

*A fragment of a treaty with Mukiš**

Elena Devecchi

Venezia

KBo 13.55 is a small fragment of text in Hittite. In the second edition of his *Catalogue des Textes Hittites* E. Laroche numbered it as CTH 136 and placed it among the texts of uncertain dating, as a possible fragment of a treaty with the north-Syrian kingdom of Mukiš. The hypothesis of it being a fragment of a treaty with Mukiš has been accepted also by G. Kestemont, who in his work *Diplomatique et droit international en Asie Occidentale* included it among the treaties of the Syrian group¹. H. Klengel mentioned it in his article about the north-Syrian kingdom contained in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, as a treaty fragment, but leaving its attribution to a treaty with Mukiš open to debate².

Later on, the text has been ignored by the main works devoted to the history of the Hittite kingdom and of Syria during the Hittite supremacy³, probably because of its poor state of preservation.

Recently B.J. Collins in her web version of the *Catalogue des Textes Hittites* suggested that KBo 13.55 should be regarded as a fragment of CTH 53, the treaty concluded by Šuppiluliuma with Tette of Nuḫašše.

On the contrary I think that, even if the text is badly preserved and the names of the two parties who signed the agreement are missing, there are enough elements to assign KBo 13.55 to the category of the treaties and in particular it can be regarded as a fragment of a treaty with Mukiš, to be dated to the reign of Šuppiluliuma I. I wish to present a transliteration and translation of the text first, then I will explain the reasons why I believe that it is a fragment of a treaty with Mukiš, more precisely to be dated to Šuppiluliuma's period.

¹ I would like to thank Prof. Stefano de Martino, Prof. Gernot Wilhelm and Prof. Lucio Milano for reading the drafts of this article and for the useful advice they gave me throughout the work. I owe some helpful hints to the kindness of Dr. J.L. Miller. Even so, I take complete responsibility for the contents of the article.

² G. Kestemont, *Diplomatique et droit international en Asie Occidentale*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1974, p. 95.

³ H. Klengel, "Mukiš", *RIA* 8 (1993-1997), pp. 411-412.

⁴ See e.g. H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*. Leiden-Boston-Köln 1999; H. Klengel, *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.* Berlin 1992; Tr. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford 1998; H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z.*, 2. Teil Berlin 1969, p. 447 who quotes the text only to remind that the Mukiš deities are mentioned in it.

Obverse, Col. I

- 1' [] 'x' []
 2' [] 'xx' DINGIR^{MES} L[Ú^{MES}]
 3' [DINGIR^{MES} MUNUS^{MES} hu]-r^u-ma-an-te-eš ŠA [KUR^{URU} Ha-at-ti]
 4' [DINGIR^{MES} LÚ^{ME}]Š DINGIR^{MES} MUNUS^{MES} hu-u-ma-r^a-[te-eš]
 5' rŠA KUR^{URU} Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-na DINGIR^{MES} LÚ^{ME}]Š DINGIR^{MES} MUNUS^{MES}
 6' hu-u-ma-an-te-eš ŠA KUR^{URU} Mu-ki-iš ták-r^a-[aš^d UTU-uš]⁴
 7' ka-ru-ú-i-li-ia-aš DINGIR^{MES}-eš hu-u-ma-an-te-e[š]
 8' ^dNa-ra-aš ^dNa-am-ša-ra<-aš> ^dMi-in-ki-iš
 9' ^dTu-hu-ši-iš ^dA-mu-um-ki-iš ^dA-la-lu-uš
 10' ^dA-an-du-uš ^dA-pa-a-an-du-uš ^dA-nu-uš

Reverse, Col. IV

- 1 zi-ga-aš-ma-aš-kán ma-a-an A-WA-TE^{MES} SIG₅-TIM
 2 pé-ra-an ar-ḫa Ú-UL ú-i-da-a-ši⁵ nu-uš-ma-[aš-kán]
 3 KUR^{URU} Ha-at-ti pé-ra-an Ú-UL SIG₅-in me-mi-iš-[ki-ši]
 4 nu-uš-ma-ša-at-kán an-da Ú-UL a-aš-ši-ia-nu-uš-[ki-ši]
 5 na-aš-ša-an A-NA KUR^{URU} Ha-at-ti KASKAL-ši SIG₅-[in]
 6 ti-it-ta-nu-uš-ki⁶ na-at^{URU} Ha-at-tu-[ši]
 7 [i-i]a-an-da-ru
 8 [i-da-l]a[-m]u-uš-ma-aš-ma-aš-kán me-mi-ia-nu-u[š]
 9 [le-e pé]-r^e-ḫu-te-ši⁷ nu-uš-ma-aš x[
 10 [pé-ra-a]n⁸ le-e me-ma-[at-ti IGI^{HI.A}-wa-kán]
 11 [ḪUR.SAG-i le-e] na-it-ti⁹ [
 12 []x-ga-x[

⁴ For the integration *ták-n[a-aš^d UTU-uš]* see B.H.L. van Gessel, *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Leiden-New York-Köln 1998, pp. 871-873.

⁵ CHD L-N, *memiya(n)*- 1 b 15', pp. 271-272 mentions instances where *memiya-* is the object of the verb *uda-* "to bring". Here we have instead *wida-* "to bring (here)", that however expresses the same concept (see CHD P, *peran* 12 c 2' g', p. 309).

⁶ Cf. with CTH 62, KBo 5.9 III 15 and CTH 66, ll. 64-65 (following the numbering given in G.F. del Monte, *Il Trattato fra Muršili II di Hattusa e Niqmepa di Ugarit*. Roma 1986, for the Akkadian parallel. See CHD P, *paša-* 1 d, p. 71 and CHD Š, *-šan* B 1 b 25', p. 137; HW, KASKAL, p. 280: KASKAL-ši *tittanu-* "auf den (rechten) Weg bringen".

⁷ Rev. 8-9 integrated on the basis of CHD P, *pehute-* b, p. 260 and HED vol. 6 *memi(y)a-*, *memiyan-*, *memi(e)n-*, p. 144.

⁸ CHD P, *peran* 1 c 1' c' 5'', p. 297 integrates only *pé-ra-an*, but the space seems too broad for only one word. A possible, but tentative reconstruction could have rÚⁿ-[UL] at the end of rev. 9 and [SIG₅-in *pé-ra-a*]n at the beginning of rev. 10.

⁹ The integration of rev. 10-11 is based on parallel passages in CTH 146, KUB 23.72+, rev. 58 and 62. Cf. with CTH 62, KBo 5.9 III 20 and CTH 68, KBo 5.13 II 21 (see CHD Š, *šakui-* 1 d 2' o' 1'', p. 72). Possibly the same clause was attested also in CTH 76, KUB 19.6 II 53 (see SV, pp. 64-65).

female deities of Kizzuwatna” and “all the male and female deities” of the specific land involved in the agreement¹⁴. The presence of the “primeval deities” also speaks for the inclusion of the text in the treaty category¹⁵.

2) The preserved part of the reverse has close parallels with the clauses that in other treaties establish the vassals’ behaviour before fugitives coming from a third country¹⁶. We find the advice to speak well of Ḫatti before runaways, to make it lovable to them and finally to turn their flight toward Ḫatti.

Before discussing the elements supporting the opinion that it is a treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Mukiš, I would linger over a particular characteristic of KBo 13.55, namely the unusual distribution of the text on the tablet. If we assume that the treaty was written on one single tablet divided into two columns, I suggest that the preserved part of the obverse corresponds to the end of the first column, while the preserved part of the reverse would represent the first lines of the fourth column. In that case the list of divine witnesses would be at the beginning of the treaty, but such a distribution of the text is in contrast with the prevailing use of placing this section among the last paragraphs of the vassal treaties. Therefore the hypothesis of inverting obverse and reverse has been considered. However this possibility can be excluded because the reverse is clearly indicated by the presence of the ruling at the top of the tablet. It is moreover impossible for a treaty to begin with a clause about fugitives, as the one in KBo 13.55 Rev. 1-12. Actually the presence of the list of divine witnesses at the beginning of the text is a problem only apparently. It is an unusual element in the vassal treaties of the imperial age, but since long it has been observed that this characteristic can be found for instance in the Kaska treaties (CTH 138 and 139)¹⁷ and in the treaty between Arnuwanda I and the People of Išmerikka (CTH 133)¹⁸, both dating to the middle Hittite period. As for Šuppiluliuma, we find the same distribution of the text also in the treaty with Huqana of Hayaša (CTH 42). Here the list of the gods takes up about 20 lines at the end of the first column and is preceded by 40 lines with the introduction of the two parties and some clauses about loyalty to Hittite dynasty and mutual loyalty. The fact that the list of the divine witnesses is at the beginning of the text also in a treaty of the imperial period, signed with the suzerain of a kingdom, is in contrast with the theory that this is a typical characteristic of middle Hittite treaties drawn up with a community rather than with a single person¹⁹. I will go back to this characteristic shared by CTH 136 and CTH 42 later when I discuss the dating of the text.

¹⁴ G. Kestemont, “Le pantheon des instruments hittites de droit public”, *Or* 45 (1976), pp. 147-177, particularly p. 152 and pp. 166-167.

¹⁵ A. Archi, “The Names of the Primeval Gods”, in *Gs E. von Schuler*, M. Marazzi – G. Wilhelm edd., *Or* 59 (1990), pp. 114-129, mentions all the texts where the “primeval deities” are attested. See also Kestemont, *Or* 45 (1976), p. 153 and p. 168.

¹⁶ Kestemont, *Diplomatique*, p. 95.

¹⁷ E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer*. Berlin 1965, p. 109 f.

¹⁸ A. Kempinski – S. Košak, “Der Išmeriga-Vertrag”, *WdO* 5 (1969-1970), pp. 191-217, particularly pp. 202-203.

¹⁹ E. von Schuler, “Staatsverträge und Dokumente hethitischen Rechts”, in *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (Historia 7), G. Walser ed. Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 34-53, particularly p. 38. E. von Schuler, “Sonderformen hethitischer Staatsverträge”, in *Helmuth Theodor Bossert'in hatirasina armağan. In*

Coming back to the problem of the identification of KBo 13.55 with a fragment of a treaty with Mukiš, the decisive element supporting this hypothesis is the presence of “all the male and male and female deities of Mukiš” among the gods invoked as witnesses of the oath. In fact in the Hittite treaties the gods of the vassal country are often invoked together with those of Ḫatti and sometimes also those of Kizzuwatna, and as far as I know there is a perfect correspondence between the parties signing the agreement and the invoked deities, as we can see for instance in the case of the Kaška²⁰, Nuḫašše²¹, Amurru²² and Ugarit²³.

We can consider now the problem of the identity of the Hittite king the text can be attributed to. G. Kestemont had already suggested that the fragment could be dated to Šuppiluliuma I, saying that the clause in Rev. 1-12 is typical of the treaties signed by this king with Syrian vassals²⁴. Actually this is a weak argument because the same provisions about rebels or fugitives coming from a third country are attested also in the treaties of Muṣšili II with Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru (CTH 62) and with Niqmepa of Ugarit (CTH 66). The reasoning of G.F. del Monte is actually more convincing: he observes that the male and female deities of Kizzuwatna are mentioned only in Šuppiluliuma's treaties (CTH 49, 51, 52, 53)²⁵ and I think that this is a very strong element supporting the attribution of the text to this king.

On the basis of the palaeographical analysis also J. Klinger and E. Neu think that the text can date back to Šuppiluliuma's reign²⁶.

The attribution to Šuppiluliuma has been accepted also by A. Archi, who however takes into account also the possibility of dating the text to Muṣšili II²⁷.

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, there are various elements supporting the attribution of this treaty to Šuppiluliuma I. We have to check now how this hypothesis can be conciliated with the historical information we have. The sources about the relationship between Ḫatti and Mukiš during Šuppiluliuma's reign can be subdivided into two groups: those relating to the hostility of Mukiš and those relating to the submission of the north-Syrian kingdom.

Beginning with the first group, an important document is the letter sent by Šuppiluliuma to Niqmadu II king of Ugarit (CTH 45) when the latter had been threatened by

Memoriam Helmuth Theodor Bossert, AnAr 2 (1965), pp. 445-464; Kempinski – Košak, WdO 5 (1969-1970), pp. 202-203; McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, p. 75.

²⁰ CTH 139, KBo 8.35 II 11-12.

²¹ CTH 53, KBo 1.4 IV 38-40.

²² CTH 49, KUB 3.7 + obv. 5-7. CTH 62, KBo 5.9 IV 13-14.

²³ CTH 66, l. 107'.

²⁴ Kestemont, *Diplomatique*, p. 95.

²⁵ Del Monte, *Muššili-Niqmepa*, p. 105.

²⁶ J. Klinger – E. Neu, “War die erste Computer-Analyse des Hethitischen verfehlt?“, *Hethitica* 10 (1990), pp. 135-160, particularly p. 141. The presence of the signs URU and LI in the old variant is not decisive for a high dating: in fact they can be found in the old variant also in other documents belonging without any doubt to Šuppiluliuma's corpus (see e.g. CTH 52 and CTH 53 *passim*).

²⁷ Archi, *Or* 59 (1990), p. 123.

Mukiš and Nuḥašše. As documented also in other texts²⁸, the kings of Mukiš, Nuḥašše and Niya had organized an anti-Hittite coalition and wanted Niqmadu to join their alliance. Since the king of Ugarit refused their proposal, they invaded and plundered his country. With this letter the Great King incites Niqmadu to side with the Hittites and to fight against Mukiš, Nuḥašše and any other country hostile to Šuppiluliuma. In exchange for this, he promises him “a sealed treaty tablet”. In this context it is interesting to take into account the following statement made by Šuppiluliuma: “You will see how the Great King deals with the kings of the land of Nuḥašše and the king of the land of Mukiš, who renounced the peace treaty with Ḫatti and are hostile to the Great King, their lord”²⁹.

It has been suggested that the claim of sovereignty on these territories was based only on the fact that Syria had been previously conquered by the Hittites, therefore they continued to consider it as a Hittite possession³⁰. Other scholars think that after the expedition against Waššukkani Šuppiluliuma regarded all the kingdoms under Mitannian control as his vassals, even if he hadn't actually conquered them yet³¹.

All these explanations could be valid if we had to deal with just a generic claim on those Syrian kingdoms, but I think that a precise reference to previous agreements should be based on their actual existence. We should therefore wonder when and by which king these older treaties could have been drawn up.

The answer to this question depends basically on the dating of the letter CTH 45. In this work I accept the hypothesis that this document dates back to the initial phase of the great offensive led by Šuppiluliuma against Syria and known in the secondary literature as “one-year campaign”³². Accepting this dating of the letter, those early treaties should be set *before* the “one-year campaign”.

Which Hittite king could have stipulated these agreements before that event? Could they be ascribed to Šuppiluliuma?

The reconstruction of the military undertakings led by Šuppiluliuma in this region before the “one-year campaign” is still under debate. It is difficult to give a chronological order to the sources, which often give contradictory accounts. It seems quite sure that a first clash with Mitanni took place on the border between the two kingdoms, probably in south-eastern Anatolia, and ended with the Hurrian victory³³. We can therefore exclude that the

²⁸ CTH 46, 47 and 49.

²⁹ CTH 45, RS 17.132 obv. 22-27.

³⁰ Klengel, *Gesch.Syr*, 2. Teil, pp. 239-240.

³¹ M. Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit*. Roma 1962, p. 40.

³² See e.g. J. Nougayrol, *Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales)* (PRU 4 = MRS 9). Paris 1956, pp. 32-33; Liverani, *Storia*, p. 40; Bryce, *KGHitt*, p. 177 dates the letter to the time when Šuppiluliuma conquered Halep; Klengel, *Geschichte*, p. 157 dates the letter to the invasion of Syria after the raid to Waššukkani; according to A. Altman, “EA 59: 27-29 and the Efforts of Mukiš, Nuḥašše and Niya to Establish a Common Front Against Šuppiluliuma I”, *UF* 33 (2001), pp. 1-25 “the most likely dating for this letter would be just before Šuppiluliuma’s incursion into northern Syria in the course of his one-year campaign”, p. 14.

³³ See EA 17 30-38. It is the expedition called “First Syrian Foray” by K.A. Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs*. Liverpool 1962, pp. 24-25. See also G. Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, Warmister 1989, pp. 31-32; Klengel, *Syria*, p. 109; Klengel, *Geschichte*, p. 155; S. de Martino, “Il regno hurrita di Mittani: profilo storico politico”, in *La civiltà dei Hurriti (PdP 55)*, AA.VV. Napoli 2001, pp. 88-89.

annexation of the Syrian territories and the consequent stipulation of vassal treaties date back to that moment.

The existence of a preliminary incursion led by Šuppiluliuma in western Syria up to Mount Lebanon³⁴ is much more debated. I don't want to go deeply into this matter, because the text I am presenting doesn't add any conclusive element to solve the problem. If we exclude that this first expedition west of the Euphrates ever took place³⁵, we automatically exclude the possibility that Šuppiluliuma could have submitted Syria before the "one-year campaign". If instead we admit its existence³⁶, we have to consider its significance and the results Šuppiluliuma could have achieved with this military undertaking. In the historical prologue of CTH 51 Šuppiluliuma remembers that before the "one-year campaign" he *plundered* the lands west of the Euphrates and he states explicitly that he conquered *only* Mount Lebanon³⁷. We also have Rib-Adda's words, who writes to the Pharaoh saying that "the king of Ḫatti took all the tributary lands of the king of Mitta(ni), that is the king of Naḫ(ri)ma"³⁸, but the significance of Šuppiluliuma's conquests could have been exaggerated by the king of Byblos, perhaps in order to press for an Egyptian intervention in Syria. Moreover both CTH 51 and some Amarna letters³⁹ seem to suggest that Tušratta reacted to the Hittite foray in his Syrian territories by leading some raids west of the Euphrates in retaliation⁴⁰. On the basis of these elements, I think that this first expedition in Syria could be interpreted as a show of strength by Šuppiluliuma, or possibly also as an attempt to take part of the Syrian kingdoms away from the Mitannic control. This however didn't bring to the actual annexation of the region⁴¹ and therefore didn't enable the Great King to bind the north-Syrian kingdoms with treaties.

In my opinion there are not enough elements to state that the "peace agreements" stipulated before the time the letter CTH 45 was written could date back to Šuppiluliuma. Therefore, we can exclude that CTH 136 is a treaty stipulated by Šuppiluliuma with Mukiš before the "one-year campaign".

Admitting that the statement we find in letter CTH 45 is not purely demagogic and that these older treaties actually exist, we need to identify the earlier king these agreements can be dated to and evaluate if CTH 136 could be the actual text of this treaty.

³⁴ Assumed on the basis of CTH 51, KBo 1.1 obv. 4 and EA 75 35-38.

³⁵ Some scholars think that these texts refer to the great "one-year campaign": see A. Goetze, "The Struggle for the Domination of Syria", CAH II/2. Cambridge 1975, p. 8; G. Wilhelm – J. Boese, "Absolute Chronologie und die hethitische Geschichte des 15. und 14. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.", in *High, Middle or Low?*, P. Åström ed. Gothenburg 1987, pp. 74-117, particularly p. 85.

³⁶ See e.g. Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma*, pp. 25-27 ("Second Syrian Foray"); J. Freu, "Les guerres syriennes de Suppiluliuma et la fin de l'ère amarnienne", *Hethitica* 11 (1992), pp. 39-101 particularly p. 57; Klengel, *Geschichte*, pp. 156-157; A. Altman, *The Historical Prologue of the Hittite Vassal Treaties*. Ramat-Gan 2004, pp. 82-87.

³⁷ KBo 1.1 obv. 4.

³⁸ EA 75: 35-38.

³⁹ EA 85, EA 90, EA 95, EA 101.

⁴⁰ Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma*, p. 27; Freu, *Hethitica* 11 (1992), p. 58; A. Na'aman, "Ammishtamru's Letter to Akhenaten (EA 45) and Hittite Chronology", *AuOr* 14 (1996), pp. 251-257, particularly p. 255; Klengel, *Geschichte*, p. 157.

⁴¹ Klengel, *Geschichte*, p. 157.

The only other Hittite king who had the control of northern Syria in a time relatively near, before Šuppiluliuma, is his middle Hittite forefather Tuḫaliya I/II⁴².

The documents don't provide direct information attesting that he conquered Mukiš, but there are enough elements supporting the hypothesis that Tuḫaliya I/II annexed also this country during his campaigns in northern Syria⁴³. The kingdom of Mukiš was located between Kizzuwatna and Halep, both conquered by the middle-Hittite king, therefore the annexation of Mukiš seems to be an essential precondition in order to control the whole region. Moreover it seems possible that Tuḫaliya I/II bound this kingdom with a vassal treaty⁴⁴, because the treaties stipulated by this king with Sunassura of Kizzuwatna (CTH 41 and 131), with Lab'u and the people of Tunip (CTH 135)⁴⁵ and with Aštata (CTH 212)⁴⁶ show that he took particular care in rendering official with written agreements the submission of conquered countries.

Could CTH 136 be the text of this earlier treaty, dating back to Tuḫaliya I/II?

There are two elements apparently supporting this hypothesis. The spelling *Mu-ki-iš*, that we find in KBo 13.55 obv. 6', is attested till now only here and in a middle Hittite text⁴⁷, the most common writing of this place name being *Mu-kiš*⁴⁸. Since however in the above mentioned letter sent by Šuppiluliuma to Niqmadu of Ugarit this place name is spelled *Mu-ki-iš*⁴⁹, we cannot exclude that writings other than the one using the sign *-kiš* existed at the time of Šuppiluliuma. Secondly, it is true that the structure with the divine witnesses at the beginning of the text is common in treaties and oaths of the Middle Kingdom, but we have seen that it is attested also in the treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Huqqana of Hayaša, therefore it cannot be regarded as an exclusively middle Hittite characteristic. These two elements supporting the dating of CTH 136 to Tuḫaliya I/II are quite weak and I think that in any case a decisive factor supporting the attribution of the text to Šuppiluliuma I is the invocation of the gods of Kizzuwatna.

If we discard the hypothesis that CTH 136 is a fragment of a treaty stipulated by Tuḫaliya I/II, or by Šuppiluliuma I before the so-called "one-year campaign", there is only one historic moment the drawing up of this text can date back to: after Šuppiluliuma conquered Mukiš, *following* the "one-year campaign" in Syria.

The documents don't give detailed information about this event: the only source containing an explicit account about the submission of Mukiš is the historical prologue of the treaty between Šuppiluliuma and Šattiwaza of Mitanni. Here the Great King states: "I overpowered the land of Halep and the land of Mukiš"⁵⁰. Immediately after this statement we

⁴² Klengel, *Geschichte*, p. 114; Bryce, *KgHitt*, pp. 151-152.

⁴³ Altman, *Historical Prologue*, pp. 73-74.

⁴⁴ Altman, *UF* 33 (2001), p. 14 footnote 44.

⁴⁵ J. Klinger, "Synchronismen in der Epoche vor Šuppiluliuma I. – einige Anmerkungen zur Chronologie der mittelhethitischen Geschichte", in *StMed* 9, pp. 235-248.

⁴⁶ H. Klengel, "Die Keilschrifttexte von Meskene und die Geschichte von Aštata/Emar", *OLZ* 83 (1988), pp. 645-653; Klinger, *StMed* 9, p. 245. KUB 57.18 has been now joined to 714/v and 1460/v and published as KBo 50.134.

⁴⁷ CTH 780.4, KUB 45.21 edge 4. *RGTC* 6/2, p. 106 s.v.

⁴⁸ *RGTC* 6, p. 275 s.v.

⁴⁹ CTH 45, RS 17.132 obv. 3. *RGTC* 12/2, p. 198 s.v.

⁵⁰ CTH 51, KBo 1.1 obv. 30.

also read that Takuwa, king of Niya, went to Mukiš to submit to Šuppiluliuma⁵¹. In the edict of Šuppiluliuma for Niqmadu of Ugarit we find that the king of Ugarit too appeared in Alalah, capital of the kingdom of Mukiš, to pay homage to the Hittite king⁵². All these data confirm the news of the capitulation of Mukiš, because it seems unlikely that the Great King would reside in Alalah if the north Syrian kingdom had not been submitted yet. Moreover we can also deduce from the edict for Niqmadu that Šuppiluliuma had the territory of Mukiš at his complete disposal, since he assigned a part of it to Ugarit⁵³.

We find more confirmations also in the treaties of Šuppiluliuma with Tette⁵⁴ and with Aziru⁵⁵, where Mukiš is listed among the countries in peace with Hatti – where the *status* of “in peace, friend” depends on the existence of a formal agreement⁵⁶.

In addition to the evidence from the texts, it has to be taken into account that the annexation of this kingdom was a fundamental precondition for the Hittite king to continue his campaign toward the south of Syria. This opens the problem of the dating of the treaty within the Šuppiluliuma’s conquests.

In CTH 51 the submission of Mukiš is placed among the very first successes achieved by Šuppiluliuma in Syria. In fact the submission of Mukiš is mentioned together with that of Halep immediately after the expedition against Waššukkanni and the crossing of the Euphrates westward.

It is impossible to demonstrate for certain that the sequence of events as related in CTH 51 is realistic, but the reconstruction seems plausible, because Halep and Mukiš are actually the first two kingdoms Šuppiluliuma meets during his march from the east.

We can also add that in the Amarna corpus we don’t find any letter sent by kings of Mukiš, or references to this kingdom in the correspondence between other Syrian kings and the Pharaoh. This is peculiar, in particular if we consider that in the case of other Mitannian vassals we know that they contacted the Pharaoh, trying to obtain Egyptian protection when Šuppiluliuma invaded Syria and it was clear that Mitanni wasn’t any longer strong enough to defend its Syrian territories. Such a strategy is attested for instance in the case of Nuḥašše and Niya⁵⁷. The absence of references to Mukiš in the letters of Syrian kings like Aziru of Amuru and Akizzi of Qatna could possibly be due also to the northern position of this kingdom, which wouldn’t be a threat to those of the low valley of the Orontes. In my opinion the absence of references to Mukiš in the Amarna corpus can be regarded as an element supporting the hypothesis that the north Syrian kingdom had been permanently annexed since the very beginning of Šuppiluliuma’s “one-year campaign”, and that it hadn’t caused

⁵¹ CTH 51, KBo 1.1 obv. 30-31.

⁵² CTH 46, RS 17.340 obv. 24-25. CTH 47, RS 17.227 rev. 43-46 could also refer to the same event.

⁵³ CTH 46, RS 17.340 rev. 3-7.

⁵⁴ CTH 53, KBo 1.4 II 13-14.

⁵⁵ CTH 49, KUB 3.7+ obv. 8'-9'. The text is very badly preserved, but the integration seems likely (see *DiplTexts*², p. 38).

⁵⁶ M. Liverani, *Prestige and Interest. International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C.* Padova 1990, pp. 180-181.

⁵⁷ The EA 51 text documents the call for help sent by Addu-nirari of Nuḥašše to the Pharaoh. We find more information about the two opposed parties in EA 53, where Nuḥašše, Niya and Zinzar appear among the countries allied with Egypt.

any problems eventually, because it wasn't any longer involved in the anti-Hittite opposition supported by other Mitannic vassals. The same situation can be assumed in the case of Halep, too.

Finally, a further element supporting the assumption that both the submission of Mukiš and the treaty date back to the early stage of Šuppiluliuma's victories can also be the peculiar distribution of the treaty text on the tablet. In fact, as we have already seen, CTH 136 shares this characteristic with the treaty with Huqqana of Hayaša, dated to the beginning of Šuppiluliuma's reign.

The text is too badly preserved and it is impossible to reconstruct the treaty conditions, but it seems likely that they weren't particularly favourable to Mukiš, because it had offered resistance to Šuppiluliuma. As previously noted, part of the territory of Mukiš was assigned to Ugarit and this has to be seen as a penalization on the enemy kingdom.

As regards the identity of the king who could have signed the agreement with Šuppiluliuma, the only king of Mukiš known for this period is Itur-Addu, whose name is attested only in the historical introduction of CTH 46. He is one of the protagonists of the anti-Hittite coalition organised by the north Syrian kingdoms in reaction to the Hittite invasion. It is therefore possible that Šuppiluliuma decided to replace him with a more trustworthy official. As from this time we don't know any other king of Mukiš, but we found only generic references to the "people of Mukiš" (CTH 64). On the basis of a later letter (RS 20.03), which can be dated to Tuḫaliya IV's reign, written by Šukur-Teššub "DUMU LUGAL" to Ammištamru of Ugarit, we can suppose that Mukiš became a territory ruled by a member of the Hittite royal family, but we don't have elements to show that this *status* dates back to the treaty with Šuppiluliuma⁵⁸.

In conclusion, CTH 136 can be easily collocated among the conquests achieved by Šuppiluliuma in Syria as a result of the "one-year campaign". On one side it represents a further step in the reconstruction of the wars led by the Hittite king and it confirms what could have been inferred from other documents. On the other hand, it increases the number of treaties known for this king, confirming his habit of ratifying with official agreements the submission of new territories.

⁵⁸ See however H.G. Güterbock, "Carchemish", *JNES* 13 (1954), pp. 102-114, particularly p. 105 fn. 15, who proposes to identify the Tuḫaliya mentioned in CTH 63.A (KBo 3.3+ II 41) with the Tuḫaliya of a relief found in Tell Atçana (L. Woolley, *Alalakh. An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay 1937-1949*. London 1955, p. 241), possibly a Hittite prince holding some office in Alalaḫ.