

**POLITICAL UNIFICATION OF THE EAST PERIPHERIES OF HITTITES – FOR  
SEARCHING OF ISMIRIKA**

ხეთების აღმოსავლეთ პერიფერიის პოლიტიკური გაერთიანების – ისმირიკას  
კვლევისათვის

**Charekishvili Nino**

Professor, Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA)

Gorgasali street #101, Tbilisi, Georgia

ORCID: 0000-0002-9568-2926

[n.charekishvili@gipa.ge](mailto:n.charekishvili@gipa.ge)

**Abstract:** The article discusses one of the important geographical points of the political units on the Eastern Periphery of Hittites, this is Ismirika. Especially it's important to mention here the Ismirika's Treaty, which the king of Hittites made with the people of Ismirika. The Treaty is published in the series of KUB and ABoT, these texts and fragments are preserved in the Boğazköy archive.

The innovation is the fact that Ismirika's special research was carried out for the first time. History of Hittites is discussed based on the Georgian translation and analyses of Ismirika's Treaty and presents the controversial issues of this period in a new way. The article analyzes the issue of dating the Treaty, either it is related to the reign of the king - Arnuwanda I or Arnuwanda II. We have tried to bring additional arguments and facts about the possibility that military operations in South-East Anatolia are associated with the name Arnuwanda I and the Treaty with Ismirika is signed by him.

In the article we are talking about the approximate location, toponymy, etymology and other important issues of Ismirika, according to which it is stated the opinion regarding its relation with historical Speri. This opinion once again states the idea that Ismirika might be one of the states of Kaskians-Mushki, settled by Kartvelian tribes. Of course, by the geographical area and the political situation, there might be the existence of Hurrian elements in the population. Ismirika had very important strategically meaning for Hittites, what can be confirmed from "Treaty of Ismerika". So, the east periphery of Hittites is very considerable to research the history of Hittites, also for study of this region and consequently it's very important for researching of the ancient history of Georgia.

**Keywords:** Assyriology, Hittite, Ismirika, Kaskians, Arnuwanda.

**ნინო ჩარეკიშვილი**

საქართველოს საზოგადოებრივ საქმეთა ინსტიტუტი (GIPA) პროფესორი,  
დოქტორი, მის.: გორგასალის ქუჩა #101, თბილისი, საქართველო  
ORCID: 0000-0002-9568-2926

[n.charekishvili@gipa.ge](mailto:n.charekishvili@gipa.ge)

**აბსტრაქტი:** სტატიაში განხილულია ხეთების აღმოსავლეთ პერიფერიაზე არსებული პოლიტიკური ერთეულებიდან ერთ-ერთ მნიშვნელოვანი გეოგრაფიული პუნქტი - ესაა ისმირიქა. განსაკუთრებით საყურადღებოა ისმირიქას ხელშეკრულება, რომელიც ხეთების მეფემ დადო ისმირიქას ხალხთან. ისმირიქას ხელშეკრულება KUB და ABot სერიითაა გამოქვეყნებული, აღნიშნული ტექსტები და ფრაგმენტები დაცულია ბოლაზქის არქივში.

სიახლეს წარმოადგენს ის, რომ პირველად არის სპეციალურად შესწავლილი ისმირიქა - ხეთების აღმოსავლეთ პერიფერიის ერთ-ერთი მნიშვნელოვანი პოლიტიკური გაერთიანება. ისმირიქას ხელშეკრულების ქართულ ენაზე გადმოთარგმნის და ანალიზის საფუძველზე განხილულია ხეთების ისტორია და ახლებურადაა წარმოჩენილი ამ პერიოდის სადავო საკითხები. სტატიაში გაანალიზებულია აღნიშნული ხელშეკრულების დათარიღების საკითხი, ანუ მისი გაფორმება რომელი ხეთი მეფის - არნუვანდა I-ის თუ არნუვანდა II-ის - მმართველობის პერიოდს უკავშირდება. ჩვენ შევეცადეთ, დამატებითი არგუმენტებითა და ფაქტებით გაგვემყარებინა მოსაზრება იმის შესახებ რომ, სამხედრო ოპერაციები სამხრეთ-აღმოსავლეთ ანატოლიაში უკავშირდება არნუვანდა I-ის სახელს და ხელშეკრულებაც ისმირიქასთან მისი დადებულია. სტატიაში ასევე ვეხებით ისმირიქას სავარაუდო ადგილმდებარეობას, ტოპონიმიკას, ეტიმოლოგიას და სხვა მნიშვნელოვან საკითხებს და შესაბამისად გამოთქმულია მოსაზრება, მისი ისტორიული სპერის ტერიტორიასთან დაკავშირების შესახებ, რომ შესაძლოა ისმირიქა ერთ-ერთი ქასქურ-მუსქური სახელმწიფო იყო, ანუ ქართველური ტომებით დასახლებული. რა თქმა უნდა გეოგრაფიული არეალის და პოლიტიკური სიტუაციის გათვალისწინებით დასაშვებია მოსახლეობაში ხურიტული ელემენტის არსებობაც. ისმირიქას, უდიდესი სტრატეგიული მნიშვნელობა ჰქონდა ხეთებისთვის, რასაც მათ შორის დადებული ხელშეკრულებაც ადასტურებს. ამდენად, ხეთების აღმოსავლეთ პერიფერია ძალიან საყურადღებოა როგორც ხეთების ისტორიის, ასევე ამ რეგიონის შესასწავლად და აქედან გამომდინარე მნიშვნელოვანია საქართველოს უძველესი ისტორიის საკვლევად.

**საძიებო სიტყვები:** ასირიოლოგია, ისმირიქა, ხეთები, ქასქები, არნუვანდა.

### Introduction:

In the II millenium BC in ancient Anatolia, there was formed kingdom of Hittites that created one great epoch in the world history. The relationship of Hittites with strategically important east peripheryes, political units and unions, rich with different resources had great importance. This region was mostly mountainous and rich with various resources (woods, copper, iron and so on), by which in addition to the Hittites and Assur, Urartu was also interested. Since III-II millenium BC great states used to fight for these territories. Priority was given to the peripheryes rich of ores and exploited by mining and metalurgical production. These countries and/or unions have been located in the east and north-east of kingdom of Hittites, and most of them were inhabited by the tribes with Kartvelian origin. In addition to that, upper Euphrates road was a convenient navigation road to establish connections between South Caucasus and Asia Minor.

In this article we review one of the political, geographically important units, situated on east periphery of Hittites – Ismirika.<sup>1</sup> Most of all we are interested in the Treaty of Ismirika which was made by the king of Hittites with the people of Ismirika. „Treaty of Ismerika“ (CTH 133: KUB 26.41, KUB 23.68 obv. 25', rev. 1, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25 + ABoT 1.58, KUB 23.113; CTH 237: KUB 26.54, 6', CTH 40: KBo 19.52 2') is published by the series of KUB and ABoT, the texts and phragments are kept in the Archive of Boğazköy. Its previous research belongs to O. Ranoszeks (Ranoszek, 1939:32). After that A. Goetze (Goetze, 1940:44) worked on this text, who proved relationship between KUB 26.41 and KUB 23.68 + ABoT 1.58<sup>2</sup>, also in addition KUB 23.113. This Treaty is very damaged. The next work is of A. Kempinski and S. Košaks (Kempinski, Košak, 1970:191).

The name Ismirika is often used in the texts as (Monte del, Tischler, 1978:149):

KUR<sup>URU</sup> Iš-mi-ri-ka (KUB 23.68. Vs. 25'. Rs 1,6,7,11);

KUR<sup>URU</sup> Iš-mi-ri-ga (KUB 23.68. Rs. 14, 16, 19, 25);

KUR<sup>URU</sup> Iš-mi-ri-ik (KUB 23.68. Rs. 13,15, 17);

KUR<sup>URU</sup> Iš-mi-ri- (KUB 26.54, 6');

<sup>URU</sup>Iš-mi-ri-ka (KUB 23.68. Rs. 18.);

<sup>URU</sup>Iš-mi-r[i- (KBo 19.52, 2').

Based on the Treaty of Ismirika's analyzes (The first translation of „Treaty of Ismerika“ in Georgian belongs to us) we review the history of Hittites and present its contentious issues in new way. We discuss Ismirika's estimated location, toponymy (this is innovation that we present) and other important issues. We have studied Ismirika in order to determine the possible relationship of east periphery with the south Caucasus. There is the opinion that people of Ismirika had the similar life rules and tribe state, as Kaskians had, we will talk about this issue below. In addition to that, we will discuss the period of the Treaty: was it made in the reign of Arnuwanda I or Arnuwanda II – kings of Hittites.

<sup>1</sup> We think the name „Išmerika, Išmeriga“, by the text should be changed into „Ismirika“.

<sup>2</sup> This plate is very damaged. We can read only some words. In the introduction there are mentioned king, queen, children and grandchildren, after that there should be the information of Ismirika. Only the words Ismirika (11 lines), Waššukanni (12 and 15 lines) and the person by the name of Waširišuwa. All the other information is impossible to be read.

**Methods:**

The research is mainly based on research methods proven in historical and political sciences: description, empirical analysis, comparative-historical method, causal-comparative analysis, methods of critical and systematic analysis.

**Results:**

- Additional arguments and facts have proved the assumption that not only military operations in south-east Anatolia were initiated by Arnuwanda I, but also the “Treaty of Ismerika”
- Ismirika is considered as political union and not as separate political unit, since it was comprised by several political units, such as: Ziyaziya, Atara and etc.
- The assumption is made that Ismirika and historical Speri are the same.
- There are given the description of Ismirika’s toponimy and etymology;
- There is presented the assumption that Ismirika was Kaskians-Mushki union.

**Discussion:**

**Arnuwanda I.** It is assumed that Arnuwanda I has ruled in 1402-1360 BC. His reign is the early period of the empire. He was the king between Tuthalija I/II and Hattušili II. Arnuwanda I must be the son of Tuthalija I/II, with whom he often participated in the military operations. At this time, he wasn’t the king of Hittites. When he became the king, he married on his sister – Ašmunikkal. Usually, among Hittites a confusion was strictly prohibited. It is assumed that this fact was influenced by Hurrians, whose establishment at the kingdom would have come from the period of Hattušili I. His wife – Puduhepa – was the daughter of priest from Kizzuwatna, so the queen originated from Hurrians, perhaps, had some Hurrian influence on the royal court. Additionally, taking into consideration that wife of Tuthalija I/II – Nikalmat was also Hurrian by her origin, it is easy to determine the strength of Hurrian influence on the royal court. So, Arnuwanda I broke the saint rule of Hittites and by the influence of his mother and generally spread out Hurrian rules, married on his sister. However, at that period, it was not perceived as a bad habit and thus tragedy, as there is no information regarding prohibition of such facts. Based on this, it can be said that on Hittite royal court it became the tradition to confuse the marriages.

Arnuwanda I issued the instructions for royal order. During his reign the kingdom of Hittites had the attacks from the north by the Kaskians. Arnuwanda tried to solve this problem, as he considered that Kaskians had strong power at that time. Arnuwanda I attacked the Kaskians, but he could not entirely prevent their aggression. During the whole history Kaskians were undefeated enemies of the Hittites. Arnuwanda I prayed and asked for help from the gods, but in vain. Additionally, there was the problem from the south also – Arnuwanda I conquered city of Adana; at the same time, he had to fight against Madduwatta in the west; in the south-east he attacked Paḥḥuwa and Isuwa; put the contract with Ismirika. So, the whole reign of Arnuwanda I was in the military operations. He fought in all the direction and tried to recover the state influence of Hittites on the active political neighbouring units, but this historical period was very challenging and not only restoring the influence in the region, but also to save the borders of the empire was hard.

Arnuwanda I died earlier than Ašmunikkal. She, of course, buried her husband by the beliefs of Hurrians and to immortalize his name, she built a great tomb on his grave (Ünal, 1999: 49).

As we see, during the reign of Arnuwanda I there happened the activation of the east peripheryes of Hittites by the superate political units. Because of the weekend influence of Hittites on them, they tried to use this moment in their favor.

Arnuwanda I or Arnuwanda II. We already know the reign period of Arnuwanda I. Now let's discuss the problema connected with the contract of Ismirika that makes controversial the identity of the author. We'll try to make clear the problem.

Text KUB 26.41 + KUB 23.68 + ABoT 58 represents the contract which was made by the king of Hittites - Arnuwanda, with the citizens of Ismirika, which also was made for the warriors, and for defending of royal court of Hittites and so on.

The preamble of the text names the king Arnuwanda, who made the agreement. However, the question remains, was he Arnuwanda I, which reigned before Šuppiluliuma I, or was he Arnuwanda II – son of Šuppiluliuma I.

As we had mentioned above, Arnuwanda I, who must have been reigned in about 1402-1360 BC, should be the son of Tuḫalija I/II. Arnuwanda II was son of Šuppiluliuma I. As we saw, before Arnuwanda I became the king, he had participated in Military Operation with Tuḫalija I/II. Arnuwanda I had to reign in very difficult period as at that time the Hittites were very weakened politically. This fact was used by not only political units, which were under the Hittites influence and became active, especially in the east peripheryes, but also, on the other hand, neighbouring states and political units which attacked the Hittites from all the directions. Arnuwanda had to fight in the north, west, south-east and inside the country, so, his reign is only the history of battles, most of which were unsuccessful.

Arnuwanda II reigned in 1322-1321 BC, he was the king for a short period. His actions were retold in the writings of the king of Muṣili II. There isn't known anything about his military operations. If he had any of famous battles, it would have been mentioned in the writings of Muṣili II. Arnuwanda II died because of the black plague. Neighbouring enimies benefited from the fact and attacked the Hittites.

At present there are more resorces available about Arnuwanda I and his wife Ašmunikkal, than Arnuwanda II: pray of Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikkal indicated to the goddess of the sun Arinna (CTH 375 (KUB 17.21, KUB 31.124+KUB 48.28+Bo 8617, Copy: KUB 23.17+KUB 31.72 +KUB 48.108)); Instructions of the noble person of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal (CTH 260 (KUB 31.44, KUB 26.24+KUB 40.15)); Document of gifting the land which is printed on by Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal (CTH 222 (KBo 5.7)); instruction of the queen Ašmunikkal for the surveillanceof the tomb (CTH 252 (KUB 13.8, KUB 47.46)); writing of Arnuwanda I (CTH 143 (KUB 23.21)); instructions of Arnuwanda I to the commander of the city Ḫattuša (CTH 257 (KBo 13.58, KUB 23.64, KUB 26.9+6971256+340/z, KBo 10.5)); "Kings' List" where there are mentioned Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikkal (CTH 661 (KUB 11.8+1307/z)).

Above mentioned treatises note about the royal pair's debts and their generation. There is the opinion that Arnuwanda I had one sun: "Kings' List" (2 BoTU 25 + Bo 890 (=Ottens, MDOG 83, 66 C)) names the prince Ašmišaruma as the son of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, we know that for announcing in the "Kings' List" he had to have any very important position. Arnuwanda I left a lot of texts, that makes us think that he reigned for a long time (he was followed by the short period reign of Ḫattušili). Arnuwanda I had a son, heir to the throne who died earlier than his father. On the other hand, Ašmišaruma couldn't be the son of Arnuwanda II who possibly died younger than Ašmišaruma. We think that Arnuwanda II had not an heir. For his short period reign, he hadn't done any important military operation which could be connected with the east periphery of Anatolia.

So, on the basis of the analysis of history and writing resources of Hittites, our conclusions are as follows:

- Arnuwanda I reigned for longer period than Arnuwanda II.
- Arnuwanda I had important military operations during all his reign, that we can't say about Arnuwanda II.
- Šuppiluliuma hasn't mentioned Arnuwanda II. He couldn't miss such facts.
- According to the informational resources the east periphery has activated during the rule of Arnuwanda I.
- Arnuwanda I had put the Treaty and he had a wife and a son.
- Arnuwanda II died without the heir of the throne and he was younger than the son of Arnuwanda I. The sources don't mention his wife, so Ašmišaruma couldn't be his son but the son of Arnuwanda I.

Based on additional arguments and facts, we tried to prove the opinion that military operations in the south-east Anatolia were by Arnuwanda I and agreement with Ismirika was initiated by him. As it seems, Ismirika played the important role between the Hittites kingdom and Mitanni together with the other cities and/or unions of East periphery of the Hittites kingdom.

The agreement is ended by one item where Mitanni-Kizzuwatna is spread till Ismirika. The king of Hittites tried to stop this expansion and for this reason connects Ismirika and Hittites. It's interesting that later this connection of Mitanni-Kizzuwatna was showed as only "Kizzuwatna" by the king of Hittites.

By the historical influence it should be acceptable the hypothesis of A. Goetze (Goetze, 1940:75-77) about "Great Kizzuwatna" which had been powerful state by this time. It's approved by the materials of Amarna, agreement of Kizzuwatna and Mitanni, but on the other hand, the historical fact shows the opposite picture, particularly the agreement of Šunaššura (CTH 41), where Kizzuwatna is under the influence of Mitanni.

In general, all the agreements with Ismirika, Paḫḫuwa, Kaskians show the try of restoring and keeping stabilization in Anatolia for which Arnuwanda I had fought during the whole his reign.

Agreement of Ismirika has very important meaning in the history of Hittites, moreover that it has much common with the old texts of Hittites (Cat. 3, 7, 14, 15, 21, 23a, 310). Also important parallels are found with the agreement of Šuppiluliuma I (Cat. 32, 36, 38, 94).

The King of Hittites made the agreement with the people of Ismirika, in which there were some statements to protect the heirs and royal pair of the Hittites. In the agreement it's said in the way of curse and threatening which aren't acceptable for the texts of Hittites. Most amazing fact is that in this document the nobles of Ismirika and their relatives, who had put the oath of liaison with Arnuwanda I, say that they lived in different districts of Kizzuwatna, among of which there are mentioned Uruša and Waššukanni. According to the geographical horizon of the texts Waššukanni is in Mesopotamia. This is the only fact where it's admitted that Waššukanni is situated in Kizzuwatna. It seems impossible as in that period Waššukanni was under the powerful kingdom of Mitanni, but the text – from the first period of the reign of Arnuwanda I – shows that Arnuwanda was able to settle the people of Ismirika in different cities of Kizzuwatna. The names of these cities are Waššukanni and Uruša, Zazlipa, Ziyaziya, Arana, Tirusa, Uriga. At that time Kizzuwatna formally belonged to Mitanni. Waššukanni was traditional capital city of Mitanni which according to this text belonged to the territory of Kizzuwatna. Thus, it can be considered that the great part of Mitanni with its capital city, was united with Kizzuwatna after this state or union had become the part of the country of the Hittites.

So, during the period of Arnuwanda I, Kizzuwatna was already the part of the Hittites and Ismirika possibly had more political role. If we take into account the fact that Kizzuwatna formally belonged to Mitanni, which later became under the influence of the Hittites, Waššukanni's socially (capital city of Mitanni) connection with Kizzuwatna is obvious.

Possibly, by the politics of the Hittites, after the conquest of Ismirika, the Hurrians had become deported in the definite settled unions of Kizzuwatna. It's proved by the names given in the agreement some of which are Hurrian, some are Luwian. Both, great quantity of Hurrian names among the royal family and growth of Luwian names among the common people are noticeable. In the concluding part of the agreement of Ismirika, by the Hurrian and Luwian names there are mentioned not only socially low level women and men, but also nobles. Hurrian names are: Eḫalteš (Rs. 11) and Akijaš (Rs. 19). Also Ḫurlanniš (Rs. 18), seems to be Hurrian name, but it's originated from Hittite-Luwian form of ḫurla. The rest names are more Luwian: Warlawalu (Rs. 13), Naniš (Rs. 17), Aliwašuš (Rs. 17), Ḫuḫananiš (Rs. 19), Zardumanniš (Rs. 20), Parijamuwaš (Rs. 24) (Götze, 1962:54).

In the text of the agreement there are given definitely different three groups of people. The first group is comprised with the people who are mentioned as people of Ismirika connected with Kizzuwatna and Waššukanni. The second group are the people of Ismirika who own cities of Kizzuwatna, but the name of Waššukanni isn't mentioned anymore. In the third group we can consider persons who aren't from Ismirika, but from Kizzuwatna. In the text of the agreement it is noticeable that the first group of people in two cases are mentioned in different forms. Maybe this was conditioned because of the existence of different ranks. These persons, who were related with Waššukanni, most likely had been nobles Mitannians and had power in Kizzuwatna and Ismirika.

According to the text, Ismirika could be considered as political union and not separate political unit, as it has been comprised from several political units: Ziyaziya, Atara and others mentioned in the agreement and which were ruled by the principals or noble elders rather and not by kings. Most likely Ismirika hasn't been ruled by king. The Treaty of Ismirika also doesn't say anything about the king of Ismirika. Arnuwanda I addresses not to the king of Ismirika, but to the people of Ismirika and makes agreement with the people of Ismirika: *"People of Ismirika! I address you with these words!"* (CTH 133. KUB 23.68 Rs. 1); *"You, people of Ismirika, are connected with the king by the oath!"* (CTH 133. KUB 23.68 Rs. 7); *"You, People of Ismirika, are proved by the oath for everybody!"* (CTH 133. KUB 23.68 Rs. 11) and so on. The Treaty of Ismirika is very similar to the agreements made with Kaskians, Paḫḫuwa, Azzi-Ḫayasa. In all cases the agreements are made between the king of Hittites and the people, in this case also it was made between king of Hittite and the people of Ismirika. It's was analogy to the case of Kaskians as we mentioned above. Like Ismirika, Kaskians were comprised by several communities, which were united against the Hittites (Ghambashidze, 2017:53-54).

By the texts, the Kaskians lived in the mountains of Ponto, on the ridge of Lazistan (Hitt.: Mountain Kasiar; Turk.: Kaçkar Mountains) in the mountainous region of "small Caucasus", in the east and south of which there was the river Chorokhi (Hitt.: Kumesmaha), and in the north it's bordered by the Black Sea. They also lived in the central north Anatolia.

We consider that Ismirika was located in the north of Malatya, near with Isuwa (present Elaziğ) and Paḫḫuwa (present Tuntceli), at the border of Mitanni, at present on the territory of the province of Erzurum, close to the Azzi-Ḫayasa, most likely on the territory of historical Speri. We consider that the toponymy of Ismiri-ka/ga need to pay attention, where the "Ismiri" is the root,

“ka/ga” is the suffix,<sup>3</sup> m/p consonants often change each other in Kartvelian language, consequently it can be concluded that Ispiri-//Speri phonetical variants comes out from root “Ismiri”. Here we also want to underline the etymology of Ismirika. By this etymology, here are interesting the terms which are met in the language of Hittites:\*

(KUS) *išmer-*, *išman-*, (KUS) *išmeri-* (n.) which means “bridle, knot” (URUDU *IŠPARDU*);

*Išmeriya-(I)* – “knotting”;

*Išmeriyant-* “knotted”;

LÚ *išmeriyaš* – “Coachman, head of Coachmen”.

Based on the information given above it can be assumed that Etymology of Ismirika comes out from the work of the people they used to be involved, such as: horse riding and maybe they were even good riders of chariots (In the Egyptian sources it’s mentioned as “Kaskians” fighters equipped by chariots”).

Historian A. Ranovich writes: “horse-riding was spread in Cappadocia in the period of Hittites and it played main role in the agriculture of this region” (Ранович, 1949:120). It’s also interesting that in later texts there are frequently mentioned horses also as the tribute after the fight of Assyrians in the Asia Minor. E.g. according to the records of Ashurbanipal (VII BC), Tabals (neighbours of Chalybes and Mushkis) were requested to deliver “big” horses as tribute (Luckenbill, 1926-27:516,531; Дьяконов, 1951). The main reason of interest of Assyrians toward Tabal was on the other hand their strategic location and on the other hand gold, silver and high variety horses. Also Strabo records are interesting. While describing surroundings of city Amasya of Pontus Cappadocia it says that these territories were suitable for animal breeding, what had important meaning in the agricultural sector (Strabo, XII:7,10). Strabo mentions: “Cappadocia, in addition to the money used to pay 1,500 horses and 2,000 donkeys, 50,000 sheep to the king of Persia yearly” (Strabo, XII: 17,8). In Persian the word Cappadocia meant “country of beautiful horses” (Pers. كاپادوكيه, Katpatuka).

These facts give us opinion that Ismirika may be one of the Kaskian-Mushki states, so it was settled by the Kartvelian tribes. Certainly, taking into account the geographical and political situation, most likely in the population there were Hurrian elements also.

Ismirika had the greatest strategic meaning. It’s proved by the fact that kings of Hittites tried to halt, especially Arnuwanda I, Mitanni-Kizzuwatna’s expansion, and against of it they try to unite the Hittites and Ismirika, “Treaty of Ismerika” also proves that. It’s the try of keeping the stabilization in Anatolia or fight for restoring the positions.

So, the east periphery of Hittites is very considerable to research the history of Hittites, also for study of this region and consequently it’s very important for researching of the ancient history of Georgia.

<sup>3</sup> There are many such endings: Kas-ka, Dudus-ka (one of the main cities of Kaskians), Mus-ka, such toponyms are also met in the central and east Anatolia: Neri-ka, Tapi-ka, Zijatis-ka, Tatis-k/ga, Taru-k/ga and etc. Interestingly, in Svan language we still find toponyms ending with „ga“. Laz-ga means a separate house and often participates in toponyms. Also Pana-ga, Leza-ga and etc.



## Bibliography

- giorgadze, gr., (1959). khetebis samepos aghmosavleti p'eriperiis zogierti p'unkt'is lok'alizebisatvis. sakartvelos metsnierebata ak'ademiis moambe, t'. XXIII, #3, tbilisi. (გიორგაძე, გრ., (1959). ხეთების სამეფოს აღმოსავლეთი პერიფერიის ზოგიერთი პუნქტის ლოკალიზებისათვის. საქართველოს მეცნიერებათა აკადემიის მოამბე, ტ. XXIII, #3, თბილისი.)
- giorgadze, gr., (2002). udzvelesi aghmosavluri etnosebi da kartvelta ts'armomavloba. tbilisi. (გიორგაძე, გრ., (2002). უძველესი აღმოსავლური ეთნოსები და ქართველთა წარმომავლობა. თბილისი.)
- kavtaradze, g., (2009). anat'olia - k'avk'asiis mijnis dzveli ist'oriis zogierti sak'itkhi. tbilisi. (ქავთარაძე, გ., (2009). ანატოლია - კავკასიის მიჯნის ძველი ისტორიის ზოგიერთი საკითხი. თბილისი.)
- ghambashidze, m., (2002). ramdeni tutkhalia da arnuvanda mepobda khetis sameposhi da vis ek'utvnis analebi. k'lio (ist'oriuli almanakhi), tbilisi, #6, gv. 3-23. (ღამბაშიძე, მ., (2002). რამდენი თუთხალია და არნუვანდა მეფობდა ხეთის სამეფოში და ვის ეკუთვნის ანალები. კლიო (ისტორიული აღმანახი), თბილისი, #6, გვ. 3-23).
- ghambashidze, m., (2006). kheturi analist'ik'a (samepo dghiurebi). nats'ili I. tbilisi. (ღამბაშიძე, მ., (2006). ხეთური ანალისტიკა (სამეფო დღიურები). ნაწილი I. თბილისი.)
- ghambashidze, m., (2017). kartvelur t'omta etnogenezis sak'itkhebi. tbilisi. (ღამბაშიძე, მ., (2017). ქართველურ ტომთა ეთნოგენეზის საკითხები. თბილისი.)
- Дьяконов И. М., (1951), Ассиро-вавилонские источники по истории Урарту, Вестник древней истории, Москва, №2, 3, 4.
- Ранович А., (1949), Восточные провинции Римской империи в I—III вв. Институт истории. Москва. Ленинград. Ст. 120.
- Ausstellingskatalog, (2001). Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Bonn.
- Burney, Ch., (2004). Historical Dictionary of the Hittites. Historical Dictionaries of Ancient Civilizations and Historical Eras, No 14, Lanham, Maryland-Toronto, Oxford.
- Beal, R.H., (1986). The history of Kizzuvatna and the date of the Šunaššura treaty. Or. 55, pp. 424-445.
- GBeckman, G., (1996). Hittite diplomatic texts. Atlanta.
- Briyce, T.R., (1982). The major historical texts of early Hittite Empire. Australia.
- Briyce, T.R., (2005). The kingdom of the Hittites. New Edition, Oxford.
- Carruba, O., (1977). Beiträge zur middlehethitischen Geschichte, I. Die Tuthaliyas und die Arnuwandas, II. Die sogenannten „Protocoles de soccession dynastique“, SMEA 18, pp. 137-195.
- Cavaignac, E., (1949). L'Arnuwandas d'Ismirikka. ArOr 17, 85-87.
- Cornelius, F., (1955). Hethitische Reisewege. RHA 13/57, 49-62.
- Cornelius, F., (1958). Geographie des Hethiterreiches. Orientalia. vol. 27, #3, Roma.
- Cornelius, F., (1958a). Zur hethitischen Geographie: die Nachbarn des Hethiterreiches. RHA 16/62: 1-17.
- Cornelius, F., (1967). Neue Arbeiten zur hethitischen Geographie. Anatolica 1, 62-77.
- Cornelius, F., (1973). Geschichte der Hethiter. Darmstadt.
- Forrer, E., (1931). Hajasa-Azzi. Caucasia 9, s. 1-24.

- Friedrich, J., (1926). Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer sprache. MVAeG 31. I Teil.
- Friedrich, J., (1930). Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer sprache. MVAeG 34, II Teil.
- Friedrich, J., (1952). Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Lf. 1, Heidelberg.
- Garstandg, J., Gurney, O.R., (1959). The Geogrophy of the Hittite Empire. London.
- Goetze, A., (1940). Kizzuwatna and the problem of Hittite geography. New Haven.
- Götze, A., (1925). Das hithitische Fragment des Šunššaura-Vertrages. ZA 36, zz. 11-18.
- Gurney, O.R., (1980). Die Hethite. Dresden.
- Gurney, O.R., (1992). Hittite Geography: thirty years on. Festschrift für S. Alp. Ankara.
- Gurney, O.R., (2003). The Upper Land, mātum elītum. (Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday-Ed. By G. Beckman, R.Beal, G. McMahon), Indiana, 119-127.
- Güterbock, H.G., (1952). Neue Texte zur Geschichte Šuppiluliumas. IF 60, zz. 199-211.
- Haas, V., (1977). Zalpa, die Stadt am Swarzen Meer und das althethitische Königium. MDOG 109, zz. 15-26.
- Houwink Ten Cate, P. H. J., (1970). The records of The early Hittite empire (c. 1450-1380 B.C.). Istanbul-Leiden.
- Kempinski, A., Košak, S., (1970). Der išmeriga-Vertrag. WdO 5, Göttingen, z. 191-217.
- Kempinski, A., Košak, S., (1982). CTH 13: The axtensive annals of Ḫattušili I (?). Tel Aviv 9, pp. 87-116.
- Klengel, H., (1999). Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches. Leiden.
- Korošec, V., (1931). Hethitische Staatsverträge. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung, Leipzig.
- Korošek, V., (1982). Über den nichtparitätischen Charakter des Šunaššura-Vertrages (KBo 1.5). AfO Bh. 19, zz. 168-172.
- Luckenbill, D.D., (1926-1927), Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia I-II, Chicago.
- Marín, J.A., (2002). Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt.v. Chr. Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes, Bd. 12/2, wiesbaden.
- Mellart, J., (1982). Archaeological Evidence For Trade and Trade Routes Between Syria and Mesopotamia and Anatolia During the Early and the Begining of the Middle Bronze Age. Studi Eblati V, pp. 15-32.
- Meyer, R.G., (1953). Huri neue Kizzuwatna-Verträge. MIO 1, zz. 108-124.
- Monte, del G., Tischler, J., (1978). a) Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Répertoire géographique 6 (heth.), Wiesbaden.
- Monte, del G., Tischler, J., (1992). b) Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement, Wiesbaden.
- Otten, H., (1951). Zu den Anfängen der hethitischen geschichte. MDOG 83, zz 33-45.
- Otten, H., (1961). Das hethiterreich. in: H. Schmökel, Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orient, zz. 334-337.
- Ramsay, W.A., (1980). The Historical Geography of Azia Minor. London.
- Sommer, F., (1947). Hethiter und Hethitisch. Stuttgart.
- Sürenhagen, D., (1985). Paritätische Staatsvertäge aus hethitischer Sicht. Zu historischen Aussagen und literarischer Stellung des Textes CTH 379. Studia Mediterana 5, Pavia.
- Tischler, j., (2011). Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Insburck.
- Ünal, A., (1976-1980). İšmiraka. RIA 5, pp. 197-198.
- Ünal, A., (1999). The Hittites and Anatolian Civilizations. Ankara.

- Von Schuler, E., (1964). Staatsverträge und Dokumente hethitischen Rechts. Neuere Hethiterforschung, zz. 34-53.
- Weidner, E., (1923). Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien. Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi, Boghazköi- Studien H.8,9, Leipzig.
- Wilhelm, G., (1983). Zur ersten Zeite des Šunaššura-Vertrages. Fs. Otten, zz. 359-370.
- Zgusta, L., (1964). Anatolische Personennamensippen. Teil 1: Text. Teil 2: Beilagen (Dissertationes Orientales 2). Prag: Academia.