

# Εοthen

Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell'Oriente antico  
fondata da Fiorella Imparati e Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli  
diretta da Stefano de Martino

## ORIZZONTI D'ORIENTE

### TRA MEDITERRANEO E ASIA CENTRALE

STUDI IN RICORDO DI SEBASTIANO TUSA

a cura di

Stefano de Martino, Massimiliano Marazzi, Lucio Milano



LoGisma editore

# Eothen

Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell'Oriente antico  
fondata da Fiorella Imperati e Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli

editor  
Stefano de Martino

scientific board  
Mauro Giorgieri, Jared L. Miller, Mark Weeden, Gernot Wilhelm

Questa pubblicazione è stata realizzata con il contributo della  
Università degli Studi di Torino - Dipartimento di Studi Storici

*Orizzonti d'Oriente. Tra Mediterraneo e Asia Centrale. Studi in ricordo di  
Sebastiano Tusa.* a cura di Stefano de Martino, Massimiliano  
Marazzi, Lucio Milano.

(Eothen; 25)

Copyright © 2022 LoGisma editore

[www.logisma.it](http://www.logisma.it) - [mail@logisma.it](mailto:mail@logisma.it)

ISBN 978-88-94926-53-8

Printed in March 2022

## EXPLORING THE BORDERS OF THE POLITIES SUBORDINATED TO ḪATTI

Stefano de Martino

1. The Hittite international treaties, as well as the royal edicts, highlight information about the process of establishing the borders of the kingdoms and polities that were subordinated to Ḫatti. Concerning the Anatolian polities, the definition of the borders occurs only in the treaties concluded with Kizzuwatna, Tarḫuntašša, and Mira-Kuwaliya (see *ultra*), whereas provisions of this kind are not included in the treaties with the Šeḫa River Land, Wiluša, Ḫapalla, and Ḫayaša.

As to the Syrian kingdoms, a detailed description of the boundary occurs in the treaty with Karkemiš KUB 19.27. Although the beginning of this tablet is missing, it is generally accepted that the two partners of the treaty were Šuppiluliuma I and his son Piyaššili/Šarri-Kušuh, and hence this would have been the first treaty signed with the newly founded polity of Karkemiš.<sup>1</sup> The precise definition of the boundary documented in this text was presumably required by the fact that the kingdom of Karkemiš was newly founded and, hence, its territory needed to be delimited accurately.

The extension of the territory of Ugarit was established by Šuppiluliuma I not in a treaty, but in the edict issued for Niqmadu II (RS 17.340; Devecchi 2012, 640-645), which bears the impression of the seal of King Šuppiluliuma and Queen Tawananna (Lackenbacher 2002, 71-73). Sharing Singer's suggestion (1999, 634 n. 94), this edict may have been written down at Karkemiš (see also Devecchi 2012, 642).<sup>2</sup> The obverse of this tablet (1'7') only lists the towns and mountains that lay on the northern territories of Ugarit at the contested border with Mukiš/Alalah (van Soldt 1997).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Devecchi 2015, 238-241; Cohen and Anor 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding we cannot exclude that scribes educated at Karkemiš were active in the Hittite capital (D'Alfonso 2005, 56-58).

<sup>3</sup> For the listed place names see the literature quoted by Lackenbacher 2002, 72 n. 173, and Belmonte Marín 2001.

In the treaty concluded by Šuppiluliuma I with Aziru of Amurru there is no mention of the boundaries of this kingdom; nonetheless, the agreement concluded later by Ḫattušili III with Bentešina<sup>4</sup> states that Šuppiluliuma I had defined the borders of Amurru on a tablet that presumably integrated the aforementioned treaty signed with Aziru. We assume that this tablet would have been an edict similar to the document issued for Niqmepa II.

Sometimes, the decision taken by the Hittite sovereign would be contested, as in the case of the boundary between Ugarit and Mukiš. The contestation and the resolution taken by Muršili II are documented in the edict RS 17.62+17.237.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, Muršili II gave a new assessment of the territory under the control of Ugarit, as documented in the tablet RS 17.382+380.<sup>6</sup> Hence, the Hittite king established that the territory of Siyannu-Ušnatu should be separate from Ugarit and given to Karkemiš; thus, Muršili II decided that the ruler of Ugarit would pay a lower tribute, as his territory was consequently reduced.

As to the reason why Muršili II took this decision, I.K.H. Halayaqa (2010, 310) assumed that Karkemiš could have his own harbour and would no longer depend on the port of Ugarit. Instead, the most convincing assumption was the aim of Muršili II, namely, to separate Ugarit from Amurru, and also to prevent either of these two polities from allying against Ḫatti, or else, raising any possible territorial disputes.<sup>7</sup>

Nonetheless, several disputes and contestations arose between the ruler of Siyannu and Niqmepa II, the king of Ugarit concerning the possession of the bordering villages and fields. When, at the time of Abdi-Anati of Siyannu, a controversy arose about the possession of some bordering villages, Muršili II issued the verdict, which is preserved in the tablet RS 17.335 + 379 + 381 + 235 (Lackenbacher 2002, 137-138). Another act was issued by Muršili II (RS 17.368, Lackenbacher 2002, 139), wherein it is written that the Hittite king had sent an official who put down boundary stones to demarcate the border. Two more tablets (RS 17.123, and 16.170, Lackenbacher 2002, 140-141) deal with the possession of other bordering lands. Again, the quarrel was resolved by confirming the older partition of these territories between Ugarit and Siyannu.

---

<sup>4</sup> See KBo 1.8 i 6; Beckman 1999, 101; Devecchi 2015, 221.

<sup>5</sup> See Lackenbacher 2002, 134-5; Beckman 1999, 174-175; Devecchi 2010.

<sup>6</sup> See Lackenbacher 2002, 135-7; Schwemer 2005b, 169-171.

<sup>7</sup> See Singer 1999, 640; Schwemer 2005b, 170.

The dispute on the demarcation of the border between Ugarit and Siyannu continued for a long time (Singer 1999, 640 and n. 111), presumably because there was no natural boundary, such as a river or a mountain chain. Two more documents belong to the *dossier* on Siyannu, namely, the tablet RS 17.292 and RS 15.077 (Lackenbacher 2002, respectively 141, 142). Lastly, S. Lackenbacher and F. Malbran Labat (2016, 57-59) recently published the letter RS 94.2408 which the high dignitary of Karkemiš Tulbi-Tešob sent to the prefect of Ugarit. Tulbi-Tešob had gone to Ugarit with the precise purpose of setting the boundary stones, but the Ugaritic official missed the meeting; hence another official by the name of Kinnariši was sent to Ugarit.

2. Moving on to the Anatolian countries, the oldest Hittite legal act that deals with the definition of the border is the treaty concluded by Zidanta II of Ḫatti with Piliya of Kizzuwatna (Devecchi 2015, 68-70). This treaty is badly preserved, but one statement is particularly interesting; in that the two kings agreed not to rebuild the towns that lay along the border zone between Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna (obv. 3 – 10). As T. B. Bryce (1986-7, 95) convincingly assumed, this provision was presumably aimed to demilitarise a contested border zone with the perspective of achieving durable, peaceful relations.

The more recent subordination treaty concluded by Tudḫaliya IV with Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna (KBo 1.5 iv 40-64; Beckman 1999, 17-26; Devecchi 2015, 73- 88) contains a detailed definition of the segment of the boundary that run from the western limit of Kizzuwatna up to the region of the Cilician Gates; indeed, the main concern of the Hittites was to keep full control over the roads that connected Ḫatti to the eastern Mediterranean coast.

The Hittite king imposed a new border between Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna; thus, the western boundary of Kizzuwatna, in the direction of the sea, was established at Lamiya, a town that lay at the mouth of the Limonlu River (= classical Lemos).<sup>8</sup> This town belonged to Ḫatti and faced the Kizzuwatnean town of Bitura (Forlanini 2013, 15; 2018, 262-263). The Hittite king agreed that the towns of Lamiya and Aruna should not be fortified; we assume the

---

<sup>8</sup> See Hawkins – Weeden 2017, 282.

latter town lay to the north of Lamiya in the direction of the Taurus Mountains (Forlanini 2018, 263). The enlargement of the Hittite territory at the border with Kizzuwatna was presumably aimed to ensure the military protection of the Hittite harbour of Ura, which had previously been quite close to the boundary (Novák-Rutishauser 2012, 265); in fact, Ura, which may be located at Silifke (Forlanini 2017, 244),<sup>9</sup> was the main Hittite harbour on the Mediterranean coast (see also *ultra*).

The next frontier marks were the town of Šaliya in the Hittite territory, and Zinziluwa and Erimma along the Kizzuwatnean border. Šaliya is mentioned in the treaty concluded with Ulmi-Teššob/Kuruntiya (KBo 4.10 obv. 29', and in the so-called Bronze Tablet i 49, see *ultra*), and can be located near the Turkish town of Pozantı (Novák – Rutishauser 2012, 264) close to the northern gate of the Cilician pass (Hawkins – Weeden 2017, 282-283).<sup>10</sup> Instead Zinziluwa and Erimma presumably marked the southern Kizzuwatnean side of this pass. The strategic function of Šaliya was to control the Hittite entrance to the pass, and hence the Hittite king reserved the right to fortify this town. Instead, Šunaššura apparently could not fortify Zinziluwa and Erimma, and this non-reciprocal clause clearly reveals the political inferiority of the king of Kizzuwatna at the time of concluding this treaty (Liverani 1973, 280-281; Miller 2020).

The next two posts were, respectively, the town of Anamušta, on the Hittite side, and the mountain close to the town of Zabarašna on the Kizzuwatnean side. The location of this mountain as well as the aforementioned town, is difficult to ascertain. Said mountain could either be the Akdağ, or the Karanfil Dağ (Novák – Rutishauser 2012, 264), or else, further east, the Mount Kale Dağı (Hawkins – Weeden 2017, 283). Instead, M. Forlanini (2013, 15-16, and n. 62; 2018, 30-34) assumed that the town of Zabarašna was close to Mount Šabaraššana, and these two place names would be different writings of the same toponym that refers to both a village and a mountain; hence, he proposed that Z/Šabaraš(ša)na lay south of the Tauros chain, and more precisely on the road that connected Ғubišna to the sea coast. Anyhow, apart from the exact location of Zabarašna, this city and

---

<sup>9</sup> See Dinçol – Yakar – Dinçol – Taffet 2000, 14-15, for the assumption that Ura was located at Olba.

<sup>10</sup> See Forlanini 2013, 15-16 and n. 65; 2018, 30, for a more western location of Šaliya.

Anamušta should have been in a strategic position to control of the Cilician pass.

The subsequent section of the treaty with Šunaššura confirms the pre-existing boundary.<sup>11</sup> The Hittite bordering zone is marked by the town of Durudna on the Hittite side, while Šunaššura maintains his control over the area in the region of Adana and in the direction of the town of Lawana, north of Adana. The Kizzuwatnean frontier post is the town of Durpina. The town of Šerikka belongs to Ḫatti, and instead the town of Luwana belongs to Kizzuwatna. The river Šamri marks the border between the two kingdoms. This river can be identified either with the Seyhan, or its western branch (Hawkins – Weeden 2017, 283).

The tablet ends here, and the provisions that established the eastern boundary of Kizzuwatna may have continued in a second tablet of the treaty (Hawkins – Weeden 2017, 283). Since this second tablet is not preserved, we cannot say whether or not the eastern border of this country reached the sea.

3. As for the boundaries of Tarḫuntašša, two treaties concluded with Ulmi-Teššob/Kuruntiya are preserved. The treaty issued by Ḫattušili III was originally written on an iron tablet, but it survives only on the tablet KBo 4.10, which is the preparatory draft of the final document (van den Hout 1995; Beckman 1999, 109-113; Devecchi 2015, 162-168). Instead, the treaty signed by Tudḫaliya IV with Kuruntiya has come to us on the original bronze tablet, as already mentioned (Otten 1988; Beckman 1999, 114-124; Devecchi 2015, 168-182). Both treaties contain a very detailed descriptions of the boundaries of Tarḫuntašša.

The clockwise description of the border mentions towns, villages, rivers, mountains, and monuments which mark the boundary of Tarḫuntašša, and hence both documents give a lot of information concerning the historical geography of this region. There are differences between the older treaty KBo 4.10 and the more recent one, documented from the afore-mentioned bronze tablet, by virtue of Tudḫaliya IV's enlargement of territory of Tarḫuntašša. The place names occurring in the two treaties have already been studied in

---

<sup>11</sup> Concerning the meaning of the word *labarnamma* (iv 52) “da tempo” see. Schwemer, 2005a, 106 n. 45; Devecchi 2015, 88.

depth,<sup>12</sup> and we only deal with the question whether the city harbour of Ura was inside the territory of Tarḫuntašša.

The description of the boundary starts from the north-western border of Tarḫuntašša, runs eastwards, and then moves westwards, but leaves undefined the western segment of the southern border. In KBo 4.10 (obv. 29'-32') the description of the boundary jumps from the aforementioned town of Šaliya, up to the Mediterranean coast. The Bronze Tablet adds more detail and mentions several place names, such as the town of Ḫauwaliya, which could have been located near the modern city of Karaman (Forlanini 2017, 249), before moving onto the western domain of the seacoast<sup>13</sup> at Šaranduwa. The latter town has been identified with classical Celenderis (Melchert 2007), although a more western location has also been put forward (Forlanini 2017, 249-250).

Hence, the boundary run from the territory inland, followed the Cilician Taurus mountain chain, and reached the coast, although no place name is mentioned on the eastern part of the coast. If we accept this assumption, Tarḫuntašša would have consequently controlled the entire southern Anatolian coast from Kizzuwatna to Parḫa/Perge, as well as the valley of the river Göksu, which would have been the core of its territory (Hawkins 1995, 52).<sup>14</sup>

In the latter case, the city of Ura would also have belonged to Kuruntiya, but, in our opinion, neither Ḫattušili III, nor Tudḫaliya IV would have left this important harbour in the hands of Kuruntiya (de Martino 1999; Melchert 2007, 510); indeed the ruler of Tarḫuntašša would have had the possibility to block the Göksu road, which was the main route from central Anatolia to the seacoast, as was already said.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, Ali Dinçol and other colleagues (2000)<sup>16</sup> argued that Ura remained under the direct control of Ḫatti, and it was a sort of Hittite

---

<sup>12</sup> See lastly Forlanini 2017; Erbil-Mouton 2018; Hawkins – Weeden 2021; Maner, Weeden – Alparsan 2021.

<sup>13</sup> See Erbil – Mouton 2018, 84, for a different interpretation of the expression *arunaz* (see the Bronze Tablet i 56).

<sup>14</sup> See Forlanini 2017, 249 n. 105 for other literature in support of the assumption that Ura was inside Tarḫuntašša.

<sup>15</sup> See lastly Matessi – Gürel – Kuzucuoğlu – D'Alfonso 2019.

<sup>16</sup> See n. 14.



“island” within the territory of Tarḫuntašša. Nonetheless, this assumption does not solve the issue about the Göksu river valley being part of Kuruntiya’s reign. Another hypothesis was recently proposed by Alvise Matessi (2016, 150 n. 58); he argued that Ura, together with its neighbouring region, was a semi-autonomous polity subordinated to Ḫatti, but, if this were so, we would expect to find a treaty concluded with the ruler of this polity, or at least evidence on its governor.

Instead, we argue that the polity given to Kuruntiya was composed of two territories separated by a corridor along the Göksu River valley that was under the direct Hittite control, as Daan Smit proposed (1990-91).<sup>17</sup> The assumption that the polity of Tarḫuntašša controlled non-contiguous territories was advanced also by the team of researchers who work at the site of Türkmen-Karahöyük which may indeed be the capital of this kingdom (Massa *et al.* 2020). Finally, in support to the argument that the territory of Tarḫuntašša was quite small, we may mention the fact that Tudḫaliya indeed required a meagre tribute from Kuruntiya, as Massimo Forlanini argued (2017, 280 n. 112).

4. Muršili II conquered the western Anatolian kingdom of Arzawa and split its territory into three polities, namely, the Šeḫa River Land, Mira-Kuwaliya, and Ḫapalla. Although the treaties concluded by Muršili II with, respectively, Targašnalli of Ḫapalla, Manapa-Tarḫunta of Šeḫa, and Kupanta-Kuruntiya of Mira-Kuwaliya are all preserved, as is the treaty signed by Muwatalli II and Alakšandu of Wiluša, the only treaty that contains the provision concerning the boundary of a western Anatolian polity is the agreement concluded with Kupanta-Kuruntiya of Mira.

This ruler was the nephew and follower of Mašḫuiluwa on the throne of Mira-Kuwaliya. It was Muršili II who had given him the power to rule, even though his uncle had rebelled against the Hittites. Muršili II stated that he did not consider Kupanta-Kuruntiya responsible for his predecessor’s betrayal and thus confirmed the boundaries of Mira-Kuwaliya, which had previously been established for Mašḫuiluwa in a treaty that is not preserved.

---

<sup>17</sup> See also de Martino 1999. Recent publications on territoriality in the ancient Near East support the assumption that a kingdom could control non-contiguous regions, see for example Smith 2007; van Valkenburgh – Osborne 2013.

As set down in the Kupanta-Kuruntiya treaty (Beckman 1999, 75-76; Devecchi 2015, 142-143), two rivers, namely, the Aštarpa and the Šiyanta, marked the boundary between Ḫatti and Mira-Kuwaliya (Gander 2017, 266). The river Aštarpa may be identified with the Akar Çay and, presumably, delimited the eastern boundary of the region of Kuwaliya. Instead, the Šiyanta river, which could be either the Porsuk or the Seydi Su, marked the border between Mira and Ḫatti (Hawkins 2020, 341).

This portion of the treaty contains an interesting clause, in that Kupanta-Kuruntiya was forbidden from founding any town in direction of the two rivers. If he should contravene this clause of the treaty, the Hittite king would have attacked him as if he were an enemy of Ḫatti. This provision aimed at creating a demilitarised buffer zone between Mira-Kuwaliya and Ḫatti.

Nonetheless, Muršili II's respect for the gods was stronger than the political strategies; hence, the Hittite king allowed Kupanta-Kuruntiya to keep only one single town on the bank of the Šiyanta river, because it was a sacred place from the time of Mašḫuiluwa and Muršili II did not want to arouse the divine anger, if the sanctuary of this city would have been abandoned.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- |                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Beckman 1999        | G. BECKMAN, <i>Hittite Diplomatic Texts. Second Edition</i> , Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.                                                                                                                           |
| Belmonte Marín 2001 | J.A. BELMONTE MARÍN, <i>Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. V. Chr., Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 12/2</i> . Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.                                                   |
| Bryce 1986-7        | T. BRYCE, "The Boundaries of Hatti and Hittite Border Policy", <i>Tel Aviv</i> 13-14, 85-102.                                                                                                                                    |
| Cohen – Anor 2020   | Y. COHEN – N. ANOR, "Forging an Empire. The Borders of Carchemish According to CTH 50 (KUB 19.27)", in M. CAMMAROSANO – E. DEVECCHI, – M. VIANO (eds.), <i>talugaeš witeš. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Stefano</i> |

- de Martino on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Münster: Zaphon, 71-79.
- D’Alfonso 2005 L. D’ALFONSO, *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria*, Pavia: Italian University Press, Studia Mediterranea 7.
- de Martino 1999 S. DE MARTINO, “Ura and the boundaries of Tarḫuntašša”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 26, 291-300.
- Devecchi 2010 E. DEVECCHI, “RS 17.62 + RS.237 (CTH 64)”, *Ugarit Forschungen* 42, 105-108.
- 2012 E. DEVECCHI, “Treaties and Edicts in the Hittite World”, in G. WILHELM (ed.), *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 637-645.
- 2015 E. DEVECCHI, *Trattati internazionali ittiti*, Brescia: Paideia, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4.4.
- Dinçol – Yakar –  
Dinçol – Taffet 2000 A. DINÇOL – J. YAKAR – B. DINÇOL – A. TAFFET, “The Borders of the Appanage Kingdom of Tarḫuntašša – A Geographical and Archaeological Assessment”, *Anatolica* 26, 1-29.
- Erbil – Mouton 2018 Y. ERBIL – A. MOUTON, “From Ikkuwaniya to Ura. A reassessment of the geography of the Hūlaya River Land according to the Hittite archaeological and philological evidence”, *Anatolica* 44, 75-122.
- Forlanini 2013 M. FORLANINI, “How to Infer Ancient Roads and Itineraries from heterogeneous Hittite Texts: The Case of a Cilician (Kizzuwatnean) Road System”, *KASKAL* 10, 1-34.
- 2017 M. FORLANINI, “South Central: The Lower Land and Tarḫuntašša”, in M. WEEDEN – L. ULLMAN (eds.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 239-261.
- 2018 M. FORLANINI, “La rout de «Portes Ciliciennes» et ses embranchmenets avant l’âge Classique”, in J-TAVERNIER – E. GORRIS – K. ABRAHAM – V. BOSCHLOSS (eds.), *Topography and Toponymy in*

- the Ancient Near East*, Leuven-la-Neuve: Peeters, 19-49.
- Gander 2017 M. GANDER, “The West: Philology”, in M. Weeden – L.Z. ULLMANN (eds.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 262-280.
- Halayqa 2010 I.K.H. HALAYQA, “The Demise of Ugarit in the Light of its Connection with Ḫatti”, *Ugarit Forschungen* 42, 297-332.
- Hawkins 1995 J.D. HAWKINS, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 3.
- 2020 J.D. HAWKINS, “VII: Tawagalawa: The Topography [with Addenda]”, in S. HEINHOLD-KRAHMER – E. RIEKEN (Hrsgg.), *Der „Tawagalawa“ Brief*, Berlin – Boston: de Gruyter.
- Hawkins – Weeden 2017 J.D. HAWKINS – M. WEEDEN, “Kizzuwatna and the Euphrates States: Kummaha, Elbistan, Malatya: Philology”, in M. WEEDEN – L. ULLMAN (eds.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 281-294.
- Hawkins – Weeden 2021 J.D. HAWKINS – M. WEEDEN, “The New Inscription from Türkmenkarahöyük and its Historical context”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 48, 384-399.
- Lackenbacher 2002 S. LACKENBACHER, *Textes Akkadiens d’Ugarit*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat (2016) S. LACKENBACHER – F. MALBRAN-LABAT, *Lettres en akkadien de la “Maison d’Urtenu”*, Leuven - Paris - Bristol CT: Peeters.
- Liverani 1988 M. LIVERANI, “Confine e frontiera nel Vicino Oriente del Tardo Bronzo: Spunti di discussione e riflessione”, *Scienze dell’Antichità. Storia, Archeologia, Antropologia* 2, 79-99.
- Maner – Weeden – Alparslan 2021 C. MANER – M. WEEDEN – M. ALPARSLAN, “Archäologische Forschungen am Karacadağ und

- eine hieroglyphenluwische Inschrift aus Karaören”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 48, 347-383.
- Massa *et al.* 2020 M. MASSA – CHR. BACHHUBER – F. ŞAHİN – H. ERPEHLIVAN – J. OSBORNE – A.J. LAURICELLA, “A landscape-oriented approach to urbanisation and early state formation on the Konya and Karaman plains, Turkey”, *Anatolian Studies* 70, 45-75.
- Matessi 2016 A. MATESSI, “The Making of Hittite Imperial Landscapes: Territoriality and Balance of Power in South-Ventral Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age”, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 3, 117-162.
- Matessi – Gürel – Kuzucuoğlu – D’Alfonso 2019 A. MATESSI – A. GÜREL – C. KUZUCUOĞLU – L. D’ALFONSO, “East of Konya: Settlements, Routes and Environment in Southern Cappadocia, and the Political Landscape of South Central Anatolia during the Second Millennium BCE”, in Y. HAZIRLAYAN – M. ÇİĞDEM (eds.), *Crossroads Kavşaklar*, Istanbul: Yayınları, 131-160.
- Melchert 2007 H.C. MELCHERT, “The Borders of Tarhuntassa Revisited”, in M. ALPARSLAN – M. DOĞAN-ALPARSLAN – H. PEKER (eds.), *VITA. Festschrift in Honour of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*. Istanbul: Yayınları, 505-513.
- Miller 2020 J. MILLER, “Two notes on Kizzuwatna’s Status as a Hittite Vassal in the Middle Hittite Period”, in M. CAMMAROSANO – E. DEVECCHI – M. VIANO (eds.), *talugaeš witteš. Ancient Near eastern Studies Presented to Stefano de Martino on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Münster: Zaphon, 345-350.
- Novák – Rutishauser 2012 M. NOVÁK – S. RUTISHAUSER, “Tuḫaliya, Šunaššura und die Grenze zwischen Ḫatti und Kizzuwatna”, in C. MITTERMAYER – S. ECKLIN (Hrsgg.), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger (OBO 256)*, Göttingen: Academic Press Friburg, 260-296, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 256.

- Otten 1988 H. OTTEN, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 1.
- Schwemer 2005a D. SCHWEMER, “Der Vertrag zwischen Tutḫaliya von Ḫatti und Šunaššura von Kizzuwatna”, in B. JANOWSKI – G. WILHELM (Hrsgg.), *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 97-106. Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments NF 2.
- 2005b D. SCHWEMER, “Edikt Muršilis II. von Ḫatti zur Trennung von Ugarit und Sijannu (RS 17.38+382)”, in B. JANOWSKI – G. WILHELM (Hrsgg.), *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 169-171, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments NF 2.
- Singer 1999 I. SINGER, “A Political History of Ugarit”, in W.G.E. WATSON – N. WYATT (eds.): *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt1., Bd. 39.
- Smit 1990-91 D.W. SMIT, “The Hittite Corridor”, *Talanta* 22-23, 113-115.
- Smith 2007 M. SMITH, “Territories, Corridors, and Networks: A Biological Modern for the Premodern State”, *Complexity* 12, 28-35.
- van den Hout 1995 T. VAN DEN HOUT, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 38.
- van Soldt 1996 W. VAN SOLDT, “Studies in the Topography of Ugarit 1. The Spelling of Ugaritic Toponyms”, *Ugarit Forschungen* 28, 653-692.
- van Valkenburgh – Osborne 2013 P. VAN VALKENBURGH – J. OSBORNE, “Home Turf: Archaeology, Territoriality, and Politics”, *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 22, 1-27.