

Šuppiluliuma and Hartapu: two "Great Kings" in Conflict?

Anna Margherita Jasink - Firenze

The reconstruction of a chronological sequence where the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ-BURUNKAYA group of rock inscriptions is placed in the 12th century, immediately after the fall of the Hittite Empire, can be primarily based on the assumption that the name of Hartapu does not appear in the texts relating to the last period of Ḫatti. There we find, in a direct sequence, Ḫattušili-Tuthaliya-Arnuwanda-Šuppiluliuma, under the last one of which the Hittite history seems to come to a conclusion. However, the recent findings of the Bronze Tablet, of the bullae bearing the seal of Kurunta and of his rock relief at Hatip, together with the mention of Tarḫuntašša in the SÜDBURG inscription, pointed out the vitality of the Tarḫuntašša state and its ambition, at least under Kurunta, of a territorial expansion and even aspiration to the Hittite throne.

As a working hypothesis I wonder if there are enough elements to date the kingdom of Hartapu to the Hittite period¹ and to identify it with the state of Tarḫuntašša, giving to Hartapu a role similar to that of Kurunta. In this way we would deal with a second expansionist trend by Tarḫuntašša, followed by the claim of its king to gain the control of Ḫatti. But this attempt failed as well and Šuppiluliuma succeeded to definitely frustrate the ambitions of Hartapu.

We shall first examine the already available data that are not in contrast with the above hypothesis:

a) From a linguistic point of view a redating before the end of the Empire of the Hartapu inscriptions poses no problems. On the contrary, the affinities of this group with YALBURT even more than with SÜDBURG² would be well explained also with an even earlier dating than the Šuppiluliuma inscription³.

b) The connection of Hartapu with Tarḫuntašša is clearly recognizable from the geographical areas where the inscriptions were found, although there is no direct mention of Tarḫuntašša. The KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ area was part of the Tarḫuntašša territory and it is even likely that the city of

¹ An imperial dating for Hartapu has been already proposed by Singer 1996, 68 ff.

² About the aedicula on KIZILDAĞ 2 and 3 inscriptions, executed in typical late Imperial style and for the epithet FORTIS (=NIR.GAL=Muwatalli) of the Storm-god on KIZILDAĞ 2, see Singer 1996, 69.

³ On this point, for a discussion of the historical aspects see in the following.

Tarḫuntašša itself was located on the Kızıldağ hill⁴. The discovery of a Hartapu inscription at Burunkaya would signify an enlargement of the Tarḫuntašša state to the north-east.

c) The presentation of Hartapu as "son of the great king Muršili" has already been interpreted⁵ as an evidence of a direct lineage from Urḫi-Tešup (Muršili III)⁶. If we accept this proposal, Hartapu would belong to the generation following Kurunta and Tuthaliya IV. Therefore, considering him as contemporary with Šuppiluliuma, it would be unnecessary to resort to the expedient of lengthening his age or of looking for a later Muršili as his father.

After these general considerations, I believe that a rereading of some passages of both the Südburg and the Karadağ-Kızıldağ-Burunkaya group inscriptions can confirm a redating of Hartapu.

d) In KIZILDAĞ 4 Hartapu is called with the title of VIR. Unlike the other titularities of Hartapu which follow the Hittite model – both the more common SOL2, MAGNUS.REX, HEROS and the more unusual VITELLUS.*285, referring to Tuthaliya IV⁷, and *416-*wani*, referring both to Tuthaliya and Šuppiluliuma⁸ – this epithet does not turn out to be shared by any king of Hatti. Hawkins⁹ noted a possible connection with the title of CAPUT.VIR mentioned in SÜDBURG, without drawing any conclusion from this. It seems possible to me to go farther and wonder if in this expression, taking VIR as a shortening of CAPUT.VIR, we should see a specific title of the king of Tarḫuntašša¹⁰.

e) If VIR and CAPUT.VIR actually represent the same title, one wonders

⁴ On the extent of the Tarḫuntašša kingdom and on the location of the city see Jasink 2001. On Late Bronze Age cult installations in the Kızıldağ area see Gonnet 1984, 119 ff.

⁵ Mellaart 1974, 514 ff; Hawkins 1992, 270.

⁶ For the existence of Urḫi-Tešup's sons see Singer 1996, 70 and n. 27.

⁷ On this title and its occurrence in EMIRGAZI fragment, EMIRGAZI Altar B 1.4, KARAKUYU 1.2, see Poetto 1993, 54 ff, Hawkins 1995, 78 f. It is worth noting that in the Mersin seal Nr. 83.5.5 (Dinçol-Dinçol 1985, 36 f; Mora 1990, 78) VITELLUS-*285 refers to Luluwa BONUS2.VIR2, who evidently is not a king. Tuthaliya and Hartapu as well use this title but it is not included in their aedicula.

⁸ For a discussion on this term and the hypothesis that it may be the phonetic rendering of the Hier. logogram SOL2 = cun. ^DUTU^{sr} see Hawkins 1995, 114 ff.

⁹ Hawkins 1992, 267; 1995, 35.

¹⁰ For an apparent connection of this title with the supposed title VIR.CAPUT – see also its alternative reading as the proper name Zita – referring to a prince in the TAŞCI rock inscription and the equivalent Hittite title LÚ.SAG see Jasink 2001.

if in the inscription of Südburg this title is really referred to Šuppiluliuma or if an alternative interpretation is possible. In my opinion the lack of phonetic complements and case-endings accompanying this ideographical expression and the occurrence of this title in a separate position from the other terms that qualify the Hittite king allow for a proposal of different solutions. The word appears in three passages scanning the three areas of Šuppiluliuma's conquests: "all the land(s)"¹¹, defined by five place names, that we can identify as a whole with the area to the west of Ḫatti, i.e. with the Lukka lands in the wider sense; an unknown mountain, conventionally transcribed (MONS)IUDEX(?).QUINQUE¹², whose name and location may only be supposed; the land of Tarḫuntašša. If we refer CAPUT.VIR not to Šuppiluliuma but to his adversary, the text would describe the very quick reconquest — apparently within one season — by the Hittite king not concerning generic and different rebellions in the territories included in the west and south-east areas but against a single, well identified, enemy who was attempting to weaken Šuppiluliuma's power.

f) CAPUT.VIR is mentioned in three passages that connect him to the three areas of rebellion: §5, §11, §15a¹³. We may interpret this term, that appears in the first position in every clause, as the subject of the action or in dative-case, as the person to whom Šuppiluliuma takes away the territories. In any case, two powers are opposed in the three above mentioned passages: Šuppiluliuma, after describing his victories in general terms in the lines preceding these passages, respectively, underlines that the enemy is always the same, CAPUT.VIR. It's CAPUT.VIR who seized all the wide area that Šuppiluliuma has now to reconquer. We may suppose that, starting from Tarḫuntašša, that was in his hands although as a vassal state of Ḫatti, CAPUT.VIR moved to north-west starting from Ikuna, at the border with his kingdom, reaching at last Wiyanawanda. Šuppiluliuma must in fact travel along a reverse route for the reconquest. The location of (MONS)IUDEX(?).QUINQUE is more questionable. A location between the Lukka lands and Tarḫuntašša follows only from its mention in the intermediate position. However, we could figure an alternative location next to the north-eastern borders of Tarḫuntašša, in an attempt of encirclement of Ḫatti by CAPUT.

¹¹ In §1a. they are generally defined as "all the land(s)", but in §5 it is specified that they are "taken away to the frontiers of Ḫatti".

¹² For a discussion on this name and the possibility of the rendering of the signs syllabically, logographically or *rebus*-writing see Hawkins 1995, 39 f.

¹³ §5 CAPUT.VIR HATTI REGIO *430 FINES-zi/a HATTI *416-wa/i-ní zi/a ARHA CAPERE — §11 CAPUT.VIR (MONS)IUDEX(?).QUINQUE zi/a-la HATTI PUGNUS.PUGNUS — §15a CAPUT.VIR TONITRUS(URBS) REGIO INFRA á-ka.

VIR¹⁴. Šuppiluliuma launches an attack first to the west and then to the east and finally brings the finishing stroke within Tarḫuntašša.

g) Who was CAPUT.VIR? In my opinion he is not anyone else than Hartapu. A possible confirmation of this, beside the identification of CAPUT.VIR with VIR, can be obtained from the combined evidence of Šuppiluliuma's and Hartapu's inscriptions. The Südburg inscription starts with the reconquest by Šuppiluliuma, with the favour of the Gods of Ḫatti, of "all the land(s)", whose five names – Wiyanawanda, Tamina, Masa, Luka, Ikuna – are specified. We are likely dealing with a geographical area extending, in classical terms, from northern Pisidia (Masa) to western and central-southern Lycia (Wiyanawanda and Luka) and as far as Lycaonia (Ikuna)¹⁵. The location of Masa in this area rather than towards the north-west of Anatolia seems to be confirmed by some Cuneiform texts as well, where it is linked with Lukka¹⁶. Following a recent interpretation by Poetto¹⁷ the place-name Masa occurs in a Hartapu's inscription also, KIZILDAĞ 4. In this text Hartapu, after presenting himself, with his titles and genealogy, is proud of the conquest, with the favour of the celestial Storm-god and all the gods, of every land (and/namely)¹⁸ of the conquest of the country of Masa¹⁹. The two considered passages show an almost specular structure and, in my opinion, refer to two connected events. KIZILDAĞ 4 precedes SÜDBURG and describes the conquest that Hartapu realized moving from Tarḫuntašša to west and north-west, reducing the borders of Ḫatti. On the other side SÜDBURG tells the later reconquest by Šuppiluliuma who, in the first stage of his campaign, starting from the areas more distant from Tarḫuntašša comes to the previous boundaries of Ḫatti, restoring his authority as far as Ikuna.

¹⁴ On this point see also in the following, p. 238.

¹⁵ Hawkins 1995, 54 ff.

¹⁶ For a survey of the proposed locations of Masa see recently Poetto 1998, 473, nn. 28, 29. Poetto hypothesizes (p. 473) that the Masa were not a stably-settled population, characterized by a certain mobility, at least in the course of time.

¹⁷ Poetto 1998, 469 ff.

¹⁸ Probably the clause of the conquest of Masa is a specification of the more generical "all lands": we find a parallel proceeding in SÜDBURG where the five place-names specify "all lands".

¹⁹ The inscription is concluded by another clause, that probably repeats in resumptive fashion what has been said before: according to the interpretation of Poetto 1998, 469, 471 f., we read that MAGNUS.REX VIR *416-*wani* VITELLUS*285 (we note that with the exception of MAGNUS.REX these titles are not present in the aedicula of Hartapu) "took all the territory by (the grace of) celestial Storm-God".

h) A reference to the expansion of Hartapu also to the north-east, that is argued from his inscription at Burunkaya, could be recognized — even if only on speculative ground — in the reconquest by Šuppiluliuma of (MONS)IUDEX(?).QUINQUE, of unknown location. I think that the possibility of a location of this mountain in the same area of BURUNKAYA is not to be discarded. I have just proposed before²⁰ this alternative location next to the north-eastern borders of Tarḫuntašša, supposing that the campaign of Šuppiluliuma had the purpose primarily to bring the Tarḫuntašša boundaries back to the situation ratified in the treaties with Ḫatti, and then to defeat Hartapu definitively eliminating all of his designs of expansion to the detriment of Ḫatti, with a direct control of Ḫatti on Tarḫuntašša.

If the above conclusions are on the whole correct, when the Hittite Empire felt under the strokes of the Sea Peoples and other enemies Tarḫuntašša did not exist anymore as an independent kingdom. The inscriptions of Hartapu don't provide information to fill the period after the collapse of the Hittite power, but only record a rebellion against the royal family of Ḫatti led by a descendent of Muwatalli who, as previously Kurunta, had legitimate aspirations for an Imperial throne. As far as we know presently, it's only starting from the 8th century B.C. with the Hieroglyphic inscriptions of kings of Tabal that we have new direct informations from the central-southern area of Anatolia.

Bibliography

Dinçol, A.M / Dinçol, B.

- 1985 "Neue hethitische Hieroglyphensiegel in den Museen zu Ankara und Mersin", *Akkadica* 45, 33-40.

Gonnet, H.

- 1984 "Nouvelles données archéologiques relatives aux inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de Hartapusa à Kızıldağ", in: *Archéologie et Religions de l'Anatolie Ancienne. Mélanges ... Paul Naster*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 119-125.

Hawkins, J.D.

- 1992 "The Inscriptions of the Kızıldağ and the Karadağ in the light of the Yalbur Inscription", in: H. Otten et al., *Hittite and other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, 259-275.
- 1995 *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattuša SÜDBURG* (StBoT Beiheft 3), Wiesbaden.

²⁰ See 236.

Jasink, A.M.

- 2001 "Il ruolo di Tarhuntašša da Muwatalli II a Šuppiluliuma II", in: *Studi in onore di P. Fronzaroli* (in press).

Mellaart, J.

- 1974 "Western Anatolia, Beycesultan and the Hittites", in: *Mélanges Mansel I*, Ankara, 493-536.

Mora, C.

- 1990 *La glittica anatolica del II millennio a.C.: classificazione tipologica - I. I sigilli a iscrizione geroglifica* (StudMed 6, Primo supplemento), Pavia.

Poetto, M.

- 1993 *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalburt* (StudMed 8), Pavia.
1998 "Traces of geography in Hieroglyphic Luwian Documents of the Late Empire and Early Post-Empire Period (Boğazköy-Südburg and Kızıldağ IV): the case of *Masa*", in: S. Alp / A. Süel (eds.), *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, September 16-22)*, Ankara, 469-479.

Singer, I.

- 1996 "Great Kings of Tarhuntašša", *SMEA* 38, 63-71.