THE STRUCTURE OF THE URARTIAN STATE *

M. Taner TARHAN

The Urartian history can be divided into two main phases. In fact, this division is by no means an artificial one, but depends on the administrative character of these phases, which also differ culturally:

a) The phase between the first quarter of the 13th century B.C. and the first half of the 9th century B.C. = In this phase the «Ur(w)atri/Urartu» and «Nairi» confederations which were founded against the common Assyrian enemy by the feudal princes, dominated the country. Feodality and tribal organization, which have their roots in the third millennium B.C., were still surviving. We designate this phase «the archaic age of Urartu».

b) The phase between the second half of the 9th century B.C. and the beginnings of the 6th century B.C. = This is the phase which we call «the age of the Urartian Kingdom» and which corresponds to what is called Urartian State in works on the political and cultural history of ancient Anatolia and the Western Asia.

---


2 For detailed information, see G.A. Meilletishvili, Nairi-Urartu (1954); M. Salvini, Nairi e Ur(w)atri (1967); M.T. Tarhan, UNK, St ff.
4 M.T. Tarhan, ibid, 73.
The transformation from «the confederative system», in another term, «the union of local prince doms», to the domination of a central power, which means «Kingdom» or «monarchic state» needed a new and lasting organization. The first step to this was the unification of the local prince doms under their powerful leaders, who were simply headmen of the greater tribes. In this «phase of Foundation» a «United State of Urartu» was formed. The first attempts in this direction was made -as seen in the Assyrian records- by Lapturi/Lutipri (ca. 880-860 B.C.). The unification was then realised by Arame/Aramu (ca. 860-840 B.C.) who was the head of another tribe, and at last put on sound fundaments by son of Lutipri, Seduri/Sarduri I (ca. 840-830/825 B.C.) who was the real founder of the Urartian State.

The Assyrian records mention royal cities administrative centres or capitals (al-dommâti / al-šarrâtî) during the region of Arame/Aramu for the first time which should undoubtedly be considered as signs of the movement towards the foundation of the central authority.

But, because of the long tradition of the feudal administrative organization, the transition to «the kingdom», or in other terms, «central governments», was not easy. The formation of concepts such as hierarchy and bureaucracy needed a considerable span of time. During this period the structure and the character of the state slowly came into being.

5 M.T. Tarhan, ibid., 80 ff.
6 See for detailed information, M.T. Tarhan, ibid., 99 ff.
7 Lapturi = Lutipri: We know Lutipri, father of Sarduri I, on the «Ma-dir Burg / Sardur Burg» inscriptions at Van (see footnote 11). His contemporary Alûr-naiîrpal II (883-859 B.C.) called him Lapturi (or Labturu). See ARAB, I, nos. 446 ff., 461 ff., 480, 497 ff.; ARL, 2, nos. 550 ff., 569 ff., 587, 629 ff., 636 ff. See for this equality which have been obtained by us, M.T. Tarhan, ibid., 92 ff.
8 See for «(URU)Sugunia» and «(URU)Arslâwâ» annuals of Salmanas- sar III (858-824 B.C.): «Monolith Inscription» from Kurkh, Col. I, 1, 24 and Col. II, 1, 48; ARAB, I, nos. 598, 804 ff.; see also M. Salvini, ibid., 77; M.T. Tarhan, ibid., 87 ff.; Ch. Y. Ikeda, Iraq, XLI/1 (1979), 77.
After this brief explanation, we would like to summarize the structure of the Urartian state:

I) The King:

The head of the state was king who is an absolute and omnipotent ruler. The succession to the throne was according to the patriarchal principle, and thus the kingship remained in the same dynasty.

The Urartian kings demonstrated their potency by adopting the boastful titles of their Assyrian counterparts: «šar kiššati = king of the universe». This title, on the other hand, points out that the Urartian kings, from Sarduri I onward, already claimed territorial rights upon neighbouring lands in northern Mesopotamia and that they considered themselves equals of the Assyrian kings who were their rivals throughout their history. In spite of this enmity, many cultural components such as the Assyrian cuneiform writing, Assyrian style in art, Assyrian administrative organization influenced the Urartian state and Urartian palace.

The Urartian kings stressed their potent authority not only by their titles; all new towns, castles, temples, palaces, dams and


10 A. Goette, Kleinasien (1957?), 195.

11 Inscriptions of Sarduri I: <Madur Burg / Sardur Burcup (=1.1); UKN, nos. 1-3 = HChI, nos. 1 a-c; E. Bilgiçi, TAD, IX/1 (1959), 45; M. Salvini, Nairi e Ur(u) atri, 13 f.; Bilingual inscription of Išpuini and his son Menua on the Kelisik stele (1.16: Assyrian text): UKN, no. 19 = HChI, no. 9; see also W.C. Benedikt, JAOS, 81 (1961), 359 ff.; Cf. UKN, 378.

12 E. Bilgiçi, ibid., 45; Cf. B.B. Piotrovskii, Urartu (1969), 64 f.

13 M.T. Tarhan, ibid., 107; Cf. M. Salvini, in ...Rivalen Assyriens, 11.


15 The first documents of Urartu, the inscriptions of Sarduri I, shown here in the footnote 11, are not written in urartean, but in assyrian.
channels were built in the name of the king. On the inscriptions of such buildings do not mention anyone but the king as the founder. New town bear the name of the kings like Menuaḫihilī, Arūgiḫhilī (= Armavir)\textsuperscript{18}, Sārdurīhilī (= Çavuştepe)\textsuperscript{19}, Rusāḫihilī (= Toprakkale)\textsuperscript{20}, Rusai URU.TUR (= Bastam)\textsuperscript{21} etc. On the other hand some towns were given names of the gods celebrated in those regions where the towns were built according to the settlement policy of the government.

It seems that the sacral and profane duties were carried out side by side in a monarchic + teocratic system, where the king was the «head priests»\textsuperscript{19} of the gods in the same time. All the Urartean kings were under the protection of the gods, and in their inscriptions they define themselves as the «servant» of «Haldi, who was «the national god» and was at the head of the pantheon»\textsuperscript{22}.

II) The state religion:

In the past as at the present, in lands where people of different confessions live together, religion seems to be a distinctive mark. In Urartu, on the contrary, religion was given a unifying function, since different religious believers and practises were transformed into a state religion.

\textsuperscript{16} See for this kind of inscriptions: UKN and HChi; see also W. Kleiss-H. Hauptmann, Topographische Karte von Urartu (1976), 39 ff.; Among these inscriptions, only the one about «the garden of Tariria», daughter of Menua seem to be an exception (UKN, no. 111 = HChi, 49). In the others, even the estates of the members of the royal family or of the noblemen are mentioned in the royal inscriptions (Cf. UKN, no. 277 = HChi, no. 123 etc.).

\textsuperscript{17} UKN, 435; HChi, 195; A.M. Dınçöl - E. Kavakli, Van Bölgesinde Bu-humnuş Yeni Urartu Yazıtları (1978), 21.

\textsuperscript{18} W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 25, no. 5.

\textsuperscript{19} W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 10, no. 7; A. Erzen, Çavuştepe, 1 (1978), 1 ff.

\textsuperscript{20} W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 9, no. 2.

\textsuperscript{21} W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 29, no. 12; W. Kleiss, Bastam / Rusa-i-URU.TUR, (1977), 9 ff.

\textsuperscript{22} A. Goetze, ibid, 195.

\textsuperscript{23} A. Goetze, ibid; T. Özgüç, ibid, 3.
We have already pointed out the fact that the establishment of a central power was not an easy task to fulfill, since the feodal system had a long tradition, and the local princes were accustomed to live and rule independently without any superior authority to control their deeds. Even after the confederations formed the united state of Urartu against the common Assyrian threat, a potent factor of unity was needed, and that was religion.

The grandson of Sarduri I, Menua (ca. 810-786 B.C.) distinguished himself by the reorganizations he undertook in the administration. This king together with his father Išpuini (ca. 830/825-810 B.C.) applied during their common, kinship a logical strategy to reach the compatibility of several religious believes of different communities both hurro-urartean and foreign origin, and established an official pantheon containing all deities celebrated in the lands under his domination, and founded a «state religion».

Thus the political unity was strengthened also by common spiritual values. It is noteworthy, that not only local gods and goddesses, but also deities of conquered lands and deified mountains, lakes, rivers and caves were worshipped which points out the existence of «totemism».

This practice remained unchanged as a part of «the state policy» during the reign of Menua. This «religious reform» was one of the factors which helped the «new settlement policy» -about which we come later- to reach its aim:

24 M.T. Tarhan, ibid, 96 ff.
26 On the inscription at the monumental rock niche called «Meher Kapısı/Çoban Kapısı/Tağ Kapısı» 79 gods and goddesses are enumerated and offerings to them are described in art and number: UKN, no. 27 = ICOH, no. 10; see footnote 27; see also M.T. Tarhan - V. Sevin, Belleten, XXXIX/155 (1975), 289 ff.; V. Sevin - O. Belli, An Ar, IV-V (1976-1977), 387 ff.
During the reign of Argištî I (ca. 786-764 B.C.) 6600 warriors from the lands of Hâte and Šupani\[^{29}\] were forced to settle\[^{29}\] at Ere-buni (= Arinberd)\[^{31}\], but their god, ḫm-mar-ši-ia, possibly of Anatolian-Luwian origin, was also brought to Urartian land, and a susi was built for him\[^{22}\].

It is evident that this «state religion» was a connecting link between the foreign countries and Urartu as B.B. Piotrovskii\[^{33}\] clearly formulates: «...We can see, therefore, that the religion of Urartu reflected cultural and political elements which bound together large territories in western Asia, combining them with ancient local beliefs...»

As we have already said, the king was «the head priest» of the chief god ḫaldi and was under his patronage; all profane or sacral deeds were made «with the aid of ḫaldi». ḫaldi was not only at the head of the pantheon who bound all gods, both foreign and native, but symbolizes in the same time the state and its divine power as the «national god = state god».

According to the inscriptions, some new towns were given the name ḫaldı́ni 乌鲁 = ḫaldi-Town\[^{34}\]. In accordance with this practice, possibly as a rule of «state religion», some new cities bore theophoric names, such as Tedēbaini (= Karmir Blur)\[^{35}\].

On the other side, impressive temples brought to light at Urartian sites, tombs, votive objects and some other small finds prove how much importance was given to religion in the Urartian society. But, in the last phases of the Urartian central authority, several


\[^{31}\] W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 26, no. 9.

\[^{32}\] The same god was called ḫurak or ḫubba; See G.A. Melikishvili, VDI, 63-2 (1938), 40 ff.

\[^{33}\] Urartu, 67.

\[^{34}\] F.W. König, Archiv für Völkerkunde, 8 (1952), 163; HChI, 185; UKN, 428.

ethnic or national elements seem to have the tendency to reject the official religion by the state, and to go back to their old totemistic beliefs.  

III) *Administration*:

One of the characteristics of this period is the reorganization of the state administration the head of which is the king at Tušpa (= Van). During the reign of Išpuini and Menna, when the central authority became powerful, the territory under the Urartian domination were divided into «regions» and «provinces» a new administrative system was organized according to the Assyrian model.

During the age of confederations, or «the stage of foundation» in other words, the feuds were accessing to power in the patrilineal order (*LO.GAR.MES = šaknunti*) as in Assyria.

After the establishment of the central authority, the lands were divided into smaller units according to their «strategic importance» or «capacity of production», and were made administratively dependent upon «provincial capitals». To these capitals «governors» or «mayors» (*LO.EN.NAM.MES = belé pahati*) were sent from Tušpa, who were appointed by the king. These collect the taxes, control the production in the name of the king, they were in charge of all building activities, and were responsible for the security of their regions. During the wartime they had to run to the front with troops.

37 W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, *ibid*, 9, no. 1; During the reign of Rusa II (ca. 680-645 B.C.), transported to Rusašini (*=Topräkale*).
38 V. Sevin, *ibid*, 142 ff.
40 See footnote 39; The Assyrian provincial organization was attempted during the reign of Adad-Nirari II (911-891 B.C.) for the first time, than Tiglatpileser III (744-727 B.C.) and the others brought it into application. See A.K. Grayson, *Di Or*, XXXIII/3-4 (1970), 135 ff.; M.N. von Loon, *ibid*.

This new system removed gradually the feudalism and put an end to the revolts of the gods against the king to increase their own interests.

The first *EN.NAM* appears in the records of Menua (ca. 810-786 B.C.)\footnote{Bilingual inscription of *Topzawa stele* (urartian text): *UKN*, no. 204, 1. 7 = *HChI*, no. 122, prg. 2 ff.; Cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, *Huitième Campagne* (1912), xvi, footnote 1; see also *ARAB*, II, nos. 22, 59, 169, 172, 175 f., 183, 213.}. Argisti I (ca. 786-764 B.C.) appointed the 4 kings of the lesser lands of Diauehi (approximately around Erzurum) as *EN.NAM’s*\footnote{EN.NAM, no. 205 = *HChI*, no. 119, prg. II.}

During the reign of Sarduri II (ca. 764-735 B.C.) the same practice is also seen\footnote{F. Thureau-Dangin, *ibid.*, 11. 277 f.; *ARAB*, II, no. 165.}


Members of the royal family acted possibly as *EN.NAM’s*. But the Assyrian records made also the contrary considerable: Sargon II (721-705 B.C.) mentions in the records of his famous 8th campaign from seven cities where the brothers of Rusa I lived\footnote{EN.NAM, no. 155 iv = *HChI*, no. 105, prg. 11. IV, 15. X.}

It is possible that the king had sent them away from the capital to secure his throne in the future\footnote{EN.NAM, no. 155 iv = *HChI*, no. 105, prg. 11. IV, 15. X.}

but not as *EN.NAM’s*.

As many authors pointed out, the Urartian state had the character of a bureaucratic state governed by the officials appointed by the king and sent from the capital\footnote{EN.NAM, no. 155 iv = *HChI*, no. 105, prg. 11. IV, 15. X.}.
Records also give enough information about the administrative organization - which is alike the one in Assyria - in the capital or in the palace. A tablet, found at the last capital Rusahinili (= Toprakkale) contains a list of «royal household» during the reign of Rusa II (ca. 685-645 B.C.)\(^{19}\).

The list contains five major sections:

Total 1113 \(^{10}\)ma-ri-GI : «nobles» or «emirs»\(^{21}\):
104 \(^{16}\)ta(r)-da-\={\textacute{a}}-be-e and
1009 \(^{16}\)ki-ri-n{\textacute{e}}-e-i : «bowel-bearer» (?)

Total 3784 \(^{16}\)Š.A.REŠ\(^{m\text{-}e}\) : «eunuchs» or «harem-a\={g}as\(^{i}\})\(^{12}\):
2409 \(^{16}\)ár-še : «ephebi/young men/youths» or «ghulams»\(^{33}\)
119 \(^{16}\)NI.G.SI.DA-ka-i : «before the man of the counting» (accountant)
68 \(^{16}\)GAD-\={\textacute{a}}-e : «women-weavers» (?)
1188 \(^{16}\)UR.ZIR : «dog-warders»

300 \(^{16}\)KUR.KUR\(^{m\text{-}e}\) : «armed tribesmen» (?)
90 \(^{16}\)UKÜ\(^{m\text{-}e}\) : «(armed men of the) people»

Total 168 \(^{16}\)e-\={\textacute{a}}-te/la \(^{E}\).GAL :
108 \(^{16}\)Š.A.REŠI \(^{E}\).GAL-i
35 \(^{16}\)hal-bi-ú-né
10 \(^{16}\)E.TIN\(^{m\text{-}e}\) : «vintners» (?)
15 \(^{16}\)ši-pi-ka-a-né

Total 52 \(^{16}\)un-qa-i-ta-a-né :
15 \(^{16}\)ú-bi-a-bi-i-ka-i : «before Ubiabe»

\(^{50}\) I.M. Diakonoff, *Urartukiye pisma i dokumenty* (1963), no. 12; G.A. Melikishvili, *VDJ*, 3-4 (1971), 231, no. 286; see also J.V. Kinnier Wilson, *ibid*, 116. My thanks are due to Prof. Dr. I.M. Diakonoff who kindly sent the translation of the tablet to my colleague Doc. Dr. V. Sevin who permitted me to use it here.

\(^{51}\) Cf. J.V. Kinnier Wilson, *ibid*, 45, 100 ff.

\(^{52}\) Cf. *ibid*, 46 ff.

\(^{53}\) Cf. *ibid*, 59 f.
Final total 5507 LÛmes «persons»

In any event the final total on the tablet gives the single and important figure of «5507 persons». As I.M. Diakonoff himself argues this total seems undoubtedly to indicate the size of the Urartian royal household at capital at the time of the document.

IV) Town planning:

It is evident from the records and the excavated sites that in the reign of Ispini and especially of Menua a wide-ranging town planning had taken place. The foundation of new settlements should not be considered merely as a sign of the economic development, but, as the result of a new «settlement policy», which originated from a new socio-economic reorganisation according to the needs of the state. In regions around the capital, as well as in the provinces, hundreds of fortresses and towns were built at the strategic points and passes on the historical road-net according to the needs of transportation and administration in peace-time and to those of military operations or defense in step by step during the war-time. These fortresses and settlements kept the routes under the control of the central authority and the king, and facilitated his domination of the provinces.

These new settlements as well as the cities built in the previous phases show a certain attitude in «town plannings». The appearan-
ce of towns with «standard plans» in the VII century B.C. even in the distant provinces prove the state monarchy on town planning. This must be considered as an achievement, since even today the state can hardly control the urbanization59.

V) Economy, production and settlement policy:

One of the characteristics of this period is that the economy was organized by the state. All kinds of production were under the state control; settlements in the central region or in the provinces were «economic centres» besides their administrative and military functions. All kinds of agricultural products such as grain, wine and sesame oil were kept in the «royal storehouses» in the fortresses at these settlements60. It seems, that the ruling class and the common people were given sufficient quantities of these ware, and the rest of the production were sent to the capital as a kind of «tax»61. This system supplied the government with a continous income62, moreover it solved the problem of nutrition of the regular army63. These storages also served as a measurement in cases of

59 It is interesting to note, that the «Hippodamos» plan which appeared in the V century B.C. in antiquity - which is the forerunner of the modern town plans of today - was already used 2-3 centuries ago by the Urartians, at Karmir Blur, at Duwagagi and with its most developed form at Zernik-Tepe at the northern coast of Lake Van (See for these towns: W. Kleiss - H. Hauptmann, ibid, 25 f., no. 8: 28, no. 8: 30 f., no. 12; see also M.T. Tarhan - V. Sevin, ibid and 352 f.). The oldest examples of such a town plan is discovered at Mohenjo-Daro (See J. Marshall, Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization, London, 1931; E.J.H. Mackay, Further Excavations at Mohenjo-daro, Delhi, 1938; Sir M. Wheeler, The Indus Civilization, Cambridge, 1968, 37 ff.). We believe that the Urartian influence - thought maybe indirect - on the urbanism of the western world should always be kept in mind.


61 Cf. A. Goetz, ibid, 195; M.N. van Loon, ibid, 18; O. Belli, ibid, 50 f.
63 Cf. O. Belli, ibid and 61.
emergency such as natural catastrophes, epidemics, bad climatic conditions—especially, long winters— or enemy attacks.

Town planning solved the problem of water supply which was the most important resource for the production; dams and canals were among the great architectural works of the Urartians.64

Besides the agricultural productions, animal breeding—which was one of the main characteristics of the nomadic people—should also be under the state control.65 On the other hand looting campaigns were made to several regions to get animals as booty. During the reigns of Argišti I and Sarduri II, raids were organized twice a year to Transcausasia and in each of them thousands of cattle and sheep were taken booty. The total of them rose up to hundreds of thousands.66

The development of Urartian metallurgy was promoted by the exhaustion of the rich metal ores—like iron and copper—in Eastern Anatolia.67 We would like to stress here the fact, that a wide ranged trade between Urartu and the Western World should be considered with reservation.68 Urartian economy was an introvert one. The import objects found at the Urartian sites are very limited in number and species, and only this points out the weakness of commercial links with foreign countries. (and also we must disregard some of objects were taken as booty or tax or gift).

It is a well-known fact, that the Assyrians, the southern neighbours of Urartu organized military campaigns against the Urartian lands from the XIII century B.C. onward in order to plunder the food storages, metal objects, valuable ores and timbers, and to de-

---

64 See B. Ögün, "Vandı urartu Úlamada Tesirleri." (1970); C.A. Burney, AS, XXII (1972), 179 ff.
69 M.T. Tarhan, UNK, 43; Cf. O. Belli, ibid, 51 f.
port the inhabitants and animals\(^{70}\). Because of these permanent Assyrian raids, Urartian economy suffered -from time to time- very much. This seems to be the main goal of the Assyrians; their military campaigns did not aim at anlasting invasion and domination of Eastern Anatolia\(^{21}\). Moreover, the Assyrians forced the people of the invaded regions to pay a heavy tribute and thus had a durable source of income for their own economy.

But, inspite of all these negative factors, the settlement policy of the Urartean kings protected the economy from a total collapse. The Urarteans deported tens of thousands of men, women -among them smiths, masons\(^{72}\) and other artisans- from the neighbouring lands and settle them in and around the newly founded towns and thus equalized their own losses of resource, and found a cheap labour force to use for their building activities\(^{72}\).

The deported people, the «slaves» and the «captives» in other terms -who were the members of the lowest social class- played thus an important role in the Urartean economy\(^{74}\). M.N. van Loon\(^{75}\) very clearly formulates this situation: «...More probably, we have to imagine the country strewn with vast, well-managed royal estates, worked mostly by resettled captives and subjected local inhabitants...»

The settlement policy which we summarized above had begun as we have already pointed out, in the reign of Menua: This king brought many captives from the land of «Hate» at Euphrates to his land\(^{76}\), and settled another group of deportees from the Assyrian

---

75 *Urartian Art*, 18.
76 *UKN*, no. 28 = *HChI*, no. 16; see also *UKN*, nos. 32-35, 38 = *HChI*, nos. 18-20.
border in Urartu proper. Argišti I followed the same trend. In the inscriptions of Rusa II, we read that women from Maamaia, men from Halitu (at the shore of Black-Sea, possibly around Trapezus) and communities from Muški (Phrygia) and Hate were forced to settle in the Urartean lands. The same king knew to keep some of the Cimmerians, who were his former enemies, as allies in Urartu and to make use of the warrior’s abilities of this nomadic people.

VI) State authority in arts:

The standardization, which is an important characteristic of the Urartean art can be seen in architecture such as house types (double roomed houses with a frontal court-yard) and temple plans as well as in the production of small objects. We would like to remind here that Urartean architecture is a monumental one - if not as impressive as that of the Assyrians. Especially the building peculiarities of the fortresses, their adaptation to the natural environment; the irrigation works, which are masterpieces of engineering, demonstrate the high level of Urartean architecture.

In spite of the standardization of plans, architects seem to have worked more freely than potters and coppersmiths. In the production of pottery and bronze objects, the shapes and styles were so

77 A.M. Dincol - E. Kavak, ibid, 21, 24 ff.
78 See footnotes 29 and 30, see also G.A. Melikishvili, VDI, 4 (1959), 37 ff., 39 f. and VDI, 4 (1961), 27 f.
79 UKN, no. 278 - HChI, no. 128; see also M.N. van Loon, ibid, 20, 83.
80 E. Ogün, TTKong., VI (1967), 89.
83 See M.T. Tarhan - V. Sevin, Belleten, XXXIX/155 (1975), 389 ff.
84 Cf. E.B. Piotrovskii, The Kingdom of Van. (1967), 19; see also M.N. van Loon, ibid., 29 ff.; S. Kroll, Keramik Urartäischer Festungen in Iran (1976) and in ...Rivale Assyriences, 82 ff.
«monotonously» repeated that they give the impression, as if they were fabricated in the same workshop. It is evident that the artists were not independent but had to work according to the clichés imposed by the royal court. This «royal style / court style» were copied by the provincial artists84.

In the period of decline the state authority was weakened, and thus, the provincial artists and the others had the freedom to create their own styles. Therefore the simplified depictions on some of the bronze plates of the «Glycimil Hoard»85 in which we are inclined to see a «return to archaism» are productions of a new and free art. «which goes back to their old totemistic beliefs».

VII) Laws:

The central authority should have undoubtedly functioned with the aid of a certain juridical system. Though we are relatively well informed on the law-codes of the Assyrians and the Hittites, we know unfortunately simply nothing on the Urartean laws which -we believe- existed. The laws of the Urartean kingdom should at least be different than those of the tribes during the «age of confederations».

On the other hand, the «patrilineal» order in the succession to the throne can be considered as part of a law-code86. The rules «which can be deduced to be existent» in the appointments of EN, NAM's, and the «hierarchy» of the officials reflect the juridical system. The determination of the offerings to the members of the pantheon, where gods and godeses are enumerated according to their ranks should also be considered as a religious law. In the

84 See B.B. Piotrovskii, ibid, 15 ff.; M.N. van Loon, ibid, 166 ff.; E. Akurgal, Anatolia, IV (1959), 67 ff. and Kunstzentre; see also O. Bell, ibid, 56 ff., 71 ff.
86 Cf. A. Goetze, ibid, 195.
economic life, the existence of several measuring units\(^{87}\), which undoubtedly were established by the state, demonstrate that there were rules in commerce as well as in taxation.
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