at the end of the Late Bronze Age (de Martino 2018, 35).

104 Singer and Gestoso Singer 2014, 321n17. On metals collected as *MADDATTU* and allocated to the temple workshops, see Siegelová 2019, 104.

105 KBo 12.39 (CTH 141): see Devecchi 2015a, 271–273 with reference to previous literature.

106 KBo 1.26 (CTH 216): see Knapp 1980; de Martino 2008, 250.

107 CTH 241.1 obv. 4 and CTH 241.2 i 5: Košak 1982, 4, 10; Siegelová 1986, 80–81, 410. It is not clear whether the Alašiyān origin of these linen products indicates that they were produced on the island, or rather “crafted in the ‘Alašiyān’ way”; see Vigo 2010, 291–293 and Singer and Gestoso Singer 2014, 318.

108 del Monte 1993, 123–124.

109 Corti 2017.

110 Siegelová 2019.

i. e., in autumn, suggesting that the annual arrival of the tribute at Hattuša could be celebrated in grand style.¹¹¹

5.2 Other Types of Contribution

Beside the delivery to the Hittite king of precious goods as tribute and compulsory gifts, the economic exploitation of the subjugated countries expressed itself also in other ways. For instance, in case of need Hatti could draw from the abundant agricultural production of northern Syria's fertile plains. This is witnessed by a famous letter originating from the Hittite court, which urges the king of Ugarit to provide a ship and a crew in order to transport a large quantity of grain from Mukiš to Ura, a port on the southeastern Anatolian coast.¹¹² The Akkadian letters from the House of Urtenu provide interesting new evidence about this topic, in particular regarding a delivery called *mānaḥ(ā)tu*, which seems to represent a contribution of food supplies occasionally requested from the kingdom of Ugarit.¹¹³

The most informative and best-preserved document is a message from the Hittite prince Taši, demanding that Ugarit's prefect (*sākinu*) send the *mānaḥ(ā)tu* he had promised to ship by boat from the town of Kināni; the delivery is urgent and necessary to literally "keep alive" the letter's writer (*bulliṭanni*), who commits himself to give back after the next harvest three times the amount that he will receive. Another letter says that the expected delivery consisted of 10 kor of wheat, while others provide further allusions to the cultivation of fields; thus, *mānaḥ(ā)tu* must have consisted of cereals and perhaps other types of agricultural products. Since

¹¹¹ KBo 18.133 (CTH 581): see Siegelová 2016, 436.

¹¹² RS 20.212 (Ug. 5 33): see also §4 above. Several hypotheses have been put forward about Ura's exact location, which remains controversial: see the overview in Beal 2015, 387. On Ura and its role in the regional trade network, see also §5.3 below.

¹¹³ See RSO 23 21 (Prince Taši to the *sākinu*), RSO 23 22 (a Hittite prince to king Niqmaddu), RSO 23 27 (Kulanamuwa to the king of Ugarit), RSO 23 81 (unknown sender to the *sākinu*), RSO 23 104 (sender and addressee not preserved), and RSO 23 107 (sender and addressee not preserved). The attestations of *mānaḥ(ā)tu* in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit are collected and briefly discussed by Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 48–49, who translate the term with the French "subsistences"; see McGeough 2020, 401, 410–411 for the possibly related Ugaritic term *mnḥ*. The word *mānaḥ(ā)tu* can have different meanings: the most famous Late Bronze Age occurrences are in the statue of Idrimi, where it is used to indicate "(loyal vassal) service" toward the king of Mittani (see most recently Lauinger 2019, 29–35); a similar meaning – "(good) service (towards an overlord)" – is attested also in the Emar land grant LN-104 (Cohen and Viano 2016; I thank R. Pruzsinszky for drawing my attention to this occurrence).

the request of *mānaḥ(ā)tu* is justified also in other letters as a way to avoid death by starvation (*ina bubūti mātu*), these statements might have been declarations of an actual state of need, rather than overdramatic figures of speech – for example, the expression “it’s a matter of life and death” (*mūtu/napultu napšātu*), which is often used in messages of this corpus.¹¹⁴

These texts convey the impression that the *mānaḥ(ā)tu*-supplies did not have to be delivered on a regular basis or meet a particular deadline but could be requested in case of need on the basis of the current good relations between the parties¹¹⁵ and even paid back in the future. As a matter of fact, a short and only partially preserved text sealed by Ini-Teššub of Karkemiš shows that *mānaḥ(ā)tu*-supplies could be exchanged in both directions and paid for in silver.¹¹⁶ However, a Hittite official uses terminology that explicitly refers to the realm of treaty obligations when he asks the king of Ugarit to deliver as soon as possible the “*mānaḥ(ā)tu*-supplies that His Majesty imposed (upon you)” (*mānaḥ(ā)ti Šamšu emda*), since “only His Majesty could release you” (*lū Šamšu untaššerakku*), but he will not (*lā umaššar*).

These new documents show that Ugarit functioned not only as a harbor that conveyed grain shipments from other Syrian vassals (e.g., Mukiš) or even from Egypt to Hatti,¹¹⁷ but also contributed directly to the provisioning of the Hittite government in Syria. However, as may be inferred from two of these letters, Ugarit probably tried to weasel out of these requests, in line with an attitude that is well attested in several documents dating to the last decades of its history, also with regard to the delivery of cereals.¹¹⁸

The abovementioned letter about the transportation of grain from Mukiš to Ura is relevant to this discourse too, because it contains a reference to the king of Ugarit being released from *ilku*-service, which might have corresponded to

114 Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat 2016, 22 (commentary to RSO 23 5, 15–16); see also RS 20.212, 33’ (Ug. 5 33) and RS 17.289, 20 (PRU IV 192).

115 See, for example, expressions such as “if there is friendship in your heart” (RSO 23 21, 17–18). This statement could be partly due to the rhetoric of friendship that is typical of this type of document, but it betrays nonetheless a different approach than the one used by the Great King or Hittite officials when they reprimanded the kings of Ugarit because they did not comply with their duties, i.e., here the emphasis is on the good terms, not on Ugarit’s subjugated status.

116 RS 19.55 (PRU IV 293, with important collations by Huehnergard 1986; see also Lackenbacher 2002, 175). It seems more likely that *mānaḥ(ā)tu* refers also here to some kind of supplies, rather than to “mutual loyalty” as suggested by Márquez Rowe 2006, 247n130.

117 Singer 1999, 715–719.

118 See in general Devecchi 2019, esp. 131 on the issue of grain and food shortages (with reference to previous literature).

the granting of an exemption from contributing troops to Hatti's military endeavors (see above, §4). However, the vassal service owed by the king of Ugarit toward the Great King did not consist only of military obligations, as is shown by a new attestation in a message of His Majesty to Niqmaddu III, saying: "Now, I sent you some wool to dye: do not object to the *ilku* and have that wool dyed quickly!"¹¹⁹ As we already saw (§5.1), the dye industry was a flourishing sector of Ugarit's economy; hence, this text shows that the Hittite king exploited the vassal's specialized manufacture not only by acquiring finished products as tribute and gifts, but also by including it among the *ilku*-services he had to perform.¹²⁰

The *ilku*-service was not exclusive to Ugarit. As we learn from a fragmentary Akkadian letter found at Hattuša and dating toward the end of the thirteenth century, Amurru too was expected to perform *ilku* and could be exempted from it.¹²¹ Unfortunately, the phrasing of the letter is too vague to allow a hypothesis about the nature of Amurru's duty, but the passage is nevertheless important evidence of a system that applied to different vassals.

A different perspective on the obligations and taxes imposed on the subjugated territories is offered by the documents from Emar. The peculiar mixed policy of direct and indirect control adopted by the Hittites in this part of the empire (see above §3) is witnessed also by the imposition of services on members of the local elite who collaborated closely with the Hittite administration and were granted real estate in return.¹²² The terminology used to indicate these obligations – *ilku*, GIŠ.TUKUL, *šaḥḥan*, and *luzzi* – is a clear reflection of the taxation system used within Hatti¹²³ and attests to the enforcement of this system in the Syrian provinces. Usually, the documents are not explicit about the nature of these obligations, which could have been "fulfilled either by military service or by work on building projects or the like, rather than by agricultural responsibilities."¹²⁴

119 RSO 23 7, 4–9.

120 The manufacturing of products is attested as an *ilku*-service also in Ugarit's inner taxation system (McGeough 2020, 401, 403).

121 KUB 3.56 (CTH 208): see §5.1 above.

122 See most recently Pruzsinszky 2020, 386–391.

123 See Klinger's essay on the Hittite economy in this volume.

124 Fleming 2003, 882.

5.3 Trade

It has been suggested that the sparseness of information about international trade practices in the Hittite texts reflects a minimal engagement in foreign trade, due to the fact that the Hittite kingdom gained access to important resources from neighboring countries by other means, namely by incorporating them as tributaries (see above §§5.1–5.2).¹²⁵

As a matter of fact, trade is even less prominent than tribute in the Hittite treaties. With the exception of the Middle Hittite agreements with the Kaška tribes,¹²⁶ the only treaty that deals with trade-related issues is the one imposed by Tuthaliya IV on Šaušgamuwa of Amurru (CTH 105). Here, the Hittite king forbids his vassal to send merchants to Assyria and likewise to allow any Assyrian merchant to enter Amurru.¹²⁷ This commercial embargo can be seen as part of the Hittite efforts to damage Assyria by limiting its trade networks at a time when the two Great Powers were at loggerheads because of Assyria's expansionist aims in southeastern Anatolia, but the embargo might also have been initiated to hamper contacts between Amurru and Assyria out of fear that the two countries might forge a dangerous alliance against the Hittites.¹²⁸

However, the absence of clauses specifically devoted to trade in the treaties does not mean that the Hittite kings were not interested in fostering trade in the subjugated countries and exploiting the vassals' commercial networks to their own advantage.¹²⁹ This is clearly shown, for instance, by a number of texts from Ugarit that record several instances of Hittite intervention aiming at regulating and safeguarding the activities of Hittite merchants in Syria.¹³⁰ In many cases, they deal with merchants from the harbor of Ura, who carried out vigorous

125 Klengel 1979, 70; Hoffner 2001, 180.

126 These texts include provisions that regulate the activities of Kaška merchants within Hittite territory. See Klengel 1979, 72–73 and Hoffner 2001, 183.

127 CTH 105 §13' (Devecchi 2015a, 230; see §11 in Beckman 1999, 59). The same text also includes the famous injunction against letting any ship of Ahhiyawa reach the Assyrian king, a ban that might have had either commercial or military purposes; see Devecchi 2010b and Beckman et al. 2011, 68. For a recent analysis of its possible implication for the reconstruction of Mycenaean trade networks, see Jung 2015, 256, 263.

128 On this embargo and its historical context, see the previous footnote and Devecchi 2010b with reference to previous literature; on Amurru's history of alternating loyalty with treachery, see Devecchi 2012b.

129 See Klengel 1979; Hoffner 2001; Bryce 2002, 87–97.

130 See the overview and the texts collected in Lackenbacher 2002, 144–167, with additional sources discussed here.

trade in Ugarit.¹³¹ The most informative and famous document is an edict issued by Hattušili III in response to a complaint of Niqmepa of Ugarit, preserved in at least four copies which record two slightly different versions found in the palace archives and in the House of Urtenu (CTH 93).¹³² It seems that the problem laid in the merchants' great economic power and that – to use Niqmepa's words – the men of Ura had become a "heavy burden" upon his land. Hattušili reacted by decreeing that the merchants of Ura could not buy real estate in Ugarit nor seize it in fulfillment of debt obligations; on the other hand, he allowed Ugari-tians and their families to enter into service with the merchants of Ura if they were unable to pay their debts. Furthermore, Hattušili stipulated that the merchants must carry out their business at Ugarit only during the summer and ordered them to return to their homes in the winter season.¹³³

The difficult coexistence of the population of Ugarit with the merchants of Ura – sometimes identified as "merchants of His Majesty," an indication that they were working at least in part for the Hittite crown – is witnessed also by a number of lawsuits concerning matters such as the restitution of stolen goods.¹³⁴

Theft was only one of the risks that Hittite merchants had to face in Syria. The town of Apsuna was often the scene of crimes against them.¹³⁵ At least

131 Lemaire 1993; Klengel 2007.

132 This fact probably testifies to the importance of the decree (Singer 1999, 660–661). The quasi-duplicate from the House of Urtenu (RS 34.179 = RSO 7 1) also mentions merchants from the Anatolian town of Kutupa.

133 The prohibition of residing at Ugarit during the winter period could have been intended to limit the merchant's influence, to forbid the exportation of grain during a time of year that could be critical for local supplies, or simply to prevent sailing when the weather conditions were not favorable. See Beckman 1999, 177 and McGeough 2019, 205–206.

134 RS 17.319 (PRU IV, 182–183). Other lawsuits where "men of Ura" appear as witnesses are recorded by the two fragmentary tablets RS 17.316 (PRU IV 190, here identified as "merchants of His Majesty") and RS 18.20 + RS 17.371 (PRU IV 203–204). The latter, which involves also Niq-maddu III of Ugarit, was judged by Zuzulli, *kartappu* of the king of Karkemiš; on this functionary, who appears also in other contemporary documents, see D'Alfonso 2005, 77–78; Bilgin 2018, 144–145, 331–332; Devecchi 2019, 127. In my opinion, it is quite likely that this lawsuit is connected with the matters discussed in the letters RSO 23 3–4, sent by the Great King to Niqmaddu III.

135 Apsuna was a town of some importance located probably in the northeast of Ugarit's territory, at the border with Mukiš (van Soldt 2005, 107); an identification with Tell Afis (Astour 1995, 58, 68) has been recently rejected (Archi and Venturi 2012, 45n7). According to D'Alfonso, the texts suggest that Apsuna might have alternated between periods of subjugation to Ugarit and periods of partial autonomy or subjugation to other local kingdoms (D'Alfonso 2005, 164n597).

two juridical documents attest the murder of merchants there,¹³⁶ while the Hittite prince Taši complains in a letter about merchants of the king (of Karkemiš) being “cut off” in Apsuna and orders Ugarit’s prefect (*sākinu*) to return their equipment to them (RSO 23 19).

The murder of merchants was a frequent issue that required the king of Karkemiš to intervene in lawsuits¹³⁷ and even led to the issuing of an edict by Ini-Teššub, who defined the procedure to be followed in the event that merchants in the service of the king of Ugarit or of the king of Karkemiš were murdered in each other’s territory; notably, the edict establishes the same amount of silver as compensation for the death of a merchant, regardless of his origin.¹³⁸

Hittite authorities often also intervened in order to ensure that merchants were exempted from paying taxes on the goods they traded. This is witnessed by several letters addressed by high officials of the Hittite administration in Syria mainly to Ugarit’s prefect (*sākinu*), demanding that the *miksu*-tax not be extracted from merchants and other individuals who were travelling to Ugarit in order to carry out their business there.¹³⁹ It is important to note that all of these messages announce the impending arrival of these persons at Ugarit; this reinforces the assumption that, in the context of long distance trade, the *miksu*-tax represented some kind of customs tax or toll levied by the king of Ugarit on imported goods.¹⁴⁰

136 Witnessed by a lawsuit judged by the Great King (RS 17.229, PRU IV 106) and by a juridical act whose exact nature is unclear, due to its fragmentary state of preservation (RS 17.69 +⁷ RS 17.369 A, PRU IV 239–240: see the remarks by D’Alfonso 2005, 46).

137 See RS 17.158 together with RS 17.42 (PRU IV 169–171) about the murder of merchants of Tarhuntašša, and RS 17.145 (PRU IV 172–173) about the murder of merchants in the service of a certain Aballa. As noted by Singer, the reference to the “merchants of the King of Tarhuntašša” proves that there was a distinction between Hatti and Tarhuntašša, but nothing indicates a tension between merchants of the two countries, both operating from the port of Ura (Singer 1996, 65n8). See also the next footnote.

138 RS 17.146 (PRU IV 154–156); for a general discussion of the procedures to be followed in the case of murder – often involving merchants – see D’Alfonso 2005, 158–166.

139 See RS 15.33 (PRU III 15–16, Hešmi-Kušuh to the *sākinu*), RS 17.78 (PRU IV 196–197, Ebina’e to the *sākinu*), RSO 14 7 (conveying a request of the *tuppalanuru*), and RSO 23 20 (prince Taši to the *sākinu* UN.ZI); RSO 23 37 also belongs to this group, but sender and addressee are not preserved. The letter RSO 7 9 records the involvement of the king of Karkemiš and of the queen of Ugarit in issues related to the payment of the *miksu*-tax.

140 On the *miksu*-tax in connection with trade at Ugarit, see most recently McGeough 2020, 408–409 (with discussion of some of the texts mentioned in the previous footnote). Complaints about the exaction of a toll on traded goods reached Ugarit also from other regions; see, for example, the letters RS 17.039+ (PRU IV 219–220, from the king of Amqu to the *sākinu*) and RSO 23 82 (from a high official of a foreign country to Uzzēnu).

The already amply attested involvement of the king of Karkemiš in matters related to trade is now further confirmed by a recently published Akkadian letter of His Majesty to Niqmaddu III, who is urged to present himself at the court of Karkemiš to confer about an important and problematic, but unfortunately not better specified matter concerning the “House of the King (of Karkemiš)” and Niqmaddu’s trade business that required the approval of the king of Karkemiš.¹⁴¹

These cases serve as examples to illustrate the kind of interest and control exercised by the Hittites over trade carried out in a subjugated country. But they also show that Hittite merchants did not enjoy by default a privileged status simply because they worked under the aegis of the Great King, but that this status was obtained because the Hittite authorities actively undertook a series of initiatives, sometimes prompted by specific situations, in order to protect the merchants and favor them in commerce, often trumping the authority of the king of Ugarit.

List of Tables

Tab. 6.1: Letters dated to the last decades of the thirteenth century that record requests for troops from Ugarit.

Tab. 6.2: The composition of Ugarit’s tribute as recorded on three separate occasions in CTH 48, CTH 47, and CTH 65.

References

- Akkermans, Peter M.M.G., and Frans A.M. Wiggermann, 2015: “West of Aššur: The Life and Times of the Middle Assyrian Dunnu at Tell Sabi Abyad, Syria,” in *Understanding Hegemonic Practices of the Early Assyrian Empire: Essays Dedicated to Frans Wiggermann*, Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 125, ed., Bleda S. Düring (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten), 89–123.
- Archi, Alfonso, 1980: “Materiale epigrafico ittita da Tell Fray,” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 22: 31–34.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Fabrizio Venturi, 2012: “Hittites at Tell Afis (Syria),” *Orientalia Nova Series* 81: 1–55.
- Archi, Alfonso, and Fabrizio Venturi, 2013: “Tell Afis in the Thirteenth Century B.C.E. under the Rule of the Hittites,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 76: 214–22.

¹⁴¹ RSO 23 3; one wonders whether this urgent issue might have been connected with the events that led to a lawsuit that involved Niqmaddu III and some “men of Ura” (RS 18.20 + RS 17.371): see n134 above.

- Arnaud, Daniel, 2001: "Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: Textes de la 'Maison d'Ourtenou' trouvés en 1986, 1988 et 1992," in *Études ougaritiques I Travaux, 1985–1995*, Ras Shamra-Ougarit 14, eds, Marguerite Yon and Daniel Arnaud. (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations), 235–415.
- Astour, Michael, 1995: "La topographie du royaume d'Ougarit," in *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.*, Ras Shamra-Ougarit 11, eds, Marguerite Yon, Maurice Sznycer, and Pierre Bordreuil (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations), 55–71.
- Balza, Maria Elena, 2008: "I trattati ittiti. Sigillatura, testimoni, collocazione," in *I diritti del mondo cuneiforme (Mesopotamia e regioni adiacenti, ca. 2500–500 a.C.)*, eds, Mario Liverani and Clelia Mora (Pavia: IUSS Press), 387–418.
- Balza, Maria Elena, 2012: "Sealed Tablets from Hattuša," in *Archivi, depositi, magazzini presso gli Ittiti / Archives, Depots and Storehouses in the Hittite World: Proceedings of the Workshop held at Pavia, June 18, 2009*, Studia Mediterranea 23, eds, Maria Elena Balza, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora (Pavia: Italian University Press), 77–110.
- Beal, Richard, 2015: "Ura A," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 14: 386–88.
- Beckman, Gary, 1989–1990: Review of *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*, by Heinrich Otten, *Die Welt des Orients* 20–21: 289–93.
- Beckman, Gary, 1992: "Hittite Administration in Syria in the Light of the Texts from Hattuša, Ugarit and Emar," in *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*, Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 25, eds, Mark W. Chavalas and John L. Hayes (Malibu: Undena Publications), 41–49.
- Beckman, Gary, 1995: "Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria. The View from Maşat and Emar," in *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Studia Mediterranea 9, eds, Onofrio Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora (Pavia: Gianni Luculano Editore), 19–37.
- Beckman, Gary, 1999: *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Beckman, Gary, 2003: "International Law in the Second Millennium: Late Bronze Age," in *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/72, ed., Raymond Westbrook (Leiden: Brill), 753–774.
- Beckman, Gary, 2019: "Hatti's Treaties with Carchemish," in *<<And I Knew Twelve Languages>>: A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, eds, Natalia Bolatti Guzzo and Piotr Taracha (Warsaw: Agade), 32–42.
- Beckman, Gary, Trevor Bryce, and Eric H. Cline, 2011: *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Bilgin, Tayfun, 2018: *Officials and Administration in the Hittite World*, Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 21 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Bordreuil, Pierre, 1991: *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville*, Ras Shamra-Ougarit 7 (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations).
- Bordreuil, Pierre, and Dennis Pardee, 2001: "Épigraphie et structure dans les textes administratifs en langue ougaritique: les exemples de RS 6.216 et RS 19.017," *Orientalia Nova Series* 70: 235–82.
- Brown, Micaheel, 2020: *Carchemish and the Hittite Empire in the Middle Euphrates Valley, in New Agendas in Remote Sensing and Landscape Archaeology in the Near East: Studies in Honor of Tony J. Wilkinson*, eds, Dan Lawrence, Mark Altaweel, and Graham Philip (Chicago: Archaeopress), 187–201.

- Bryce, Trevor, 1986: "The Boundaries of Hatti and Hittite Border Policy," *Tel Aviv* 13–14: 85–102.
- Bryce, Trevor, 2002: *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Bryce, Trevor, 2011: "Hittite State and Society," in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, eds, Hermann Genz and Dirk P. Mielke (Leuven: Peeters), 85–97.
- Çakırlar, Canan, Lionel Gourichon, Suzanne P. Birch, Rémi Berthon, Murat Akar, and K. Aslıhan Yener, 2014: "Provisioning an Urban Center under Foreign Occupation: Zooarchaeological Insights into the Hittite Presence in Late Fourteenth-Century BCE Alalakh," *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies* 2: 259–276.
- Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva, 1996: *Die mittellassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad*, Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēḫ Hamad/Dūr Katlimmu 4 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Cohen, Yoram, 2013: "Problems in the History and Chronology of Emar," *KASKAL* 10: 281–94.
- Cohen, Yoram, 2016: "Scribal Traditions of Late Bronze Age Emar," in *Cultures and Societies in the Middle Euphrates and Habur Areas in the Second Millennium BC – I. Scribal Education and Scribal Traditions*, *Studia Chaburiensia* 5, eds, Daisuke Shibata and Shigeo Yamada (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 119–131.
- Cohen, Yoram, 2017: "The Historical Geography of Hittite Syria: Phylology," in *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, eds, Mark Weeden and Lee Z. Ullmann (Leiden: Brill), 295–310.
- Cohen, Yoram, 2019: "Forging an Empire: The Land of Aštata According to the Šattiwaza Treaty (CTH 51) and Additional Sources," in *De l'argile au numérique: Mélanges assyriologiques en l'honneur de Dominique Charpin*, eds, Grégory Chambon, Michaël Guichard, and Anne-Isabelle Langlois (Leuven: Peeters), 279–298.
- Cohen, Yoram, and Netanel Anor, 2019: "Forging an Empire: The Borders of Carchemish According to CTH 51 (KUB 19.27)," in *talugaeš witteš: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, eds, Michele Cammarosano, Elena Devecchi, and Maurizio Viano (Münster: Zaphon-Verlag), 71–79.
- Cohen, Yoram, and Eduardo Torrecilla, 2020: "Forging an Empire: The Borders of the Land of Karkemiš According to the Treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Šattiwaza," *Tel Aviv* 47: 193–207.
- Cohen, Yoram, and Maurizio Viano, 2016: "A Land-grant Document from Emar: A (re-)Edition and Discussion of LN-104 (AKA Gs-Kutscher 6)," *KASKAL* 13: 57–71.
- Cordani, Violetta, 2017: *Lettere fra Egiziani e Ittiti* (Brescia: Paideia).
- Corti, Carlo, 2017: "Wine and Vineyards in the Hittite Kingdom: A Case Study of Northern Anatolia and the Southern Black Sea Coast," in *Of Vines and Wines: The Production and Consumption of Wine in Anatolian Civilizations through the Ages*, ed., Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (Leuven: Peeters), 41–60.
- D'Alfonso, Lorenzo, 2005: *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a.C.)*, *Studia Mediterranea* 17 (Pavia: Italian University Press).
- D'Alfonso, Lorenzo, 2008: "Talmi-šarruma Judge? Some Thoughts on the Jurisdiction of the Kings of Aleppo during the Hittite Empire," *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49: 159–69.
- D'Alfonso, Lorenzo, 2010: "'Servant of the king, son of Ugarit, and servant of the servant of the king': RS 17.238 and the Hittites," in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, *Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* 51, eds, Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, and Jared L. Miller (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 67–86.

- D'Alfonso, Lorenzo, 2011: "Seeking a Political Space: Thoughts on the Formative Stage of Hittite Administration in Syria," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38: 163–76.
- D'Alfonso, Lorenzo, 2014: "The Kingdom of Tarhuntašša: A Reassessment of its Timeline and Political Significance," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw 2011*, eds. Piotr Taracha and Magdalena Kapeluś (Warsaw: Agade), 216–235.
- de Martino, Stefano, 1999: "Ura and the Boundaries of Tarhuntašša," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 26: 291–300.
- de Martino, Stefano, 2008: "Relations between Hatti and Alašiya, according to Textual and Archaeological Evidence," in *Hattuša – Boğazköy: Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients. 6 Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 22–24 März 2006*, ed., Gernot Wilhelm (Würzburg: Harrassowitz), 247–263.
- de Martino, Stefano, 2010: "Symbols of Power in the Late Hittite Kingdom," in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 51, eds. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, and Jared L. Miller (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 87–98.
- de Martino, Stefano, 2018: "The Fall of the Hittite Kingdom," *Mesopotamia* 53: 23–48.
- de Martino, Stefano, 2019: "Review of *Hethitische Texte in Transkription*, KBo 12 (DBH 50), by Giulia Torri and Francesco G. Barsacchi; and, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription*, KBo 13 (DBH 51), by Giulia Torri and Francesco G. Barsacchi," in *Orientalia Nova Series* 88: 285–87.
- del Monte, Giuseppe F., 1993: *L'annalistica ittita* (Brescia: Paideia).
- del Monte, Giuseppe F., 2008: *Le "Gesta di Šuppiluliuma": L'opera storiografica di Muršili II re di Hattusa* (Pisa: Edizioni Plus).
- Démare-Lafont, Sophie, and Daniel E. Fleming, 2015: "Emar Chronology and Scribal Streams: Cosmopolitanism and Legal Diversity," *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 109: 45–77.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2010a: "'We Are All Descendants of Šuppiluliuma' – The Aleppo Treaty Reconsidered," *Die Welt des Orients* 40: 1–27.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2010b: "Amurru between Hatti, Assyria, and Aḫḫiyawa. Discussing a Recent Hypothesis," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 100: 242–56.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2012a: "Treaties and Edicts in the Hittite World," in *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg, 21–25 July 2008*, ed., Gernot Wilhelm (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 637–645.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2012b: "Aziru, Servant of Three Masters?," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39: 38–48.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2013a: "(Re-)defining the Corpus of the Hittite Treaties," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 19: 89–98.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2013b: "Šuppiluliuma's Syrian Campaigns in Light of the Documents from Ugarit," in *New Results and New Questions on the Reign of Šuppiluliuma I*, Eothen 19, eds. Stefano de Martino and Jared L. Miller (Florence: LoGisma), 81–97.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2015a: *Trattati internazionali ittiti* (Brescia: Paideia).
- Devecchi, Elena, 2015b: "Missing Treaties of the Hittites," *KASKAL* 12: 156–82.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2015c: "The International Relations of Hatti's Syrian Vassals, or How to Make the Best of Things," in *Policies of Exchange. Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E.*, Oriental and

- European Archaeology 2, eds, Birgitta Eder and Regine Pruzsinszky (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), 117–126.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2017: “The Eastern Frontier of the Hittite Empire,” in *At the Northern Frontier of Near Eastern Archaeology*, Subartu 38, eds, Elena Rova and Monica Tonussi (Turnhout: Brepols), 283–297.
- Devecchi, Elena, 2019: “A Reluctant Servant: Ugarit under Foreign Rule during the Late Bronze Age,” in *A Stranger in the House – The Crossroads III: Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*, eds, Jana Mynářová, Marwan Kilani, and Sergio Alivernini (Prague: Charles University), 121–136.
- Dietrich, Manfred, and Walter Mayer, 1999: “The Hurrian and Hittite Texts,” in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/39, eds, Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (Leiden: Brill), 58–75.
- Diñçol, Ali, et al., 2000: “The Borders of the Appanage Kingdom of Tarhuntašša – A Geographical and Archaeological Assessment,” *Anatolica* 26: 1–19.
- Düring, Bleda S., 2020: *The Imperialisation of Assyria: An Archaeological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Edel, Elmar, 1994: *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- Faist, Betina, 2002: “Die Rechtsordnung in Syrien nach der hethitischen Eroberung: Wandel und Kontinuität,” in *Brückenland Anatolien? Ursachen, Extensität und Modi des Kulturaustausches zwischen Anatolien und seinen Nachbarn*, eds, Hartmut Blum, Betina Faist, Peter Pfälzner, and A.-M. Wittke (Tübingen: Attempto), 129–146.
- Faist, Betina, and Uwe Finkbeiner, 2002: “Emar: Eine syrische Stadt unter hethitischer Herrschaft,” in *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich: Volk der 1000 Götter*, ed., AAVV (Bonn: Theiss), 190–195.
- Faist, Betina, et al., 2009: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (4),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 41: 181–91.
- Faist, Betina, et al., 2011: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (5),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 43: 99–116.
- Faist, Betina, et al., 2014: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (6),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 45: 95–110.
- Faist, Betina, et al., 2016: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (7),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 47: 53–68.
- Faist, Betina, Juan-Pablo Vita, and Josué Javier Justel Vicente, 2003: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 35: 191–230.
- Faist, Betina, Juan-Pablo Vita, and Josué Javier Justel Vicente, 2005: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (2),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 37: 1–11.
- Faist, Betina, Juan-Pablo Vita, and Josué Javier Justel Vicente, 2008: “Bibliografía de los estudios de Emar (3),” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 39: 141–60.
- Fink, Amir S., 2010: *Late Bronze Age Tell Atchana (Alalakh): Stratigraphy, Chronology, History* (Oxford: Archaeopress).
- Fleming, Daniel E., 2003: Review of *Late Hittite Emar: The Chronology, Synchronisms, and Socio-Political Aspects of a Late Bronze Age Fortress Town*, by Murray Adamthwaite, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123: 880–883.

- Fleming, Daniel E., and Sophie Démare-Lafont, 2009: "Tablet Terminology at Emar: 'Conventional' and 'Free Format'," *Aula Orientalis* 27: 19–26.
- Freu, Jacques, 1999: "La fin d'Ugarit et de l'empire hittite. Données nouvelles et chronologie," *Semitica* 48: 17–39.
- Freu, Jacques, 2000: "Ugarit et les puissances à l'époque amarnienne," *Semitica* 50: 9–38.
- Freu, Jacques, 2006: *Histoire politique du royaume d'Ugarit* (Paris: L'Harmattan).
- Genz, Hermann, 2006: "Hethitische Präsenz im spätbronzezeitlichen Syrien: die archäologische Evidenz," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 37: 499–509.
- Genz, Hermann, 2011: "Foreign Contacts of the Hittites," in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, eds, Hermann Genz and Dirk P. Mielke (Leuven: Peeters), 301–331.
- Gerçek, İlgi, 2017: "Approaches to Hittite Imperialism: A View from the 'Old Kingdom' and 'Early Empire' Periods (c. 1650–1350 BCE)," in *Innovation versus Beharrung: Was macht den Unterschied des hethitischen Reichs im Anatolien des 2. Jahrtausends v. chr.?*, BYZAS 23, ed., Andreas Schachner (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları), 21–38.
- Giorgieri, Mauro, and Clelia Mora, 2012: "Luxusgüter als Symbole der Macht. Zur Verwaltung der Luxusgüter im Hethiter-Reich," in *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg, 20–25 July 2008*, ed., Gernot Wilhelm (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 647–664.
- Glatz, Claudia, 2009: "Empire as Network: Spheres of Material Interaction in Late Bronze Age Anatolia," *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 28: 127–141.
- Glatz, Claudia, 2013: "Negotiating Empire. A Comparative Investigation into the Responses to Hittite Imperialism by the Vassal State of Ugarit and the Kaska Peoples of the Anatolian Black Sea Region," in *Empires and Complexity: On the Crossroads of Archaeology, History and Anthropology*, ed., Gregory Areshian (Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press at UCLA), 21–56.
- Glatz, Claudia, 2020: *The Making of Empire in Bronze Age Anatolia: Hittite Sovereign Practice, Resistance, and Negotiation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Glatz, Claudia and Roger Matthews, 2005: "Anthropology of a Frontier Zone: Hittite-Kaska Relations in Late Bronze Age North-Central Anatolia," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 339: 47–65.
- Goetze, Albrecht, 1933: *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 38 (Leipzig: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Gromova, Daria, 2007: "Hittite Role in Political History of Syria in the Amarna Age Reconsidered," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 39: 277–309.
- Güterbock, Hans G., 1967: "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26: 73–81.
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine, 1989a: *Die Korrespondenz der Hethitern I. Teil*, Texte der Hethiter 15 (Heidelberg: Winter-Verlag).
- Hagenbuchner, Albertine, 1989b: *Die Korrespondenz der Hethitern II. Teil*, Texte der Hethiter 16 (Heidelberg: Winter-Verlag).
- Hawkins, John D., 1998: "Tarkasnawa King of Mira. 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy Sealings and Karamel," *Anatolian Studies* 48: 1–31.
- Heltzer, Michael, 2003: "New Evidence about Tribute from Ugarit to the Hittite King (KTU 4.610 and RS 92.2001 + 92.2002)," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 35: 239–242.

- Herbordt, Susanne, 2005: *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa Boğazköy-Hattuša 19* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern Verlag).
- Hoffner, Harry A., 2001: "Some Thoughts on Merchants and Trade in the Hittite Kingdom," *Kulturgeschichte: Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds, Thomas Richter, Doris Prechel, and Jörg Klinger (Saarbrücken: Harrassowitz), 179–189.
- Hoffner, Harry A., 2009: *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom* (Atlanta Society of Biblical Literature).
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J., 1994: "Urhi-Teššub Revisited," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 51: 233–59.
- Huehnergard, John, 1986: "RS 15.86 (PRU 3, 51f.)," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18: 453.
- Jakob, Stefan, 2003: "Diplomaten in Assur – Alltag oder Anzeichen für eine internationale Krise?," *Isimu* 6: 103–14.
- Jakob, Stefan, 2009: *Die mittellassyrischen Texte aus Tell Chuēra in Nordost-Syrien* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Jung, Reinhard, 2015: "Imported Mycenaean Pottery in the East: Distribution, Context and Interpretation," in *Policies of Exchange: Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E.*, Oriental and European Archaeology 2, eds, Birgitta Eder and Regine Pruzsinszky (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), 243–275.
- Klengel, Horst, 1963: "Der Schiedsspruch des Muršili II hinsichtlich Barga und seine Übereinkunft mit Duppi-Tešup von Amurru," *Orientalia Nova Series* 32: 32–55.
- Klengel, Horst, 1979: "Handel und Kaufleute im hethitischen Reich," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6: 69–80.
- Klengel, Horst, 1996: Review of *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: Les textes de la 34^e campagne*, edited by Pierre Bordreuil; and *Le pays d'Ougarit de 1200 av. J.-C.*, eds, Marguerite Yon, Maurice Sznyczer, and Pierre Bordreuil, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 91: 558–562.
- Klengel, Horst, 2001a: "Einige Bemerkungen zu hethitischen Herrschaftsordnung in Syrien," in *Akten des IV Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 45, ed., Gernot Wilhelm (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 255–271.
- Klengel, Horst, 2001b: "Nochmals zur Rolle der Herrscher von Ḫalab und Karkamiš in der hethitischen Großreichszeit," in *Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds, Thomas Richter, Doris Prechel, and Jörg Klinger (Saarbrücken: Harrassowitz), 191–196.
- Klengel, Horst, 2007: "Ura, Ugarit und der hethitischen Mittelmeerhandel," in *VITA: Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, eds, Metin Alparslan, Meltem Doğan Alparslan, and Hasan Peker (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları), 383–388.
- Klengel, Horst, 2009: "Šarri-Kušuḫ," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12: 78–79.
- Kloekhorst, Alvin, 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden: Brill).
- Knapp, A. Bernard, 1980: "KBo 1 26: Alašiya and Hatti," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 32: 43–47.
- Korn, Evelyn, and Jürgen Lorenz, 2013: "Staatsverträge der Bronzezeit: Lizenzen zur Bereicherung?," *Die Welt des Orients* 44: 57–75.

- Korošec, Viktor, 1931: *Hethitische Staatsverträge: Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung*, (Leipzig: T. Weicher).
- Košak, Silvin, 1982: *Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241–250)*, Texte der Hethiter 10 (Heidelberg: Winter-Verlag).
- Kozal, Ekin, and Mirko Novák, 2007: “Geschenke, Tribute und Handelswaren im Hethiterreich,” in *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute: Antike Abgabenformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, eds, Hilmar Klinkott, Sabine Kubisch, and Renate Müller-Wollermann (Leiden: Brill), 323–346.
- Kühne, Cord, and Heinrich Otten, 1971: *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag* Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie, 2002: *Textes akkadiens d’Ugarit*, Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 20. (Paris: Les éditions du cerf).
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie, and Florence Malbran-Labat, 2005: “Ugarit et les Hittites dans les archives de la ‘Maison d’Urtēnu’,” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 47: 227–240.
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie, and Florence Malbran-Labat, 2007: “A propos d’un rituel mentionné dans des lettres envoyées à Ugarit,” *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2007: 45.
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie, and Florence Malbran-Labat, 2016: *Lettres en akkadien de la “Maison d’Urtēnu”*: Fouilles de 1994, Ras Shamra-Ugarit 23 (Leuven: Peeters).
- Lauinger, Jacob, 2019: “Discourse and Meta-Discourse in the Statue of Idrimi and its Inscription,” *Maarav* 1: 19–38.
- Lebrun, Charlotte, 2014: *Présence et pouvoir hittites à Ougarit: Le cas des DUMU.LUGAL* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Lemaire, André, 1993: “Ougarit, Oura et la Cilicie vers la fin du XIII^e s. av. J.-C.,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 25: 227–36.
- Liverani, Mario, 1990: *Prestige and Interest: International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600–1100 B.C.* History of the ancient Near East/Studies 1 (Padua: Sargon).
- Lorenz, Jürgen, 2020: “Empire Period Hatti—Tax Haven in the Late Bronze Age,” in *Economic Complexity in the Ancient Near East: Management of Resources and Taxation (Third–Second Millennium BC)*, eds, Jana Mynářová and Sergio Alivernini (Prague: Charles University), 437–444.
- Lorenz, Jürgen, and Ingo Schrakamp, 2014: “‘Our Master! Do not destroy us!’ The fate and role of non-combatants in the wars of the Hittites,” in *The Other Face of the Battle: The Impact of War on Civilians in the Ancient Near East*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 372, eds, Davide Nadali and Jordi Vidal (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 37–64.
- Manuelli, Federico, 2012: “Gli Hittiti e Malitiya. Riflessioni e confronti sul materiale ceramico del periodo hittita imperiale di Arslantepe,” in *Studi di Archeologia del Vicino Oriente: Scritti degli allievi fiorentini per Paolo Emilio Pecorella*, ed., Stefania Mazzoni (Florence: Firenze University Press), 163–184.
- Manuelli, Federico, 2017: “Hatti and the East. A reassessment of the archaeological evidence from the Upper Euphrates Region: places, spaces and artifacts,” in *Places and Spaces in Hittite Anatolia I: Hatti and the East, Proceedings of an International Workshop on Hittite Historical Geography in Istanbul, 25th–26th October 2013*, ed., Metin Alparslan (Istanbul: Turkish Institute of Archaeology), 137–158.
- Manuelli, Federico, 2020. “The Dawn and Demise of Imperial Impact – Tell Atchana vs. Arslantepe in the Framework of the Hittite Expansion and Dissolution,” in *Alalakh and*

- Its Neighbours: Proceedings of the 15th Anniversary Symposium at the New Hatay Archaeology Museum, 10–12 June 2015*, eds, K. Aslihan Yener and Tara Ingman (Leuven: Peeters), 317–341.
- Marizza, Marco, 2009: *Lettere ittite di re e dignitari* (Brescia: Paideia).
- Márquez Rowe, Ignacio, 2006: *The Royal Deeds of Ugarit*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 335, (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
- Matessi, Alvise, 2015: “Territorial Administration in Alalah during Level IV,” in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome, 4–8 July 2011*, ed., Alfonso Archi (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 398–408.
- Matessi, Alvise, 2016: “The Making of Hittite Imperial Landscapes: Territoriality and Balance of Power in South-Central Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 3: 117–162.
- Matoïan, Valérie, and Juan-Pablo Vita, 2009: “Les textiles à Ougarit: Perspectives de la recherche,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 41: 469–504.
- McGeough, Kevin, 2019: “‘The Men of Ura Are a Heavy Burden Upon Your Subject!’: The Administration and Management of Strangers and Foreigners in Ugarit,” in *A Stranger in the House – The Crossroads III: Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*, eds, Jana Mynářová, Marwan Kilani and Sergio Alivernini (Prague: Charles University), 197–220.
- McGeough, Kevin, 2020: “Taxation and Management of Resources at Ugarit,” in *Economic Complexity in the Ancient Near East: Management of Resources and Taxation (Third–Second Millennium BC)*, eds, Jana Mynářová and Sergio Alivernini (Prague: Charles University), 399–418.
- Melchert, H. Craig, 2007: “The Borders of Tarhuntašša Revisited,” in *VITA: Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, eds, Metin Alparslan, Meltem Doğan Alparslan, and Hasan Peker (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları), 507–513.
- Millard, Alan, 2010: “The Cuneiform Tablets from Tell Nebi Mend,” *Levant* 42: 226–36.
- Miller, Jared L., 2006: “Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (1–10),” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 96: 235–41.
- Miller, Jared L., 2007: “Muršili II’s Dictate to Tuppi-Teššub’s Syrian Antagonists,” *KASKAL* 4: 122–52.
- Mora, Clelia, 2006: “Riscossione dei tributi e accumulo dei beni nell’impero ittita,” in *Fiscality in Mycenaean and Near Eastern Archives*, ed, Massimo Perna (Paris: De Boccard), 133–146.
- Mora, Clelia, and Mauro Giorgieri, 2004: *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Hattuša* History of the ancient Near East/Monographs 7 (Padua: Sargon).
- Niedorf, Christian, 2002: “Ein hethitisches Brieffragment aus Alalah,” in *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux: Festschrift für Manfred Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 281, eds, Oswald Loretz, Kai A. Metzler und Hanspeter Schaudig (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 517–526.
- Nougayrol, Jean, 1956: *Le palais royal d’Ugarit IV. Textes accadiens des archives sud* (Archives internationales), Mission de Ras Shamra 9 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale; Librairie C. Klincksieck).

- Nougayrol, Jean, 1968: *Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit*, Ugaritica 5 (Paris: P. Geuthner).
- Novák, Mirko, and Susanne Rutishauser, 2012: "Tuthaliya, Šunaššura und die Grenze zwischen Hatti und Kizzuwatna," in *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 256, eds, Catherine Mittermayer und Sabine Ecklin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 259–269.
- Otten, Heinrich, 1971: "Das Siegel des hethitischen Grosskönigs Taḫurwaili," *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 103: 59–68.
- Otten, Heinrich, 1988: *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten Beiheft 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Pallavidini, Marta, 2017: "The Hittite Word *kuri/ewana-*, *kui/erwana-*: A New Assessment," *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 32: 1–11.
- Pardee, Dennis, 2003: "Le traité d'alliance RS 11.772+," *Semitica* 51: 5–31.
- Pitard, Wayne T., 1999: "The Alphabetic Ugaritic Tablets," in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/39, eds, Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (Leiden: Brill), 46–57.
- Pruzsinszky, Regine, 2020: "Taxation and Management of Resources—The Evidence from the Late Bronze Age Middle Euphrates Region," in *Economic Complexity in the Ancient Near East: Management of Resources and Taxation (Third–Second Millennium BC)*, eds, Jana Mynářová and Sergio Alivernini (Prague: Charles University) 383–398.
- Pucci, Marina, 2020: "Economic Decay and Urban Rebirth in the Amuq. The Hittite Conquest of Hatay and the End of the Late Bronze Age (Mid-14th to the 12th Century BC)," in *Anatolia between the 13th and the 12th Century BCE*, Eothen 23, eds, Stefano de Martino and Elena Devecchi (Florence: LoGisma), 327–360.
- Richter, Thomas, and Sarah Lange, 2012: *Das Archiv des Idadda*, Qaṭna Studien 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Roche, Carole, 2003: "La tablette TK 03.1.," *Berytus* 47: 123–28.
- Siegelová, Jana, 1986: *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardoku mente* (Prague: Národním muzeum v Praze).
- Siegelová, Jana, 2014: "Tribut D. Bei den Hethitern," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 14: 133–134.
- Siegelová, Jana, 2016: "Einige Überlegungen zur Abgabenerhebung in Hatti," in *ANTAŞSUMSAR "ÇİĞDEM" – Eski Anadolu Araştırmalarına ve Hititlere Adanmış Bir Hayat / Studies in Honour of Ahmet Ünal = Ahmet Ünal Armağanı*, eds, Sedat Erkut and Özlem Sir Gavaz (İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları), 433–438.
- Siegelová, Jana, 2019: "Naturalabgaben für den Kult und für Kulteinrichtungen des Hethitischen Reiches," in *Economy of Religions in Anatolia: From the Early Second to the Middle of the First Millennium BCE. Proceedings of an International Conference in Bonn (23rd to 25th May 2018)*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 467, eds, Manfred Hutter and Sylvie Hutter-Braunsar (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 103–112.
- Simon, Zsolt, 2013: "Die hethitische Präsenz in der Levante während der Spätbronzezeit: Archäologische vs. schriftliche Quellen," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 40: 295–313.
- Singer, Itamar, 1996: "Great Kings of Tarhuntašša," *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 38: 63–71.

- Singer, Itamar, 1999: "A Political History of Ugarit," in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/39, eds, Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (Leiden: Brill), 603–733.
- Singer, Itamar, 2000: "New Evidence on the End of the Hittite Empire," in *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, ed., Eliezer O. Oren (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 21–33.
- Singer, Itamar, 2006a: "Ships Bound for Lukka: A New Interpretation of the Companion Letters RS 94.2530 and RS 94.2523," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 33: 242–62.
- Singer, Itamar, 2006b: "The Urḫi-Teššup Affair in the Hittite-Egyptian Correspondence," in *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV*, ed. Theo P.J. van den Hout (Leiden: Brill), 27–38.
- Singer, Itamar, 2008: "Purple-Dyers in Lazpa," in *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbors: Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*, eds, Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova, and Ian Rutherford (Oxford: Oxbow), 21–43.
- Singer, Itamar, 2011a: "The Historical Context of Two Tell Nebi Mend / Qadeš Letters," *KASKAL* 8: 161–175.
- Singer, Itamar, 2011b: "Takuḫlinu and Ḫaya: Two Governors in the Ugarit Letter from Tel Aphek," in *The Calm before the Storm: Selected Writings of Itamar Singer on the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Levant*, ed., Itamar Singer (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature) 147–171.
- Singer, Itamar, 2017: "Alalah/Mukīš under Hittite Rule and Thereafter," in *Overturning Certainties in Near Eastern Archaeology: A Festschrift in Honor of K. Aslıhan Yener*, eds, Çiğdem Maner, Mara T. Horowitz, and Allan S. Gilbert (Leiden: Brill), 614–633.
- Singer, Itamar, and Graciela Gestoso Singer, 2014: "Alašian products in Hittite source," in *Studies in Economic and Social History of the Ancient Near East in Memory of Péter Vargyas*, eds, Zoltán Csabai and Tibor Grüll (Budapest: L'Harmattan), 317–336.
- Skaist, Aaron, 2005: "The Order of the Rulers of Emar," in *"An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing": Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, eds, Pinhas Artzi, Chaim Cohen, Barry L. Eichler, and Victor Avigdor Hurowitz (Bethesda, MD: CDL), 568–74.
- Torrecilla, Eduardo, and Yoram Cohen, 2019: "On the Emar 'Problem Documents' and the Practice of (Re)producing Deeds," *Aula Orientalis* 37/1: 143–57.
- van den Hout, Theo, 1995: *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten* 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- van den Hout, Theo, 2011: "The Written Legacy of the Hittites," in *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, eds, Hermann Genz and Dirk P. Mielke (Leuven: Peeters), 47–84.
- van den Hout, Theo, 2012: "Tarḫund/tašša," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12: 460–463.
- van Soldt, Wilfred H., 1991: "Fabrics and Dyes at Ugarit," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 22: 321–357.
- van Soldt, Wilfred H., 1999: "The Syllabic Akkadian Texts," in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/39, eds, Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (Leiden: Brill), 28–45.
- van Soldt, Wilfred H., 2005: *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 324 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

- Viano, Maurizio, 2018: "Continuity and Change in the *ḫazannu* Office at Emar," *KASKAL* 15: 47–56.
- Viano, Maurizio, 2020: "The Economic Activities of the Zū-Ba'la Family and the Archival Practices in Building M₁ at Emar," in *Des polythéismes aux monothéismes: Mélanges d'assyriologie offerts à Marcel Sigrist*, eds, Uri Gabbay and J. J. Pérennès (Leuven: Peeters), 469–489.
- Vigo, Matteo, 2010: "Linen in Hittite Inventory Texts," in *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, eds, Marie-Louise Nosch and Cécile Michel (Oxford: Oxbow), 290–322.
- von Dassow, Eva, 2005: "Archives of Alalah IV in Archaeological Context," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 338: 1–69.
- von Dassow, Eva, 2020: "Alalah between Mittani and Hatti," *Asia Anteriore Antica: Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures* 2: 193–226.
- Yamada, Masamichi, 1994: "The Northern Border of the Land of Aštata," *Acta Sumerologica* 16: 261–68.
- Yamada, Masamichi, 2006: "The Hittite Administration in Emar: The Aspect of Direct Control," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 96: 222–34.
- Yamada, Masamichi, 2013: "The Chronology of the Emar Texts Reassessed," *Orient* 48: 125–56.
- Yamada, Masamichi, 2014: "The Royal and Urban Authorities in Emar: A Diachronic Analysis of Their Relations," *Al-Rāfidān* 35: 73–108.
- Yamada, Masamichi, 2019: "The 'Overseers of the Land' in the Emar Texts," in *Prince of the Orient: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of H.I.H. Prince Takahito Mikasa*, eds, Ichiro Nakata et al. (Tokyo: Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan), 193–210.
- Yener, K. Aslihan, 2013: "New Excavations at Alalakh: The 14th–12th Centuries BC," in *Across the Border: Late Bronze–Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia: Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Research Center of Anatolian Studies, Koç University, Istanbul, May 31–June 1, 2010*, ed. K. Aslihan Yener (Leuven: Peeters), 11–35.
- Yener, K. Aslihan, 2017: "Cult and Ritual at Late Bronze II Alalakh: Hybridity and Power under Hittite Administration," in *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday*, ed., Alice Mouton (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları), 215–224.
- Yener, K. Aslihan, Murat Akar, and Mara T. Horowitz, 2019: "Interpretation and Discussion." in *Tell Atchana, Alalakh Volume 2 (Text): The Late Bronze II City, 2006–2010 Excavation Seasons*, eds, K. Aslihan Yener, Murat Akar, and Mara T. Horowitz (Istanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları), 311–341.
- Yener, K. Aslihan, Belkıs Dinçol, and Hasan Peker, 2014: "Prince Tuthaliya and Princess Ašnuhepa," *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2014/4: 136–138.
- Waal, Willemijn, 2015: *Hittite Diplomats: Studies in Ancient Document Format and Record Management*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten 57 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Wilhelm, Gernot, 2013a: "Texts and Royal Seals of the Middle Hittite Period from the 'House of the Chief of the Guards' at Hattuša," in *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, eds, Billie Jean Collins and Piotr Michalowski (Atlanta: Lockwood), 343–353.
- Wilhelm, Gernot, 2013b: "Telipinu C. Priester und König von Ḫalab," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 13: 513.