

THE NEW INSCRIPTION FROM THE SÜDBURG OF BOĞAZKÖY-HATTUŠA

by John David Hawkins

DISCOVERY AND STATE OF THE INSCRIPTION

The circumstances of the discovery of Kammer 2 on the Südburg have already been described in detail by Peter Neve, as have also the condition of the monument and the clear evidence for its reconstruction¹. To this archaeological report, Professor Heinrich Otten has added a preliminary report on the inscription², in which he makes a number of very pertinent points on its epigraphic aspects and historical context. In the excavation season following the discovery of the monument, Peter Neve devoted much effort to the investigation of the archaeological context of the structure, but unfortunately discovered that most of the evidence had been destroyed by the Phrygian building operations, so that the Hittite structure has been left an architectural fragment largely without context³.

We should begin by recapitulating briefly the basic facts about the inscription as noted by Neve and Otten. The restoration of the two blocks found reused in the Phrygian wall as blocks I and II filling the gap at the upper right section of the inscription on the west wall of Kammer 2 is established by the archaeological observation of their shape and dimensions: these fit exactly into the space and into the marks of the beddings visible on the top of the in situ blocks IV, V and VI⁴. This restoration is confirmed by epigraphic observations from the inscription itself:

1. the sequence of seven words straddling blocks I + II, line 1, is repeated in line 2, again straddling the two blocks⁵;
2. the clear raised right edge of block I indicates that it belonged to the right edge of an inscription⁶;
3. the sequence of two words straddling blocks II + III, line 3, is repeated shortly thereafter on block IV, line 1 (i. e. the 4th. line of the restored inscription). For these repeating sequences as noted, compare the sequence of four words straddling blocks V + VI, line 4, repeated immediately below in line 5, again straddling the two blocks.

With blocks I and II certainly restoring the upper right quarter of the inscription and joining the in situ blocks III – VI, we have the inscription covering the entire surface of the first two courses of blocks of the west wall of Kammer 2. The inscription has to be complete, since, besides the observation of the raised right edge of blocks I and VI, it is clear archaeologically that no further blocks could have stood to the right of this wall, nor were the blocks

I would like to express my great gratitude to Dr. Peter Neve and to the German Archaeological Institute for their invitation to me to visit Boğazköy to work on the inscription.

In addition to the abbreviations according to ArchBibl and AA 1989, 721 ff., the following will be used:

Laroche, Hiéroglyphes = E. Laroche, Les Hiéroglyphes hittites I (1960)

Otten, Inschrift = H. Otten, Die hieroglyphen-

luwische Inschrift, in: AA 1989, 333 ff.

Özgüç, İnandiktepe = T. Özgüç, İnandiktepe: An Important Cult Centre in the Old Hittite Period (1988)

¹ P. Neve, AA 1989, 316–332.

² Otten, Inschrift 333–337.

³ See above pp. 279–284.

⁴ P. Neve, AA 1989, 320.

⁵ Otten, Inschrift 333 f.

⁶ Otten, Inschrift *ibid.*

a third course above the inscription inscribed (they have been identified among the fallen stones, and will be restorable to their original position). The inscription thus began at its right corner and ran sinistroversely along line 1 for the whole length of the wall, blocks II, returning boustrophedon along line 2, and so continuing until it terminated on block III, half-way along line 6, leaving the remainder of the line blank and less carefully dressed. The surface of the inscription is almost entirely preserved: some flakes from blocks III line 1 and VI line 4 were recovered and can be restored. Altogether no single sign is completely lost, though a few are damaged. Such an excellent state of preservation is all too rare.

The signs are executed in relief by the cutting away of the background, as is normal in the cuneiform inscriptions of the Empire Period. In general they are rather roughly and crudely rendered, and do not show as much surface marking and decoration as may be seen elsewhere (note in particular the very indistinct form of the sign *ni* throughout). This is in marked contrast to the elegant rendering of sign forms on the inscriptions of Hattusa IV from YALBURT⁷ and EMIRGAZI. The line-dividers on the SÜDBURG inscription are only partially shown by being left in relief.

The writing of the text is preponderantly logographic and shows comparatively few phonetically written words. Connective particles are not written at all, and noun and verb endings are very sparsely. These features contribute heavily to the difficulty and uncertainty of interpreting the text. Many of the logograms are otherwise unattested and/or of unknown meaning. The lack of connective particles makes the clause division of the text very uncertain, and that of the noun and verb endings obscures grammatical relationships. In particular it is difficult to identify with certainty the subject(s) of the clauses throughout, and thus to understand the actions recorded.

It is remarkable that the discovery of the SÜDBURG inscription should have coincided almost exactly with the publication of the long YALBURT inscription⁸, which, though discovered in 1900, had not hitherto been available to scholars. The publication of this important text at this particular juncture was very fortunate, since the close connections between the two inscriptions YALBURT and the SÜDBURG were immediately apparent, and they will facilitate the elucidation of each other. A further surprise to emerge from the simultaneous appearance of these two inscriptions is that another, long-known group of inscriptions can also now be shown to be closely connected, namely the inscriptions KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ (with the more recently discovered BURUNKAYA)⁹. Thus in the interpretation of the SÜDBURG inscription, frequent reference will be made to YALBURT and also to KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ.

PRINCIPAL PROBLEMS IN UNDERSTANDING THE INSCRIPTION

In the context of the present preliminary report, only a summary of the inscriptions content can be offered. Detailed examination and attempted elucidation of all the problems (which attach to almost every word of the inscription) will have to await final publication¹⁰. But even

See n. 8.

Published as photographs of the eighteen blocks in Özgüç, İnandıktepe 172–174 pls. 85–95; and note the remarks of R. Temizer *ibid.* p. XV–XVII and XXV–XXVII in the introduction.

Note the important re-examination and re-edition of all the material in the context of the new inscription BURUNKAYA by S. Alp in: *Anatolian Studies*

presented to H. G. Güterbock (1974) 17–27 pls. 1–10. See also P. Meriggi, *Manuale di cuneo geroglifico II* 3 (1975) 266–271 nos. 12–18 pls. 1, 2.

¹⁰ It is proposed to produce the definitive publication of the SÜDBURG inscription as quickly as possible in the series *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* as Beiheft 2.

the presentation of a summary of the contents necessitates a consideration of some main problems, since without this, a well-founded interpretation of the general sense is not possible. These main problems relate to the identification of the subject(s) of the clauses throughout.

The end of the inscription is fortunately comparatively clear, and it is here that we start¹¹.

§ 17. ... *137(-)ha-sà DEUS-zi/a DARE-ha

§ 18. zi/a + à-ti DEUS.*202 pa-ti ANNUS i(a)-zi/a

§ 17. »... an offering to the gods I gave¹²,

§ 18. here¹³ a divine *202 in that year (I) construct(ed)«.

Clearly § 18 provides the key both to the identification of the Südburg monument and to the formulation of the entire text: it can be recognized as a regular type of building inscription characterized by the phrase »in that year«, which is typically appended to a past historical narrative, as the body of the present text can be seen to be¹⁴. The object of the construction, the DEUS.*202, can only refer to the Südburg monument itself; what this deity is considered below, p. 314.

Though the verb of § 18, *izi-*, »make«, is written without verbal ending, as typically in other Empire Period inscriptions¹⁵, the clear writing in § 17 of the ending of 1st singular preterite permits us to understand the verb in § 18 as being in the same person, number and tense, thus »(I) construct(ed)«. Indeed it is § 17 that, by its verb ending of 1st singular preterite (probably the sole verb ending written in the entire inscription), provides the only evidence that the inscription has a »speaker«, a 1st. person singular narrator. In spite of the absence of the usual introductory formula »I (am) So-and-so«, followed by genealogy and title, it can hardly be doubted that this »speaker« is the Suppiluliuma, whose name occurs four times: he is entitled »Great King, Hero«¹⁶, and twice »Great King, Tawani«¹⁷, where the word can be seen from its occurrences in the YALBURT inscription to be a royal title¹⁸.

¹¹ For a photograph, see P. Neve, *AA* 1989, 328 fig. 59.

¹² The phrase *137(-)ha-sà DARE, »give an offering«, is fortunately found in a sufficiently clear context on the EMIRGAZI altars inscription: see J. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 25, 1975, 130 cit. 11.

¹³ The writing of »here«, *zati*, as *zi/a + à-ti* provides a quite unexpected but welcome example of the ligature *zi/a + à = za*, i.e. the definition of the vocalization of the ambiguous *zi/a* by the addition of *à*, graphically simplified in the Late Period inscriptions by the distinction of *za* from *zi*. We have noted the preservation of the writing *zi/a + à* in archaic texts of the Late Period and its revival in archaizing ones: see A. Morpurgo Davies—J. D. Hawkins, *AnnPisa* 8, 1978, 779 f. It is very gratifying to find a late Empire Period example of the practice.

¹⁴ See further below, p. 310.

¹⁵ See e.g. YALBURT block 9: Özgüç, *İnandıktepe* pl. 88, 2; also the shortly post-Empire KARAHÖYÜK (ELBISTAN), II, 7, 9: see H. G. Güterbock in: T. and N. Özgüç, *Ausgrabungen in Karahöyük* 1947

(1949) pl. 49.

¹⁶ §§ 2, 6: see below, p. 309.

¹⁷ §§ 9, 14, not examined in detail in this text. *Tawani* is written *ta²-wa/i-ni*, in which the form read *ta²*, appearing on SÜDBURG as *ta²* YALBURT (following note) as *ta²*, has been elsewhere on seals: see Laroche, *Hieroglyphy* 416; H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 32, 1973, 1, 141; *id.* in: Boğazköy V (1975), 70–73 no. 10; R. M. Boehmer—H. G. Güterbock, *Aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy* (1987) 194, all with discussions of reading. The form for identifying it as the Empire Period form for Late *ta²* (𐎲 𐎶) is provided by the expert analysis of KARKAMIS A 21, which renders *ta²* as *ta²* for which see J. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 31, 1977, cit. 7 § 7; i.e. the last sign form provides evidence for what the skillfully archaizing Suppiluliuma considered the Empire Period form of *ta²*.

¹⁸ Here it normally occurs with the nom. sg. ending *-s(a)* (blocks 7, 12: Özgüç, *İnandıktepe* pls. 89, 1; 91, 2; 93, 2), twice in clauses with verb clearly 1st. sing. pret., i.e. the subject

380, this course above the inscription inscribed (they have been identified among the fall. shows, and will be restorable to their original position). The inscription thus began at its upper right corner and ran sinistroversely along line 1 for the whole length of the wall, blocks I-III, returning boustrophedon along line 2, and so continuing until it terminated on block IV, half way along line 6, leaving the remainder of the line blank and less carefully dressed. The surface of the inscription is almost entirely preserved: some flakes from blocks III line 1 and IV line 4 were recovered and can be restored. Altogether no single sign is completely lost, though a few are damaged. Such an excellent state of preservation is all too rare.

The signs are executed in relief by the cutting away of the background, as is normal in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Empire Period. In general they are rather roughly and unevenly rendered, and do not show as much surface marking and decoration as may be seen elsewhere (note in particular the very indistinct form of the sign *ni* throughout). This style is in marked contrast to the elegant rendering of sign forms on the inscriptions of Tadmort IV from YALBURT⁷ and EMIRGAZI. The line-dividers on the SÜDBURG inscription too are only partially shown by being left in relief.

The writing of the text is preponderantly logographic and shows comparatively few phonetically written words. Connective particles are not written at all, and noun and verb endings only very sparsely. These features contribute heavily to the difficulty and uncertainty of interpreting the text. Many of the logograms are otherwise unattested and/or of unknown reading. The lack of connective particles makes the clause division of the text very uncertain, and that of the noun and verb endings obscures grammatical relationships. In particular it is hard to identify with certainty the subject(s) of the clauses throughout, and thus to understand the actions recorded.

It is remarkable that the discovery of the SÜDBURG inscription should have coincided almost exactly with the publication of the long YALBURT inscription⁸, which, though discovered in 1870, had not hitherto been available to scholars. The publication of this important text at this particular juncture was very fortunate, since the close connections between the two inscriptions of YALBURT and the SÜDBURG were immediately apparent, and they will facilitate the elucidation of each other. A further surprise to emerge from the simultaneous appearance of these two inscriptions is that another, long-known group of inscriptions can also now be seen to be closely connected, namely the inscriptions KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ (with the more recently discovered BURUNKAYA)⁹. Thus in the interpretation of the SÜDBURG inscription, frequent reference will be made to YALBURT and also to KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ.

PRINCIPAL PROBLEMS IN UNDERSTANDING THE INSCRIPTION

In the context of the present preliminary report, only a summary of the inscriptions content can be offered. Detailed examination and attempted elucidation of all the problems (which attach to almost every word of the inscription) will have to await final publication¹⁰. But even

7 See n. 8.

Published as photographs of the eighteen blocks in Özgüç, *Inandiktepe* 172-174 pls. 85-95; and note the remarks of R. Temizer *ibid.* p. XV-XVII and XXV-XXVII in the introduction.

8 Note the important re-examination and re-edition of all the material in the context of the new inscription from BURUNKAYA by S. Alp in: *Anatolian Studies*

presented to H. G. Güterbock (1974) 17-27 pls. 1-10. See also P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico* II 3 (1975) 266-271 nos. 12-18 pls. 1, 2. It is proposed to produce the definitive publication of the SÜDBURG inscription as quickly as possible in the series *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* as Beiheft 2.

the presentation of a summary of the contents necessitates a consideration of some of the main problems, since without this, a well-founded interpretation of the general sense is hardly possible. These main problems relate to the identification of the subject(s) of the clauses throughout.

The end of the inscription is fortunately comparatively clear, and it is here that we must start¹¹.

§ 17. ... *137(-)ha-sà DEUS-zī/a DARE-ha

§ 18. zī/a + ā-ti DEUS.*202 pa-ti ANNUS i(a)-zī/a

§ 17. ... an offering to the gods I gave¹².

§ 18. here¹³ a divine *202 in that year (I) construct(ed)«.

Clearly § 18 provides the key both to the identification of the Südburg monument and to the formulation of the entire text: it can be recognized as a regular type of building inscription, characterized by the phrase »in that year«, which is typically appended to a passage of historical narrative, as the body of the present text can be seen to be¹⁴. The object of the construction, the DEUS.*202, can only refer to the Südburg monument itself; what this might be is considered below, p. 314.

Though the verb of § 18, *zi-*, »make«, is written without verbal ending, as typically also in other Empire Period inscriptions¹⁵, the clear writing in § 17 of the ending of 1st. singular preterite permits us to understand the verb in § 18 as being in the same person, number and tense, thus »(I) construct(ed)«. Indeed it is § 17 that, by its verb ending of 1st. singular preterite (probably the sole verb ending written in the entire inscription), provides the only evidence that the inscription has a »speaker«, a 1st. person singular narrator. In spite of the absence of the usual introductory formula »I (am) So-and-so«, followed by genealogy and title(s), it can hardly be doubted that this »speaker« is the Suppiluliuma, whose name occurs four times. Twice he is entitled »Great King, Hero«¹⁶, and twice »Great King, Tawani«¹⁷, where the latter word can be seen from its occurrences in the YALBURT inscription to be a royal title¹⁸. It is

¹¹ For a photograph, see P. Neve, *AA* 1989, 328 fig. 59.

¹² The phrase *137(-)ha-sà DARE, »give an offering«, is fortunately found in a sufficiently clear context on the EMIRGAZI altars inscription: see J. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 25, 1975, 130 cit. 11.





¹³ The writing of »here«, *zati*, as *zī/a + ā-ti* provides a quite unexpected but welcome example of the ligature *zī/a + ā = za*, i.e. the definition of the vocalization of the ambiguous *zī/a* by the addition of *ā*, graphically simplified in the Late Period inscriptions by the distinction of *za* from *zi*. We have noted the preservation of the writing *zī/a + ā* in archaic texts of the Late Period and its revival in archaizing ones: see A. Morpurgo Davies-J. D. Hawkins, *AnnPisa* 8, 1978, 779 f. It is very gratifying to find a late Empire Period example of the practice.

¹⁴ See further below, p. 310.

¹⁵ See e.g. YALBURT block 9: Özgüç, *Inandiktepe* pl. 38, 2; also the shortly post-Empire KARAHÖYÜK (ELBISTAN), II 7, 9; see H. G. Güterbock in: T. and N. Özgüç, *Ausgrabungen in Karahöyük* 1947

(1949) pl. 49.

¹⁶ §§ 2, 6; see below, p. 309.

¹⁷ § 9, 14, not examined in detail in this report. *Tawani* is written *ta₄-wa-i-ni*, in which the sign form read *ta₄*, appearing on SÜDBURG as  and YALBURT (following note) as , has been noted elsewhere on seals: see Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 416; H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 32, 1973, 138 n. 3; 141; *id.* in: Boğazköy V (1975), 70-73 no. 37; *id.* in: R. M. Boehmer-H. G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy* (1987) 67 no. 194, all with discussions of reading. The evidence for identifying it as the Empire Period form of the Late *ta₄* () is provided by the expert archaism of KARKAMIS A 21, which renders *ta₄* as  (l. 6, for which see J. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 31, 1981, 157 cit. 7 § 7); i.e. the last sign form provides good evidence for what the skillfully archaizing scribe considered the Empire Period form of *ta₄* to be.

¹⁸ Here it normally occurs with the nom. sing. MF ending *-s(a)* (blocks 7, z. 12: Özgüç, *Inandiktepe* pls. 89, 1; 91, 2; 93, 2), twice in clauses where the verb is clearly 1st. sing. pret., i.e. the subject is the

assumed that in at least three if not all four clauses where it occurs, the subject is Suppiluliuma. In a further five clauses the title *Tawani* appears without the king's name¹⁹, and it is probable, but not certain, that the title still denotes Suppiluliuma and is the subject of the verb. One of this latter group of clauses begins with two signs CAPUT.VIR, which further initiates two other clauses without *Tawani*²⁰. This group CAPUT.VIR could be a personal name²¹ or a title²². Since in fact in the contexts it would be very hard to understand the intrusion of a second person designated either by personal name or title, it is likely that this is a title further designating Suppiluliuma himself, perhaps to be rendered directly from the known usage of the logograms »Prince-Man«²³. This interpretation, while also uncertain, would satisfactorily explain the occurrence of CAPUT.VIR in the same clause as *Tawani*.

INTERPRETATION AND CONTENT OF THE INSCRIPTION

If these interpretations are correct — and I consider them to be the best, even the only way of understanding the inscription — it would mean that the subject of most of the clauses is expressed by some permutation of the following:

1. Suppiluliuma, Great King, Hero, *Tawani*, 'Prince-Man' ...

This will make the inscription very repetitive in a curiously patterned fashion, which suggests that it might represent verse or a song. This can be exemplified by a translation of the part of the text visible on blocks I–II²⁴:

1 a. When²⁵ (to) Hatti²⁶ the *Tawani* subject(ed)²⁷ all(?) the land(s)²⁸ —

»speakers«, Tudhaliya IV (blocks 13 and 11: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pls. 93, 1; 94, 1). The last two occurrences serve to identify it clearly as a title, and as such, it will demand detailed further consideration.

¹⁹ §§ 1, 4, 5: see this page and following; also §§ 8, 12, not examined here in detail.

²⁰ §§ 5, 11, 15, not examined in detail here; cf. the remarks on the signs by Otten, *Inscript 335 f.* fig. 66.

²¹ For personal names ending *-iti-* (i.e. Hier. VIR), see F. Laroche, *Les Noms des Hittites* (1966) 234 f.; CAPUT does not obviously correspond to any of the elements attested in compound with *-iti-*. The Hier. combination CAPUT.VIR is not attested on seals, where one might look for a title. An equivalence with Cun. LÜ.SAG, »nunch(?)« or simply »prince(?)« (see F. Pecchioli Daddi, *StCior* 27, 1977, 178–182; ead., *Mestieri* [1982] 513–515) could be envisaged if either sense could be shown to be appropriate to the context. Cf. further following footnote.

²² Late Period CAPUT-*ti-*, »(person.) prince«, is based on KARALPE § LX, 335 /Phoen. *ṣṣa* (for which see F. Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe* [1979], 112 f.). It is attested further on KARKAMIS A6 § 1; BABYLON stele § 1; and qualified by *tiwatinis/tiwarimis*, »Sun-blessed(?)«, KARATEPE § I; KULULU 2 § 1; KARKAMIS A5a § 1, etc., see P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico* II 1 (1967) and II 2 (1975). Hier. VIR

is found in titles linked to other elements, signifying »man (of) ...«.

²⁴ For photographs, see P. Neve, *AA* 1989, 317 f. fig. 41 f.

²⁵ REL + *ra/i*: see already Otten, *Inscript* 333 f. and n. 56. Since we would not expect to find rhotacism at this period, this should not be a phonetic development from *kwati*, but should represent a genuine *kwari*, attested in Cun. Luw. but only in fragmentary contexts (see F. Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 30 (1985) 157 (ll. 19', 20'), 170 (l. 5'), 226 (l. 10'), 227 (l. 5'), 228 (ll. 3'–5'), 267 (ll. 4'–5'), 282 (ll. 21, 23 [+ha]; l. 13'). In this inscription, REL + *ra/i*, »when«, appears to link the whole historical section (§§ 1–17), to the »in that year« of the building inscription (§ 18); cf. below, p. 310.

²⁶ The toponym »Hatti« is written in this inscription, and on YALBURT (block 4: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pl. 90, 2) simply with the sign Laroche, Hiéroglyphes no. 196, which in the Late Period inscriptions is well established as having a phonetic value *hā*, alternating freely with *ha* (Laroche, Hiéroglyphes no. 215). The writing of »Hatti« was first recognized by E. Laroche on the NIŞANTAŞ inscription (Anatolia 3, 1970, 94 f.), though the actual forms of the sign were not clear on that eroded inscription. The SÜDBURG and YALBURT inscriptions show the sign form very clearly: a tall slender form of three prongs splaying outward from a narrow base,

b. Wiyanawanda²⁹, Tamina, Masa, Luka, Ikuna.

(§ 2, block III: Suppiluliuma, Great King, Hero ...)

§ 3. (block III: list of gods) (they) stood with abundance³⁰.

§ 4 a. the *Tawani* subject(ed) them³¹ —

b. Wiyanawanda, Tamina, Masa, Luka, Ikuna.

§ 5. the »Prince-Man« (to) Hatti all(?) the land(s) — (to) the frontiers (of) Hatti³² the *Tawani* these(?)³³ (he) took away³⁴.

§ 6. Suppiluliuma, Great King, Hero, (for) Hatti (in) all(?) the land(s) thereupon³⁵ (block III: build(ed); list of cities follows).

The central prong regularly showing a pronounced hook. The only evidence for the Empire usage of this sign is to write »Hatti«; evidence for a phonetic value *hā* are all post-Empire. I thus regard the transcription *Hā* (REGIO) as inappropriate, and will transcribe *HATTI*, following the only evidence at present available. I examine this question in detail in: *Festschrift van Loon* (forthcoming).

Written INFRA *ā-ka*: this appears to be a preverb + verb, written phonetically but without tense-ending, a typical Empire-Period habit. In the YALBURT parallels to the present clause observed in the following note, the verb is *-mi* (reflexive) ... *muwa-*, which can be shown to correspond exactly to Hitt. *-ta* (reflexive) ... *tarh-*, »conquer«. The choice here of the translation »subject« has been selected to reflect the preverb INFRA (= *kata*, »down«, or *anan*, »under«).

²⁸ Written REGIO *430, this phrase recurs in closely similar but clearer contexts on YALBURT (block 16: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pl. 95, 2), and KIZILDAĞ 4//KARADAĞ 1 (S. Alp in: *Anatolian Studies* presented to H. G. Güterbock [1974] pls. 7, 9). The sign *430 occurs further in the group DEUS*430 (SÜDBURG § 3, at beginning of god-list; KIZILDAĞ 4//KARADAĞ 1 — Alp *ibid.*). Otten, *Inscript* 334 and n. 58 figs. 64 a, 65 a has already hinted at *430 as a plural marker; its interpretation as »all« will be argued in detail elsewhere.

²⁹ The large, almost grotesque sign twice visible on block II (l. 1 beginning, l. 2 end), recurs on YALBURT followed by the determinative REGIO, »lands«, as here also in proximity to the »Lukaland« (block 9: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pl. 88, 2). It thus represents a country associated with Lukka. As to identification of the sign, it may be observed that the pendulous end exactly resembles the Late Period sign VINUM (Laroche, Hiéroglyphes no. 160), which is used to determine words connected with the vine. It seems likely that the enlarged version of the sign here simply represents, however oddly, a »winestock«; and »winestock(-country)« could hardly represent any other toponym than *Wiyanawanda*.

³⁰ Written *su-na-sa-ti* CRUS, already discussed by

Otten, *Inscript* 335 and nn. 64, 65. F. Starke now further explores the association of *su-na-sa-ti* with the stem *summa-*, »fill« (Stammes, *Luwiensches Nomens* [forthcoming] § 303).

³¹ Written *ā-tā*: rather than take this as verbalizing (CRUS *ā-tā* — so Otten *loc. cit.*), I prefer to recognize it as the enclitic pronoun, 3rd. sing. 1st. pers. acc. N. Since this inscription nowhere writes connective particles, *wa* ... etc., the sentence appears handing in mid-air.

³² Written FINEs: *zi-la* HATTI (final group on block I, l. 3): the identification of the Empire Period form of FINEs (i.e. *arha/irha-*) depends on the contextual recognition on YALBURT of the phrases *arha-lala-*, »take away«, and *arha DELEKE*, »destroy« (blocks 14 and 13: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pls. 92, 93, 1). This further permits the identification of several attestations of the sign on EMIRGAZI, where its unclear writings led me to read *āe*, which produced an awkward double negative: *we thus identify arha EXERCITUS(?)*, »attack(?)« (see S. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 25, 1975, 128 f. cit. 5 [ii]), *arha lupi-*, »smash« (*ibid.*, cit. 9 [iii]); *arha DELEKE*, »destroy« (*ibid.*, cit. 10 [v]); also *arha CAPERE*, »take away« (altars A, l. 5; C l. 3; B d. 4) E. Laroche, in her EMIRGAZI edition, corrected by repeated reading *ni*, but did not positively identify the sign (JSav 1979, 40 f., and cf. 33 fig. 8 no 2).

³³ Written simply *zi-la*: interpretation uncertain. Is this the demonstrative pronoun *za-*, »these«, perhaps with omission of case ending? — This perhaps standing for *za(ya)*, »these«, the countries already listed.

³⁴ Written FINEs.CAPERE, as on EMIRGAZI (see n. 32 above). YALBURT block 14: Özgüç, Inandiktepe pl. 92, 2 attests a phonetic writing of the verb, FINEs (= *arha*) *la-la-ha*.

³⁵ Written phonetically *zi-la*: presumably identical with Cun. Luw. *zila*, »adornment« (E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* [1954] s.v.). In the Late Period inscriptions the »new» *zi-la* produced further attestations: see J. D. Hawkins — A. Morpurgo Davies — G. Neumann, *Kulte-Gött.*, Phil.-hist. Klasse 6, 1973, 47; further, TEU AHMAR 1 § 13 (J. D. Hawkins, *AnatSt* 30, 1980, 141).

It will be seen that if the clauses with *Tawani* and »Prince-Man« do not refer to Suppiluliuma (as subject), the sense would be very different, in fact quite unclear. Two further passages apparently relating conquest and annexation (see below) are formulated very similarly, i. e.: »the *Tawani* subjected ..., Suppiluliuma, Great King. *Tawani* subjected ..., the 'Prince-Man' (did something ...)«.

The interpretation of the text along the lines suggested above, though perhaps only one of the possibilities, would permit the analysis of the content into only a few topics, as follows:

1. Conquest of Wiyawanda, Tamina, Masa, Luka, Ikuna (§§ 1, 4), with the help of the gods (§ 3), and their annexation (§ 5).
2. Building in the conquered territory of seven cities (their names written largely with unknown logograms and thus unreadable, §§ 6, 7).
3. Conquest and annexation of a mountain (name still of uncertain reading, §§ 8–11).
4. Conquest and annexation of the land of Tarhuntassa³⁶ (§§ 12–15).
5. Building of further city; offerings to gods (of/in) the city Tarhuntassa³⁷ and two other cities (§§ 16–17).
6. Construction of the Südburg monument »here, in that year« (§ 18).

The historical section, constituting almost the entire text, is introduced by »when« (REL+ra/h), which is taken up, after a long, rambling narrative, by the »in that year« of the final clause, the building inscription, as identified above³⁸. Thus the text is formulated in a familiar style evolved in Mesopotamia throughout the 3rd and 2nd millennia B. C., which in Assyria during the Middle Assyrian Period was moving towards the writing of full historical annals³⁹. Such a formulation has not been observed before in Hittite writing of the Empire Period, where the building inscription is notably absent, but the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of the 1st millennium B. C. can supply good parallels⁴⁰. Whether the chronographic information »in that year« is to be taken literally is uncertain. Mesopotamian parallels may be adduced, where »in one year« is a figure of speech only, and covers events which took place over a longer period; but here it is quite possible that the phrase is used exactly, so that the events described all belong to a single campaign⁴¹.

DATE AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE INSCRIPTION

Otten has already adduced strong grounds for attributing the inscription to Suppiluliuma II, thus to the end of the 13th. century B. C.⁴². But for his observations however, one would have

³⁶ Written TONITRUS(URBS) REGIO: already identified by Otten, *Inchrift* 335f. with fig. 66b as indicating Tarhuntassa. The stele CAĞIN has the figure of a Storm-God holding his name (DEUS)TONITRUS TONITRUS(URBS), to be read »Storm-God of Storm-God City« (H. G. Güterbock, *Halil Edhem Hatira Kitabı* [1947], 554, 566f.), i. e. »Tarhunta of Tarhuntassa« (H. T. Bosworth, *JbKIF* 2, 1951, 106f.). This is definitely not the »Storm-God of Hatti« (so Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 199 [c] 6), who appears in the SÜDBURG inscription written DEUS.TONITRUS HATTI. For the now possible clear distinction between the signs HATTI (Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 196) and TONITRUS (Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 199), see

J. D. Hawkins in: *Festschrift van Loon* (forthcoming).

³⁷ Written simply TONITRUS(URBS): see preceding note.

³⁸ See above, pp. 307, and 308 with n. 25.

³⁹ See A. K. Grayson, *Orientalia* 49, 1980, 140ff., especially 150–152; for details of the development, id., *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions I* (1972) §§ 379, 388, 396, 524, 687; II § 4.5.

⁴⁰ E. g. KARKAMIS A11b, §§ 7–15: REL+ati (ANUS)usi ... pati »ANNUS«usi, ..., »in which year ..., in that year ...«.

⁴¹ For a non-literal use in Mesopotamian writing, cf. the observations of H. Tadmor, *Iraq* 35, 1973, 143; and for the likelihood of more precise Hittite usage,

been tempted at first sight to explain the inscription's peculiarities of epigraphy and orthography as archaic, thus demanding an early date, i. e. the reign of Suppiluliuma I. Thus the clumsy and undeveloped rendering of the signs, which is in such marked contrast to the elegant forms found on the inscriptions of Tudhaliya IV (EMIRGAZI and YALBURT), could have been considered early; as could also the very pronounced failure to write the connective particles and the noun and verb endings, which again contrasts with the practice of EMIRGAZI, YALBURT and even what can be read of the NIŞANTAŞ inscription, attributable to Suppiluliuma II himself.

An even stronger argument for an attribution to Suppiluliuma I has been recently pointed out to me by Professor Gurney. This is Otten's identification of the different forms of the sign used to write *suppi*⁴³, thus one form in Fig. 1 was used for Suppiluliuma I, the other (Fig. 2) for Suppiluliuma II⁴⁴. In addition there are the forms of *mi*, written diagonally for Suppiluliuma I (Fig. 3) and vertically for Suppiluliuma II (Fig. 4)⁴⁵. It is of course the first form in each case that we find in the SÜDBURG inscription, thus it should be the work of Suppiluliuma I. (But see now Addendum, p. 314 below).



Fig. 1



Fig. 2



Fig. 3



Fig. 4

This inference would however clash with Otten's two strong points in favour of a Suppiluliuma II attribution. The first is the general point that substantial Hieroglyphic monumental inscriptions are hardly known before the reign of Tudhaliya IV: the earliest datable example is ALEPPO I, executed by Talmi-Sarruma, King of Aleppo, grandson of Suppiluliuma II (thus of the generation of Muwatalli and Hattusili), but even that is rather brief⁴⁶. More specifically, Otten pointed out that a late date is demanded by the appearance of the *lead* of Tarhuntassa. This is a very strong point: all that we know of Tarhuntassa suggests that it was of no account, indeed may not even have existed, before Muwatalli built it as his capital⁴⁷. The actions against Tarhuntassa described in the later part of the inscription are difficult to attribute to Suppiluliuma I.

In this context, the figure of Suppiluliuma, Great King, from the east wall of Karkamish should be considered. The king is represented dressed as a god with the horned hat of divinity. Is he therefore deified, thus dead? While this status does not seem absolutely certain⁴⁸, if he

see below, p. 312 and n. 54.

⁴² Otten, *Inchrift* 336.

⁴³ PURUS, Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 322.

⁴⁴ See H. Otten, *ZA* 55, 1967, 227f. Unfortunately this distinction is no longer so clear cut as it was. New bullae with impressions of Suppiluliuma seals were found in Temple 2 in 1987: see P. Neve, *AA* 1988, 371, 374, 376 with fig. 23a–c. The forms of *suppi* do appear to have bars across them. Neve asserts that the impressions must belong to Suppiluliuma II, but the matter requires detailed demonstration. Note that the published photographs suggest that the LABARNA-sign was not present on the seals.

⁴⁵ Otten *ibid.* The contrast is not quite so definite as in the case of the form of the *suppi*, since on the seal of Suppiluliuma I from Ugarit (RS 17.227, see

Ugaritica III [1956] 3, 98f.) the strokes of *mi* are vertical not diagonal. But the fact remains that in cases of *mi* with diagonal strokes can yet be attributed to Suppiluliuma II — unless the new Suppiluliuma bullae from Temple 2 (see preceding footnote) can definitely be shown to belong to him.

⁴⁶ See E. Laroche, *Syria* 33, 1956, 131 (cf. P. Liebig, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico* II 3 (1975) 330f., no. 306).

⁴⁷ Cf. H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* Beih. 1 (1988) 3.

⁴⁸ Hattusili III, shown on the FRANKIN tablet as dressed pouring a libation to the Storm-God, could perhaps be considered as dead and deified; but Tudhaliya IV, also shown, so dressed in the bronze of Sarruma on his seal from Ugarit (RS 17.159; Ugaritica III [1956] 14–24, 144–145) is

is to be regarded as such, he presumably represents a deified guardian ancestor in the same way that the figure of Tudhaliya, Great King, from the chapel in the precinct of Temple 5 has been interpreted⁴⁹. It would be hard to understand how a figure of Suppiluliuma (I) in this guise would be in place alongside an inscription giving a historical narrative with building inscription of the same king.

It does not seem to me that the main argument on either side for a Suppiluliuma I or II attribution, namely the form of the sign *suppi-* or the existence of Tarhuntassa, can be absolutely conclusive, since either may be argued around. Peter Neve informs me that archaeological evidence will support the Suppiluliuma II attribution, but this is not yet published and available for evaluation⁵⁰.

We should at this point consider the historical information contained in the inscription, with a view to seeing whether it could be judged more appropriate to the reign of Suppiluliuma I or II. Thus the first topic appears to record the conquest of «all(?) the land(s)», specified as a group of five countries which should all perhaps be regarded as Lukka-lands, including: Wiyanawanda⁵¹ (= Oenoanda, though there may be more than one place of this name, both Hittite and Classical versions), attested in Cun. Hitt. texts only as a city, but here a country; Tamina, not apparently otherwise attested⁵²; Masa and Luka, clearly identifiable with Hitt. *Masa* and *Lukka*; Ikuna, probably identical with Hitt. *Ikkuwaniya*, the identification of which with Ikonion-Konya has become more likely with its appearance on the Bronze Tablet⁵³.

The second topic is the building of seven cities, among which only one name may be read as identified, a possible reading *Tarahna*. The third and fourth topics are the conquest and annexation of the mountain with the name of uncertain reading, then of Tarhuntassa. The likelihood is that these events all belong to a single campaign, as is implied by the final clause «in that year»⁵⁴.

In seeking to place such a campaign's actions in the reign of either Suppiluliuma, we encounter two different sorts of historical gap. For Suppiluliuma I we have some information on his relations with the west⁵⁵, but none of the surviving fragments of historical data relating to these offer any links at all with the events described on the Südburg inscription. On the contrary, as we have seen, the very mention of Tarhuntassa is a major obstacle to this

certainly not dead — the tablet RS 17.159 bearing the seal impression contains the record of a case heard by him (see J. Nougayrol, *Le palais royal de Ugarit* IV [1956] 126 f.).

⁴⁹ P. Neve, *Anatolica* 14, 1987, 64, 67 f.; H. Gonnert, *Bibl.* 70 f.

⁵⁰ His evidence, it seems, will consist of the identification of late sherds in the fill surrounding the Südburg monument. He is strongly of the opinion that the new Suppiluliuma bullae from Temple 2 should be attributed to Suppiluliuma II, but since their appearance would normally lead to a Suppiluliuma I attribution, this will require a forceful demonstration (cf. above n. 44 f.).

⁵¹ G. P. Del Monte—J. Tischler, *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes* VI (1978) s. v.

⁵² Unclassified perhaps identifiable with Tumana or Tima (Majana), the former apparently associated with

Pala, the second with Išuwa (Del Monte—Tischler op. cit. s. v.).

⁵³ Otten op. cit. (see above n. 47) 22 (III 48), and 52.

⁵⁴ See above, p. 310 and nn. 38—41. That all the events of the historical narrative did indeed all take place in the one year, that of the building of the Südburg monument, may indeed be understood from other examples of the rather precise Hittite employment of chronological formulae. Note the careful *ma ki INA MU.LKAM iyanun*, «these things I did in one year», which occurs regularly at the end of the account of every year in Mursili's Ten Year Annals. Cf. also the «in one year» describing First Syrian War of Suppiluliuma I (Suppiluliuma-Sattiwaza treaty, Keilschrifttexte aus Bogazköy I [1916] 1 obv. 46).

⁵⁵ Sources collected by S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa, Texte der Hethiter* 8 (1977) chap. IV.

attribution. If these events did belong to his reign, they must be placed in a complete gap in the documentation, which, given the state of preservation of his historical sources, is by any means impossible.

For Suppiluliuma II, there is a virtually virgin gap waiting to be filled. Little in the way of his military activities outside Hatti is known, with the striking exception of his invasion of Cyprus (Alasiya)⁵⁶. Singer has plausibly redated the text referring to the disastrous battle in Nihriya to the reign of Tudhaliya IV⁵⁷, and he emphasizes the lack of evidence for contact between Suppiluliuma II and Assyria. He has also stated⁵⁸: «For the last kings of Hatti, Arnuwanda III and Suppiluliuma II, we lack any evidence for western campaigns or for any contacts at all.» The attribution of the Südburg inscription to Suppiluliuma II would, very unexpectedly, supply just such evidence.

A campaign against the Lukka-lands from Ikuna (Ikonion/Konya?) to Wiyanawanda (Oenoanda?), though unattested in the scanty Cuneiform sources for his reign, seems by no means impossible, especially when it is remembered that he was able to fight a naval battle off Cyprus. Also these goals would compare well with those of his father Tudhaliya IV as recorded on his YALBURT inscription: there the Lukka-lands and Wiyanawanda are specifically mentioned⁵⁹, and Awarna and Pina are also known to belong to the West⁶⁰. The very existence of the Yalburt spring sanctuary attests Hittite control in this area at a late date.

The appearance of Tarhuntassa, while the strong argument for a Suppiluliuma II attribution, would, if the text has been correctly interpreted to narrate its conquest and annexation, supply a somewhat astonishing historical event to his reign. Yet this could tie in well with the evidence of recent discoveries at Boğazköy, notably the Bronze Tablet and the impressions of the royal seal of Kurunta⁶¹. These have already been taken to show a strained peace between Tudhaliya IV and his cousin Kurunta, who had a quite considerable claim to the Great Kingship of Hattusa itself. The seal impressions, it has been thought, can only indicate a short-lived seizure of the Hittite throne by Kurunta, which may be marked in the archaeological record by a layer of burning and destruction followed by reconstruction⁶². The Südburg inscription's narrative of a conquest and annexation of Tarhuntassa may show that this tension between Hattusa and Tarhuntassa was extended into the next generation, and resolved at least temporarily, in favour of Hattusa by Suppiluliuma II.

On balance I think that one would say that the historical events of the Südburg inscription do fit perfectly plausibly into the reign of Suppiluliuma II, but one certainly could not exclude an attribution to Suppiluliuma I on the basis of any reference, other than the problematic one to Tarhuntassa.

⁵⁶ H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 26, 1987, 73—81.

⁵⁷ I. Singer, *ZA* 75, 1985, 100—123 (text Keilschrifttexte aus Bogazköy IV [1920] 14 = E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* [1971] no. 123).

⁵⁸ Id., *AnatSt* 33, 1983, 217.

⁵⁹ See above, p. 309 and n. 29.

⁶⁰ These two places, attested in Cuneiform in the Millawanda letter (Laroche op. cit. no. 182, for which see now H. A. Hoffner in: 28. *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* Wien 1981, *AfO* Beih. 19 [1982] 130—137) are mentioned as military

goals on YALBURT, blocks 12 and 13 (Özgüç, *Inandiktepe* pl. 93, 2 and 1). For the identification of a parallel narrative on the EMIRGAZI block, see already E. Masson, *JSav* 1979, 14 f. 36 f. though of course the inference drawn there for the identification of Awarna and Pina (also Millawanda) in the neighbourhood of Emirgazi is self-evidently invalid.

⁶¹ See H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy, Hittitisch zu den Boğazköy-Texten* Beih. 1 (1988) 35.

⁶² See P. Neve, *AA* 1987, 400—404.

CHARACTER OF THE SÜDBURG MONUMENT

We have seen above that the building inscription appended to the historical narrative of the SÜDBURG inscription states (p. 307, § 18): »here a DEUS.*202 in that year (I) construct(ed)«; and that this can hardly refer to anything other than the Südburg monument itself. What then is a DEUS.*202?

The second sign⁶³ is attested elsewhere twice on the KARAHÖYÜK (ELBISTAN) stele in not particularly clear contexts. The sign form there is however clear: it consists of a ligature of the signs VIA⁶⁴ with TERRA⁶⁵, and the sign SCALPRUM⁶⁶ is written once on top, once inside. The last sign SCALPRUM is recognized as determining objects made of stone, and appears to be absent from the SÜDBURG attestation, where *202 is preceded instead by DEUS. If in pursuit of the meaning of this word we transcribe DEUS.VIA + TERRA, we find an exact, one-for-one Hieroglyphic equivalent for the Cuneiform concept DINGIR.KASKAL.KUR⁶⁷. This has been convincingly elucidated as referring to a geographical feature, common on the Anatolian Plateau, the point at which rivers disappear underground (Turkish *düden*)⁶⁸. The DINGIR.KASKAL.KUR features in Cun. Hitt. texts principally: 1. in lists of divine witnesses to treaties after the mountains, rivers and springs; 2. as fixed geographical points in boundary descriptions. Can we plausibly identify the Südburg monument as a DINGIR.KASKAL.KUR, and if so, in what sense?

It would seem probable that the monument could be so designated because it was conceived as an (artificial) entrance to the Underworld. For the DINGIR.KASKAL.KUR, there is no specific textual evidence that this (divine) geographical feature was so regarded, but this is implicit in its name⁶⁹, and would be a readily intelligible idea. The DINGIR.KASKAL.KUR in this sense would then correspond to the Hurr.-Hitt. *ḫapi-*, well attested as »pit to the Underworld, bothros«⁷⁰, and to the old Hitt. *hattešsar*, »hole«, with the same connotations. Both these latter terms occur in specific references to contact with and offerings to the Underworld.

The Südburg monument was an open-ended vaulted chamber, apparently from such archaeological indications as have been recovered built into the side of a tumulus. Besides its inscription, the figures with which it is adorned must have significance: the figure of Great King Suppiluliuma, dressed as a god with spear and bow, to be restored to the east wall of Kammer 2 opposite the inscription, facing outwards; and the Sun-God (or King) on the end wall holding the *ankh*. A detailed study of the iconography of these figures may well suggest further interpretation of the character of the monument, though this lies beyond the scope of the present report.

Addendum: Research in Turkey during the summer 1990 has established that the SÜDBURG writing of *suppi-* is in fact consistent with an attribution to Suppiluliuma II.

Address: Prof. Dr. John David Hawkins, University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, GB-London WC1H 0XG

⁶³ Laroche, *Hieroglyphes* no. 202.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* no. 221.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* no. 201.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* no. 268.

⁶⁷ See H. Otten, *RLA V* (1980) s. v. KASKAL.KUR; and *id.*, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy, Studien zu*

den Boğazköy-Texten Beih. 1 (1988) 33 f.

⁶⁸ E. Gordon, *JCunSt* 21, 1967, 70–88.

⁶⁹ See Gordon *loc. cit.* 76–78.

⁷⁰ See J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary I* (1984) s. v. *api-*, with earlier bibliography.

ASPECTS OF MINOAN CULT, SACRED ENCLC

THE EVIDENCE FROM THE SYME SANCTUARY (CRET)

by Angeliki Lebessi and Polymnia Muhly

INTRODUCTION

Tucked in a fold of the southern slopes of Mt. Dikte, on the east of Crete, the Syme sanctuary overlooks the southern coast of the island from a height of 1130 m (Fig. 2). The existence of an abundant spring decisively the choice of this remote location for the establishment of place in the Minoan period. Other features of the locality might have growth of the sanctuary: the ground on which the earliest structures and unstable, while the erosion of the overhanging heights precipitated at least on two occasions, caused widespread damage. Despite such setbacks continued to develop, surviving the transition to the Iron Age to regular Greek and Roman periods.

The investigation of the site, begun in 1972 under the auspices of the Society, is nearing completion after 12 short seasons of excavation (Fig. 1). As remains to be done, the evidence accumulated from excavation and the is bringing us closer to an understanding of the factors that conditioned the sanctuary's development and long survival. It has become increasingly clear that juxtaposition of areas open to the sky and roofed buildings was characteristic throughout most of its existence. Despite some shifts of emphasis, open probably from the beginning, perhaps around 1700 B. C., to the present period cult activity took place only in roofed shrines until the site was excavated in the century A. D. Iconographic, epigraphic and literary evidence combined show that worship of Hermes had been established by the eighth century B. C., and may have been introduced even earlier. The same sources also provide evidence for activities carried out in the open during the Geometric-Archaic period for post-pubertal males?

Sources of illustrations: Figs. 1, 3, 5: N. Zariphis. — Figs. 2, 4: Syme Archaeological Project. — Fig. 6: D. Smyth. — Figs. 7–14, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25: G. Xylouris. — Figs. 15, 16, 21: K. Illiakis. — Fig. 17: After J. Shaw, *AJA* 82, 1978, fig. 9. — Fig. 18: Drawing based on photograph, courtesy I. Pini. — Fig. 23: Courtesy National Museum, Athens.

The project is sponsored by the Archaeological Society at Athens and has also received support from the National Geographic Society, the Insti-

tute for Aegean Prehistory and the Hellenic Republic.

¹ For preliminary report see Lebessi, *Prakt* 1972, 1974, 222–227; 1975, 1981, 380–396; 1983, summary account see Lebessi, *Prakt* 1983, 1984, 1985.

² A. Lebessi, *Tò iepò toù oròu Sýmē Biánnou I*, *Arch. Epigr. Soc. Athens* 102 (1984), 1–10.