

DE 12.59

ANATOLIAN STUDIES

Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara

VOL. XXIX

1979

CONTENTS

	Page
The Year's Work - - - - -	3
R.E.C.A.M. Notes and Studies No. 5: A Roman Family in Phrygia, by Stephen Mitchell	13
The Gymnasium at Alexandria Troas: Evidence for an Outline Reconstruction, by A. C. G. Smith - - - - -	23
Troy and Anatolian Early Bronze Age Chronology, by Jak Yakar - - - - -	51
Eight New Fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda, by Martin Ferguson Smith - - - - -	69
A Lydian Funerary Banquet, by Nancy Hirschland Ramage - - - - -	91
The Authorship of the Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos, by William A. P. Childs - - - - -	97
The Chronology of Alalakh Level VII once again, by Nadav Na'aman - - - - -	103
On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and their Context, by Irene J. Winter - - - - -	115
Some Historical Problems of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, by J. D. Hawkins - - - - -	153
R.E.C.A.M. Notes and Studies No. 6: Jews, Christians and Heretics in Acmonia and Eumenela, by A. R. R. Sheppard - - - - -	169
Recent Archaeological Research in Turkey - - - - -	181

Published annually by

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT ANKARA
c/o The British Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London W1V 0NS

SOME HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF THE HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN INSCRIPTIONS*

By J. D. HAWKINS

(1) *Who was Azatiwatas?*

Two Neo-Hittite rulers occupied positions of authority, the proper understanding of which demands a detailed examination of the textual passages describing this authority. The rulers, Azatiwatas of Karatepe and Yariris of Carchemish, seem moreover to have enjoyed curiously analogous positions. Neither gives in his inscriptions any very exact information on his rank, nor do they record their fathers' names, yet both seem to have exercised a high degree of authority over their cities, Adana and Carchemish respectively, and both refer to their "lords" and their lords' families in ways which have in the past been somewhat misunderstood.

Ever since the discovery of Karatepe in 1946, debate has continued concerning the dating of the monument and its inscriptions,¹ and the position of Azatiwatas is to some extent bound up in this question.² Azatiwatas does not directly claim any specific royal title but only the vague religious honorifics "the Sun-blessed(?) man, Tarhunzas's servant" (§ I), adding that he was promoted ("made great") by Awarikus the king of Adana (§ II) and that Tarhunzas has made him mother and father to Adana (§ III). Although much of the inscription concerns the benefits which he conferred upon Adana (especially §§ IV–VI, XXIV, XXXI–XXXII, XXXVII), he does not claim to have sat on the throne himself – on the contrary, he explicitly, if rather imprecisely, states that he established his "lord's family" on it (§§ XIV–XVI, with the notes on these passages on p. 107). The lord in question must presumably be understood to be Awarikus, and the establishment of his family in Adana must refer to a time after his death or disappearance. Azatiwatas further refers to the "house of Muksas" in a way which leaves it open as to whether he is referring to the family of his lord or his own lineage, with the possibility that both his lord and he were members of that house (§§ XXI, XLII, LVIII). The only place clearly under the direct authority of Azatiwatas himself is the city Azatiwataya–Karatepe itself, a site geographically removed from the plains of Adana – for which the

*In this article, the system of transliteration of Hieroglyphic is as suggested by J. D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo Davies and G. Neumann, "Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: new evidence for the connection" (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Nr. 6, 1973) – hereafter abbreviated *HHL*; see also J. D. Hawkins, *An. St.* XXV (1975), 119 ff., especially 153–155 (Tables 1 and 2). Abbreviations as noted in *HHL*, [3]; in addition note J. D. Bing, *Cilicia – A History of Cilicia during the Assyrian Period* (Indiana University PhD, 1969; University Microfilms, Ann Arbor 1973); P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *LPG – Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Brill, Leiden, 1971); W. Orthmann, *USK – Untersuchungen zur spätheth. Kunst* (Bonn, 1971); J. C. L. Gibson, *TSSI – Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions II* (Oxford, 1975); H. Genge, *NSR – Nordsyrisch-Südanatolische Reliefs* (Copenhagen, 1979).

¹ See Irene Winter's contribution to this volume for a bibliography of previous views and a new suggestion for reconciling the widely differing estimates; also *RIA V*, s.v. Karatepe.

² For a correct commentary on the question, and a summary of previous views, see Weippert, *ZDMG*, Suppl. I/1 (1969), 193 note 8. For the spelling of the name *Azatiwatas*, see below, footnote 19. For the passages of KARATEPE cited below, reference should be made to *An. St.* XXVIII (1978), 103–119, and the discussions and translation there. The question is also reviewed in detail by Steinherr, *WdO VI/2* (1971), 171–182. Unfortunately I cannot agree with any of his interpretations.

inscription is the foundation document (§ XXXVIII ff.). In spite of this reticence about his exact *locus standi* in Adana, Azatiwatas does definitely rank himself with kings (§§ XVII–XVIII, XXVI–XXVII, LII, LIX–LXIV). He presents himself as a prince, perhaps of the Adana ruling house of Muksas, who was raised by a king of Adana to the rulership of a district lying north-east of the plain of Adana and including Azatiwataya–Karatepe. Subsequent to the reign of his lord, Azatiwatas was in a position to confer many benefits on Adana and in fact ensured the succession of his lord's family there, thus showing himself to be acting as regent over Adana and guardian to the house of Muksas. So much may be safely accepted from an examination of the text itself.

Attempts to date the monuments of Karatepe have been based both on stylistic criteria of the sculptures and on historical considerations. Among the latter, one important point is the identification of the KARATEPE hieroglyphic name *Awarikus* with the *Urikki* (and variants) attested in cuneiform sources of Tiglath-pileser III (for 738 and 732 B.C.)³ and Sargon (for 710–9 B.C.),⁴ and the possible, though not established, supposition that both the hieroglyphic and the cuneiform references are to the same individual.

If Awarikus was not the same as Urikki but a homonymous forebear on the throne of Adana, he could hardly have reigned as a contemporary of Shalmaneser III, for whom other contemporaries in Que are attested.⁵ He could thus have reigned *either* before Shalmaneser III *or* between Shalmaneser III and Tiglath-pileser III, periods for which we have no historical information about Que.⁶ The KARATEPE inscription could be fitted without difficulty, but equally without corroboration, into either of these two historically blank periods. Arguments for one or the other can only rest on alleged stylistic criteria.⁷

If, however, Awarikus is to be identified with Urikki – and the discussion which follows will be based on this assumption – the range of possible dates for Azatiwatas is strictly limited. Assyrian relations with Que from 745 B.C. are documented, though sparsely. Urikki was king of Que in 738 and 732 B.C., and was still alive in 710–9 B.C.⁸ though not necessarily on the throne, since by that date an Assyrian governor of Que is attested. It is not clear at what date before 710 Que became an Assyrian province,⁹ nor how Urikki survived the take-over. This latest date for Urikki, which has only been established comparatively recently, does, however, have the effect of lowering the hypothetical date of Azatiwatas by over twenty years.

The position of Que within the Assyrian Empire presumably lasted until 705 when Sargon met his death in battle, but it seems likely that thereupon Que

³ Tribute list, 738 B.C. (Rost, *Tiglath-pileser*, Annals I. 151 and Plate XV, = *ANET*, 283a; Levine, *Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran* (ROM Occasional Paper 23, 1972), 18 l. 8; cf. Weippert, *ZDPV* 89 (1973), 26–39; Cogan, *JCS* 25 (1973), 96–99; Tribute list, 732 B.C. (Nimrud tablet, K.3751, rev. l. 7' = *ARAB* I, § 801; cf. Weippert, loc. cit., 52 f.).

⁴ Postgate, *Iraq* 35 (1973), 22 ff., 28.

⁵ *Kate*, attested for the years 858–833, replaced by *Kirri* in 833 (*III R* 7, ll. 53–4; Michel, *WdO* II/1 (1954), 40 ll. 22–34, etc.; id., *ibid.* II/3 (1956), 221 ff. = *ARAB* I § 582–3; for the latter dates see Grayson, *Bi. Or.* 33 (1976), 140–143; contra, Reade, *ZA* 68 (1978), 251–260).

⁶ Beyond the fact that an unnamed king of Que took part in the Arpad-led coalition against Zakur of Hamath in 796 B.C.(?) (Donner and Röllig, *KAI* 2 no. 202, A6; also Gibson, *TSSI* II, no. 5, p. 8 f.; for the date see *CAH* III/1² (forthcoming), ch. 9 part IV and note 230).

⁷ Cf. above, Winter.

⁸ See above, footnotes 3 and 4.

⁹ See Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung*, 70–72; Landsberger, *Sam'al*, 77 f.; Postgate, *Iraq* 35 (1973), 30.

revolted, along with Tabal, Hilakku and Melid.¹⁰ The extent of Sennacherib's control of his north-west frontier is doubtful, in spite of his accounts of his campaigns against Que in 696 B.C. and Til-garimmu in 695 B.C.¹¹ It is possible, but not certain, that the Que expedition re-established Assyrian control, but contrary to some assertions,¹² there is no specific evidence for any renewed military activity in the north-west after Sennacherib's conquest of Babylon. It is however further possible that a damaged entry in the Eponym Canon may note an Assyrian governor of Que for 685 B.C.,¹³ thus confirming Assyrian control of the province for this date. Esarhaddon's Tabal campaign of 679 B.C. seems to imply a safe passage through Que,¹⁴ but in 676 B.C. Sanduarri, king of Kundu and Sissu, an area located north-east of the Cilician plain, formed an anti-Assyrian alliance with Sidon but was captured and beheaded.¹⁵ Thereafter Que seems to have remained firmly in Assyrian hands until the collapse of the Empire.

In an attempt to establish Azatiwatas in this period, various factors must be taken into account. Urikki, as has been seen, had a long reign, though one which is paralleled by that of Warpalawas of Tuwana and indeed attested in the same documents (see below). If he was the king who "promoted" Azatiwatas, this must have occurred late in his reign, since the bulk of the latter's actions as recorded in KARATEPE must be understood to have occurred *after* the reign of the former. Furthermore it is hard to believe that these actions, the pacification and extension of the frontiers of Adana and the establishment of the house of Muksas on the throne of Adana, could have occurred in the later reign of Sargon when an Assyrian governor was resident in Que. Such considerations suggest that 705 B.C. may be a *terminus post quem* for Azatiwatas' benefactions to Adana and the building of Azatiwataya.

But can we, with any greater historical plausibility, place the same events in the reign of Sennacherib? Only, it would seem, on the assumption that Azatiwatas was in some way involved in Sennacherib's campaign of 696 B.C. The narratives of Sennacherib and Azatiwatas could best be reconciled by the supposition that the Assyrian expedition was made with the purpose of supporting Azatiwatas, effective ruler of Adana—Que since Sargon's death, against the rebellious Kirua of Illubru supported by the Hilakku and the cities Ingira (Anchiale) and Tarzi (Tarsus).¹⁶ This latter alliance could be identified with the "strong fortresses in the west" deported and resettled by Azatiwatas (§ XXV ff.). If this were so, Azatiwatas would be following Zakur of Hamath in omitting reference to his Assyrian benefactors in his celebratory inscription, in contrast to Kilamuwa of Sam'al who made due, if somewhat patronizing, acknowledgement of the military debt. On the Assyrian side, we would have to suppose that

¹⁰ Landsberger, *Sam'al*, 81 f.; Na'aman, *BASOR* 214 (1974), 33 note 36; Bing, *Cilicia*, 87 ff.

¹¹ King, *CT* XXVI (1909), no. 1, col. iv 61–v 22, and pp. 9–15; Luckenbill, *Sennacherib*, 61 ff.; Heidel, *Sumer* 9 (1953), 150 ff.; Bing, *Cilicia*, 96 ff.

¹² Landsberger, *Sam'al*, 82. This unsupported assertion unfortunately tends to be repeated, e.g. by Na'aman, *BASOR* 214 (1974), 33 and note 36; Winter, above, p. 147 with n. 144.

¹³ *RIA* II, 427, C^d (= *KAV*, no. 20, col. iv l. 35); collation supports the restoration *Que* – information, courtesy of A. R. Millard; see his forthcoming book, *Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire* (Warminster, 1979).

¹⁴ Borger, *Asarhaddon*, 33 l. 18; 51, Episode 8; 100 § 66 l. 23 and n. 24; Grayson, *ABC*, 125 f.

¹⁵ Borger, *Asarhaddon*, 49 f., Episode 6; Grayson, *ABC*, 83.

¹⁶ For previous attempts to place Azatiwatas in this historical context, see I. Lévy, *Les inscriptions de Karatepe* (*La Nouvelle Clio* 2 (1950), 106–121); M. Mellink, "Karatepe: more light on the dark ages" (*Bi. Or.* 7 (1950), 141–50); Bing, *Cilicia*, ch. 4.

Sennacherib satisfied himself after 696 B.C. with exercising through the client Azatiwatas, and his clients, the house of Muksas in Adana, a remoter control over Que than had his father. The possible existence of an Assyrian governor of Que in 685 B.C. is one further factor which must be taken into account in this somewhat hazy historical reconstruction.

Irene Winter has suggested that Sanduarri, king of Kundu and Sissu, executed in 676 B.C. by Esarhaddon,¹⁷ may be identified with Azatiwatas. In favour of this identification the following points may be made:

1. The identification of the names *Azatiwatas* (hieroglyphic) and *Sanduarri* (cuneiform) presents few problems: the omissibility of an initial *a*- is well paralleled in Hieroglyphic;¹⁸ the quality of the Hier. *z* is not sufficiently clearly determined to cast doubt on a cuneiform transcription by *s*;¹⁹ and Akkadian has a tendency to introduce a nasal before voiced consonants, especially *d*;²⁰ the second element of the name, *-tiwata-* is also written in the inscription with rhotacism of the intervocalic dental, *-tiwara-*,²¹ probably representing the actual pronunciation, and a cuneiform rendering of this as *-duarri* seems sufficiently close. *Azatiwatas* is probably to be analysed as *aza-* + *tiwat-*, "beloved of the Sun",²² so the classification of *Sanduarri* as a theophoric name incorporating the god Santa²³ would have to be abandoned. However, while the names could well be identical, it must be remembered that they do not necessarily refer to the same individual any more than do Awarikus—Urikki.

2. The location of Kundu and Sissu in the district north-east of the Cilician plain, where Karatepe is also situated, seems probable.²⁴

3. Stylistically the sculptures associated with the Azatiwatas inscription,²⁵ and palaeographically the Phoenician letter forms,²⁶ are more easily dated later (after Sargon II) than earlier (before Tiglath-pileser III) or very early (before Shalmaneser III). Also it may be argued that a later rather than earlier date could explain the peculiar palaeography of the Hieroglyphic with its profusion of rare and freakish sign forms and values.

To summarize the present argument, the plausible identifications of Awarikus—Urikki and Azatiwatas—Sanduarri combine with the historical possibilities and stylistic criteria to suggest the following sequence of events. Azatiwatas, coming to power in the district of (modern) Kozan, shortly before or after the death of Sargon, reigned as a contemporary of Sennacherib, during which time he collaborated with the Assyrians, extended his authority over Adana—Que, built Karatepe which he adorned with his own and some reused older sculptures, and composed his commemorative inscription. Perhaps pressed too hard by his Assyrian masters and perhaps seeking to profit from the disorder consequent on the murder of Sennacherib, he joined with the king of Sidon in an anti-Assyrian naval alliance, on the failure of which he met his grisly end, with

¹⁷ See above, p. 155 and footnote 15.

¹⁸ See *HH*, no. 19.

¹⁹ *HHL*, § 4.1; and for the spelling *Azatiwatas*, *ibid.*, [20] f., [44].

²⁰ Von Soden, *GAG* § 32b.

²¹ *Manuale* I, cap. I § 27.

²² *Glossar*₂, s.v.; Laroche, *Noms*, 290.

²³ Laroche, *Noms*, 291.

²⁴ M. Gough, *An. St.* II (1952), 91 f.; Houwink ten Cate, *LPG*, 26; contra Bing, *Cilicia*, 00.

²⁵ As now demonstrated by Irene Winter, who also identifies an earlier style of reused sculpture.

²⁶ J. D. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician scripts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), ch. IV esp. 116–119.

his head, together with that of his fellow rebel, paraded through the streets of Nineveh.

This appears to me to be our best chance at present of fitting Azatiwatas into a historical context. The reigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon II appear to be ruled out on historical grounds — the presence of Urikki and of strong Assyrian influence in Cilicia. The blank historical periods prior to Tiglath-pileser III and to Shalmaneser III seem to be excluded as being generally at variance with the stylistic criteria which demand a later date.

(2) *Who was Yariris?*

Yariris (formerly read Araras), whose portrait and inscription appear on the "Royal Buttress", shows himself leading by the hand the young Kamanis and followed by eight other children playing in two registers, the rear being brought up by a woman holding a baby and leading an animal.²⁷ It has been generally understood from the combined inscription, pictures and context that Yariris was king of Carchemish, and that he was presenting his eldest son, Kamanis, and the rest of his family.²⁸ A more careful consideration of the wording of the inscriptions, however, indicates that this is not actually what is said.²⁹

In the matter of his own rank, Yariris in CARCHEMISH A 6 l. 1 styles himself first "ruler" (*tarwanis*), a title which may be used by a subordinate governor;³⁰ secondly "the DEUS.AVIS-*tanisamis* *tasparuwatis* prince (CAPUT-*tis*)", a title not clearly understood but apparently parallel to Azatiwatas's title "Sun-blessed(?) prince",³¹ and thirdly, the "prince far renowned by the west and the east,³² beloved of the gods". This may be compared with the introduction of CARCHEMISH A 15 b, where he says (§§ 1–3): "I (am) Yariris, the ruler, the

²⁷ The Yariris sculpture and inscriptions, CARCHEMISH A 6 + 7, B 4–8, A 15 b, A 24, have received much attention from scholars seeking to determine their date, readings and historical implications; see E. Akurgal, *Spaethethitische Bildkunst* (Ankara, 1949), 38, 144 etc.; H. T. Bossert, *St. Cl. Or.* 1 (1951), 35–67; R. D. Barnett, *Carchemish III* (London, 1952), 261 ff.; P. Meriggi, *St. Cl. Or.* 2 (1953), 5–28; id., *Athenaeum* 30 (1952), 174–179; H. T. Bossert, *Belleten* 16 (1952), 537 ff.; E. Laroche, *Anadolu* 2 (1955), 19 ff.; P. Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1 (Rome, 1967), nos. 9–11; W. Orthmann, *USK*, 187–191; J. D. Hawkins, *Iraq* 36 (1974), 72 f.; H. Genge, *NSR*, 153–167.

²⁸ By all scholars cited in footnote 27, with the exception of Meriggi (see footnote 29).

²⁹ Meriggi, op. cit., (footnote 27), influenced by the newly discovered KARATEPE bilingual, drew attention to the correct translation (see below, especially footnote 35).

³⁰ E.g. Tarhunazas, author of the BULGARMADEN inscription, bears the title while at the same time declaring himself to be a "servant" of Warpalawas; see below, footnote 82.

³¹ DEUS.AVIS-*tanisamis*: Bossert's identification of this word with Empire period dUTU-*ši* (**ištanušmiš*), "My Sun", which is accepted by Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, p. 23), may be rejected, based as it is on values for DEUS.AVIS now discarded, and the implausible theory of an otherwise unattested survival of the Cun. Hitt. enclitic possessive pronoun *-mi*. The word is clearly connected with the noun DEUS(var. LITUUS).AVIS-*ta-ni/ní*, which in the phrase *miya(n)za* DEUS.AVIS-*taniya(n)za* has a clear contextual meaning of "in my days" (Meriggi, *Glossar*₂, 68 f., although again the phonetic reading cannot be maintained). We appear to have a participle of an iterative (*-sa-* suffixed form) of a denominative verb, parallel in formation (as noted by Meriggi, loc. cit.) with **tiwatami*, "sun-blessed(?)" of KARATEPE and elsewhere. Since the connotations of the basic noun seem to extend to "good times", a sense such as "well-fortuned, lucky" might be guessed.

LITUUS+*ta-sa-pa*-CERVUS-*wa-ti-i-sa*: Bossert's recognition, as modified by Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, 23 f.), that this word is a compound of the storm god Tešub and the Stag-God seems not implausible. However it should be pointed out that the Stag-God's name seems to have been *Runt(iya)*- or *Runza*- (Houwink ten Cate, *LPG*, 128 ff.), and evidence to connect this with the onomastic element *ruwa(ta)*- is inconclusive.

³² Hawkins, *An. St.* XXV (1975), 151 f.

prince beloved by the gods Tarhunzas, Kupapas, Karhuhas and the Sun. Me the gods made strong and *exalted(?)* over Carchemish, and I strengthened(?) Carchemish."³³

Yariris claims neither the title "king" nor that used by other Carchemish rulers (Astuwatamanzas, Suhis II, Katuwas, Kamanis, Pisiris(?)), "Carchemishean country-lord". His actual titles show the same imprecise religious flavour, a reliance on divine appointment rather than hereditary right, as those of Azatiwatas. Also, he refers to his "lord" in a manner strongly reminiscent of Azatiwatas's references to Awarikus. Thus he talks of "my lord Astiruwas's children",³⁴ and in a parallel phrase "Kamanis my lord's son".³⁵ In a sentiment very comparable to those of Azatiwatas in KARATEPE, §§ XIV–XVI, he says, "I [*rai*]sed up(?) my lord's [hou]se".³⁶ In view of these passages, another reference to his lord, previously assumed by me to apply to a god,³⁷ should perhaps also be taken to refer to his human lord, namely Astiruwas.

In spite of this seemingly subordinate position, Yariris elsewhere claims in addition a high degree of international fame,³⁸ a measure of royal power in terms similar to those employed by Azatiwatas: where the latter says (§ XVIII), "and every king made me father to himself because of my justice and my wisdom and my goodness", and (§ L), "and let him (i.e. me, Azatiwatas) be made highly preeminent over all kings", Yariris, in two somewhat obscure clauses says, "for every king I caused to *benefit* the subjects",³⁹ and "because I *displayed* virtue in preeminence over kings".⁴⁰

His relationship with his lord's children may be examined in greater detail. CARCHEMISH A 6–7 is in substance the dedicatory inscription of a structure built for Kamanis, Yariris's lord's son, while still a minor, as is emphasized no less than three times.⁴¹ The other children are introduced thus: "With him (Kamanis) I made his brothers"⁴² and "(This is Kamanis), and these are his younger

³³ *Manuale* II/1, 31; *HH.*, no. 39, I 1–2. For PUGNUS-*ri+ti*, see below, footnote 36.

³⁴ See below, p. 159 f. with footnote 52.

³⁵ *Kamaniya ami DOMINUS-nani INFANS-ni* (dat. sing.). As pointed out by Meriggi, it now seems syntactically inescapable that Kamanis was Yariris's lord's (i.e. Astiruwas's) son, not his own.

³⁶ *DOMINUS-naniya(n)za-[pa]wamu* [DOMUS]-*na(n)za* [PUGNUS-*ri*]+*i-ha*. For this restoration, against that of Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, 31 f.), the following may be urged: (i) there is very little space for restoration and the three and a half signs restored represent a minimum and would conveniently fit; (ii) the dat. plur. of "children" as seen in 1. 3 is *INFANS-ni-ia-za*; (iii) no direct object is provided by Meriggi, whereas the *parna(n)za* gives an acc. sing. neuter instead of the dat. plur. The verb, a minimal restoration, which overcomes the difficulty noted by Meriggi, is stylistically appropriate to the context, thus: "The gods made me *strong* and *exalted(?)* over Carchemish, and I *strengthened* Carchemish, and I *exalted(?)* my lord's house."

³⁷ *An. St.* XXV (1975), 150 f.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 152.

³⁹ CARCHEMISH A 6 l. 3: *wata tanimi REX-ti mita(n)ti(n)zi a(n)ta* (BONUS)/*wasaranuha*; cf. Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, 25.

⁴⁰ See below, p. 159 with footnote 49.

⁴¹ CARCHEMISH A 6 l. 4, A 7 a ll. 2–3 (*INFANS-nis-was REL-za asta*); A 6 l. 6 (*Kamanis-pawa REL-i INFANS-nis asta*).

⁴² CARCHEMISH A 6 l. 4: *CUM-ni-pawatuta apas FRATER-la(n)zi iziha*; cf. Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, 26. Laroche's "with him" (*CUM-ni . . . -tu*), and Meriggi's "made (as sculpture)" surely the senses to be preferred. The word for "brother" *FRATER* (i.e. *INFANS*)-*la*- has been recognized since Forrer, principally on the basis of this and the following two associated contexts (footnotes 43 and 44), and to a lesser degree from others. The lack of correspondence between Cun. Hittite-Luwian on the one hand and Hieroglyphic on the other is odd and puzzling – Hitt. *ŠEŠ-ni*-, Luw. *nani*-, Lyc. *nēni*-, Hier. *FRATER-la*-, "brother"; Hitt. *DUMU-la*-, Hier. *INFANS-ni*-, "son, child", but cf. Luw. *DUMU-ni*-.

brothers",⁴³ these statements tally with another, "I brought up his (Kamanis's) younger brothers".⁴⁴ These therefore are also the children of Yariris's lord.

The epigraph attached to the woman carrying the baby and leading the animal has usually been taken to refer to the woman but is somewhat problematic. It may be understood to say "This is Tuwarsais, the ZARZA-ed of the ruler, the person proclaimed for preeminence".⁴⁵ "Person" (CAPUT-*tis*) seems unlikely to refer to a woman but is common in the sense "prince";⁴⁶ for this reason we should perhaps relate the epigraph to the baby rather than the woman. Also the special mention accorded to him could be taken to imply that this is Yariris' own son, not merely the youngest of Kamanis's brothers.

In CARCHEMISH A 15 b, Yariris, after stating albeit ambiguously his own position in Carchemish (line 1) and describing his irrigation and other works (line 2) returns to the subject of his relations with Kamanis and the other children (line 3), before terminating with the extraordinary boasts⁴⁷ of his own skill in writing and language (line 4). Line 3 may be provisionally translated "I brought up (lit. "made great") Kamanis as successor,⁴⁸ and because I displayed virtue in pre-eminence over kings,⁴⁹ I brought up his younger brothers.⁵⁰ I . . . -ed them(?) to/for the ATALA's,⁵¹ and to/from them, to/from my lord Astiruwas's children, I . . . -ed away the . . . "⁵²

⁴³ CARCHEMISH A 7 a l. 1: *za(n)zi-pawatu* POST+RA/I-*zi* FRATER-*la(n)zi*; recognize in POST+RA/I-, with Meriggi, Hier. *apara/i-* (= Hitt. *appezzi-*), but translate, with Hrozny (IHH, 191) and Laroche (HHL, no. 34 IIa), "younger", rather than "(physically) following".

⁴⁴ See below, with footnote 50.

⁴⁵ CARCHEMISH A 7 j: *zas-pawa* ¹Tuwarsais *tarwanis* (*357) *zarzamis* "FRONS"-*hiti asazamis* CAPUT-*tis*. *tarwanis* unlikely to be nominative apposition to PN referring to woman, as noun (Laroche) or adjective (Meriggi); thus presumably genitive dependent on *zarzamis*, participle of unknown verb *zarza-*. "FRONS"-*hiti*, understood as dat. sing. of **ha(n)tahi*-, "firstness, pre-eminence", cf. below, footnote 49. *asazamis*, certainly participle of verb *asaza-*, "speak, pronounce, proclaim", for which see Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, JRAS 1975/2, 132 f.

⁴⁶ Cf. especially KARATEPE § LX f. (CAPUT-*tis* = Phoen. *rzn* and ʕ).

⁴⁷ An. St. XXV (1975), 150 f.

⁴⁸ ¹Kamanin-*pawa* CRUS.CRUS(-)*jniyasatalan uranuha*. CRUS.CRUS(-)*ni-ia-sa-ta-la-*, sense perceived since Hrozny, but form of word requires elucidation; clearly *nomen actoris* in -*tala-* from verb, a comparison of the occurrences of which suggest the reading CRUS.CRUS(-)*ni(-ia)-za-sa-*, the -*za/sa-* being recognized as iterative suffixes of the types noted in HHL, § 4.5.3; cf. now H. Mittelberger, *Grazer Beiträge* 7 (1978), 13 f.

⁴⁹ *wata* REX-*ta(n)za* "FRONS"-*hiti* *273-*n* REL-*ti* (MANUS.*273) *suhiitiha*. "FRONS"-*hiti*, understood as dat. sing. of **ha(n)tahi*-, "primacy, preeminence" (*hant-*, "front, forehead", An. St. XXV (1975), 148 f., +*-ahi-*, neut. abstract suffix); *273-*n*, probably rendering *warpi*, HH., no. 273(a); cf. l. 4 (end) of this inscription, (*273) *warpi*, and comment in An. St. XXV (1975), 151. *warpi* seems to denote an intellectual or moral rather than physical attribute; cf. the examination of the root by Weitenberg, *Hethitica* 2 (Louvain, 1977), 47-52 - but the hieroglyphic attestations require further examination. *suhiiti-*, otherwise unknown verb, determined by the uninformative MANUS.*273, at a guess "displayed".

⁵⁰ POST+RA/I-*zi-pawatu* FRATER-*la(n)zi uranuha*.

⁵¹ *wata* ("INFANS.NI") *atala(n)za a(n)ta sasaha*. *sasa-*, unclear whether transitive (in which case analyse *wa+ata*, "and them" (i.e. Kamanis and his brothers) to provide direct object) or intransitive; at a guess, associate with Hitt. *sai/siya-*, "seal", Hier. (SIGILLUM) *sasa(n)za*, "seal". *atala(n)za*, dat. plur., indirect object; Laroche takes as full phonetic reading of FRATER, which would give, "I A(N)TA SASA-ed (intrans.) to/for the brothers"; Meriggi prefers "cousins" which could give, "I A(N)TA SASA-ed them to/for the cousins" (HH., no. 45 III; *Manuale* II/1, 34).

⁵² (*243) *karpar(?) (an)tahisa-pawama(n)zata amiya(n)za* DOMINUS-*naniya(n)za* ¹Astiruwas INFANS-*niya(n)za arha* "LONGUS"(-)*yariha*. To the interpretation of this passage offered in Iraq 36 (1974), 72 n. 37, the following modifications are now suggested: -*ma(n)za*, "for/from them"; as seen by Meriggi (*Manuale* II/1, 34) it is best to take "them" merely as anticipating "the children" not referring to a different group of persons. "My lord Astiruwas's children"

In this last passage unknown words obscure the sense, as do also doubts about to whom the pronouns apply. The view taken here, contrary to previous interpretations, is that Yariris is probably boasting of the good he is doing to Kamanis and his brothers, the children of his lord Astiruwas. The sum of all the passages quoted taken together seems to indicate that Yariris was acting as regent and guardian of Carchemish and the house of Astiruwas in a very similar fashion to that in which Azatiwatas was acting towards Adana and the posterity of Awarikus.

(3) *Kamanis and Sasturas*

In due season, Kamanis succeeded his guardian Yariris as ruler of Carchemish, as is attested by the inscriptions written under his authority, CARCHEMISH A 31/32, A 4 a, and CEKKE.⁵³ His titles and affiliation if ever given, have been broken away from A 31/32, a dedication of the Kubaba temple and cult-statue. A 4 a and CEKKE are similar documents, both being donations, though the latter is much larger and more elaborate. On the former, Kamanis is entitled simply "king" (REX-ti-), on the latter "ruler, country-lord of the cities Carchemish (and) ..."⁵⁴ His titles, it will be observed, are much more grandiose than those of Yariris. In the matter of his affiliation, it has been noted that the fragment CARCHEMISH A 27 e 1, reading "... country-lord, of Astiruwas ...", apparently belongs to a genealogy and implies that the author ruled in Carchemish.⁵⁵ The most obvious attribution of this piece would, in the view taken here, be to Kamanis.

A clear understanding of the introductions giving the authorships of the two halves of CEKKE (obverse, reverse) is important, and previous views, including my own,⁵⁶ should now be modified in a crucial respect as a result of the reinterpretation of FRONS-lá/i-, the reading †nala-, "no", now being discarded in favour of hantili-, "first, foremost".⁵⁷ This replaces the phrase "no servant" with "first servant" (i.e. "prime minister"!)). In the past it was undecided whether this phrase applied to Sasturas in relation to Kamanis or vice versa,⁵⁸ and in its reinterpretation I left the question open as to who was whose "first servant". A closer examination of the context, however, seems to permit a more positive conclusion. The inscription on the reverse is, as should be recognized, completely self-contained and independent of that on the obverse, and constitutes the official

must refer back to Kamanis and his brothers, since Kamanis is "my lord's son" (above, footnote 35).

karpar(an)tahisa; as noted by Meriggi, should be a neuter abstract in -*ahi+sa*, and the direct object; but since we are quite ignorant of its meaning, as of that of the verb *arha* (-*lyari*-), we can hardly determine whether the action is good, neutral or bad, and thus whether it is of advantage or disadvantage to the children. In the past, scholars have assumed a bad sense (Barnett, Bossert, Meriggi, also myself), but the interpretation of the tenor of Yariris' inscriptions suggested in the present article implies that we should assume a good sense in the action of this clause.

⁵³ Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, nos. 257, 162; II/1, no. 28.

⁵⁴ See below, footnote 59; the unknown city name, written VITELLUS-zá(URBS), is hardly to be interpreted, as does Meriggi (*Manuale* II/2, 148), as "Malatya", written VITELLUS(=*ma*_x?) -li-zi(URBS).

⁵⁵ Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 165.

⁵⁶ *An. St.* XXII (1972), 105.

⁵⁷ In the phrase *Sasturas* ¹*Kamanis* FRONS-lá/i-*sa mita(s)* (CEKKE, rev. 1; see below, footnote 59); for the reinterpretation, see *An. St.* XXV (1975), 149 f.

⁵⁸ Bossert, "Of S. (is) K. ... servant", denied by Meriggi, "S. (is) K.'s ... servant" (*St. Cl. Or.* 2 (1953), 34 and footnote 2).

document of foundation of a city Kamana, by the joint action of Kamanis (after whom the city was named) and Sasturas. The following interpretation of the introduction is now offered:

- § 1. Kamanis the ruler, the country-lord of the cities Carchemish (and) . . . , (and) Sasturas, Kamanis's first servant — the city of Kamana for the Kana-puweans they *founded(?)* by their *munificence(?)*,⁵⁹
 § 2. and to them 600 donkey(s) they gave, (saying): " . . .

The following five clauses each contain verbs in the 1st person plural present(?) ("we shall give . . . , we shall give . . . , we shall make . . . , we shall give . . . , we shall give . . .").

§ 1, unusually, but intelligibly in the context, is introduced by no connective particles, and Kamanis and Sasturas with their titles are introduced asyndetically. If the clause is understood like this, it may be appreciated that the possibility that Kamanis was designated "first servant of Sasturas" is absolutely excluded: if such had been his title, his name would not have followed that of Sasturas nor indeed would it have been repeated at all.⁶⁰

Curiously enough, now that the format of the donation can be understood in this way, two very probable antecedents for CEKKE may be suggested, which could have served as model for both the text of the donation and the actual shape of the stele itself. The Pazarcık stele of Adad-nirari III (and Shalmaneser IV) in Maraş Museum, and the Antakya Museum stele of the same king are cast in the form of donations of boundaries (*tahūmu*) to Syro-Hittite kings.⁶¹ On them, the agents making the donation are Adad-nirari III and Sammu-ramat (Pazarcık, obverse), Adad-nirari III and Šamši-ilu the turtan (Antakya), and Shalmaneser IV and Šamši-ilu the turtan (Pazarcık, reverse). The relationship between Kamanis and Sasturas on CEKKE appears exactly parallel to that of the Assyrian kings and their turtan Šamši-ilu. We should also bear in mind that Šamši-ilu in his very long turtanship (c. 800–745 B.C.) was probably a contemporary, as well as a close neighbour from his seat in Til-Barsip, of both Yariris and Kamanis.

This understanding has important historical implications. It has been held that Sasturas should be identified with Sarduri II of Urartu.⁶² Such an identification must be completely excluded by the interpretations offered above — it is not credible that the king of Urartu at this period could be called first servant of the king of Carchemish. Sasturas must therefore have been an otherwise unknown vassal of Carchemish (conceivably bearing an Urartian name), who was himself

⁵⁹ *Kamanis tarwanis Karkamisa*(URBS) *VITELLUS-zá*(URBS) *REGIO.DOMINUS Sasturas* *I Kamanis ha(n)tilis mita(s) Kamanan*(URBS) *URBS+MI-nin Kanapuwana(n)za*(URBS) *CUM-ni* *344(-) *isa(n)ta apasati* *314(-) *satanati* : for the verb *344(-) *ij/ya/sa-*, see *Manuale* II/2, 102.

⁶⁰ For a somewhat comparable introduction, see KARABURUN, 1, below, footnote 101. If Kamanis really had been the "first servant" of Sasturas, we would have expected an introduction of the pattern: "K., titles, (patronym), of S. (titles) the first servant" — cf. introduction to BULGARMADEN, below, footnote 82.

⁶¹ *CAH* III/1 (new edition), ch. 9 part IV with footnotes 218, 222, 225, 227, 230, 233 (forthcoming).

⁶² Suggested by Bossert, *St. Cl. Or.* 1 (1952), 63 f.; accepted by most scholars, with reservations; cf. the remarks of Orthmann, *USK*, 188; Genge, *NSR*, 157 ff. is less cautious.

sufficiently powerful to dominate a vassal of his own, the DOMINUS-*tiwaras*,⁶³ dedicator of the entire CEKKE stele on behalf of his lord Sasturas. The author of the inscribed relief CARCHEMISH A 21/22 *b + a* speaks of "my father Sastu(ras)",⁶⁴ though his own name is missing. The name *Astiru* appearing on an associated fragment has generally been restored as that of the author,⁶⁵ with the unfortunate result that this sculpture has been attributed to Astiruwas, the predecessor of Yariris, in flat contradiction to the clear stylistic and epigraphic criteria of a late date.⁶⁶ In fact, as I have noted, the restoration of the name *Astiru* as that of the author is by no means compelling,⁶⁷ since it could just as plausibly belong in the author's genealogy, or even some completely different context. Thus if we follow the stylistic pointers to a late date for this and associated sculpture, and reject the unconvincing Astiruwas ascription, we are free to date it a generation later than Kamanis, and to indentify Sasturas, first servant of Kamanis, as the same individual as the Sastu(ras) father of the author of CARCHEMISH A 21/22 *b + a*. As I have also observed, the restoration of the name of the author is comparatively certain, since it seems clear that the date demanded by the sculptural style must fall within the reign of Pisiris, the last king of Carchemish, contemporary of Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V and Sargon II (at least 738–717 B.C.).⁶⁸ We may safely conclude therefore that it is he who was son of Sasturas. At the same time evidence of inscribed fragments suggests that a descendant (or descendants) of Astiruwas and Kamanis ruled in Carchemish.⁶⁹ This could imply that Sasturas was himself related to Kamanis, either by blood (hardly brother or son, but perhaps nephew) or, as I have previously considered possible, by marriage (perhaps son-in-law), or even by adoption as son. The *Astiru* fragment associated with A 21/22 *b + a* could then be placed in Pisiris's genealogy.

(4) *The Kings of Tabal in the later Eighth Century B.C.*

In 837 B.C. Shalmaneser III had encountered 24 kings of Tabal. The

⁶³ The author of CEKKE, obverse, written DOMINUS.SOL-*waras* (collated, phonetic reading of first element unknown; contra Meriggi, *Ki²-UTU-wa-r-s²*) is doubtless the same individual as the DOMINUS-*tiwaraya Ahalisan*, "DOMINUS-*tiwaras* Ahalis's son" (dat. sing.) of rev. 4 (cf. *An. St.* XXV (1975), 148 for form of patronymic); the father also features, rev. 3: *Ahaliya AQUA.DOMINUS PRAE-na*, "before Ahalis the River-Lord". DOMINUS-*tiwaras* calls himself *Sasturas wasamis mita(s)*, "honoured servant of Sasturas", and further (obv. 4) refers to "Sasturas his lord" (*sa-sa-tu [+ra/i]-ia* | DOMINUS-*ni á-pa-sa-na*, dat. sing.; collated, contra Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, 108).

⁶⁴ *mis tati sastu tiwatami CAPUT-ti*, "my father Sastu(ras), the Sun-blessed man", taken as nominatives with unexpressed case endings (Hawkins, *An. St.* XXII (1972), 113, contra Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 148); otherwise with Meriggi, contra Bossert, *St. Cl. Or.* 1 (1951), 58 f.

⁶⁵ Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 147 f.

⁶⁶ For the contradiction, see Orthmann, *USK*, 191, but cf. 187 and notes 39–44 for a consideration of earlier views.

⁶⁷ Hawkins, *An. St.* XXII (1972), 104; Genge, *NSR*, 160 ff., attempts to revive this ascription, unnecessarily in my opinion.

⁶⁸ *Iraq* 36 (1974), 73 and n. 44.

⁶⁹ Evidence for a regnant descendant of Astiruwas (son or grandson?) has been noted above, p. 160 and footnote 55; CARCHEMISH A 17 *b* hints at a regnant descendant of Kamanis (Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 131), but besides the name and titles little sense can be extracted from the text as it stands, though collation might improve matters. The piece CARCHEMISH A 26 *f* seems to preserve traces of a genealogy to which the restoration of Kamanis has been suggested on the strength of a surviving *ma* (Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 163), but apart from this, little enough of the text or sculpture survives to suggest an attribution with any confidence.

inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II preserve the names of a number of Tabalian kings and provide some information on the political events on the Anatolian plateau at this period. Most of the hieroglyphic monuments, rock inscriptions and inscribed stelae may be dated to this period, and of these, many have already been associated with Assyrian-attested rulers, while new information permits some enlargement of the picture.

Tiglath-pileser III listed as tributary in 738 and again in 732 B.C. a group of Anatolian rulers:⁷⁰

Wassurme of Tabal
Urballa of Tuhana
Ušhiṭti of Atuna
Tuhamme of Istunda
U(i)rimme of Hupišna

Between the years 732 and 729 B.C., Wassurme defaulted on his tribute payment, and was deposed by the *rab-sarīs* and replaced by Hulli, a "son of a nobody".⁷¹

Sargon's inscriptions resume the story. In 718 B.C., Sargon deposed Kiakki, king of Sinuhtu and presented his city to Kurti (previously read *Matti*) of Atuna.⁷² At an uncertain date Sargon had restored Hulli, deported to Assyria by Shalmaneser V, to the throne of Tabal, and Hulli had been succeeded by his son Ambaris (or Amris – representing a pronunciation *Ambris*?), now called either king of Tabal or king of Bīt-Burutaš, to whom Sargon had given his daughter in marriage.⁷³ But in 713 B.C. Sargon deported Ambaris too, and constituted Tabal a province, perhaps still under the authority of his own daughter. In c. 710–709 the letter of Sargon to his provincial governor in Que throws vivid light on the position of the surviving Tabalian kings now caught between the newly reconciled Assyria and Phrygia.⁷⁴ The letter refers to "all those kings of Tabal" but names only Urballa, perhaps the most important of them. Men of Atuna and Istuanda (= Istunda) are said to be raiding villages of Bīt-Paruta (= Bīt-Burutaš). In 705 B.C. Sargon, summoned to Tabal, fell in battle, perhaps against the Cimmerians,⁷⁵ and Tabal passed for ever beyond Assyrian political control.⁷⁶

The two most prominent Tabalian kings, to judge from the written monuments of Anatolia, were Wasu-Sarmas (Wassurme) and Warpalawas (Urballa). The former is known from inscriptions scattered over a fairly wide area, those of his servants (SULTANHAN, KAYSERİ and SUVASA), and, probably, of himself (TOPADA – see below). In the last he is entitled "Great King, Hero, son of Tuwatis, Great King, Hero". The spread of these inscriptions indicates that he controlled a territory, Bīt-Burutaš, roughly equivalent to the vilayets of Kayseri and Nevşehir, of which the capital city was perhaps at the modern village site of Kululu.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ See above, footnote 3, for sources; also Weippert, loc. cit., 48 ff. The name of Hupišna and its contemporary king are lost from the second list.

⁷¹ Nimrud Tablet (dated 729 B.C.) includes the narrative immediately after the Tribute List of 732 B.C. (ll. 14'–15' = ARAB I, § 802).

⁷² Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958), 86 note 262, 94; Levine, *Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran*, 36; Lie, *Sargon*, 10 (Annals, ll. 68–71 = ARAB II, § 7); Winckler, *Sargon*, I, 102 (Display Inscription, ll. 28–9 = ARAB II, § 55).

⁷³ *RIA* IV, s.v. Hulli, for sources; also Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung*, 71 ff.

⁷⁴ Nimrud Letter 39; see Postgate, *Iraq* 35 (1973), 21–34.

⁷⁵ Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958), 97 and notes 311–15.

⁷⁶ See above, footnote 10.

⁷⁷ See T. Özgüç, *Kultepe and its vicinity in the Iron Age* (Ankara, 1971), for a description of the site and its remains.

His father, Tuwatis, is also known from inscriptions written by his servants, namely KULULU 1 and ÇİFTLİK. The name *Tuwatis* is found elsewhere on an Urartian inscription of Argišti I (785–760 B.C.) in the form *Tuate*⁷⁸ and also earlier as *Tuatte*, the king of Tabal encountered by Shalmaneser III in 837 B.C.⁷⁹ It thus seems to have been a recurring Anatolian dynastic name.

The inscriptions associated with the names of Tuwatis and Wasu-Sarmas show markedly divergent styles of script which may be classified roughly as follows:

(1) the *simple* characterized by very regular use of the syllabary, many full phonetic spellings and plain linear incised sign-forms (ÇİFTLİK, SULTANHAN, KULULU 1).

(2) the *elaborate*, characterized by ornate relief sign-forms and unusual syllabic values (KAYSERİ).

(3) the *bizarre*, characterized by ill-executed linear incised sign-forms and a profusion of otherwise unattested signs and rare or aberrant syllabic values (SUVASA, TOPADA).

It would appear that these discrepancies were attributable to local scribal schools rather than, as has been suggested, differences of date. Thus for example there seems no adequate grounds for considering, with Meriggi, that TOPADA and SUVASA are archaic, and thereby postulating an earlier Wasu-Sarmas.⁸⁰ Laroche's view that these styles are simply archaizing seems preferable.⁸¹ TOPADA will be discussed below.

Warpalawas of Tuwana (*Urballa* of *Tuhana* to the Assyrians) is the Anatolian king best represented by surviving sculpture. His own work includes the inscribed rock relief of İVRİZ and the stele of BOR, and he is named as overlord by the author of the rock inscription of BULGARMADEN.⁸² The ANDAVAL stele fragment, written by a certain Saruwanis, king of Nahita, appears to mention Warpalawas in a fragmentary context,⁸³ which might imply that Saruwanis was his father, as the more archaic style would seem to suggest.⁸⁴ Recently a fine storm-god stele has been discovered reused as a threshold stone in a mosque at Niğde.⁸⁵ Its short inscription identifies it as the work of Warpalawas's son and successor Muwaharas.

The distribution of Warpalawas's monuments indicates that his kingdom Tuwana was approximately the area of the Tyanitis, the modern vilayet of Niğde, stretching from Ereğli (İvriz) to the north end of the Cilician Gates (Zeyve Hüyük, Bulgarmaden) and in the north including Bor, Niğde and Andaval. Whether the mountain-top Neo-Hittite palace of Göllüdağ belonged to Tuwana or

⁷⁸ König, *Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften*, 89 and note 7.

⁷⁹ *Iraq* 21 (1959), 153 ff.

⁸⁰ *Manuale* II/1, 122 f.; II/3, 283 f.; *Glossar*₂, 153.

⁸¹ *HH.*, 262; compare very evident archaism of the certainly late CARCHEMISH A 21/22 b + a.

⁸² *amu-wami Tarhunazas tarwanis TarhuwarXs nimuwa(n)zas Warpalawasis REX-tis HEROS -tis tarwanis mitas*, "I (am) T. the ruler, T.'s son, servant of W. the king, the hero, the ruler".

⁸³ Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 10 (on BOR) and 13, with a somewhat different interpretation of ANDAVAL.

⁸⁴ Orthmann, *USK*, 219 f. with criticism of the earlier dating of Ussishkin, *Anadolu* 11 (1967), 197 ff.

⁸⁵ Reported by Mellink, *AJA* 81 (1977), 300; and in detail by Professor Mustafa Kalaç at the XXIV R.A.I., Paris, 1977. I am most grateful to Professor Kalaç for his personal communication on this important new piece.

its northern neighbour, Bit-Burutaš, is not clear, since no inscriptions have been found with the sculpture on that site.

Warpalawas also enjoyed a substantial reign, minimally from 738–710 B.C.,⁸⁶ and it would seem that at least ostensibly he cooperated with the Assyrians. The new stele of his son must therefore be one of the latest closely datable examples of Neo-Hittite sculpture.

Besides this new stele of Warpalawas's son, another stele has recently turned up in Aksaray and has been published by Mustafa Kalaç.⁸⁷ Though it is only the lower part of a stele, showing the Storm-God's legs on the obverse and inscribed on the reverse and sides – thus having lost any introductory presentation and titles of the author – the last line of the reverse shows "to me Kiyakiyas the ruler". The name *Kiyakiyas*, of a common Anatolian reduplicated type, which occurs also on KULULU lead strip 1 in the form *Kiyaki*,⁸⁸ appears in the cuneiform sources as Kikki⁸⁹ or Kiakki.⁹⁰ Indeed it may well be suggested that this Kiyakiyas, the ruler on the AKSARAY stele, was in fact the same individual as Kiakki of Šinuhtu. The location of Šinuhtu at Aksaray could be argued but is bound up with the question of the location of Atuna (Tunna).⁹¹ What may be judged of the date of this new stele would not contradict this identification.

The inscription TOPADA contains a first person narrative describing a frontier war against an enemy, the "Parzutean" (man of the city Parzuta) by means of cavalry.⁹² Its general sense has become clearer in spite of obscure passages. Much of its difficulty resides in the orthography: the text uses a large number of rare or freakish syllabic values. One is often driven to postulate otherwise unattested values in order to extract a hypothetical sense,⁹³ an unsatisfactory process unless and until confirmation can be found elsewhere.

The inscription is introduced by the name, titulary and affiliation of Wasu-Sarmas, and thus appears to be presented as his own inscription, though this is followed by an obscure second clause which casts some doubt on the identity of the "I" of the first personal narrative. It continues:

"Against me in Parzuta there were seven king(s) of lesser and greater rank . . ."⁹⁴

and three kings were favourable to me . . ."⁹⁵

The names of the three kings follow.

⁸⁶ Sources: Tiglath-pileser III, Annals (738 B.C.) and Nimrud Tablet (732 B.C.); Sargon, letter to governor of Que (710 B.C.) – as above, footnotes 3 and 4.

⁸⁷ As for footnote 85; for the forthcoming publication, see Kalaç, KZ 92 (1978), 117–125.

⁸⁸ T. Özgüç, *Kültepe and its vicinity in the Iron Age*, Plate L, rev. I (*Ki-ia-ki*; not in index, *ibid.*, p. 115).

⁸⁹ Son of Tuatte king of Tabal encountered by Shalmaneser in 837 B.C.; see above, footnote 79.

⁹⁰ See above, p. 163, and footnote 72.

⁹¹ See below, p. 166 f. with footnote 98 and Editorial Note. The location of Šinuhtu (Šinahuddum) has always depended on its association with Atuna/Tunna: see J. Lewy in *Halil Edhem Hâtıra Kitabı*, 16 (with Wahšuşana in VAT 15316); Garelli, *Les assyriens en Cappadoce*, 123.

⁹² Supplement the translation of Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, no. 31 with that of *An. St.* XXV (1975), 127 f., 141, 148 ff.

⁹³ E.g. I suggested, *loc. cit.*, the values *pa_x* and *sī* on the grounds that such readings would at least give sense in several different contexts, thereby in some measure providing support for each other.

⁹⁴ In *An. St.* XXV, 150, five kings was read; but further collation of photographs suggests that this numeral may be seven.

⁹⁵ See also the treatment by A. Morpurgo Davies and Hawkins, below, footnote 98.

(1) *wa/i₄+ra/i-pa-x-wa/i-x*: under the circumstances it is difficult to avoid completing the name as *Warpalawas*, i.e. attributing to the sign *Meriggi* 402, occurring elsewhere in this inscription but otherwise unknown, the value *la_x*; and to the final syllable the value *sa_x* to produce a nominative ending.⁹⁶ It would be very satisfactory to find here the name of *Warpalawas* as an ally of his attested contemporary *Wasu-Sarmas*.

(2) **241-ia*241-ia-sa₄-ha*: the recent discovery of the *AKSARAY* stele, as noted above, prompts us to allocate to **241* the value *ki*, and to find here the name of *Kiyakiyas* (of *Šinuhtu*). Whether **241* is in fact the *TOPADA* version of the usual *ki* (*HH*, no. 446) or a completely different sign is not clear.

(3) *ru-*296-ta-sa-ha*: the attribution to **296* of the arbitrary value *wa_x*⁹⁷ would not only produce an attested name here, but would also permit the interpretation of **296* and **326* at the beginning of line 5 as *wa-tu*, connective particle and enclitic pronoun. We therefore adopt it as a working hypothesis, though the resulting king *Ruwatas* is not otherwise known. The name is followed by a curious sign, a "foot" and two "wheels" (*HH*, no. 92). In this context the easiest thing to suppose is that it is a title. Thus by more or less summary methods, we read in this passage:

"and three kings were favourable to me: *Warpalawas* and *Kiyakiyas* and *Ruwatas* the . . .".

Besides these inscriptions of *Bīt-Burutaš* and *Tuwana*, only two other certainly royal inscriptions have been found on the Anatolian plateau, the stele *BOHÇA* and the rock inscription *KARABURUN*. In a new edition of *BOHÇA*, Anna Morpurgo Davies and I have considered the historical context of the piece.⁹⁸ In particular, we have drawn attention to the similarities of the names of the author of *BOHÇA*, *Kurtis* and his father, probably read *Askwisis* (*á-sa-REL₂-si¹-sa₄*) with the names of two attested kings of *Atuna*, *Kurti*⁹⁹ and *Ušhitti*.¹⁰⁰ We have suggested the possible identity of the two pairs, but have pointed out the difficulty of reconciling the supposed location of *Atuna* at or near *Zeyve Hüyük* at the north end of the *Cilician gates* with that of modern *Bohça*. After examining some recent evidence bearing on the problem, we consider that until more evidence is forthcoming, the identification of *Askwisis* and *Kurtis* of *BOHÇA* with *Ušhitti* and *Kurti* of the *Assyrian records* remains no more than a possibility.

The inscription of *KARABURUN* is a curious little document, a record of agreement between two men called *Sipis* (previously *Sapis*), distinguished as "Sipis the king" and "Sipis Nis's son" (*Sipis Niyas(is)*) concerning the restoration of the citadel, at the gateway of which the inscription is cut on a rock.¹⁰¹ King

⁹⁶ This seems to be supported in the following line where the sign recurs in a context in which it alternates with *sa₅*, namely a verb **336-na-ha-sa₅/sa_x* (*Glossar₂*, 68; *HH*, no. 336 II, 3). *Meriggi* and *Laroche* consider the sign to be *su(?)*, and indeed it is possible that this sign should have been used, abnormally, for the nominative *-s*.

⁹⁷ As suggested by *Meriggi*, *Manuale* II/1, ad loc.

⁹⁸ "The Hieroglyphic Inscription of *BOHÇA*", in *Studies in honour of Professor P. Meriggi for his 80th Birthday* (forthcoming).

⁹⁹ Mentioned by *Sargon* in 718 (above, footnote 72) and 713 B.C. (*Winckler, Sargon*, II, 45, S.2022, ll. 3'-10' = *ARAB* II, § 214).

¹⁰⁰ Mentioned by *Tiglath-pileser III* (above, footnote 3).

¹⁰¹ *awa Sipis REX-ta Sipis-pawa Niyas tapariyalata harnisa(n)za tama(n)ta wara/i zati sama(n)za iziya(n)ta*, "Sipis was king and Sipis Nis's son was governor — they built the fortress and they(?) for themselves(?) made a *SAMA(N)ZA* here"; cf. *RHA* XXIX (1971), 123 and 129; and for the patronymic, *An. St.* XXV (1975), 148.

Sipis is not yet attested in any other source, but was presumably the ruler of a single city, the site of Karaburun, like the other lesser Tabalian kings. Since the inscription seems to belong palaeographically to this late period, it could be that he was numbered among "all those kings of Tabal" so slightly referred to by Sargon.

EDITORIAL NOTE

It seems to me that Mr Hawkins is unnecessarily cautious. The identification of Atuna with Ptolemy's Tynna (securely located near Faustinopolis in the Cilician Gates by *CIL* VI 5076) has never been based on anything more than the resemblance of the names, Atuna varying with Tuna (twice) and Tunna (once only). Von Soden (*OLZ* LVI 577) placed it at Adana. Weippert (loc. cit.) argues that Tiglath-pileser's tribute list is in geographical order and therefore Atuna should be situated between Tabal (approximately Kayseri) and Tuhana (Niğde). Thus a location at or near Bohça is perfectly plausible, with Šinuhtu (and Wahšušana) at or near Aksaray. The connexion of Mt. Tunni, the silver mountain, and probably also of Hittite Dunna, with Tynna and the Taurus Mountains remains unaffected. Atuna could well be Hittite Adunuwa, which occurs in the sequence Nenisankuwa-Adunuwa-Apzisna-Sarissa-Samuha (*KBo.* I 58). Ištunda-Istuanda, which joined with Atuna in raiding Bīt-Burutaš, could be identified with Hittite Wasuduwanda, which follows the Lower Land in *KUB* VI 46 iii 9 and has a shrine of Hepat (Laroche, *RHA* XIX/69, 61).

O.R.G.

ADDITIONAL LOGOGRAMS TRANSCRIBED INTO LATIN

SIGILLUM (*HH*, 327)VITELLUS (*HH*, 109)