

OFFPRINT FROM

*Organization, Representation,
and Symbols of Power
in the Ancient Near East*

Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
at Würzburg
20–25 July 2008

edited by
GERNOT WILHELM

Winona Lake, Indiana
EISENBRAUNS
2012

© 2012 by Eisenbrauns Inc.
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
www.eisenbrauns.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rencontre assyriologique internationale (54th : 2008 : Würzburg, Germany)
Organization, representation, and symbols of power in the ancient Near East :
proceedings of the 54th Rencontre assyriologique internationale at Wuerzburg,
20–25 July 2008 / edited by Gernot Wilhelm.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-1-57506-245-7 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Middle East—Civilization—To 622—Congresses. 2. Middle East—
Politics and government—Congresses. 3. Middle East—Antiquities—
Congresses. 4. Assyria—Civilization—Congresses 5. Assyria—Politics and
government—Congresses. 6. Assyria—Civilization—Congresses.

I. Wilhelm, Gernot. II. Title.

DS41.5R35 2008

939.4—dc23

2012019372

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48–1984. ©™

Contents

Vorwort	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Program	xvii
Das Ansehen eines altorientalischen Herrschers bei seinen Untertanen	1
WALTHER SALLABERGER	
L'exercice du pouvoir par les rois de la I ^{ère} Dynastie de Babylone: problèmes de méthode	21
DOMINIQUE CHARPIN	
Verwaltungstechnische Aspekte königlicher Repräsentation: Zwei Urkunden über den Kult der verstorbenen Könige im mittelassyrischen Assur	33
EVA CANCEK-KIRSCHBAUM	
Bild, Macht und Raum im neuassyrischen Reich	51
DOMINIK BONATZ	
Die Rolle der Schrift in einer Geschichte der frühen hethitischen Staatsverwaltung	73
THEO VAN DEN HOUT	
WORKSHOP: Collective Governance and the Role of the Palace in the Bronze Age Middle Euphrates and Beyond	85
Introduction	85
ADELHEID OTTO	
Archaeological Evidence for Collective Governance along the Upper Syrian Euphrates during the Late and Middle Bronze Age	87
ADELHEID OTTO	
Textual Evidence for a Palace at Late Bronze Emar	101
DANIEL E. FLEMING	
Die Rolle der Stadt im spätbronzezeitlichen Emar	111
BETINA FAIST	
Les « Frères » en Syrie à l'époque du Bronze récent: Réflexions et hypothèses*	129
SOPHIE DÉMARE-LAFONT	
Organization of Harrādum, Suhum, 18th–17th Centuries B.C., Iraqi Middle Euphrates.	143
CHRISTINE KEPINSKI	

Contents

Ein Konflikt zwischen König und Ältestenversammlung in Ebla	155
GERNOT WILHELM	
WORKSHOP: The Public and the State	167
Introduction	167
EVA VON DASSOW	
The Public and the State	171
EVA VON DASSOW	
From People to Public in the Iron Age Levant.	191
SETH SANDERS	
Administrators and Administrated in Neo-Assyrian Times	213
SIMONETTA PONCHIA	
The Babylonian Correspondence of the Seleucid and Arsacid Dynasties: New Insights into the Relations between Court and City during the Late Babylonian Period	225
ROBERTO SCIANDRA	
La liste Lú A et la hiérarchie des fonctionnaires sumériens	249
ALEXANDRA BOURGUIGNON	
Königslisten als Appellativ-Quellen	257
PAVEL ČECH	
From King to God: The NAMEŠDA Title in Archaic Ur.	265
PETR CHARVÁT	
The Uses of the Cylinder Seal as Clues of Mental Structuring Processes inside Ur III State Machinery	275
ALESSANDRO DI LUDOVICO	
EN-Priestess: Pawn or Power Mogul?	291
JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ	
Die Uruk I-Dynastie—ein Konstrukt der Isin-Zeit?	313
CATHERINE MITTERMAYER	
Neue Erkenntnisse zu den königlichen Gemahlinnen der Ur III-Zeit	327
MARCOS SUCH-GUTIÉRREZ	
Ĝeštinanna und die Mutter des Šulgi	347
FRAUKE WEIERSHÄUSER	
Vom babylonischen Königssiegel und von gesiegelten Steinen	357
SUSANNE PAULUS	
Marduk and His Enemies: City Rivalries in Southern Mesopotamia.	369
J. A. SCURLOCK	
Text im Bild — Bild im Text: Bildmotive als Bedeutungsträger von Machtansprüchen im hellenistischen Mesopotamien?	377
KARIN STELLA SCHMIDT	
The Tablet of Destinies and the Transmission of Power in Enūma eliš	387
KAREN SONIK	
Aššur and Enlil in Neo-Assyrian Documents	397
SPENCER L. ALLEN	

Contents

“The Charms of Tyranny:” Conceptions of Power in the “Garden Scene” of Ashurbanipal Reconsidered	411
MEHMET-ALI ATAÇ	
Les archers de siège néo-assyriens	429
FABRICE Y. DE BACKER	
King’s Direct Control: Neo-Assyrian Qēpu Officials	449
PETER DUBOVSKY	
Triumph as an Aspect of the Neo-Assyrian Decorative Program	461
NATALIE NAOMI MAY	
Local Power in the Middle Assyrian Period: The “Kings of the Land of Māri” in the Middle Habur Region	489
DAISUKE SHIBATA	
Women, Power, and Heterarchy in the Neo-Assyrian Palaces	507
SAANA SVÄRD	
Organising the Interaction Between People: a New Look at the Elite Houses of Nuzi	519
DAVID KERTAI	
Les femmes comme signe de puissance royale: la maison du roi d’Arrapha.	531
BRIGITTE LION	
Power Transition and Law: The Case of Emar	543
LENA FIJAŁKOWSKA	
The Representatives of Power in the Amarna Letters	551
J. MYNÁŘOVÁ	
Herrscherrepräsentation und Kult im Bildprogramm des Aḫirom-Sarkophags	559
H. NIEHR	
Religion and Politics at the Divine Table: The Cultic Travels of Zimri-Līm	579
CINZIA PAPPI	
The City of Ṭābatum and its Surroundings: The Organization of Power in the Post-Hammurabi Period	591
SHIGEO YAMADA	
The Horns of a Dilemma, or On the Divine Nature of the Hittite King	605
GARY BECKMAN	
The Power in Heaven: Remarks on the So-Called Kumarbi Cycle	611
CARLO CORTI AND FRANCA PECCHIOLI DADDI	
Die Worte des Königs als Repräsentation von Macht: Zur althethitischen Phraseologie.	619
PAOLA DARDANO	
Treaties and Edicts in the Hittite World.	637
ELENA DEVECCHI	
Luxusgüter als Symbole der Macht: Zur Verwaltung der Luxusgüter im Hethiter-Reich	647
MAURO GIORGIERI AND CLELIA MORA	

Contents

Autobiographisches, Historiographisches und Erzählelemente in hethitischen “Gebeten” Arnuwandas und Mursilis	665
MANFRED HUTTER	
The (City-)Gate and the Projection of Royal Power in Ḫatti	675
J. L. MILLER	
Hethitische Felsreliefs als Repräsentation der Macht: Einige ikonographische Bemerkungen	687
ZSOLT SIMON	
“ . . . Ich bin bei meinem Vater nicht beliebt. . . ”: Einige Bemerkungen zur Historizität des Zalpa-Textes	699
BÉLA STIPICH	
Dating of Akkad, Ur III, and Babylon I	715
PETER J. HUBER	
Cuneiform Documents Search Engine	735
WOJCIECH JAWORSKI	
Fluchformeln in den Urkunden der Chaldäer- und Achämenidenzeit	739
JÜRGEN LORENZ	
Arbeitszimmer eines Schreibers aus der mittelelamischen Zeit	747
BEHZAD MOFIDI NASRABADI	
Siegel für Jedermann: Neue Erkenntnisse zur sog. Série Élamite Populaire und zur magischen Bedeutung von Siegelsteinen.	757
GEORG NEUMANN	
Did Rusa Commit Suicide?	771
MICHAEL ROAF	
Über die (Un-)Möglichkeit eines “Glossary of Old Syrian [GIOS]”	781
JOAQUÍN SANMARTÍN	
Adapas Licht	795
ILLYA VORONTSOV	
Early Lexical Lists and Their Impact on Economic Records: An Attempt of Correlation Between Two Seemingly Different Kinds of Data-Sets.	805
KLAUS WAGENSONNER	



Treaties and Edicts in the Hittite World

Elena Devecchi

VENEZIA

1. In this paper I would like to discuss some problems related to typological issues and consequently to the definition of the corpus of subjugation treaties and edicts drawn up by the Hittite kings for their vassals. Limiting this analysis to the documents issued by the Hittite kings for the Syrian vassals, the following are the texts usually regarded as subjugation treaties,¹ listed here with their *CTH* numbers² and the names of the two counterparts:

<i>CTH</i> 49	Šuppiluliuma I—Aziru of Amurru
<i>CTH</i> 51–52	Šuppiluliuma I—Šattiwaza of Mittani
<i>CTH</i> 53	Šuppiluliuma I—Tette of Nuḫḫašše
<i>CTH</i> 62	Muršili II—Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru
<i>CTH</i> 66	Muršili II—Niqmepa of Ugarit
<i>CTH</i> 75	Muršili II—Talmi-Šarruma of Aleppo (official copy of Muwattalli II)
<i>CTH</i> 92	Ḫattušili III—Bentešina of Amurru
<i>CTH</i> 105	Tuḫaliya IV—Šaušgamuwa of Amurru

To this group of documents one should add other texts which are considered by some scholars as treaties, by others as edicts.

<i>CTH</i> 46	Šuppiluliuma I—Niqmaddu of Ugarit
<i>CTH</i> 47	Šuppiluliuma I—Niqmaddu of Ugarit
<i>CTH</i> 65	Muršili II—Niqmepa of Ugarit

There is general agreement in regarding *CTH* 46 as the first vassal treaty between Ḫatti and Ugarit,³ but some, e.g. Nougayrol and Altman, consider it an edict.⁴

Author's note: This paper is based on my Ph.D. dissertation “Trattati ed editti nel mondo ittita: tipologia, struttura e modalità di redazione” (Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia, 2008) written under the supervision of Prof. Lucio Milano, to whom I wish to express my deepest gratitude. Sincere thanks are also due to Prof. Stefano de Martino for his constant support and several suggestions and to Prof. Gernot Wilhelm, who allowed me to spend long research periods at the Institut für Altorientalistik of the Julius-Maximilians-Universität in Würzburg. During the drafting of this article I also benefited from some helpful remarks made by Prof. Jared Miller and Prof. Itamar Singer.

1. See e.g. Laroche 1971: 10–11, 13–15, 17; Beckman 1999: 6–8; Altman 2004: 64–5.

2. Unless otherwise explicitly stated, the numbering of the documents and of their different manuscripts mentioned in this paper follows the <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

3. See for instance Laroche 1971: 10, Liverani 1962: 45, von Schuler 1983: 131–2, Beckman 1999: 34, Singer 1999: 603–735, 634, van Soldt 2005: 52, D’Alfonso 2006: 303–329, 309, 311.

4. Nougayrol 1956: 34 n. 2, Altman 2004: 64. See also the doubts about the nature of this document raised by MacCarthy (1978: 68 n. 63).

CTH 47 is usually regarded as an edict,⁵ although Dietrich and Loretz consider it a treaty.⁶ The same holds true for *CTH 65*, which is usually considered an edict,⁷ but which Zaccagnini, for instance, has alternatively defined as an “agreement”, a “treaty” and an “edict”.⁸ It is important to underline, though, that these three texts share exactly the same structure and terminology, and it therefore seems reasonable to assign them to the same documentary typology instead of regarding them variously as treaties and edicts.

I suspect that the uncertainty shown toward the nature of this second group of texts can be traced to two factors. On the one hand, the fact that the structure of these documents resembles that of the treaties could have been misleading. On the other hand, historical considerations may have had an influence on the decision to regard them as treaties, especially in the case of the texts issued by Šuppiluliuma I for Niqmaddu. Scholars seem to have based their interpretations on the assumption that Šuppiluliuma must have followed with Ugarit the same procedure followed with other Syrian kingdoms he conquered, such as Amurru and Nuḥḥašše. They therefore expected the existence of a subjugation treaty with Ugarit and, in absence of any document comparable to *CTH 49* and *53*, they hypothesized that the dossier of documents issued by Šuppiluliuma for Niqmaddu replaced it.⁹ This anomaly has been explained by assuming either that at that time the form of the international treaty was not fixed yet,¹⁰ or that Ugarit was granted a special status different than the normal subjugation.¹¹

2. I believe that, in order to alleviate this uncertainty, we should first of all return to the definition of a subjugation treaty given by Korošec in his study of the juridical features of the Hittite treaties, which can still be regarded as the best starting point for any classification and typology. Korošec identifies the bond established by the Hittite king and the oath sworn by the vassal as the two fundamental elements of a subjugation treaty, as he clearly states in several passages.¹² Since this definition has not been questioned in later studies, one would expect it to be the base of any classification of the documents traditionally included in the corpus of the Hittite subjugation treaties. In order to ascertain which of the texts mentioned above actually fit Korošec’s definition of subjugation treaty by including the two fundamental elements (the bond and the oath), two aspects need to be analyzed: the terminology and the structure. As for the terminology, one basically must look for the Akkadian and Hittite words for bond and oath and for the technical formulas

5. Laroche 1971: 10, Beckman 1999: 166.

6. Dietrich & Loretz 1968: 206–45.

7. Laroche 1971: 14, Beckman 1999: 175.

8. Zaccagnini 1990: 37–79, 61 n. 97, 63.

9. Singer 1999: 634–35.

10. Liverani 1962: 45.

11. Nougayrol 1956: 34 n. 2.

12. V. Korošec 1931: 26: “Der Ḫattiherrscher stellt das *riksu*, die Vertragsbestimmungen, auf, während der Vasall durch deren Beschwörung, die *māmītu*, seinen Konsens zum Vertragsabschluß ausdrückt. Dadurch erlangt der Vasallenvertrag seine Verbindlichkeit”. idem, 34: “[...] setzt sich jeder Staatsvertrag aus zwei Elementen zusammen: einerseits der Aufstellung von Vertragsbestimmungen (*riksu*, *išhiul*) durch den einen Vertragsteil, andererseits durch deren Beschwörung (*māmītu*, *lingaiš*) seitens des anderen”. For this reason (i.e. for the fact that a Hittite subjugation treaty consists of these two elements), I prefer to avoid the translation “treaty” for Akk. *riksu*, *rikiltu* and Hitt. *išhiul*- in favour of “bond”, which is their most neutral and basic meaning. Another possible translation could be “contract”, but in this context it would be inappropriate because it refers to a documentary category typical of the civil law, while here we are in the realm of international law.



related to these two words. Starting with the first group of documents, it can be seen that both words recur only in some of these texts (*CTH* 49, 51, 52, 53, 62, 66, 92, 105), while in *CTH* 75 one finds no mention to the swearing of an oath by Talmi-Šarruma of Aleppo.

A further distinction can be made by analyzing the structure of these documents. In fact, only some of them (*CTH* 49, 53, 62, 66, 92, 105) contain a section whose importance has been underestimated until now and that may be regarded as a litmus test for assigning a text to the category of the subjugation treaties.¹³ This section can be placed between the preamble and the historical prologue,¹⁴ between the preamble and the normative section,¹⁵ or between the historical prologue and the normative section.¹⁶ It is useful to quote here the best preserved Akkadian and Hittite renderings of this section, taken from *CTH* 66, the treaty between Muršili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit, and from *CTH* 62, the treaty between Muršili II and Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru, respectively:

CTH 66 obv. 2–12¹⁷

⁽²⁾*attūka ša mNiqmepa a[na Š]EŠ^{MEŠ}-ka [] u LUGAL ana GIŠGU.ZA abīka* ⁽³⁾*ultē-šebka KUR ša an[aku]*¹⁸ *u* ⁽⁴⁾*ttēra[kka] u attā mNiqmepa qadu KUR-ka ĪR-di u* ⁽⁵⁾*[šumma a]tta mNiqme[a] ištu ūmi annī ina EGIR ūmi* ⁽⁶⁾*LUGAL KUR URUḪatti bē[lka u] KUR URUḪatti ul tanašsar u kī attā mNiqmepa* ⁽⁷⁾*ramānka SAG.DU-ka DAM^{MEŠ}-ka [DUM]U^{MEŠ}-ka u KUR-ka aqratakku u ra[mān LUGAL]* ⁽⁸⁾*SAG.DU LUGAL DUMU^{MEŠ} LUGAL u KUR Ḫatti ana darāti lū aqra[takku]* ⁽⁹⁾*u ina arkat ūmi ša LUGAL KUR [UR]UḪatti ša DUMU^{MEŠ} LUGAL ša DUMU.DUMU^{MEŠ} [LUGAL]* ⁽¹⁰⁾*u ša KUR URUḪatti rik[sa] u šalāma ušur*

⁽²⁻³⁾I [] to your brothers, Niqmepa, and I, the King, have placed you upon the throne of your father. ⁽³⁻⁴⁾The land I returned to you and you, Niqmepa, together with your land, are my subjects. ⁽⁴⁻⁵⁾And if you Niqmepa, from now on into the future, do not protect the King of Ḫatti, [your] lord, [and] the country of Ḫatti—⁽⁵⁻⁶⁾as yourself, Niqmepa, your person, your wife, your [son]s and your country are dear to you, ⁽⁶⁻⁷⁾(in the same way) the bod[y of the King], the person of the King, the sons of the King and the land of Ḫatti shall be forever dear to you. ⁽⁸⁻⁹⁾And in the future you shall respect the bond and the oath of the King of Ḫatti, of the sons of the King, of the grandsons [of the King] and of the land of Ḫatti.

CTH 62.II A col. I 19'–28'

^(19')*[n]u tuk maḥḥan=ma dUTU-ŠI IŠTU AWĀT ABĪ[K]A EGIR-an* ^(20')*šaḥḥun nu-tta ANA AŠAR ABĪKA titta[nu]nun* ^(21')*nu-tta kāšma ANA LUGAL KUR URUḪatti KUR URUḪatti* ^(22')*U ANA DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA DUMU.DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA šer linga-nunun* ^(23')*nu NIŠI DINGIR-LI ŠA LUGAL U ŠU LUGAL paḥši dUTU-ŠI=ma tuk* ^(24')*mTuppi-d10-upan paḥḥašši maḥḥan=a DAM-KA tattī* ^(25')*nu=za mān DUMU. NITA IAŠI nu katta INA KUR URUAmurri apāš* ^(26')*LUGAL-uš ešdu nu tuk maḥḥan*

13. Since *CTH* 53 is broken where one would expect to find this section, its presence in this treaty is only hypothetical. It seems, however, that it has to be regarded as highly probable because *CTH* 53 A preserves the clauses about the tribute and the yearly visit to the Hittite king, which always conclude the paragraph under discussion here.

14. *CTH* 49.I B, *CTH* 49.I C, and *CTH* 49.II.

15. *CTH* 49.I A and *CTH* 66.

16. *CTH* 53 A, *CTH* 62.II, *CTH* 92, and *CTH* 105.

17. The line numbering follows Del Monte (1986).

18. See Del Monte 1986: 46 for the reasons why this reading is preferable to the one proposed by Kestemont (1974: 85–127, 94 n. 12: KUR ša a-b[i-ka u]t-te-er-ra-ak-[ka]) and followed by Beckman (1999: 65) who accordingly translates “and (I) returned the land of your father to you”.



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from: Gernot Wilhelm, ed.,
Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power
in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th
Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
© Copyright 2012 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.

^aUTU-ŠI *paḥḥašši* DUMU-KA=ya ⁽²⁷⁾ QATAMMA *paḥḥašši zik=ma* ^mTuppi-^d10-upan LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Hatti ⁽²⁸⁾ KUR ^{URU}Hatti DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA DUMU.DUMU^{MEŠ}-IA *ziladuwa paḥši*

^(19'-20') Because I, My Majesty, took care of you according to the request of your father and I placed you in the position of your father, ⁽²¹⁾ I have hereby made you swear loyalty to the King of Hatti, to the land of Hatti, ⁽²²⁾ to my sons and to my grandsons. ⁽²³⁾ Respect the divine oath and the authority of the King ^(23'-24') and I, My Majesty, will protect you, Tuppi-Teššup. When you take a wife and ⁽²⁵⁾ you have a son, he will be king in the land of Amurru and ^(26'-27') as I, My Majesty, protect you, I will likewise protect your son. ^(27'-28') You, Tuppi-Teššup, in the future shall protect the King of Hatti, the land of Hatti, my sons and my grandsons.

In these two instances and in all the other occurrences of this section one can identify two parts, which are strictly interconnected from the functional point of view. First, one finds what one might call the kingship concession (*CTH* 66 obv. 2–4; *CTH* 62.II A col. I 19'–20'), whose function is to indicate the Hittite king as the ultimate source of any political right of the vassal, who does not rule in his country due to hereditary rights, but only because the Great King allows him to occupy the position formerly held by his predecessor. The kingship concession and the consequent condition of total subordination of the vassal are the necessary conditions introducing the second part, the fidelity request (*CTH* 66 obv. 4–12; *CTH* 62.II A col. I 21'–28'), as the following passage of *CTH* 62 shows very clearly. Here Muršili II says to Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru: “Because (. . .) I installed you in the position of your father, now I made you swear loyalty to the king of Hatti, the country of Hatti, to my sons and my grandsons”. The loyalty that the vassal owes to the Hittite king consists in loving and protecting the Great King, his country and the royal family as much as he loves and protects himself, his own country and his own family. In order to fully understand the function of this section, it is important to emphasize that the key words and the phraseology used here (to protect, to love) are the same as the ones used in a paragraph of the oath documents that Giorgieri has termed a “fidelity oath”.¹⁹ Based on the affinities between the fidelity request of the subjugation treaties and the “fidelity oath” of the oath documents, it may be suggested that the fidelity request should be regarded as the oath formula that the vassal had to pronounce on the occasion of his submission to the Hittite king. The oath would thus not correspond to the section containing the invocation to the gods, the blessings and the curses, as has been proposed by del Monte and Beckman.²⁰

The absence of this section in three particular texts (*CTH* 51, 52 and 75), which also show a very peculiar formulary, confirms that they should be regarded as atypical binding documents,²¹ to which I intend to dedicate a future paper.

3. If one applies to the second group of documents (*CTH* 46, 47 and 65) the same criteria used for the subjugation treaties, one is immediately struck by the complete absence of any mention of the swearing of an oath by the vassal.²² In fact, neither the term *māmītu* nor the section identified above with the oath request ever occur in these documents, where one finds only one of the two fundamental elements of

19. Giorgieri (1995: 45) defines “giuramento di fedeltà” as “la formula stilizzata in 1ª pers. in cui si promette fedeltà e protezione al sovrano e, solitamente, anche alla sua discendenza diretta”.

20. Del Monte 1986: 11, Beckman 1999: 2.

21. See D'Alfonso (2006: 310, 319–25) who regards them as “pseudo- oder halbparitätischen Verträge”.

22. See also MacCarthy 1978: 68 n. 63.



a subjugation treaty, i.e. the bond and this is mentioned in formulas different than the ones used in the treaties, e.g.:

RN ₁ rikilta ana RN ₂ /GN akanna irkus ²³	“RN ₁ bound a bond for RN ₂ /GN as follows”
RN ₁ rikilta akanna irkus/ittadin ²⁴	“RN bound/issued a bond as follows”

The differences between these documents and the subjugation treaties are not restricted to the lack of references to an oath and to the use of a different terminology. Careful analysis of their structure reveals the same sequence of sections in the treaties, whereas each section in these texts has different features and function. For instance, the historical prologue of a subjugation treaty narrates the history of the political relationship between Ḫatti and the vassal country since the very beginning until the moment when the last treaty is ratified, while in the historical prologue of *CTH* 46, 47 and 65 one finds only references to the very specific events that led to the necessity of issuing the documents. The normative section of a subjugation treaty normally consists of several paragraphs, each devoted to a specific topic, while in these documents the normative section deals with only one or two topics which are usually not attested in the treaties, such as the detailed definition of tribute and the border. There are also substantial differences in the section containing the summoning of the gods and the curses. In the treaties the deities are summoned as witnesses to the bond and the oath, and divine punishment is invoked upon the vassal who does not respect the obligations of the treaty. In *CTH* 46 and 47 the gods are summoned as punishers of whoever will modify the content of the document, and the vassal never appears as the object of the curses.²⁵

4. These formal differences lead to several further considerations. First, the formal differences likely indicate a functional difference. Indeed, a treaty ratifies the submission of the vassal, who swears loyalty to the Hittite king, while documents like those from Ugarit do not intervene in the hierarchical relationship between king and vassal, but only in specific issues related to the practical administration of the subjugated territories. Consequently, it seems clear that the Ugarit documents cannot be attributed to the same textual category as the subjugation treaties. Instead, the term “edict” reflects very well their nature as normative and administrative measures issued by the Hittite king when the situation required his intervention *ad hoc*.²⁶

As for the hypothesis that the edicts issued by Šuppiliuma for Niqmaddu might have replaced a normal subjugation treaty because of some special status granted to Ugarit, two factors would seem to militate against this possibility. On the one hand, the dossier concerning Muršili and Niqmepa shows that the stipulation of a subjugation treaty (*CTH* 66) does not exclude the issuing of an edict (*CTH* 65),

23. *CTH* 46 B obv. 3’–6’ and *CTH* 47 A rev. 46–48: UD-ma mŠuppiluli(w)ma LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR Ḫatti rikilta ana mNiqmadda LUGAL KUR URU^UUgarit akanna irkus; *CTH* 65 rev. 60–63 mMuršili LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR URU^UḪatti DUMU-šu ša mŠuppiluli(w)ma LUGAL GAL UR.SAG rikilta annīta ana KUR URU^UUgarit akanna irkus.

24. *CTH* 46 B rev. 19’–20’ UTU-ši LUGAL GAL rikilta kanna irkus; *CTH* 47 A rev. 46–48 u UTU-šu LUGAL GAL EN-šu rikilta annīta akanna ittadinšu.

25. *CTH* 65 does not attest the section with the curse and the summoning of the gods.

26. It can be useful to recall here that the term *rikiltu*, used in the Ugarit documents to indicate the edict, is attested with the same meaning in Babylonia, where it always indicates a decree issued by a superior to a subordinate, while “there is no trace in Middle Babylonian of *rikiltu* meaning anything like ‘contract’, ‘agreement’, or ‘political covenant/treaty’” (see Brinkman 1990: 81–111, 90–1).



so that the same situation can at least theoretically be assumed also for the time of Šuppiluliuma and Niqmaddu. Secondly, one should be careful in regarding Ugarit as an anomaly, since this impression is based on very partial documentation. Indeed, one cannot exclude that, should the royal archives of Amurru and Nuḥḥašše ever be discovered, one might encounter the same kind of edicts issued by the Hittite kings for Ugarit.

Moreover, for chronological reasons one cannot consider these edicts as a sort of missing link between the middle Hittite parity agreements and the subjugation treaties of the imperial period.²⁷ In fact, when Šuppiluliuma I issued texts such as *CTH* 46 and 47, his chancellery had already developed the “classical” model of the subjugation treaty, as the existence of *CTH* 49 and 53 demonstrates.

5. These two groups of documents differ also with regard to other aspects. One is the find spot. It is noteworthy that all the subjugation treaties but the one between Muršili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit come from the archives of the Hittite capital, while the edicts have been found only at Ugarit.

Second, the treaties with the Syrian vassals are known only from archive copies, written on large, flat tablets, while the Ugarit edicts have been handed down in official copies bearing the impression of the royal seal and drawn up on the so-called “tablettes coussin”, which resemble very closely the tablets of the Hittite *Landschenkungsurkunden*. The fact that the official copies of the edicts were stored in the archives of the vassal’s capital is a further confirmation that these documents were substantially different than the subjugation treaties, official copies of which were kept in the temples of the most important deities of Ḫatti and of the vassal’s country.

Third, subjugation treaties and edicts differ also with regard to palaeography and orthography. One might expect them all to share the features of the texts produced by the Hittite chancellery, but comparison of the two groups reveals that the edicts show very specific characteristics which are uncommon in the treaties and in the Akkadian Boğazköy texts in general. For instance, in *CTH* 46, 47 and 65 one finds several sign variants which are not attested in the Hittite sign inventory²⁸ and some very peculiar orthographical features, e.g.:

The word *rikiltu* is spelled *ri-kíl-tV* or *ri-kí-il-tV* in the edicts,²⁹ but neither of these two graphical renderings occurs at Ḫattuša, where one finds only *ri-kil-tV* or *ri-ki-il-tV*.³⁰ Moreover, to my knowledge, the sign GILIM is used at Ḫattuša with the syllabic value *kil* only in one ritual text.³¹

27. For this hypothesis see Liverani 1962: 45 and Zaccagnini 1990: 61.

28. See for instance the following forms used for ŠUM (𐎗𐎠 *CTH* 46 B obv. 7; *CTH* 47 A rev. 48; *CTH* 65 rev. 51; cf. *HZL* Nr. 91), MA (𐎡𐎢𐎣 *CTH* 46 A obv. 7 passim; *CTH* 46 B obv. 3', 7', rev. 16', 17', 21'; *CTH* 47 A obv. 1, 3; *CTH* 65 obv. 1 passim; cf. *HZL* Nr. 208; it has to be noted that the normal Hittite MA with three horizontals occurs in all these texts, beside the form with four horizontals), and GIL (𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤 *CTH* 46 A rev. 14'; *CTH* 47 A rev. 47; *CTH* 65 rev. 41 passim; cf. *HZL* Nr. 258). See also Klinger 2003: 237–48.

29. *ri-kil-tV*: *CTH* 46 A rev. 14'; *CTH* 47 A rev. 47; *CTH* 47 C rev. 12; *CTH* 47 E rev. 9; *CTH* 65 rev. 59, 62. The same spelling is used also in an edict issued by Ḫattušili III for Niqmepa (*CTH* 93 A obv. 8, rev. 35, *CTH* 93 C obv. 9, rev. 35) and in a verdict of Muršili II for Niqmepa (*CTH* 64 A obv. 5). *ri-kí-il-tV*: *CTH* 46 A rev. 16'; *CTH* 46 B obv. 4', rev. 19; *CTH* 47 A obv. 18; *CTH* 47 B obv. 18. The line numbering of *CTH* 47 B (RS 17.330+17.347+17.446) is based on the text that can be reconstructed according to the joins indicated by Pardee (1984: 239–45).

30. *ri-kil-tV*: *CTH* 92 obv. 6, 9, 24, 28, 29. *ri-ki-il-tV*: *CTH* 75 A obv. 3, 7; *CTH* 75 B obv. 2', 8'; *CTH* 91 A obv. 14. See Labat 1932: 190, *CAD* R, *rikistu* 2, 346 and *AHw* III, *rikis/štu*, *rikiltu*, 984.

31. KBo 36.29 col. II 34, cf. *HZL* Nr. 258.



In the edicts the name of the Hittite king Šuppiliuma is spelled ^mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-ma or ^mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-ma,³² instead of the usual ^mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-u-ma.

At Ḫattuša the title “My Majesty” is written ^dUTU-ši independently of its syntactical function, whereas in *CTH* 46 and 47 it has the phonetic complement -šu when it is the subject of the sentence, while it is written ^dUTU-ši when it functions as an oblique case.³³

I have been looking for terms of comparison for these peculiarities in order to identify the scribal school that might have issued these edicts. Unfortunately, this search has been hampered by the lack of studies on the palaeography and orthography of the Akkadian texts from Boğazköy and of the Late Bronze Age Syrian corpora in general, but a hypothesis proposed by Otten and Neu, who for different reasons suggested that Karkemiš might have been the origin of the letters and juridical documents issued by the Hittite Kings for the kings of Ugarit,³⁴ appears to be a promising one. Indeed, I was able to find some interesting similarities between the palaeographical and orthographical features of some documents issued by the kings of Karkemiš and those of Šuppiliuma and Muršili for the kings of Ugarit³⁵ that would seem to support Otten’s and Neu’s proposal. Another possibility, recently proposed by d’Alfonso in his work about the verdicts issued by the Ḫatti and Karkemiš kings for the Syrian vassals, should also be mentioned. He finds it difficult to accept that the Hittite kings would have entrusted their seals to the kings of Karkemiš, and he hypothesizes that Syrian scribes trained at the Karkemiš school were working at Ḫattuša, where they would have been responsible for the documents addressed to the Syrian vassals.³⁶ The hypothesis suggested by Otten and Neu, however, would seem to better explain why no single fragment of these documents has been found in the Boğazköy archives.

6. It may be concluded that the need of administrating a wide and complex territory such as the one conquered by Šuppiliuma I forced the Hittite chancellery to

32. ^mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-ma: *CTH* 46 A obv. 1 passim; *CTH* 47 A obv. 1; *CTH* 65 obv. 2 passim (this spelling is attested also in Muršili’s verdict *CTH* 64 A obv. 2 and 4, and *CTH* 64 B 26’). ^mŠu-up-pi-lu-li-ma: *CTH* 46 B obv. 3; *CTH* 47 A obv. 16.

33. ^dUTU-šu: *CTH* 46 A obv. 11, rev. 15’; *CTH* 47 A obv. 14, rev. 43, 46; *CTH* 47 B rev. 47; *CTH* 47 E obv. 14, rev. 5’. ^dUTU-ši: *CTH* 46 A obv. 4, 12, 25, rev. 13’; *CTH* 47 A obv. 4, 10, 13, rev. 45; *CTH* 47 B rev. 46; *CTH* 47 C obv. 4, rev. 10’; *CTH* 47 E obv. 4, 11, rev. 8’. The same use is attested also in Ḫattušili III’s edict *CTH* 93 (A obv. 8, rev. 34).

34. Otten (1995: 24, 26–7) noticed that the seal impressions attested on the Ugarit edicts issued by Šuppiliuma I and Muršili II do not correspond to any seal impressions found in the Hittite capital, leading him to suggest that the seals used for the Ugarit edicts were produced *in loco*, possibly at Karkemiš. Neu (1995: 115–29, 125–6) bases his hypothesis on the difference between the *ductus* attested at Ḫattuša and that of the edicts, which is closer to that of the north-Syrian scribal traditions.

35. As for the palaeography, cf. the forms attested in the edicts issued by Ini-Teššup (ŠUM in *CTH* 100.1 obv. 8; *CTH* 100.2 obv. 6 passim; *CTH* 100.3 obv. 4 passim; MA in *CTH* 100.1 obv. 7 passim; *CTH* 100.2 obv. 5 passim; GIL in *CTH* 100.2 obv. 4, rev. 47, 48). The spelling *ri-kil-tV* occurs also in an edict of Ini-Teššup (*CTH* 100.2 obv. 4, rev. 47, and rev. 48) and in the label *CTH* 100.5 (*tuppu ri-kil-ti ša LUGAL KUR Kargamiš*). In a letter of the king of Karkemiš to the king of Ugarit (RS 20.237 obv. 7) we find ^dUTU-šu used for the nominative as in the edicts issued by the Hittite kings. The alternation between ^dUTU-šu and ^dUTU-ši according to its function in the text occurs also in another letter to the king of Ugarit (RS 20.212 obv. 3’, rev. 18’, 19’, 28’): the personal name and/or the title of the sender is unfortunately lost, but the content of the letter seems to suggest that he was a Hittite official active in northern Syria. See also Del Monte 1986: 39. I am aware that the edicts issued by Ini-Teššup are not the ideal terms of comparison for those issued by Šuppiliuma I and Muršili II, since they are not contemporary, but I think that the similarities between these two groups of texts cannot be regarded as mere coincidences and may rather witness the subsistence of a peculiar scribal tradition.

36. D’Alfonso 2005: 56–58.



develop since the very beginning of the New Kingdom two types of normative documents, treaties and edicts, with very well defined functions and features. Moreover, if the hypothesis presented in this paper regarding the palaeographical and orthographical features of the subjugation treaties and edicts issued by the Hittite kings for their Syrian vassals is confirmed by an analysis of a wider selection of texts, new light may perhaps be cast on the role played by Karkemiš in the organization of the Syrian territories.

References

- Altman, A.
2004 *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties. An Inquiry into the Concepts of Hittite Interstate Law*. Bar Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.
- Beckman, G.
1999 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts. Second edition*. WAW 7. Atlanta GA: Scholars Press.
- Brinkman, J.
1990 Political Covenants, Treaties, and Loyalty Oaths in Babylonia and between Babylonia and Assyria. Pp. 81–111 in *I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma ideologia funzione*, ed. L. Canfora, M. Liverani & C. Zaccagnini. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider.
- D'Alfonso, L.
2005 *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a.C.)*. StudMed 17. Pavia: Italian University Press.
2006 Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.-12. Jh. v.Chr.). Pp. 303–29 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*, ed. M. Witte et al. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Del Monte, G. F.
1986 *Il trattato fra Muršili II di Ḫattuša e Niqmepa di Ugarit*. *Oriens Antiqui Collectio* 18. Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente C. A. Nallino.
- Dietrich, M. & Loretz, O.
1968 Der Vertrag zwischen Suppiluliuma und Niqmadu. *WdO* 3: 206–45.
- Giorgieri, M.
1995 *I testi ittiti di giuramento*. Ph.D. dissertation. Università di Firenze.
- Kestemont, G.
1974 Le traité entre Mursil II de Hatti et Niqmepa d'Ugarit. *UF* 6: 85–127.
- Klinger, J.
2003 Zur Paläographie akkadischsprachiger Texte aus Ḫattuša. Pp. 237–48 in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry H. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. G. Beckman, R. Beal, & G. McMahon. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Korošec, V.
1931 *Hethitische Staatsverträge. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung*. Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien 60. Leipzig: Theodor Weicher.
- Labat, R.
1932 *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köy*. Bordeaux: AMS Press.
- Laroche, E.
1971 *Catalogue des textes Hittites. Études et commentaires* 75. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Liverani, M.
1962 *Storia di Ugarit nell'età degli archivi politici*. StudSem 6. Roma: Università di Roma, Centro di studi semitici.



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from: Gernot Wilhelm, ed.,
*Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power
in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th
Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*
© Copyright 2012 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.

MacCarthy, D. J.

1978 *Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*. Analecta Biblica 21a. Roma: Biblical Institute Press.

Neu, E.

1995 Hethiter und Hethitisch in Ugarit." Pp. 115–29 in *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung. Vorträge gehalten während des Europäischen Kolloquiums am 11.-12. Februar 1993 Bd. 1: Ugarit und seine altorientalische Umwelt*, ed. M. Dietrich & O. Loretz. ALASP 7. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Nougayrol, J.

1956 *Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales)*. PRU 4 = MRS 9. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale / Klincksieck.

Otten, H.

1995 *Die hethitischen Königssiegel der frühen Großreichszeit*. AdWL Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1995/7. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur / Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Pardee, D.

1984 Three Ugaritic Tablet Joins. *JNES* 43: 239–45.

van Soldt, W. H.

2005 *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit*. AOAT 324. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

von Schuler, E.

1983 Vertrag zwischen Suppiluliuma I. und Niqmaddu II. von Ugarit. Pp. 131–32 in *Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden. Historisch-chronologische Texte. Lieferung 2: Staatsverträge*, ed. O. Kaiser et al. TUAT I. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.

Singer, I.

1999 A Political History of Ugarit. Pp. 603–735 in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt. HdO I 39. Leiden: Brill.

Zaccagnini, C.

1990 The Forms of Alliance and Subjugation in the Near East of the Late Bronze Age. Pp. 37–79 in *I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma ideologia funzione*, ed. L. Canfora, M. Liverani & C. Zaccagnini. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider.



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from: Gernot Wilhelm, ed.,
*Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power
 in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th
 Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*
 © Copyright 2012 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.