
HISTORY

**THE EUPHRATES CONTACT ZONE
IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIII CENTURY
(Before the Crisis)**

Aram Kosyan

Doctor in History

Institute of Oriental Studies NAS RA

Abstract

Contact zones represent those geographical segments of mankind where civilizing units meet each other and cooperate in different levels. At the same time permanent contacts create economic, political, and cultural background which secures the emergence of new civilizing qualities and progress. Exactly in such zones emerged the so-called "daughter-civilizations" (or "secondary civilizations") which by the time expanded into the "barbarian periphery". Among Near Eastern contact zones it is worth to mention that which begins from the Upper Euphrates and reaches the "Fertile crescent" in the south (the bordering territory between Turkey, Syria, and Iraq). This zone had played important role in the history of early state formations of the Armenian Highland.

Keywords: Contact zone, Armenian Highland, Near Eastern world-system, Hayaša, Azzi

Definition of the Contact Zone

Much has been written about contact zones and their civilizing role.¹ These regions were and until now represent those geographical segments of mankind where civilizing units meet each other and cooperate in different levels. At the same time permanent contacts create economic, political, and cultural background which secures the emergence of new civilizing qualities and progress. Exactly in such zones emerged the so-called "daughter-civilizations" (or "secondary civilizations") which by the time expanded into the "barbarian periphery".

Near East is one of the earliest centers where mankind had made its first steps in achieving much of its civilizing values. Due to the diversity in terms of relief and climate it consists of numerous contact zones, thus making it easy the transfer of these values into neighboring "barbarian" regions. Among these it is worth to mention the Euphrates contact zone. The southern part of it partially includes the "Fertile crescent" which is well studied in the archaeological literature. In the north this zone starts from the big bend of the Euphrates (the region of modern Kemakh-Malatya) and continues until the borderland between Turkey, Syria and Iraq in the south. Thus, this zone from one side

¹ Wallerstein 1974-1989; Parker 2006 (with references to special literature); Margaryan 2012: 67ff.; and Margaryan 2016 (ed.) etc.

borders Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia and western, south-western parts of the Armenian Highland.

Taking into account historical realities of the ancient Near East, the eastern extremity of this zone along the southern limits of the Armenian Taurus until the Lake Urmiya could be regarded as its inseparable part. To such treatment of the Euphrates contact zone, besides the political, economic, and cultural considerations based on written sources², point also archaeological studies which prove that the regions to the north and south of the zone used to have close contacts at least going back to Chalcolithic period if not earlier.³

In the present article we shall discuss the period of ancient Near Eastern history which concludes the Late Bronze age civilizations, followed by the devastating long-lasting crisis.

Near Eastern world-system in the second half of the XIII century

The second half of the II millennium BC, especially the XIV-XIII centuries was one of the most significant periods of the Near Eastern political history. During this period the Near Eastern political scenery had undergone substantial changes. Particularly in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Asia Minor the political and economic development of statehoods had culminated in the establishment of extensive kingdoms/empires. In Asia Minor the New Hittite kingdom had come into existence on the basis of numerous small city-states (Kuššar, Purušhanda, Neša, Hattušaš etc.), later to be incorporated into the Old Kingdom (XVII century BC) and Early Empire/New kingdom⁴ (XV century BC). In Mesopotamia the process of political unification first was carried out under the hegemony of the Amorite Aššur and Babylonia, then was formed the bipolar political system - Middle Assyrian kingdom and Kassite Babylonia. The background of Mittani comprise numerous Hurrian principalities of Northern Mesopotamia, whose "buffer" position between Mesopotamia proper, Syria, Asia Minor, and Armenian Highland was the main obstacle in the process of creating strong political and economic basis for centralized statehood. The core of Mittani lays along the crossroads of the "Fertile Crescent", in the place where passes east-west and north-south strategic and trade roots. As to Egypt, only after the disintegration of the Middle Kingdom and the Hyksos rule here was established the New kingdom under the leadership of the pharaohs of Thebe.

² Here it is worth to mention contacts fixed still in the XXIV-XXIII centuries BC cuneiform texts of the Akkadian Empire which were continued well into the II millennium BC and later.

³ Different close contacts between Mesopotamia and societies of the southern limits of the Armenian Highland are elucidated by numerous archaeological materials (see Matney, Roaf, MacGinnis, McDonald 2002; Matney et al. 2003; Parker 2003; Creekmore 2007 etc.).

⁴ The term "Early Empire" was introduced by S.De Martino (De Martino 2010: 186).

Already in the XV century BC took place the polarization of political space where Egypt, Mittani, and the Hittite Early New kingdom were main actors. After the Hittite conquest in 1330's Mittani was withdrawn from this line-up and replaced by the Middle Assyrian kingdom. Each of these great polities was supplemented with a number of satellite states. The following two centuries, until the late XIII century BC the Near Eastern world-system is characterized by the dominance of these states.

How could be characterized the XV-XIII centuries BC world-system and their driving forces, which allow them to survive and hold their position about two centuries, despite several political events which threaten their territorial integrity and even existence. Let us sum up the possible causes.

1. These "super" powers had succeeded to conquer and keep under their control all neighboring political entities which could threaten their existence. Actually, there were no contact zones between these states. All principalities between Mesopotamia and Egypt, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, Egypt and Asia Minor comprised vassal states of this or that great power and were attached to them through vassal/non-parity treaties. Except Assyria whose relations with conquered countries were not regulated by means of such treaties. Assyrians introduced the system of vassal treaties only in the VIII-VII centuries BC, about a century before the fall of their statehood.⁵

In this geopolitical space none of the existing states was able to keep intact more than its own relatively independent status.⁶ This situation could be characterized as "stable equilibrium" where confrontation rarely turned into military conflicts. In the period under study only twice were registered wars.⁷ Usually armed conflicts took place on the territory of vassal states, in order to extend the spheres of influence, although, without significant territorial achievements.

2. The cases of "Stable equilibrium" seemingly satisfied all conflicting sides; probably, except Assyria whose need of material resources and the lack of trade routes forced it to extend the spheres of influence.⁸ This desire of Assyria began to expand significantly in 1260-1230's when Shalmaneser I and his successor Tukulti-Ninurta I initiated campaigns directed mostly against the eastern and south-eastern Hittite-bound countries.⁹ The next direction of Assyrian expansion was targeted against the weakened Babylonia whose last chance to survive was the Hittite empire.¹⁰

⁵ See Parpola and Watanabe 1988.

⁶ Mittani was a loose political organization consisting of numerous city-states under the domination of Indo-Iranian elite. Its multiethnic population (different Semitic peoples, Hurrians etc.) could not be regarded as reliable support for central authorities (On the state structure of Mittani see, particularly Kühne 1999).

⁷ The campaigns of Ramesses II against the Northern Syrian region which to that date was under the Hittite rule and which culminated in the 1274 BC battle near Qadesh against the Hittite king Muwatalliš II, the 1234/3 BC northern campaign and the battle of Nihriya (see on this event Singer 1985).

⁸ The main material resources of Assyria, particularly metals, besides trading activities were obtained in the Taurus mountains, where Assyrian texts refer to the existence of many small political organizations (tribal units) with whom were established trading activities, although sometimes their relations were more than strained.

⁹ For example, during the western campaign of Shalmaneser I against Mittani, when the Hittite appanage kingdom had suffered serious blow; Assyrian army reached until the River Euphrates, opposite Carchemish but Assyrians did not

During this troublesome period was organized the anti-Assyrian coalition, probably initiated by the Hittite king Tudhaliyaš IV. The main actors of this coalition were Hatti and Egypt; the two empires remained loyal to the principles of the 1259 BC treaty signed between Muwatalliš II and Ramesses II.¹¹ Due to this treaty, in the Syrian-Palestinian region was installed *status quo*, which stabilized not only the situation of the 200 years long confrontation between two empires but makes possible to establish restraining mechanisms against the ambitions of Assyria. Among the allies Hatti desires such support, taking into account its economic problems, i.e. the import of grain from Egypt.¹²

In the second half of the XIII century BC, until the first wave of the advance of the "Sea Peoples" towards the northern borders of Egypt during the early reign of pharaoh Merenptah, seemingly nothing threatens Egypt from outside, unlike Hatti where the situation was much more serious. The troublesome decades lasting at least beginning from the reign of Hattušiliš III and continued during Tudhaliyaš IV were marked by wars against the vassal states of Western Asia Minor who from time to time were supported by Ahhiyawa (Mycenaean Greece or its part).¹³ These external problems were combined with the long-lasting struggle between two branches of the Hittite ruling dynasty. With the bifurcation of Hittite statehood still during Hattušiliš III¹⁴ when was established the appanage kingdom of Tarhuntašša, emerged one more threat for the rulers of Hattušaš.

During the reign of Tudhaliyaš IV the situation in Hatti was becoming more and more critical, especially in the face of several sources of external threat (Western Anatolian vassal states plus Ahhiyawa, Assyria, the Upper Euphrates countries). In the treaty signed between Tudhaliyaš and Šaušgamuwa, the vassal king of Amurru (in Phoenicia) the Hittite king warns him to hold off from any contacts with Ahhiyawa and

proceed further, evidently well beware of the possibility of Hittite counter-attack (Grayson 1987: 183f. [text N. A.O.77.1]). This policy continued his son Tukulti-Ninurta I, but this time Assyrians targeted the countries located in the north, in the Taurus mountainous region (Grayson 1987: 275f. [A.O.78.24]). But even after the victorious 1234/3 BC battle against the Hittites the Assyrians did not succeed much.

¹⁰ The correspondence between the Hittite and Babylonian kings points on the existence of allied relations and depleted resources of Babylonia as well (Otten 1959-1960: 39-46).

¹¹ The significance of the "Eternal treaty" signed between the Hittite Empire and Egypt could be illustrated by the letter of Nofretari, the Egyptian queen (chief wife of Ramesses II) sent to Puduhepa, Hittite queen. "Egypt and Hatti should become a single country" (KUB XXI 38 V 13 f.). The same idea is expressed in another letter: "(The Sun-god) shall perpetuate the beautiful brotherhood of the Great king, king of Egypt and his brother – king of Hatti" (KBo I 29, 8-11).

¹² See, in particular, Klengel 1974: 165-174.

¹³ Numerous studies deal with this problem (Bryce 1985: 13-23; Bryce 1986: 1-12; Bryce 1989: 297-310; Bryce 1991: 1-21; Güterbock 1983: 133-138; Güterbock 1986: 33-44; Singer 1983 etc.).

¹⁴ The creation of this kingdom became a benchmark for the bifurcation of the Hittite ruling dynasty *de jure*, the process which had begun still during the reign of Muwatalliš II when Hatti was divided into two kingdoms (indeed, under some hegemony of the rulers of Hattušaš). After the dethronement of Muršiliš III (Urhi-Tešub) Hattušiliš III put on the throne Ulmi-Tešub, the brother of the latter in Tarhuntašša with hereditary rights (on details of this undertaking see Otten 1988; Singer 1996; Bryce 2005: 268-271 etc.).

Assyria.¹⁵ This is a fair testimony of problems existing in the Near Eastern political map. The policy of "continental blockade" directed against two hostile powers which was introduced by the Hittite ruler, the *coup-d'état* of Kurunta, king of Tarhuntašša against Tudhaliyaš IV who had succeeded to temporarily capture Hattušaš,¹⁶ is the best evidence of the existing problems. Tarhuntašša was not the only dangerous internal factor for the territorial integrity of Hatti. It is not excluded that Kurunta was relying upon considerable part of the Hittite ruling dynasty and aristocracy.¹⁷

The world-system which has been drawn above in regard to the second half of the XIII century BC in the Near East had culminated towards the end of the same century and this vast geographical area appeared in the deep and long-termed crisis. Before we shall try to answer the questions "why" and "how" let us point on some current concepts regarding the problem of the end of the Late Bronze age in the Near East.

The transitional period from the Late Bronze age to Early Iron age which has been formulated as the "XII century BC crisis",¹⁸ was not limited with this period but continued well at least into the next two centuries.¹⁹ When the curtain is raised again, the Near Eastern and Aegean societies appear in fundamentally different color. The ethnic-cultural content, political and social-economic structure of the states are quite different,²⁰ several Late Bronze age polities had ceased to exist, including the Hittite empire. Instead, in the place of the Hittite empire, the former leading actor of the preceding period came into existence numerous small political entities. The disintegration of the Late Bronze age societies, the long period of their revival (about two centuries) and, finally, the scarcity of the contemporary written sources were the reasons for the rise of a widely accepted term "Dark Ages" still in the mid-XX century.

¹⁵ The treaty signed between Tudhaliyaš IV and Šaušgamuwa, king of Amurru, probably shows that a coalition really could have existed (Kühne und Otten 1971), where Assyria and Ahhiyawa are named as potential enemies.

¹⁶ On the confrontation of Tudhaliyaš IV and Kurunta of Tarhuntašša and the *coup d'état* see Singer 1996; Dinçol, Yakar, Dinçol, and Taffnet 2000, 160; Van den Hout 2001, 215ff.; Bryce 2005: 319ff. etc. Until now scholars fail to come into consensus regarding the coup of Kurunta. According to some (Hawkins 1994: 91), Kurunta had succeeded to capture Hattušaš, but some had suggested a dual kingship in the Hittite Empire, saying that Tudhaliyaš IV ruled in Hattušaš and Kurunta in Tarhuntašša, both claiming the title "Great king" (Singer 2000: 26; Collins 2008: 70f. etc.).

¹⁷ The Hittite text which represents of the category of texts entitled as "Judicial process" is mentioned the failed conspiracy of the prince Hešni against Tudhaliyaš (KUB XXXI 68, see Werner 1967: 64ff.; Tani 2001). Whether Hešni's attempt to dethrone Tudhaliyaš was in some way connected with Kurunta's activities is difficult to say. Among the supporters of Hešni it is worth to mention the king of Išuwa. Anyway, it seems that inner problems were in no way inferior to that of external.

¹⁸ The term first was introduced by the present author (Kosyan 1999). Other authors usually call this period "Crisis" without further specification (for example, Ward, Sharp Joukowski 1989).

¹⁹ In the Aegean basin, particularly in the territory of Mycenaean states this period extended well into the X-IX centuries BC which probably could be explained by the less expressed continuity with the preceding period, like that in the Near East.

²⁰ The history of this period has been studied by many scholars (Hawkins 1982; Kosyan 1994; 1999: 140-167; Jasink 1995).

This term usually is used until now in regard to the history of Asia Minor in the XII-X centuries BC,²¹ and the XI-IX centuries BC in regard to Continental Greece.²²

However, the situation which was briefly described above does not mean that in this extensive geopolitical space the main actors who were responsible for the creation of the Late Bronze civilization had ceased to exist. Regardless the destructive factors of the disintegration of the political system, it will be wrong to speak about the disappearance of the population of urban centers and even the essential quantitative losses. At best, one can postulate with some shift of local population groups and the influx of alien invading population from outside (mostly that of the "barbarian periphery"). Particularly, the Mesopotamian urban centers continue their existence, which means that they had preserved their traditional lifestyle. The same is true for the regions of inland Syria. Here the continuity is evident.

That in the XII century BC really took place some political and other events which in some cases had led to catastrophic outcome, could not be questioned since the unprecedented political, economic, and cultural development of the XV-XIII centuries BC which is well documented by contemporary written sources and material culture, at first sight unexpectedly was replaced by absolutely new situation. The polities which had survived the crisis had lost significantly their economic and military potential (Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia), international trading activity had been drastically reduced, many flourishing urban centers had lost their importance, instead came into existence new centers, sometimes with less economic potential. And, finally, throughout the Near East and the Aegean world is observed significant mobility of different peoples (ethnic movements) which in some regions brought to catastrophic consequences ("Sea Peoples", north Balkanic peoples, Aramaeans, Jewish tribes, Mushkians etc.).

The Euphrates contact zone in the second half of the XIII century

In the second half of the XIII century BC the Hittite cuneiform sources report on numerous small political formations in the Euphrates contact zone which occupy the territory extending from the upper stream of the Euphrates until southern slopes of the Armenian Taurus mountains, in the region where the river flows into the Syrian-Mesopotamian plain. Among these cuneiform sources (besides Hittite also Assyrian) should be mentioned a number of political entities which are generally known especially to Hittites under the collective name Išuwa.²³ The information contained in these texts show that the central part of Išuwa corresponds to the territory of modern Elâzığ (Tsopk' of medieval Armenian sources), to the east of Malatya towards the Lake Van.²⁴

²¹ Barnett 1967: 3.

²² Snodgrass 1971: 2; Desborough 1972: 11.

²³ In the treaty/instruction of the Hittite king Arnuwandaš I with the Upper Euphrates "countries" compiled around 1400 BC is preserved their list (KUB XXIII 72+, complete edition see in Kosyan 2006; Kosyan et al. 2018).

²⁴ References on Išuwa and opinions regarding its location see in Del Monte und Tischler 1978: 154ff.; Kosyan 2004: 61-63.

To the south of Išuwa, in the neighborhood of modern Lake Hazar (Arm. Tsovk') where begins the River Tigris, lays another well known country of Alzi (Arm. Aghdznik'),²⁵ which had played an important role still in the XV-XIV centuries in the context of confrontation of Mittani with the Hittite empire (see below).

As to other players of the contact zone, two political formations are of special interest – Hayaša and Azzi, whose location until now remains problematic.²⁶ According to the present author, they should not be looked to the north of the upper flow of the Euphrates, somewhere close to the Black Sea, as it is postulated by many scholars,²⁷ but to the north-east of Išuwa, probably in the plain of Erznka.²⁸

Besides these four, there were also some other formations whose names are preserved in Assyrian texts compiled in the context of northern campaigns of Shalmaneser I and Tukulti-Ninurta I.²⁹

Indeed, here in this part of the Armenian Highland hardly is possible to speak about the existence of large and stable political formations, as it could be deduced from the information contained in the Assyrian texts. Probably, the reason should be looked in the truncated mountainous terrain of the Armenian Taurus. None of the local tribal units did possess with strong economic potential and appropriate political system for expansion in order to achieve an upper arm on its neighbors. These formations which appear in the Assyrian sources under the names of Uruatri and Nairi, both had collective background and they could be regarded as loose confederation of tribes. Regardless the proposed locations of these two groups of polities, one is free to assume that we deal with small tribal organizations located along the Taurus mountain system.³⁰

The history of the western part of the contact zone is reconstructed mostly due to the information contained in the Hittite sources; some late Middle Assyrian texts also are useful for this purpose. It is worth to mention that they mostly deal with Išuwa. In this late period neither Hayaša, nor Azzi appear in the texts.

Išuwa which had an important role in the context of the late XV-XIV century eastern policy of Hatti,³¹ most probably in the middle part of the XIII century, during the reign of Hattušiliš III had become a Hittite appanage kingdom, thus performing the role of buffer in the traditionally turbulent Upper Euphrates region against Assyria and

²⁵ For cuneiform texts and location see Del Monte und Tischler 1978: 10; Golovleva 1978; Kosyan 2004: 33-34.

²⁶ For the location of these two countries see Kosyan 2004: 44-45, 48-50; also Forlanini 2017 (locates in the plain of Erznka).

²⁷ For opinions see Kosyan 2004: 44-45, 48-50.

²⁸ But see Kosyan 2013; 2015 where it was suggested have been located to the east of Išuwa, in the region between Išuwa and the Lake Van.

²⁹ On these tribal units see Harutyunyan 1970: 12-29; 1985.

³⁰ For the location of these "states" see Kessler 1980 (by entries); Nashef 1982: 274-275; Harutyunyan 1985: 148-149. This part of the contact zone should be presented in our forthcoming study.

³¹ The study of Hittite texts in regard to Išuwa and political processes see Klengel 1968; Torri 2005; Devecchi 2017; Kosyan et al. 2018: 108-143 etc.

Hayaša at the same time. Between the Hittite ruling dynasty and Išuwa were established close relations; the queen of Ari-Šarruma, the first king of Išuwa was the daughter of Puduhepa, the Hittite queen.³² Ari-Šarruma and his successor Ehli-Šarruma regularly participated in the political and religious life of the Empire. It is worth to mention that in the treaty signed between Hattušiliš III and Ulmi-Tešub, king of Tarhuntašša, Ari-Šarruma is mentioned as one of the witnesses. During the next generation Ehli-Šarruma became witness to the treaty of Tudhaliyaš IV with Kurunta, the next king of the same Tarhuntašša.

In one Hittite oracle text, probably compiled by the order of a Hittite king, the king of Išuwa is listed as one of the candidates who could lead the Hittite army against Hayaša.³³ During this period the kingdom of Išuwa has privileged status in the system of Hittite vassal states (along with Kargamiš, Tarhuntašša, Amurru, Šeha River country, and Tummanna).

But already at some point in the second half of the XIII century BC the Hittite sources tell that the loyalty of Išuwa show cracks, probably connected with instability in Hatti itself, namely the struggle between Tudhaliyaš IV and Kurunta of Tarhuntašša, and the Hešni-conspiracy (see above).

It has been suggested by some that Kurunta even had temporarily captured Hattuša. As to the prince Hešni, among his arrested supporters is mentioned an unnamed king of Išuwa (probably, Ari-Šarruma)(see above). The next demonstration of the disloyalty of Išuwa (this time also the name is lost in the text) is connected with the battle of Nihriya at the beginning of Tudhaliyaš IV's reign. The ruler of Išuwa did not perform his obligation to assist the Hittite king with military contingent against the Assyrian army. Two texts deal with this affair - KBo IV 14³⁴ and KBo VIII 23.³⁵ According to these sources, the troops of Išuwa did not participate in the battle which resulted in the defeat of the Hittite army.

The disloyalty of Išuwa in the period of this event, indeed, did not lead to its cessation from the Hittite empire, but anyway it shows that the relations between the two were no more the same as they were before.

The relations with Hayaša and Azzi³⁶ also seem to have been strained if not hostile. Actually during the whole XIII century BC almost all Hittite texts unequivocally testify that these countries, particularly Azzi (in the XIII century BC the term Hayaša is not mentioned) was regarded as hostile. The text of Tudhaliyaš IV which comprises

³² See Güterbock 1973: 135ff.; De Roos 1987: 74ff.; also Kosyan 1997/1: 178-179.

³³ IBoT I 32 (yet unpublished).

³⁴ The treaty of the Hittite king signed with Išuwa (Stefanini 1965: 39ff.).

³⁵ This is a letter sent to the Hittite king by some Hittite official (for some details of the battle see Singer 1985: 116ff.). Possibly, this official was the same person who was the commander of the Hittite troops at Nihriya.

³⁶ The location and status of Hayaša and Azzi, as well as their relations with the Hittite Empire has been thoroughly discussed in our previous studies (Kosyan 2008; 2013; 2015; 2016: 108-151).

“Instructions”³⁷ addressed to the governors of bordering provinces of Hatti Azzi is mentioned as a country which needed to keep an eye on its possible hostile actions.

At the end of the XIII century BC political formations of the Armenian Highland, which comprise part of the contemporary Near Eastern geopolitical space could not avoid the consequences of contemporary developments, i.e. the crisis which severely affected the whole Late Bronze age civilizations. Although existing written sources, particularly Hittite, fail to contain any direct evidence as to what could happen in the Upper Euphrates region, archaeological studies and Assyrian texts compiled during the reigns of Tiglathpileser I and his successor Aššurbelkala allow us to assume that this region of the Armenian Highland also had suffered the destructive influence of the crisis. Manifestations of the crisis are the next:

1. Significant increase in the mobility of population. This could be deduced by the texts of Tiglathpileser I where it is said that 50 years before his accession on the throne several tribes entered and captured first Alzi, then proceeded further to Northern Mesopotamia (Muški, Kašku, and Apišlu).³⁸ These sources did not clarify from where this migration had started. But even with this gap it becomes clear that the reason for this population movement most probably was the deterioration of political and economic situation in the primary area of these migrants. However, the entrance of new population into Alzi and Northern Mesopotamia could not but negatively affect also the population of Alzi.

2. Archaeological excavations conducted on several sites of Išuwa³⁹ show that compared with the well-developed Late Bronze age period during the existence of the kingdom of Išuwa, the small settlements of the post-Hittite period represent a primitive society, in no way comparable with the architecture of the Hittite period (for example, Noršuntepe and Korucutepe).

Currently it is a difficult task to guess about the possible course of events which took place in the western part of the Armenian Highland after the disintegration of Hatti. One could suggest fundamental changes in demography, political, social, economic, and cultural spheres.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnett R.D.1967. The Sea Peoples, in Cambridge Ancient History, vol.II, Ch.XXVIII.

Bryce T.R.1985. A Reinterpretation of the Milawata Letter in the Light of the new join piece, AnSt, vol. XXXV, 13-23.

Bryce T.R. 1986. Madduwatta and Hittite Policy in Western Anatolia, Historia XXXV, H.1, 1-12.

³⁷ Schuler von 1956: 8ff.

³⁸ Grayson 1991: 14ff. (N. A.O.87.1), 33f. (N. A.O.87.2), 42 (N. A.O.87.4) etc.; see also Harutyunyan 1970: 29ff.

³⁹ The results of excavations had been discussed in Kosyan 1997; 1998.

- Bryce T.R. 1989. Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans – an Anatolian Viewpoint, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 8(3), 1989, 297-310.
- Bryce T.R. 1991. The Trojan War in its Near Eastern Context, *Journal of Ancient Civilisations* 6, 1-21.
- Bryce T.R. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford (second edition).
- Collins B. J. 2008. *The Hittites and Their World*, Leiden.
- De Martino S. 2010. Some Questions on the Political History and Chronology of the Early Hittite Empire, *AoF* 37/2, 186-197.
- Desborough V.R.d'A. 1972. *The Greek Dark Ages*, New York.
- Devecchi E. 2017. The Eastern Frontier of the Hittite Empire, in E. Rova and M.Tonussi (eds.) *At the Northern Frontier of Near Eastern Archaeology (Proceedings of the International Humboldt-Kolleg Venice, January 9th-January 12th, 2013)*, Venice, 283-297.
- Dinçol A. M., Yakar J., Dinçol B., and Taffnet A. 2000. The Borders of the Appanage Kingdom of Tarhuntassa - A Geographical and Archaeological Assessment, *Anatolica* 26, 1-30.
- Forlanini M. 2017. The Ancient Land of “Northern” Kummaha and Aripša “Inside the Sea”, in M. Alparslan (ed.), *Places and Spaces in Hittite Anatolia I: Hatti and the East. Proceedings of an International Workshop on Hittite Historical Geography in Istanbul, 25th-26th October 2013*, Istanbul, 1-12.
- Golovleva L.M. 1978. The Kingdom of Alzi in the second half of the II millennium BC, *Drevnij Vostok* 3, Yerevan, 71-87 (in Russian).
- Güterbock H.G. 1973. Hittite Hieroglyphic Seal Impressions from Korucutepe, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32, 135-147.
- Güterbock H.G. 1983. The Hittites and the Aegean World: The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered, *American Journal of Archaeology* 87/2, 133-138.
- Güterbock H.G. 1986. Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite History, *In Troy and the Trojan War*, 1986, 33-44.
- Hawkins J.D. 1982. The Neo-Hittite States in Syria and Anatolia, *In CAH III/1*, 372-441.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1994. The End of the Bronze Age in Anatolia: New Light From Recent Discoveries, *Anatolian Iron Ages 3. The Proceedings of the Third Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium Held at Van, 6–12 August 1990*, Oxford, 91–94.
- Harutyunyan N.V. 1970. Biainili (Urartu), Yerevan (in Russian).
- Harutyunyan N.V. 1985. Toponyms of Urartu, Yerevan (in Russian).
- Jasink A.M. 1995. Gli stati Neo-Ittiti. Analisi delle fonti scritte e sintesi storica, Pavia (= *Studia Mediterranea* 10).
- Kessler K.-H. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordmesopotamiens*, Wiesbaden.
- Klengel H. 1968. Die Hethiter und Išuwa, *OA* 7, 63-76.
- Klengel H. 1974. “Hungerjahre” im Hatti, *AoF* 1, 165-174.

Kosyan A.V. 1997. Isuwa (Tsopk') in the XIII-XII centuries BC, PBH 1/2, 177-192 (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 1998. Isuwa and Gordion (comparative study), PBH 3, 177-194 (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 2004. The Toponyms of the Armenian Highland (According to the Hittite Cuneiform Sources), Yerevan (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 2006. Arnuwandas I in the East, Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies I, 72-97.

Kosyan A.V. 2008. Hayasa and Azzi, in A.Petrosyan (ed.), Gift From Heaven: Myth, Ritual, and History. Studies in Honour of Sargis Harutyunyan on his 80th Birthday, Yerevan, 263-291 (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 2013. From Van to the Euphrates (in the roots of Early Armenian statehood), in V.B.Barkhudaryan et al. (eds.), Haykazuns, Yerevan, 48-63 (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 2015. Between Euphrates and Lake Van (on the Location of Hayasa and Azzi), International Symposium on East Anatolia – South Caucasus Cultures, vol.I, Cambridge, 271-276.

Kosyan A.V. 2016a. The XIV century BC Interstate Treaties Between the Hittite Empire and Hayasa, Yerevan (in Arm.).

Kosyan A.V. 2016b. The Euphrates-Tigris Contact zone in the III – first half of the I millennium BC, in Ye.G.Margaryan (ed.), At the Junction of World-systems. From the History of Contact zones in Antiquity and Modern period, Yerevan, 2016, 66-95 (in Russian).

Kühne C.1999. Imperial Mittani: An Attempt at Historical Reconstruction, In Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 10, Bethesda, 203-221.

Laneri N., Valentini S., D'Agostino 2007. The Upper Tigris Valley in Southeastern Anatolia. A Bridge Between Mesopotamia and Anatolian Regions between the 3rd and 2nd Millennium BC., In A.Greaves – A.Fletcher (eds.), Transanatolia: Connecting East with West in the Archaeology of Ancient Anatolia (Proceedings of the Conference held at the British Museum 31 March – 1 April 2006), AnSt 57, 77-86.

Manuelli F. 2011. Malatya – Melid between the Late Bronze and the Iron Age, In EOTHEN 17, 61-85.

Margaryan Ye.G. 2012. At the Junction of Roman and Eastern Hellenistic civilizing “nomoses”. From the History of The Euphrates contact zone, Critics and Semiotics 2, 66-94 (in Russian).

Otten H. 1959-1960. Ein Brief aus Hattusa an Bābu-ahu-iddina, Archiv für Orientforschung 19, 39-46.

Otten H. 1988. Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijaš IV, Wiesbaden (=StBoT, Beih.1).

Parker B.J. 2006. Toward an Understanding of Borderland Processes, American Antiquity, vol.71/1, 77-100.

Parpola S. and K.Watanabe 1988. Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths, Helsinki (= SAA 2).

- Roos J. de 1987. Who was Kilushepa?, JEOL 29, 74-83.
- Schuler E. von 1957. Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte, Graz.
- Singer I. 1983. Western Anatolia at the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C., AnSt 28, 205-217.
- Singer I. 1985. The Battle of Nihriya and the End of the Hittite Empire, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 75, 100-123.
- Singer I. 1996. Great kings of Tarhuntassa, Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 38, 63-71.
- Singer I. 2000. New Evidence on the End of the Hittite Empire, in E. D. Oren (ed.), The Sea Peoples and their World: a Reassessment, Philadelphia, 21–33.
- Snodgrass A.M. 1971. The Dark Age of Greece, Edinburgh.
- Stefanini R. 1965. KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049 (Atti della Accademia Nazionale del Lincei [serie 8] 20), Roma, 39-79.
- Tani N. 2001. More about the „Hešni Conspiracy“, AoF 28, 154-164.
- Torri G. 2005. Militärische Feldzüge nach Ostanatolien in der mittelhethischen Zeit, AoF 32, 386-400.
- Van den Hout Th. 1995. Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag, Wiesbaden (= StBoT 38).
- Van den Hout 2001. Zur Geschichte des jüngeren hethitischen Reiches, In Akten IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999 (Hrsg. G.Wilhelm)(= StBoT 45), 213-223.
- Wallerstein I. 1974-1989. The Modern World-System, 3 vols., New York.
- Ward W.A., Sharp Joukowsky M. (Eds.) 1989. The Crisis years: the 12th century BC. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris, Dubuque.
- Werner R. 1967. Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle, Wiesbaden (= StBoT 4).

Abbreviations

- AnSt – Anatolian Studies, London.
- AoF – Altorientalische Forschungen, Berlin.
- PBH – Patmabanasiraan hands, Yerevan.
- IBoT - Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletlerinden Seçme Metinler
(H.Bozkurt-M.Çiğ-H.G.Güterbock), Istanbul, Bd.I, 1944.
- RGTC 5 - Nashef Kh. 1982. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittellassyrischen Zeit, Wiesbaden (= Repertoire Geographique des Textes Cuneiformes, Bd.5).
- RGTC 6.1 - Del Monte J.F. und J.Tischler, Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden, 1978 (= Repertoire Geographique des Textes Cuneiformes, Bd.5).
- StBoT - Studien zu den Boghazkoy-Texten, Wiesbaden.