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Abstract

Cilicia is a well defined geographical region in south-west Turkey, consisting of a large fertile plain surrounded by mountain ranges and bordering on the Mediterranean sea in the south.

The archaeological importance of Cilicia has been established by extensive surveys and some excavations. The large number of settlement mounds located, clearly outline the trade/communication routes which traverse the plain from east to west and north to south.

An important development in the study of Hittite historical geography has been the identification of Kizzuwatna, frequently mentioned in Hittite records, with the province of Cilicia. At the same time it is thought that Kizzuwatna extended into the mountainous area of the Anti-Taurus to the north, a theory primarily based on the equation of the Hittite city Kummanni with classical Comana and a series of Hittite rock reliefs in the same region.

The study explores the cultural relations of the Cilician plain with the mountain areas in the north, considering aspects of seasonal movements, the exploitation of metal sources, the ceramic evidence, as well as the epigraphic contents of the Hittite rock reliefs.

The political relationship of Kizzuwatna with Hatti and its N.Syrian neighbours forms the essential part of the thesis and a re-assessment of the historical sources has been attempted. The study traces the historical development from the formation of an independant kingdom in Cilicia towards the end of the Hittite Old Kingdom to the annexation of Kizzuwatna in the Early Empire period.

The primary sources for the kingdom of Kizzuwatna are a series of treaties concluded with Hatti which illustrate the role of Kizzuwatna as a buffer state.
between the Hittites and their chief opponent Hurri/Mittani.

The uncertainties regarding the chronological order of the treaties, and hence the sequence of Kizzuwatnean kings, are examined on the basis of text dating criterion, as well as on the stylistic evidence of the so-called Tabarna seals. It is generally accepted that Kizzuwatna was finally absorbed into the Hittite state during the time of Suppiluliuma I, but cumulative textual evidence presented here suggests that the annexation and hence the dating of the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5) predates the reign of Suppiluliuma I.
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Introduction

An important landmark in the study of Hittite geography has been the identification of Kizzuwatna with a sizeable territory in south-east Anatolia of which Cilicia formed the essential part. The extension of Kizzuwatna into the Anti-Taurus region is generally accepted and primarily based on the equation of Hittite Kummanni with classical Comana.

The textual and archaeological evidence point to the role of Kizzuwatna/Cilicia as a receiver and transmitter of cultural material and concepts, acting as a land-bridge between the Anatolian plateau and N.Syria.

From the archaeological point of view, cultural elements can be traced as coming alternatively from the Anatolian plateau as well as Syria reflecting, no doubt, the Hurro/Luwian mixed elements which are so evident in the texts of Kizzuwatna.

At the same time, it should be stressed that the mountain ranges of the Taurus and Amanus form a natural barrier which encouraged regional development of archaeological material and, according to the textual sources, a fusion of cultural elements, developing into religious concepts which can be termed "Kizzuwatnean".

The thesis had originally been planned with the view of adopting an interdisciplinary approach in which equal prominence would be given to the archaeological and historical data and to present the material in two separate parts. It had been intended to incorporate the unpublished material of the Cilician survey, undertaken by the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara under Seton-Williams, in conjunction with a re-assessment of the Cilcian MBA/LBA sequence. Unfortunately, the survey pottery could no longer be located in the Adana Museum where it had been deposited in 1951 by the survey team. We have, however, made extensive use of the information contained in the initial report published in Anatolian Studies 1953.

The other aim was to establish how the Cilician plain related culturally to the Anti-Taurus region. This has been partly achieved by recording the second millennium survey.
material collected by G.H. Brown in the Anti-Taurus, the summary results of which are presented here, and secondly by including a discussion on the Hittite Anti-Taurus rock reliefs which relate directly to Kizzuwatna.

The archaeological data which is set out in Chapter I is primarily intended to provide the cultural background for the historical material which forms the major part of this study.

The archaeological investigation has been restricted to the ceramic evidence; apart from a general outline of the MBA/LBA Cilician sequence, it has been attempted to re-assess the pottery of LBA I levels at Tarsus which fall into a period associated with the kingdom of Kizzuwatna.

Furthermore, it is hoped, that the highlighting of the geographical aspects of the region, and in particular the distribution of settlement mounds in Cilicia, will contribute to the better understanding of the historical geography of Kizzuwatna.

Since the publication of A. Goetze's admirable monograph "Kizzuwatna and the Problem of Hittite Geography" where he assembled and discussed most sources available at the time, additional textual material, which bears on the Kizzuwatna question, has come forward from Boğazköy and Alalah. Furthermore, Hittite studies have been widened by investigations into the palaeography and linguistic development of Hittite texts, which has effected the interpretation and historical assessment of some documents concerning Kizzuwatna. Although the history has been sketched on occasions, this has mainly been done on a peripheral basis while discussing Hittite history. A joint treatment and reappraisal of the historical sources for Kizzuwatna seems therefore appropriate.

The texts dealt with in this study have been restricted to those pertaining to the kingdom of Kizzuwatna; not included is the period of its existence as a geographical region and administrative centre after Kizzuwatna's annexation into the Hittite state.

The method of approaching the historical data is basically a chronological one. Chapter III outlines the
political history of Cilicia in the Old Kingdom and tries to determine the point in time at which the kingdom of Kizzuwatna came into being.

The corpus of treaties, the only primary sources for the state of Kizzuwatna, is treated in Chapter IV which includes an analysis of the internal and external evidence of the texts and discusses the problems of their chronological order.

The remaining historical data relevant to the history of Kizzuwatna is examined in the framework of the Early Empire period, followed by a discussion on the dating of the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5) and Kizzuwatna's subsequent annexation into the Hittite state.

Since the study in hand deals with archaeological as well as historical aspects, the volume of bibliographical source material incorporated in it is rather large. For this reason some of the sources are quoted with their full reference in the text and were not entered in our bibliography.
Chapter I

Cilicia and the Anti-Taurus: Aspects of the Archaeology in the Second Millennium B.C.

1(a). The Geographical and Cultural Background

Cilicia has been the subject of detailed investigations by a number of early geographers and travellers whose accounts and observations are still a valuable source of information. The first researches into the prehistory of Cilicia were undertaken by E. Gjerstad, H. Goldman and J. Garstang in the 1930s, after which Tarsus and Mersin were chosen for excavation.

Cilicia is a well defined geographical region in south-east Anatolia bordering on the Mediterranean sea in the south. The large fertile plain is separated from adjoining areas by formidable mountain barriers which are formed by the Taurus in the west and north-west, the Anti-Taurus to the north and the Amanus range in the east.

Greek sources distinguished between Cilicia Pedias (Cilician "Plain") and Cilicia Tracheia ("Rough" Cilicia), the mountainous terrain to the west (Strabo XIV. 5.1), which correspond approximately to the areas occupied by the countries Que and Hilakku in the Neo-Assyrian period and Hume and Pirindu in Neo-Babylonian times (Houwink ten Cate 1961, 17ff; Hawkins forthcoming). Indeed, Greek Kilikia is a derivation of Assyr. Hilakku but the former designated a much larger area than the latter, as indicated above (Hawkins, R1A IV, 402f).

The Cilician plain itself, although basically homogenous, can also be divided into two geographical regions: the Lower or Western plain and the Upper or Eastern plain. They are separated by the Misis Daği, a low spur of the Amanus which meets the foothills of the Anti-Taurus in the region of Misis (Mopsuhestia, Ramsay
1903, 358). Through the defile of the two mountain ridges flows the Ceyhan. Furthermore, while the western part is uniformly flat, the plain in the east rises to 85m and is interrupted by isolated crags. The rich alluvium deposited by the three major rivers, the Ceyhan (Pyramos), the Seyhan (Saros) and the Tarsus Çayı (Cydnus) are largely responsible for the formation of the Cilician plain, which forms one of the most fertile regions in Turkey. The alluvial soils are easily cultivated, offering opportunity for intensive agriculture which in turn has favoured urban development. The continuous and dense occupation of Cilicia since prehistoric times must be sought in the favourable environment which the region offered. The climate is greatly affected by the Taurus ranges which hold off the cold air masses of the Anatolian plateau, hence winters are mild and rainy. The summers are dry and oppressively hot, but the rivers which have their sources in the mountains never dry up. In contrast, in the Taurus and Anti-Taurus regions summers are pleasantly cool and winters cold. In November snow begins to cover the peaks and passes are frequently blocked during the winter months (Admir. Hb., 82; Erzen 1940, 14ff; Rother 1972, 10f).

The Cilician Taurus forms the highest part of the Taurus range, rising to a height of 3700m. Between the Bolkardağları and the Aladağ lies the gap of the Cilician Gates (Gülek Boğazı). The Cilician Anti-Taurus consists of two great parallel ridges running north-south which cut the Taurus roughly at right angles. In the west the Zamanti river separates the Aladağ from the Anti-Taurus while in the east the course of the Ceyhan forms the division between the two mountain systems of the Anti-Taurus and the Amanus. Since the alignment of the Anti-Taurus ranges are north-south, the passes (there are six) run in an east-west direction (Admir. Hb., 66ff).

An important aspect of the interaction between the plain and the Taurus ranges is the seasonal movement of nomadic and semi-nomadic communities. The mountain regions, cut by deep valleys, offer rich summer pastures
which have traditionally induced nomadic movements and at the same time provided an escape from the intense heat of the plain during the summer months. Dwellers of the plain move with their livestock to the mountain yaylas where they encamp from June to September (Admir.Hb., 34, 86, 89f; Erzen 1940, 7; Eberhard 1953, 37f; see also below).

The Coastline

The Cilician coastline must have undergone considerable changes since the 2nd millennium. The constant accumulation of alluvium deposited by the above mentioned rivers has pushed the coast further and further out to sea. The coast of the Cilician plain which stretches from the Lamassu to the gulf of Iskenderun does not offer any good natural harbours. The only major port today is Mersin which is relatively unprotected and open to the prevailing southerly winds during the winter months. The uninterrupted flatness of the coastline and continuous silting up of the estuaries, no doubt, affected shipping already in ancient times. Strabo remarks on the silting of the Pyramos and quotes an oracle which prophesied that the beaches of the Pyramos river would reach Cyprus in time to come (XII.2.4).

This raises the question of ancient harbours along the Cilician coast. In the west, the coast between Anamur and Mersin (Rough Cilicia) has a number of sheltered bays and inlets which provide safe anchorages. The most prominent is the port of Taşucu (Silifke), near the estuary of the Göksu (Calycadnus) which is commonly equated with the coastal town of Ura of Hittite and Ugarit records (RGTC 6, 457f). The coastal plain begins to widen at Mersin and in this region a cluster of coastal sites were first investigated by Garstang (see below). Near the site and village of Kazanlı, 7 km east of Mersin, remains of an old port have been located, but how far it goes back in antiquity is not known (Admir.Hb., 134; see map 2). Rather more information is
available for Tarsus which was connected to the sea and is known to have functioned as a harbour city. Strabo reports that the Cydnus (Tarsus Çay) was navigable and flowed through the city of Tarsus. The harbour lay a few kilometres south-west of the city on a lagoon which was fed by natural springs and the Cydnus (Strabo XIV.5.10).

The re-routing of the Cydnus in the late Roman period is thought to have been responsible for the sanding up of the lagoon which consequently led to the decline of Tarsus as a harbour city (Rother 1972, 30; Erzen 1940, 12,16f). There is no textual evidence that Hittite Tarsa which survived as class. Tarsus (Assyr. Tarzi) functioned as a port. It is, however, very likely that also in the second millennium, ships sailed up the Tarsus river to off-load their goods and seek shelter from a mainly unprotected coast, particularly as the silting of the river would have been less acute than in Roman times and the coastline much closer to the city. There is, on the other hand, relatively little evidence for maritime contact amongst the archaeological remains at Tarsus, except for the Mycenaean LH IIIC pottery (see sect. 2(c)). From the gulf of Mersin the coastline runs south-east towards the cape of Karataş where a limestone ridge runs down from the Misis Dağ forming a small protected harbour, the location of the ancient port of Magarsus (Ramsay 1903, 361; Erzen 1940, 13). The Ceyhan (Pyramos) which hugs the western edge of the Misis Dağ in its lower reaches, makes a 90° turn to the east and flows into the gulf of Iskenderun. From the head of the gulf a series of sites reach down to the small harbour Yumurtalık (Ayas) (Cil.Surv., Fig. 1). At Payas, on the east coast of the gulf of Iskenderun, the plain narrows as the Amanus chain sweeps down to the sea. Modern shipping today makes for the commercial port of Iskenderun.
1(b) Communication Routes (maps 2 and 3)

Cilicia has frequently been described as a landbridge between the Anatolian plateau and Syria. The main thoroughfare, which leads through the Cilician Gates in the Taurus across the plain towards the Amanus passes, has been in use for millennia (Erzen 1940, 25f). Communication routes follow the natural contours of the land and by tradition rarely change their course. This fact was perfectly demonstrated by the results of the Cilician Survey. Sites were plotted according to period (Neolithic/Chalcolithic - Roman) on a series of distribution maps and the settlement patterns which emerged show a remarkable degree of conformity (Figs. 2-6).9

From Tarsus, which controlled the southern approach of the Cilician Gates,10 the route to the Amanus passes is clearly outlined by a series of large mounds (among smaller ones) - Misis (11), Sirkeli (65), Mercin (12), Boz Hüyük (25) Sultan Tepe (7), all of which were occupied in the second millennium (see map 2). The above route would also have been used by traffic which reached the Cilician plain from the direction of Rough Cilicia via the Göksu valley and along the narrow coastal strip11 (see below 2(b)). Mersin-Yümük Tepe, Kazanlı (78) and neighbouring sites Çavuşlu (81) Tirmil (19) controlled this western route and at the same time marked the western boundary of the Cilician plain (Garstang 1953, 3).

Between Tarsus and Adana at Zeytinli (14) a southern route in the direction of Karataş is indicated by a series of höyük - Paşa Höyük I (138), Höyük (140), Alyahanem (131) on the Seyhan (see below), Tenevardi I (115), Yenice Höyük (118), Nergis (104), Domuz Tepe (74),12 situated mainly to the west of the modern Adana-Karataş road.

In traversing the plain two major rivers have to be crossed, the Seyhan and the Ceyhan. The main crossing of the former lies at Adana. The name is undoubtedly a survival of Hittite Adaniya but so far the town has not
revealed any remains predating the Hellenistic period. Hittite Adaniya occurs as a province as well as a town (see ch.III.1, 2) and could therefore be located at one of the mounds in the vicinity of Adana. However, since Adaniya is mentioned in connection with a bridge in a Hittite annal text (ch.V.2(b)), it must be sought on the river, i.e. the Seyhan (= Hitt. Samri, see ch.IV.7). The only candidates to fulfill this requirement are Velican (75) 12 km north of Adana (considered too small by the Cil.Survey) and Alyahanem (131) c.20km south-west of Adana. The latter is a large mound and was thought to have controlled a former crossing of the Seyhan (Cil.Surv., 148). A location of Adaniya at Alyahanem would, however, mean that the Tarsus-Misis route ran much further south than today. On the other hand, to locate the Hittite city at Adana itself is still a possibility. The sondage which was made on the ancient mound of Tepebağ in the old city can hardly be taken as conclusive evidence that pre-Hellenistic settlements did not exist. Earlier remains may well be masked by those of later periods, but equally may have been washed away by the Seyhan, as suggested by J.Mellaart (personal communication).

The crossing of the Ceyhan lies at Misis (Roman bridge), one of the most important mounds in the plain with occupational deposits of all periods (Cil. Surv., 164f; Bossert 1950, 122ff, Tab.III Abb. 4). While Misis is situated at the western end of the Misis Dağ defile, Sirkeli, a major Hittite site, guarded the eastern end, and both sites controlled the passage from the Lower/Western plain to the Upper/Eastern plain.

The greatest concentration of hûyüks exists on the approaches to the Bahçe pass (in the Amanus), in the area where the main east-west route and the road to Kadirli form a triangle. The region is not only of strategic importance but also well watered by the Ceyhan and hence intensely cultivated. Among a number of small sites there are several impressive settlement mounds which are the largest in the eastern plain and must represent towns
of some importance. Most noteworthy are Boz Hüyük (25), on the direct route to the Bahçe pass, Tatarlı (39), a multi period site including Hittite and Assyrian, Minareli (41), an imposing hüyük near the Ceyhan, 5km north-east of Tatarlı (Cil.Surv., 144, 137, see also ch.III.1 and n.15).

The above region not only controls the approaches to the Bahçe pass but lies at the crossroads of other road systems. Towards the north Mercin (12) Yarım (13) Tilan (141) and Tarmil (50) identify the road leading to Kozan and Feke in the foothills of the Anti-Taurus, while Ceyhan II (24), Kücük Çiftlik (33) Pascu (35) Samsin (82) indicate a north-east route towards Kadirli.

To the south a row of mounds mark a track to Ayas on the coast with Ada Tepe II (62) Hesigin (64) at the entrance of the Misis Dağ pass and Soyali (63), a large mound with mainly Hittite occupation at the south end of the pass, followed by Hamzali (95) Yeniköy II (90). The other route leading south is the coastal road along the Amanus to the Beilan pass indicated by Sultan Tepe (7), Kara Hüyük (147), Kinet Hüyük (6), Kara Ağacı (4). However, the Cil.Surv. report remarked on the lack of sites in this region and emphasized the greater importance of the Bahçe pass over the Beilan pass (p.144)."

An additional route to the Cilician plain from the Anatolian plateau (no longer used by modern traffic) is through the Anti-Taurus passes via Feke and Kozan, but it should be stressed that this is unsuitable terrain for wheeled traffic (for details see sect. 4 below). Two other tracks which link eastern Cilicia with Göksun in the Anti-Taurus were located during a series of explorations by the team engaged in the excavations of the Iron Age hill fort of Karatepe and described in great detail by U.B. Alkim (1950, 549ff; 1959, 207ff). The western route runs from Anavarza, Kadirli, through the Bağdaş and Mazgaç passes to Göksun. The second route further east is the so-called Akyol (white road) on which Karatepe lies. It reaches Göksun by way of Andarin, Geben and the
Meryemcil pass.\textsuperscript{15} Most of the ancient remains lining the above routes belong to the Roman and medieval periods. There is consequently no firm indication that they were already used in the second millennium. The roads are, however, still followed today by the inhabitants of the Cilician plain who go up to their summer quarters. Significantly, the road from Andarin to Göksun is known as Göç Yolu (nomad road), testifying to the long standing seasonal movements between the plain and the mountains (Alkim 1950, 559; 1959, map 3, see above and ch.IV.6(d)).

1(c). Metal Sources

The mountain ranges bordering on the Cilician plain are rich in metal ore deposits, in particular the Bolkardag and Aladağ in the Taurus which is the best known area for existing metal resources as well as ancient mine workings.\textsuperscript{16}

Kizzuwatna has long been linked with Hittite metal industry, mainly on the basis of the much discussed letter CTH 173 written by Hattusili III to an Assyrian king in which he refers to iron in the E M4KISIB in the city of Kizzuwatna. The request for "good iron", which had been made by the addressee, is answered to the effect that the desired metal is not available in the Kizzuwatna "seal house" at present, but when it became available it would be duly dispatched.\textsuperscript{17} Much has been inferred from this statement as to the location of Kizzuwatna and its iron producing capabilities. However, the text does not make clear whether Kizzuwatna was the place of production as well as distribution.

Cilicia, as a source of iron which was imported into Babylonia, is also mentioned in a number of economic texts of the Neo-Babylonian period.\textsuperscript{18}

Major iron ore deposits in the mountain ranges surrounding the Cilician plain occur in three locations: 1) In the Anti-Taurus between the Zamanti and the Göksu
river, as well as in the Beyrut Dağ, east of Göksun. Neither sources have been explored and communication routes in the former region are said to be difficult.

2) In the Amanus mountains, with a concentration of iron ore beds east of Payas which have been known for some time. 3) In the Taurus ranges which reach down to the coast between Silifke and Anamur (MTA 1964, 48f, 53f; MTA 1975, 89f). There have been no reports of ancient mine workings in any of the above locations.

Much more information is available for the Bolkardağ region which has been explored and mined over a long period. The district is primarily known for its silver-lead deposits, some of the richest in the Near East, which were already exploited in antiquity. Considerable amounts of slag were located at Madenköy, Kildere and Gümüş in the Bolkardağ, some of which is thought to be ancient (MTA 1972, 104f; de Jesus 1980, 64f).

A detailed survey of the Bolkardağ mining district, which lies 15 km south-west of Çiftehan and c.20 km north of the Cilician Gates, is currently being carried out by a Turkish team. Their investigation involves the locating of archaeological sites and ancient mining installations, but the main objective has been to locate and sample the ores of ancient silver mines with the view of gaining an insight into the evolution of metallurgical technology over the millennia (Yener and Özbal 1986, 309ff; Yener 1986, 469ff). Some thirty archaeological sites and mines have been traced in the district in the first two seasons (1983, 1984). It was found that the pottery collected was primarily of Iron Age date but a cluster of prehistoric sites were found at the entrance of the mining valley (Maden dere) near the road leading to the Cilician Gates (Yener and Özbal 1986, Table 29.1 and map Fig. 29.2; Yener 1986, 471f).

The exploitation of the Bolkardağ silver mines may have its earliest textual attestation in a text from Mesopotamia. The "silver mountains" which Sargon reached
while campaigning in Syria, according to a text of the Agade period (c.2370-2290 B.C.), are thought to refer to the silver deposits of the Taurus (Gadd, CAH vol.I, ch.XIX, 425f).

More precise and positively identifiable with the Bolkardağ range are the references of the Neo-Assyrian period. The annalistic accounts of Shalmaneser III report that in the year 837 the Assyrian king, after receiving tribute from the kings of Hatti and Melid (Malatya), advanced across Mount Timur (Anti-Taurus) to Tabal (south-east corner of the Anatolian plateau) whose cities he destroyed. Shalmaneser then proceeds southwards to Mount Tunni the "silver mountain" and Mount Muli the "alabaster mountain," probably both to be located in the Bolkardağ mountain range. It is assumed that he continued south into Que via the Cilician Gates, although the relevant lines are not preserved in the text (Bing 1969, 176ff; Hawkins, CAH vol.III, prt.1, 394; Michel 1947-52, 61 and n.19, n.20).

Of considerable interest, in the context of silver mining, is the Neo-Hittite Hieroglyphic rock inscription of Bulgarmaden situated c.400 m above the village of Alihoca. The inscription is significant on two accounts. The author is Tarhunazas, a vassal of Warpalawas (738-710 B.C.) of Tuwana (class. Tyana) who states that his overlord granted him the sacred Mount Muti to whose deities yearly sacrifices are offered. Presumably Mount Muti designates part of the Bolkardağ and the location of the inscription probably indicates the south-east boundary of Tuwana, i.e. the northern approaches to the Cilician Gates.

The second significant aspect of the rock inscription is the reference to silver in the text. The sign for "silver" in hieroglyphic Luwian has recently been identified by J.D. Hawkins in connection with the verb "to sell" as attested in the Bulgarmaden inscription. The context in which the "silver" sign occurs in Bulgarmaden in another clause has led to the suggestion that the term "CHISEL.SILVER"
(-)suhapan(a)t-, a word not attested elsewhere, stands for "silver mine." This would fit well with the findings of the above mentioned survey which located remains of smelting furnaces, slag and pottery of Iron Age date only a short distance from the rock inscription (Yener and Özbal 1986, 316).

The sources of tin for the production of bronze in the Ancient Near East have long been a puzzle and the subject of numerous discussions. One of the most startling results of the Bolkardag mining district project has been the discovery of stannite tin in the sampled ores (Yener and Özbal 1987, 220ff). A high concentration of tin is reported from the eastern slopes of the Bolkardag near the Sulucadere valley, in association with galena and zinc (op.cit., Fig.1) The high level of tin is also reflected in the slag collected from all over the region, providing at the same time evidence for smelting activities in the mining valley.

The survey has revealed beyond doubt that significant amounts of tin were available in the Bolkardag and the need for seeking external sources for early Anatolian tin-bronzes has been considerably diminished. Future analysis of trace elements in tin-bronze artifacts will show in how far the Bolkardag served as a source of tin over the millennia (op. cit., 223ff).

In the above context we note that tin from Kizzuwatna features in two inventory texts (Košak 1982, 77ff). Relatively small amounts of tin (12 shekels and 3 minas 12 shekels respectively) are listed among large quantities of silver and copper as tribute (mandattu) provided by the town of Kizzuwatna for the Hittite state. Needless to say, the texts give no indication as to the source of the tin.
2. The Pottery Sequence of the Middle and Late Bronze Age in Cilicia

Introduction

The great importance and richness of Cilicia as a cultural province has been clearly demonstrated by the survey work discussed above and yet archaeologically the province is not very well known. At present our knowledge of Cilicia's archaeological sequence rests entirely on the excavation results of Tarsus (Goldman, Tarsus II & III) and Mersin (Garstang 1953).31 Both mounds are situated in the Western plain (c.25 km apart) and the material they produced, not surprisingly, shows a high degree of similarity. Furthermore, at both sites only a limited area was investigated.

Mention should be made, however, of a rescue excavation recently undertaken at Domuztepe, prior to the completion of the Aslantaş Dam Project in north-east Cilicia.

The material remains, when fully evaluated, should show whether east Cilicia developed on the same lines as the west, or whether regional differences existed within the plain. The preliminary reports have revealed, however, that Domuztepe had a long sequence of occupation which ranged from the Neolithic to the Iron Age and later. The excavators commented also on the extensive area which the first and second millennium settlement occupied and remarked on the great importance of Domuztepe to the historical geography of Cilicia (H. Çambel and M. Özdoğan 1984, 259ff; Çambel 1985, 273ff, 1986, 331ff). Domuztepe (now partly submerged) lies on (what was) the east bank of the Ceyhan directly opposite the Iron Age fort of Karatepe, well known for its hieroglyphic Luwian/Phoenician bilingual inscriptions (Hawkins RIA V, 409ff Karatepe A; Orthmann, ibid., 411ff Karatepe B). The function of Karatepe as a border fortress is stated in the text itself; it is likely that Domuztepe fulfilled a similar function in the second millennium.
The archaeological remains of Cilicia reflect what J. Garstang called "the ebb and flow of Oriental and Anatolian contact," an apt description for the alternating cultural influences which reached Cilicia from the west and east (1953, 209). Contacts with the west have become much clearer through the extensive surveys undertaken by J. Mellaart in the Konya plain (1958, 311ff; 1959, 31ff; 1963, 199ff) and not least by his excavations at Çatal Hüyük (1967). The results have put the Cilician material into a new perspective and have shown that much of the contact was maintained through the Göksu valley. This has to some extent been confirmed by the findings of the Göksu valley survey carried out by D. French who also underlined the close ties of the valley with Cilicia (1965, 186). Cultural links with the east have been stressed by M. Mellink who put much emphasis on the contacts of Cilicia with N. Syria and created the concept of a Syro-Cilician culture (1962, 219ff, 1962a, 34ff). While ties are strong at times, particularly in the early second millennium when the Amuq and Cilicia share the same painted pottery tradition, viewed as a whole this concept seems no longer justified.

A key site, regarding relations between central Anatolia and Cilicia is the mound of Porsuk (Zeyve Hüyük) which guards the northern entrance to the Cilician Gates. At present the earliest known level (I.V) belongs to the Late Bronze Age and ceramic links with Tarsus and Mersin are evident (S. Dupré 1983, passim).

A brief review of the prehistoric phases illustrates perfectly Cilicia's role as a land-bridge between the Anatolian plateau and N. Syria. During the Neolithic period links are closest with the Konya plain and cultural impulses arrive in Cilicia primarily through the Göksu valley (Mellaart, CAH vol.I ch.VII(b), 313; Mellink 1962, 220ff). The pendulum swings to the east in the Chalcolithic with the introduction of Halaf and 'Ubeid' pottery, widely distributed over the Cilician plain, but
contacts with the Konya plain are maintained (Mellaart, CAH vol.I ch.XVIII, 363ff). The onset of the Early Bronze Age period is marked by a ceramic change which indicates newcomers, this time from the Anatolian plateau. Characteristic of the period is a new "red gritty" ware with typical Anatolian shapes, including beak-spouted vessels and a slipped burnished ware (Mellaart 1963, 228ff; cp. Mellink 1962, 223). Contacts with the east are also evident by the appearance of wheelmade light clay bowls which did not reach the plateau (Mellaart, CAH vol.I. ch.XVIII, 397). After the widespread destruction of EB II sites, the intrusive culture which enters Cilicia is essentially that of Troy II. The events at the end of EB II suggest a major shift of population which has been linked with the arrival of Luwian population groups in south Anatolia (Mellaart, op.cit., 406ff).

2(a) The Middle Bronze Age Period in Cilicia: An Outline

Unlike most Anatolian regions where no cultural break is noted between EBA III and MBA, Cilicia suffered a major intrusion which appears to be connected with similar events in the Amuq (Mellink 1962, 226). Tarsus was severely burnt and there is a marked ceramic change (Tarsus II, 164). Similar observations were made by Garstang at Mersin (1953, 210).

Three major MBA building phases are reported from both sites, represented by levels XI-VIII at Mersin (ibid. 209ff) and at Tarsus 7.50m-6.00m in Section A (Tarsus II, 40ff, plans 16, 17, 18).32

The MBA wares of Tarsus and Mersin are a pleasing assemblage which consists, broadly speaking, of a variety of light clay wares with carefully finished surfaces, frequently burnished to a medium lustre. Vessels show a preference for carinated shapes. By far the most distinctive pottery in Cilicia during the MBA period is the so-called Syro-Cilician painted ware which was
equally widespread in the Amuq (Seton-Williams 1953, 57ff; Mellaart 1982, 28ff). It was found in large quantities at Tarsus and Mersin and the Cilician Survey reported an even distribution of this ware (Cil. Surv., 131ff). Syro-Cilician pottery could also be traced along the coast to the Göksu valley where it occurred at Maltepe (Mellaart 1958, 324, Fig.61; cp. D. French 1965, 185f). Examples of this painted pottery were found at Alalah in levels XVI-VIII (Woolley 1955, 340ff, Pl. LXXXIV-LXXXV ) and it occurred in phases K-L of the Amuq sequence (Tubb 1983, 50). At Alalah it was no longer found in level VII, the destruction of which can now be attributed with some confidence to Hattusili I which implies that at Alalah Syro-Cilician painted pottery predates the Old Kingdom (see ch.III.1).

The most characteristic patterns of the pottery are hatched triangles and the "butterfly" motif which are arranged in bands on the shoulder of vessels, as well as the "hawk-eye" design on the neck of trifoil-mouthed jugs.

Although Syro-Cilician painted pottery is most prominent in the early levels at Tarsus (7.50m-6.50m, Tarsus II, Figs. 287, 370) and Mersin (levels XI-IX, Figs. 143, 144, 148, Garstang 1953, 213ff), it continues to a lesser degree in later levels. At Tarsus the so-called Bronze Age House was considered the last of the MBA levels and Goldman remarks that it yielded some excellent pottery characteristic of the end of the MBA period (Tarsus II, 43, plans 17, 18). Only three vessels of the Bronze Age House are actually described in the catalogue (761, 882, 857), but among these is a Syro-Cilician painted "eye" jug (857). It would appear therefore that in Cilicia Syro-Cilician painted pottery continued to be made until the end of the Middle Bronze Age, as devised by Goldman, and indeed certain elements of this ware can still be found in the Late Bronze Age I period (see sect. 2(b)).

Syro-Cilician pottery has on occasions been linked
with Habur ware and with the entry of Hurrian population groups into the N. Syria and Cilicia (Seton-Williams 1953, 57, 61ff; Hrouda 1957, 28, 44). Recent studies have, however, expressed scepticism on both accounts. J. Tubb who made a detailed analysis of Syro-Cilician ware which he calls Amuq/Cilician, stated categorically that it bears no resemblance whatsoever to Habur ware. He also clarified the relation of Amuq/Cilician with the painted pottery tradition of Palestine (MB IIA) which he regards as contemporary, but as two separate groups (1983, 50ff, 55).

The study by D.L. Stein of Nuzi and Habur ware comes to the conclusion that there is no basis for accrediting either pottery to the Hurrians, mainly on the grounds of the antecedents of these wares and the lack of uniformity among the shapes and designs in the case of Habur ware (Assur 4/1 (1984), 25f, 27f, 29ff).

A valuable chronological link in the MBA period with Kültepe has been the discovery of Syro-Cilician painted pottery in karum IV and II which is thought to have originated in Cilicia. It formed the basis for Mellink's correlation of Kültepe level IV and II with Cilician MB I and MB II (1965, 119f). Although this clearly indicates contact between Cilicia and Kültepe, to our present knowledge, Cilicia appears to have been excluded from the activities of the Assyrian merchants and so was the Amuq (Mellaart 1982, 31). None of the Old Assyrian trade routes seem to have touched on the Cilician plain.

The publication of the Domuztepe material may confirm this or, indeed, provide new evidence for the relations of the Eastern plain with Old Assyrian trading centres of central Anatolia. The preliminary reports mention a large MBA settlement which covered most of the slope. It was surrounded by an extensive city-wall built in the case-mate technique which had at least two main building phases (Çambel and Özdoğan 1984, 265f; Çambel et al., 1985, 277).

The transition from the Middle to the Late Bronze
Age is archaeologically not clearly marked in Cilicia. Mellink's scheme of correlating Kültepe karum levels IV-Ia with Cilician MB I-IV does not easily fit the material as known from the Tarsus and Mersin sequence and has led to some confusion, a problem which is taken up in the following section.

2(b). The Late Bronze Age I Pottery from Tarsus

The presence of Middle Bronze Age features in the Late Bronze Age I pottery of Tarsus has been commented on by a number of writers, among them M. Mellink and F. Fischer (1963, 89f). M. Mellink has in fact advocated that some of the Tarsus LB I pottery may have to be reassigned to MB III-IV which she correlates with Kültepe karum level Ib (=MB III) and karum level Ia (=MB IV) up to the fall of Babylon. Both phases are considered transitional at Tarsus (1965, 118, 120). Goldman in her final report emphasized that there was no clear break between MBA and LBA levels at Tarsus and postulated a short transitional phase (Tarsus II, 46, 62).

Stratigraphy

The excavators described two building levels beneath the Hittite Temple of LB IIa and two on a terrace to the south of it (Section A) (p.44ff). The stratigraphical relationship between the two areas is not altogether clear. The lower level in the Temple area consisted of the so-called Late Bronze Age I House, a large building made up of a series of rooms grouped around a courtyard. Over the rooms A, C, G in the west lay the Pottery Storage Room (Plan 21). A number of badly preserved rooms made up the Earlier Terrace unit (Plan 19) which lay under the Later Terrace rooms. The latter is said to be contemporary with the Pottery Storage Room or, perhaps, a trifle later in time (ibid., 47). Both buildings back onto a terrace wall (Plan 20). The
Pottery Storage Room lay at a depth of about 1m below the west corner of the Temple wall (Goldman 1935, 537). It contained a mass of pottery from which more than thirty vessels could be reconstructed.

The LB I pottery at Tarsus is characterized, broadly speaking, by the survival of some Syro-Cilician - style painted ware and the marked increase of monochrome burnished wares of which a number of vessels show affinities with pottery from Central Anatolian sites of the karum Ib period. The evidence can to some degree be paralleled at Mersin where the continuation of Syro-Cilician - style pottery is still present in level VII but is almost totally displaced by monochrome burnished wares in level VI (Garstang 1953, Figs. 154, 155).

Examples of the dark-on-buff painted ware of Syrian character at Tarsus are the two-handled jars from the Earlier Terrace building (Fig.311:1044) and the Late Bronze Age I House (Fig.311:1045). Other examples of the transitional pottery are the bowl fragments with linear rim painting (Fig.302:992-995) and the beak-spouted jug (Fig. 309:1009), Syro-Cilician in decor but clearly of Anatolian shape.

Plain wares occur throughout, but are said to increase in the upper layers.

The most characteristic pottery in the LB I levels, however, is the monochrome burnished ware which is already well represented in the Earlier Terrace unit (Fig.307:1032, 1033 Fig.502:973, Fig.378:984), the level considered by H.Goldman as MB/LB transitional. Pots are either entirely or partially slipped and burnished and shapes are predominantly Anatolian. To the partially slipped and burnished category belongs the pithoi-based bath tub (Fig.310:1054) from the Later Terrace building. It can be paralleled at several karum sites but equally with the example (base only) from Korucutepe Phase I (Griffin 1980, PIs. 17E, 18P) and Beycesultan level 1 (Mellaart 1956, Fig. 6:7; idem. 1970, 65). Large rectangular tubs were still found in Tarsus LB IIa (Tarsus II, 204, not illustrated).
The Pottery Storage Room

A precise assessment of the LB I material at Tarsus is difficult to achieve as diagnostic pottery is frequently not clearly stratified. This is undoubtedly due to the extensive disturbance caused by the construction of the Hittite Temple in the level above and the effects of erosion in the Terrace area. The discovery of the Pottery Storage Room (which forms the second LB I level) in the Temple area has therefore been particularly valuable. Its importance lies in the fact that the contents can be regarded as a closed find which indicates that the entire pottery repertoire present was of contemporary use. It has been isolated from the catalogue and is presented in Fig. 1.

In this level the Syrian-style painted ware is no longer in existence. The collection is almost exclusively monochrome. The most favoured surface treatment is the partial slip and burnish. This technique is already employed in the previous levels on bowls in the Late Bronze Age I House (Fig. 376:961, Fig. 302:967) and the Early Terrace building (Fig. 302:973, Fig. 378:984). In fact the percentage of entirely red-slipped vessels is relatively low in LB I levels at Tarsus and seems to be primarily reserved for jugs.

Contents

A number of pottery shapes found in the Pottery Storage Room cannot be paralleled within the Tarsus sequence like the fruit-stands, four-handled bowls and funnels, but the red-slipped jug (Fig. 307:1030) with two bosses has identical counterparts from R.40 (Fig. 307:1032, 1033, 1034) of the previous level, indicating a continuous development.

The Pottery Storage Room contained ordinary kitchen wares (mainly plain) and more sophisticated vessels of the red-slipped and burnished type. With the possible
exception of the lentoid flask (1024) they appear to be of local manufacture.

Fruitstands (974-977) are well attested at Kültepe but there they usually occur with handles (K. Emre, Anatolia 7 (1963), Fig.7; T. Özugç 1986, 56, pls. 101, 102). Examples without handles come from Maşat level V (T. Özugç 1982, 108, Fig.65-66) and Beycesultan level II (Mellaart, AnSt. 5 (1955), 57 Fig.7:10).

Carinated bowls with four handles and rim-base have a close parallel at Maşat level V (T. Özugç 1982, Fig.43, Pl. 48:2). The Kültepe examples show similar profiles but have mostly inverted V-shaped handles (Emre op. cit., Fig.10). Carinated bowls without handles (972) continue into the Empire period at Boğazköy (Fischer 1963, 66, Pl.98) and Porsuk level V (Dupré 1983, Pls. 16-19).

The funnels (1061, 1062) have counterparts in Boğazköy IVd (karum period, Orthmann Boğazköy VI, Fig.21:196), Kültepe II (Emre op. cit., Fig.10) and Beycesultan where they first appear in level IV (MBA) and continue into LBA levels (Mellaart, AnSt 6 (1956), Fig.15:10).

The one-handled lentoid flask (1024) has its closest parallels at Kültepe where they are first introduced in level Ib but the circular band decoration makes the Tarsus example very distinct; but a similar counterpart comes from Beycesultan (LBA level Mellaart 1970, 63, Fig.3).

The red-rim slipped and burnished shallow bowl (962) can be matched among the reddish wares with red-rim decoration in the early phase of LB II at Tarsus (and level V at Mersin) and can be regarded as one of the few ceramic links to the Empire period level in Cilicia.37

While the karum affinities of this pottery assemblage are undoubtedly present, many of the shapes have later counterparts elsewhere.

The uninterrupted survival of karum Ib pottery, however, into the post-karum period is now becoming clear from central Anatolia. The discovery of an Old Hittite
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pottery assemblage in the Lower City level 3c at Boğazköy, where many shapes were direct descendants from the karum period, prompted the excavator to comment that if the pieces had been found out of context they would have been attributed to the karum period (Neve, Boğazköy VI, 63ff). A similar observation was made by T. Özgüç in his discussion of "Old Hittite" pottery from Inandik (1988, 77ff). As yet this cannot be demonstrated for sites in the Konya plain whence Cilicia received much of its cultural impulses. Karahüyük Konya has provided evidence for the MBA period only and since level V at Porsuk covers merely the Empire period (Dupré 1983), there is as yet no complete MB/LB sequence for the region which could demonstrate whether karum period shapes continued to be popular in LBA, as indeed was the case at Beycesultan (Mellaart 1970, 62ff).

The excavators interpreted the Late Bronze Age I House (which pre-dates the Pottery Storage Room) as an official residence and associated it with the Isputahsu bulla, although this was found between the west wall and the drain of the Hittite Temple (LB IIa), i.e. well above the LBA I House (Goldman 1935, 535). The bulla of Isputahsu who is known to have been king of Kizzuwatna in the time of Telipinu (see ch.III.4) was in fact one of the principal objects used for dating the LB I period for which a time span of 1650-1450 B.C. was proposed. Considering the circumstances of this find one must, however, question the validity of the bulla for dating purposes and certainly its association with the Late Bronze Age I House. Nevertheless, a date of c. 1650-1600 B.C. for the beginning of LB I seems correct; the increasing predominance of monochrome wares of central Anatolian origin can surely be interpreted in the light of Hittite expansionist policy which began in the reign of Hattusili I (see ch.III.1).

At Tarsus levels pre-dating LB IIa (Empire period) were only explored in one area (Section A). The ceramic change from LB I pottery to the plain "drab" wares of the
Temple level (IIa) does appear rather abrupt (Tarsus II, 203). H. Goldman speaks of two more building levels between 5.00m and 4.00m, the remains of which could not be reconstructed and were consequently not illustrated (ibid., 56). An earlier wall at 3.50m (below the Temple) can be seen in the Section A drawing (Plan 26) and on Plan 22 (already noted by Fischer 1963, 90 n. 106). This would indicate that three more building phases existed between the construction of the Temple and the Pottery Storage Room which may, at least in part, explain the noticeable ceramic change between LB I and LB II.

An important chronological link with Alalah is the distinctive white-filled incised and impressed Gray Ware from Tarsus (Fig. 314: 1086 - 1107). The most characteristic shapes are spindle bottles and goblets. Unfortunately none of this type of pottery is clearly stratified at Tarsus, but a number of pieces are reported as coming from the "Intermediate Level" below the Hittite Temple and Goldman remarks that it was probably not found in the earlier levels (Tarsus II, 185). At Alalah shapes are different from those of Tarsus but the technique and the decorative motives are very similar (Woolley 1955, 342ff, Pls. C, CI). It occurs here in level VI but mainly in level V, the second half of which is now thought to date to the reign of Idrimi and which ended in c. 1460 B.C.

Idrimi concluded a treaty on the mutual return of fugitives with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna (AT 3). The latter reigned most probably after Isputahsu and was a contemporary of Zidanza II of the Hittite Middle Kingdom (ch. III.2, ch. IV.3).

The correlation of the impressed Gray Ware at Tarsus (in the 4.00m-5.00m level(s)) with Alalah V provides a basis, if tentative, for the dating of the Pottery Storage Room of the preceding level for which a date of the second half of the Old Kingdom can be suggested.

Since the pottery items with karum Ib affinities cannot be isolated for re-dating purposes (Mellink 1965,
120) from the rest of the contents of the Pottery Storage Room, one must assume that at Tarsus karum Ib pottery tradition continued well into the Old Kingdom.

2(c). The Late Bronze Age II Pottery in Cilicia.

H. Goldman reported two main levels for the second Late Bronze Age phase LB IIa and LB IIb which were explored in Section A and B. LB IIa and level V at Mersin were completely destroyed by fire (Tarsus II, 49ff; Garstang 1953, 240). Mycenaean pottery of LH IIIC type was found in the succeeding level LB IIb (but not at Mersin) and it must be assumed that the newcomers who introduced this ware were responsible for the destruction of LB IIa buildings, including the "Hittite" Temple. Whether Hittite domination of Cilicia was brought to an end permanently or temporarily is unclear.42 At Tarsus the Mycenaean pottery was found together with Hittite monochrome ware which was also the case at Fraktin where a LH IIIC stirrup jar occurred with Empire period pottery (sect.4). LH IIIC sherds were also found at Domuz Tepe (74) in the sounding made by the American Expedition to Tarsus (Cil.Surv., 154). It was also collected from eight sites (eleven sites according to the distribution chart) during the Cilician Survey, mainly from coastal mounds and those on the routes to the north-east (Cil.Surv., 134f).43

The Mycenaean LH IIIC pottery from Tarsus (which is not discussed here) was re-assessed by E. French who concluded that its affinities lay with material from Cyprus and other sites in Cilicia (1975, 73f).

Other links with Cyprus are some white-slip II milk bowl fragments (Tarsus II, Fig.329:1248-52), but Goldman remarks on the relatively small amounts of imports at Tarsus (p.205). At Mersin fragments of Cypriot base-ring ware in level VI were replaced by milk bowls in level V, according to Garstang (1953, 242). Base-ring pottery is also reported from the Cilician Survey (but the sites on which it was found are not specified), as well as a local
imitation base-ring ware which is said to have been found with or without Hittite period material (p.134f). The latter ware has been identified by Mellaart as EBA metallic ware of the Konya plain and hence should be disregarded (1963, 228).

The monochrome pottery of LBIIa and b is described jointly in the catalogue, and Goldman states that no marked development could be detected within the sequence, except that LB IIa had more reddish wares than LB IIb in which drab colours prevailed (Tarsus II, 203).

The abrupt change from LB I to LB II wares has been mentioned above. There is a noticeable reduction in the ceramic repertoire in LB II and plain monochrome wares are now universally in use. Little attention is given to surface treatment and the majority of the pottery is described as "drab" (Tarsus II, 203).

Apart from these "drab" wares which are usually wet-smoothed and occasionally burnished, a certain percentage of pottery still received a red wash; red-rim bowls are still in use at Mersin level V (Garstang 1953, 243) and Tarsus LB IIa (Tarsus II, Fig. 318:1132-1133).

The decline of pottery tradition is equally marked at other LBA sites, except at Beycesultan (Mellaart 1970, 62ff) and to some extent Boğazköy where more sophisticated vessels exist side by side with the mass produced wares (Fischer 1963, Abb.18, passim). LBA sites do not only share a decline of ceramic skills but also a repertoire of shapes which is universal and includes shallow bowls, plates, lentoid flasks, trifoil jugs and miniature vessels. The reason for the uniformity of LBA pottery has been explained with Hittite political dominance over large parts of Anatolia, which included the Altinova in the east and Cilicia in the south (Mcqueen 1986, 102; Korbel 1985, 123).

In our view there seems no basis for the proposal by van Loon that the mass production of low-quality pottery originated in Kizzuwatna and spread to east Anatolia (1980, 276).
3. Second Millennium Survey Pottery from the Anti-Taurus Region: A Summary

The Cilician Anti-Taurus forms the natural barrier between central Anatolia and Cilicia and is an important area regarding the historical geography of Kizzuwatna as it is generally considered to have been part of Kizzuwatnean territory.

As stated above, the region can be reached from the Cilician plain by various routes (sect.1(b)) but is more easily accessible from the Konya plain in the west, the Kayseri area in the north and the Elbistan plain in the east (see map 3).

A comprehensive survey of the Anti-Taurus region was undertaken by G.H. Brown in the 1960s. It covered an area which can roughly be divided into three regions: (1) the Elbistan plain, (2) the mountainous terrain between Göksun and Fraktin, (3) a group of sites along the Pınarbaşı-Bünyan road, due east of Kayseri. The last region has been excluded here as it is considered to be well outside the sphere of the historical geography of Kizzuwatna.

The prehistoric pottery of the survey was comprehensively published by Brown in Anatolian Studies 1967, but the pottery of later date remains unpublished. Our request to study the Anti-Taurus material was granted, and the pottery considered to be of second millennium date was noted and drawn at the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, the summary results of which are presented here.45

Two of the sites which fall into the survey region were briefly excavated by T. Özgüç; the mound of Fraktin on the western edge of the Anti-Taurus (sect.4 below) and Karahüyük in the Elbistan plain (T. Özgüç, 1948). The most representative group of LBA survey sherds was in fact collected from these mounds.
(1) The Elbistan plain

A large part of Brown's survey was concentrated on the Elbistan plain, a well watered, fertile region surrounded by mountain ranges. It was crossed by the *Itinerarium Antonini* which led from Kayseri to Malatya via Comana (Şar) and Cocusos (Göksun) in Roman and Byzantine times (Hild 1977, 87ff, maps 6, 7; D. French 1988, Sivas sheet 341B). It has also been argued that the main Old Assyrian trade route to Kültepe passed through the Elbistan plain, having mounted the plateau from the direction of the Maraş region (Garelli 1963, 102ff; Hecker, ZA 70 (1980), 187; Mellaart 1982, 27).

The strategic situation and favourable environment of the Elbistan (= Arab. al bustan "garden") plain accounts for the great concentration of settlements. Brown located some 20 mounds of which 9 produced second millennium wares and a further 3 are possible candidates, according to our findings. The publication of the brief excavation conducted at Karahüyük (Elbistan) by T. and N. Özgüç in 1947 reports four building phases of the "Post-Hittite" period (1949, 66ff) and describes some pottery of the "Hittite" period (84ff). An important find of this excavation has been the discovery (in situ) of a stele which bears a well preserved hier. Luwian inscription dated to c.1100 B.C. (ibid. 69f, P1.XLIX). The text contains a royal dedication to the Storm-god of a country written with a "cup" sign POCULUM-ti-L 67 (reading uncertain) which is presumably a reference to the Elbistan plain itself (ch.III n.14, ch.V n.34).

(2) Leaving the Elbistan plain towards the west, the road follows the Göksun river in the direction of Göksun town which lies at a major cross-road. From here a route leads south-east to Maraş and another north to Yalak, Sariz and Pinarbaşı. Göksun has a substantial mound which is almost totally built over by the modern town. Although prehistoric pottery was well represented in Brown's survey collection, it contained no second millennium material.
(Brown 1967, 161), probably due to the masking of ancient remains by the modern settlement. The second millennium pottery collected at Yalak (13) is limited and not very representative of the period, but a good selection of LBA sherds came from Sariz (11).

The archaeological background and communication routes for the remaining area, i.e. the region between the Mağara district and Fraktin is discussed in the context of the Hittite rock reliefs in the following section.

The Pottery

The survey pottery has been classified according to wares, which is followed by a list of sites where they occurred (see Appendix). The illustrated pottery (Pis.1-9) represents a selection of the recorded survey material and has been arranged according to shapes under which it is discussed here.

It should be noted at this point that some of the LBA pottery continued into the early Iron Age and there is no clear demarcation between the two periods, an observation made by several excavators (Goldman, Tarsus III, 92; Griffin 1980, 64). For that reason sites which did not yield a representative group of second millennium sherds were disregarded or marked as questionable.

Equally problematic is the distinction between karum red wares and the later Hittite red burnished pottery of which a few sherds were collected by Brown (1967, 125 n.15, see Appendix).

The group of survey material which could be clearly regarded as belonging to the Middle Bronze Age was extremely small and consisted mainly of the above mentioned red slip wares and of grey wares of which some belonged to the type described as "gray wheel-marked ware" at Korucutepe (Phase G) (Griffin 1980, 4).

We note that Syro-Cilician painted pottery, which was shown to be widespread in Cilicia, was totally absent in the Anti-Taurus region.
The remaining pottery falls into groups which can be paralleled, on the basis of shape, with material from other Anatolian sites with a second millennium sequence: Korucutepe (Griffin 1980) and Norsuntepe (Korbel 1985) in the Elaziği region, Boğazköy (Fischer 1963) and Maşat (T. Özgüç 1982) in central Anatolia, Porsuk (Dupré 1983) on the eastern edge of the Konya plain and Tarsus (Tarsus II) and Mersin (Garstang 1953) in Cilicia.

Bowls and plates

A large proportion of sherds belonged to bowls and plates, which come with a variety of thickened rims:

1) The "rolled-in" or inverted rim (Pls. 1-2) is a very typical and widespread profile for shallow bowls and plates which occurs throughout the Late Bronze Age, but becomes less common towards the end of the Empire period. Vessels of this type are particularly common at Porsuk level V where they occur with many variants (Dupré 1983, 30f, Pls.9-10, 12). Also at Tarsus in LB II (Tarsus II, Fig.384:1119, 1127, 1138), Mersin level V (Fig.157:7), Norsuntepe (Korbel 1985, Taf.38:1797, 1207), in the Göksu valley (D. French 1963, Fig. 3:25,27; Fig.4:12). At Maşat they are common in level III and become rare in level I (T. Özgüç 1982, 95f, 101). At Boğazköy from karum level onwards (Fischer 1963, 65f, Taf. 93-96).

2) Bowls with rounded shoulders and upright rims (Pl.3) occur at Boğazköy from level IV C – III (Fischer 1963, Taf. 88:765), also Maşat (T. Özgüç 1982, Figs. 1-20(16)) and Porsuk V, Pl.8:39, 42 (Dupré 1983).

The carinated bowl from Fraktin (Pl.4:14) has a close parallel at Porsuk where grey wares are still in use (Dupré 1983, 24, Pl.17:99). Carinated bowls are no longer found at Tarsus in LB II but are quite common at Porsuk (Pls. 15-19) and Boğazköy (Fischer 1963, 66, Pl. 98).

3) Plates belong to the category of mass produced vessels with a wide distribution. At Tarsus in levels LB IIa and b, (Tarsus II, 210, 1120-1124). Mersin most common in
level V (Garstang 1953, Fig.157:8), Boğazköy mass produced in level III but occur as early as level IVc, (Fischer 1963, 66, Taf. 100-101), Norşuntepe (Korbel 1985, Taf.63), Fraktin (N.Özgüç 1955, Fig. 5-11). The wide-rim variety occurs at Porsuk with a rope pattern (Dupré 1983, Pls. 20-21).

**Cooking pots (Pl. 5)**

Mostly brown/black gritty cooking ware, identical material described by Korbel (1985, 66, Taf. 88-98) also at Porsuk (Dupré 1983, 23, Pls. 27-28); not reported from Tarsus or Mersin.

**Trifoil jugs (Pl. 6)**

A shape which was popular from the karum period to the end of the Late Bronze Age. At Tarsus in LB I (Tarsus II, 192f, LB IIa Fig.321:1182), Boğazköy (Fischer 1963, 46f, Taf. 39:404, 405, Taf. 44), Porsuk V (Dupré 1983, Pl.23:142, 143).

**Miniature or votive vessels (Pl. 7:23)**

Miniature cups and juglets belong to the category of mass produced wares of the Empire period but they are already known in level IVc at Boğazköy. They were found in large quantities near the Tudhaliya stele on Büyükkale (Fischer 1963, 69, Taf. 119:1032-1033, 1047-1051), also Maşat 1.III (Özgüç 1982, Figs.1-20(3-5)). Common at Tarsus (Tarsus II, 204, Fig.327:1170,1176,1177), also Fraktin (N. Özgüç 1955, Fig. 19-20). The vessels are carelessly made, often string-cut, and are of no practical use, but may have been used as foundation deposits.

**Incised pottery symbols (Pl.7:22)**

A common occurrence on LBA period pottery; at Tarsus mainly on plates and shallow bowls of the LB II period Tarsus II, 204, Fig.319), similarly at Mersin level V (Garstang 1953, 242). Incised pottery marks are also found at Maşat (T. Özgüç, 1982, Figs.1-20(1)) Boğazköy
Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from the Anti-Taurus survey must, by the nature of the evidence, be limited and one can only comment on a number of trends which have emerged from this study.

There is, first of all, an overall lack of second millennium material from the region between Göksun and Fraktin which would allow any firm conclusions regarding cultural relations with Cilicia. However, we have noted that Syro-Cilician ware was not found on the survey and it would seem that the Anti-Taurus region was not part of the Syro-Cilician painted pottery province.

Most of the pottery, as indicated above, falls into the category of shapes and wares that can be matched at a number of LBA sites. Certainly, the material from Fraktin has close counterparts at Tarsus, but can equally be paralleled at other sites.

Porsuk, on the other hand, in spite of shared trends in Empire wares, has a much superior ceramic repertoire, indicating that its pottery tradition lay with the west.

Probably the most noticeable trend which emerged from the survey concerns the pottery from the Elbistan plain where sampling of material was by far the best. It indicated that in the second millennium ceramic affinities of the Elbistan plain lay with the Elaziğ region to the east, the area in which Isuwa was located. This is suggested by two characteristic wares: the grey wheel-marked pottery and the chaff-faced ware (see Appendix) which are not known in Cilicia or Boğazköy. Furthermore, it was noted that there is a distinct preference for orange wares, common in the Altinova, as opposed to the red, brown and buff wares, characteristic of central Anatolia and Cilicia.
4. Aspects of the Hittite Rock Reliefs in the Anti-Taurus and their Archaeological Context

The meaning and function of Hittite rock reliefs in the second millennium remain a point of discussion and by no means all the questions they pose can at present be answered.46

Characteristic is their frequent association with water and in many cases their strategic situation marking communication routes. Whether the rock reliefs can be identified with the term "huwasi-" frequently mentioned in Hittite texts, in religious as well as secular contexts, remains unconfirmed but is highly likely (Carter 1962, 26ff, 41; Darga 1969, 5ff).

Topographically the Cilician plain offered little opportunity for the carving of rock reliefs; nevertheless two examples are known, at Sirkeli and Hemite, both situated on the Ceyhan river.

Sirkeli is carved on a rock-face just below the mound and the relief bears the name of Muwatalli and his genealogy. During more recent visits to Sirkeli the additional sign L 45 = "son", first seen by Bossert (SBo I, 24 n.86), was confirmed by Güterbock (1979, 238f, 244 Abb.3) and Kohlmeyer (p.98) which completes the genealogy and reads: "Muwatalli Great King, Hero (of) Mursili Great King, Hero, the son" (see also ch.II.2).47

Hemite is situated on the middle reaches of the Ceyhan, due south of Kadirli. It appears to mark a river crossing of a route leading from Kozan and Kadirli in the north which joins the main east-west road across the Cilician plain, south of Hemite (see sect.1(b) and map 2 and below on contents of relief).

For the majority of rock reliefs which are of relevance to Kizzuwatna, we have to look to the mountainous region of the Anti-Taurus. The four rock reliefs, Fraktin, Taşçı, Imamkulu and Hanyeri represent a distinct group which clearly outline an east-west route through the Anti-Taurus region by using the Gezbel pass (Alkim 1959, 208f; see map 3). Fraktin, the most westerly
of the group, is situated on the edge of the Anti-Taurus range. Two other reliefs lie on the route to the east, Taşçı c. 15 km south-east of Fraktin and, at about the same distance, the relief of Hanyeri in the Gezbel pass.

Imamkulu does not lie on the direct route but is situated between Taşçı and Hanyeri some 10 km to the north, on the road leading to Tomarza.

The Gezbel road emerges into the small plain of the Mağara district in which the two mounds of Pinarlar (No 15) and Damlali (No 14) were located (Brown 1967, 156). From here a route leads south to the Cilician plain via Feke and Kozan and another continues eastwards to Yalak where it meets the Göksun - Pinarbaşı road (see sect. 3 and map 3).

The route to classical Comana in Roman and Byzantine times did not lead through the Gezbel pass but used the Kuruçaybel and Kurubel respectively (Hild 1977, 85f, map 6; D. French 1988, Prt. II, Sivas (341B) and map 14). Both passes lie to the north of the Gezbel. However, Şar/Comana can be reached from Mağara/Tufanbeyli by a north-easterly track. From Comana the Roman road turned east to Kemer, then south to Yalak and Göksun (French 1988, 554 map. 15; see ch. II.3).

**Fraktin**

**The Topographical and Archaeological Setting**

Fraktin is situated at the point where the Zamanti/Yenici Irmak makes a 90° bend to the south. The relief and the neighbouring hüyük appear to mark an important crossroad which led to the Kayseri region in the north, the Zamanti valley to the south, the Konya plain in the west and the Gezbel pass to the east. The surrounding region of the Fraktin relief has been investigated on a number of occasions. K. Bittel and R. Naumann located various archaeological features on the plateau above the relief which included "cup marks", wheel ruts and a small settlement c. 400m north of the rock relief (AA 1939,
The latter was further investigated by T. Özgüç (1956, 65ff) who excavated a prehistoric dwelling dated to the Chalcolithic period (Mellaart, CAH vol.1 ch.XVIII, 367).

Clearly visible from the relief, at a distance of c.1800m north-east lies the mound of Fraktin (No 9, Brown 1967, 160, see above sect. 3). T. Özgüç conducted a limited excavation on the mound and revealed two Hittite building levels, both burnt and separated by a 2m refuse layer of which 70cm are said to have consisted of sand. The later level was dated to the Empire period and is thought to have been contemporary with the rock relief (T. Özgüç 1948, 264ff; N. Özgüç 1955, 301f).

Apart from the pottery mentioned above the site was rich in metal objects which included shaft-hole axes, vessels and spearheads (N. Özgüç ibid., 302ff, Figs.21-31).

Among the seals recovered an Old Babylonian cylinder seal mentioning Hammurabi represents an heirloom of considerable antiquity (op.cit., 304 Fig.32). The above and two other cylinder seals (Figs.33,34) are evidence for contacts with the Syro/Mesopotamian world. Contacts with the Aegean are demonstrated by a Mycenaean stirrup-jar (unpublished) which was found on a house floor of the Empire level (ibid., 303). The vessel is said to belong to the LH IIIC period which may suggest that the later Hittite level at Fraktin should be dated after the reign of Hattusili III (C. Mee 1978, 128; T. Özgüç 1982, 103, see sect. 2(c) above).

In the Zamanti valley south of Fraktin a number of shallow settlement mounds were located by T. Özgüç (between Aşşepinar and Menengi) who reported black burnished ware with white paint comparable to Karaoğlan pottery of the late "Copper Age", as well as some Hittite sherds (1948, 262, 1956, 69, Pl.XVII). In the same region F. Steinherr reported a rock-altar (throne?) which he found c. 5km south-east of Fraktin. It consists of three steps and a bull's head carved in relief and probably belongs to the Iron Age (1975, 316f, Abb.3).
Whether the above located sites indicate an additional route through the Anti-Taurus to the Cilician Plain is uncertain. The importance of the Zamanti valley in more recent times, lies in the lead and zinc mines of the region (Brown 1967, 157 n.85) which may have been already exploited in ancient times.

A short distance to the east of the Fraktin relief, in the direction of Taşçı, lies the mound of Şahmelek (No 10) Its occupation during the Late Bronze Age is clear from the survey collection.

The Fraktin Relief

The Fraktin rock relief depicts a double libation scene, with Hattusili (III) on the left facing a deity which most probably represents the Storm-god, and Puduhepa on the right opposite the seated goddess Hepat. The royal couple are pouring libation and are both separated from their respective deity by an altar.

The relief has been described and illustrated on numerous occasions and requires no further discussion here. However, a group of hieroglyphic signs, sketchily carved, which are attached to the right side of the figure of Puduhepa (frequently left out in illustrations) is of considerable interest (Fig.2).

The reading of this group has recently been elucidated and was shown to be an epithet of Puduhepa. It reads:

\[
\text{pu-du-ha-pa MAGNUS DOMINA} \\
\text{kà-zu(wa)-na} \\
\text{REGIO} \\
\text{FILIA}
\]

followed by four signs (see below). The reading of the country name as "Kizzuwatna" was first suggested by Laroche (for discussion see ch.II.2). The following signs MANUS(INFANS) + L 79 (FEMINA) = "daughter" at Fraktin was recognized and read independently by Güterbock (1978, 129ff) and Hawkins (1978, 112f). An important contribution to the
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above reading had been Güterbock's observation that L 79 (=L 408 FEMINA) represented the female counterpart of L 386 (¶ = VIR₂) on husband and wife seals of the Empire period (1975, Nos. 37, 38, 72ff) as well as the evidence of the Korucutepe seal (No. 2) which belongs to a royal pair (1973, 137).³⁴

The remaining four signs of Puduhepa's epithet were read by Güterbock as GOD ᵃ-ᶻᵃ-ᵐⁱ⁵⁵ "loved by the god" (1978, 131ff, Abb.3.f.). The entire epigraph reads then: "Puduhepa Great Queen, daughter of the country Kizzuwatna, loved by the god(s)".⁵⁶

Puduhepa's description as "daughter of Kizzuwatna" at Fraktin receives support in the cuneiform texts (Kizz., 71; Otten 1975, 14). Apart from the introduction in Puduhepa's Vow (CTH 585) where she refers to herself as "daughter of Kummanni", we have also the description of Puduhepa's seal in the Egyptian version of the Ramses II treaty which reads: "Seal of Puduhepa Great Queen, Queen of Hatti, daughter of Kizzuwatna" (Kizz., 71; ch.II.1). The same wording may have been written in the cuneiform legend of her seal (impression) found at Tarsus (No. 15, Tarsus II, Figs. 401, 405, p.248).⁵⁷ Güterbock had suggested a restoration of the cuneiform legend as: "...daughter of the country Kizzuwatna, servant of Hebat" (SB 3, 29f) which in the light of Fraktin, he thinks, could be amended to "loved by Hebat" (1978, 129).

Taşçi

Very little is known about the region between the mound of Şahmelek (No 10) near Fraktin and the area around Taşçi. Along the route, which follows roughly the course of the Zamantisu, no hüyükş have been located. Their absence may be due to the fact that the building material used in this region was timber, as suggested by T. Özelüg who believes that the area was far more wooded than it is today (1948, 262).

Three shallow mounds with Roman and Byzantine pottery are reported in the immediate vicinity of the Taşçi relief
The Reliefs (Taşçı I and II)

The reliefs are situated on the banks of a small river (Urlumuçay) near its confluence with the Zamantisu. The carving technique used is incising which distinguishes it from the remaining Anti-Taurus reliefs, which are worked in bas-relief.

The main group (Taşçı I) depicts a procession of three figures moving from left to right. The lower part of the figures are no longer visible.

The inscription consists of personal names and titles, among them, to the left of the group, the epigraph of Hattusili (III) in its well known form (HAxLI) flanked by MAGNUS REX, HEROS.

The reading by Steinherr (1975, 315f) and others of the remaining epigraphs has been largely superseded by more recent attempts to interpret the much weathered traces (Kohlmeyer, 77f, Hawkins forthcoming). It is not clear how the epigraphs are to be distributed amongst the figures. Hawkins reads: ...x-li-zi ma-na-à-zi FILIA lu-pa-ki"...x-lizi Manazi daughter of Lupaki". (Hawkins forthcoming n.13). This epigraph is probably attached to the third figure who appears to be female.

While the reading of "Lupaki" is assured, the following signs which may represent his title(s) are problematic. The signs below EXERCITUS (L 269) have been read in a variety of ways; Steinherr (1975, 315) ...KARAŞ-tu-pi+ as part of PN,Meriggi (Manuale II/3 No.74) KARAŞ - UR (ur(a)) DUMU ("great one of the army, son of.."), also Hawkins EXERCITUS SCRIBA-tå(?) (ibid.n.13), and most recently by Kohlmeyer who is certain of seeing L 326 the sign for "scribe" followed by a "hand" sign (L 41 or L 66) which he reads KARAŞ-tu₄-tå/pi as a personal name or possibly "army scribe" (p.78).
The reading "army scribe" can be substantiated by its occurrence on at least two seals of the Empire period; ARMA-zi, army scribe (Güterbock 1975 No.15, 57ff) and pi-ti-ku[x] with the same title on a seal from Malatya (Merriggi, OA 8 (1969), p.135 Pl.XXIII 2,4). The designation of army scribe for Lupaki is therefore quite feasible and not inappropriate if we consider that the Anti-Taurus route under discussion must have served the Hittite army on their way to Cilicia and N. Syria.64

The remaining signs of the epigraph are traditionally read as VIR-á (ziti-á) and interpreted as PN Zida which can be paralleled with the seal impression SBo II No.26, Vir-á written twice antithetically with titles L 173, prince. The spear-like sign (L 173) has recently been elucidated by Güterbock (AfO 28, 71) who convincingly equates it with a court official in Hittite texts known as LÚ.GIŠ.SUKUR "man of the spear", an office of moderate rank.

Accepting Kohlmeyer's reading of the scribal sign, the entire epigraph would read: lu-pa-ki EXERCITUS SCRIBA FILIUS VIR-á HASTA, "Lupaki army-scribe, son (of) Zida the 'man of the spear'". Lupaki who is probably the author of Taşçi (I), does indeed appear as an official in the reign of Hattusili III. He is listed by Laroche (Noms No 708) as a Łóqartappu (KUB XXXI 68 II 39) but Stefanini believes that the qartappu and Lupakki in the above text are two different persons (1962, 32).

A Lupakki GAL.DUMUMES E.GAL (chief of the palace pages) appears among the witnesses of the Muwatalli-Talmi-Sarruma treaty (KBo I 6 rev.21) who may still have been active during the reign of Hattusili III.

Taşçi II lies c. 100m upstream from the main relief. It depicts a single figure with an epigraph which, because of its poor state of preservation, is not very rewarding (Börker-Klähn, 263; Kohlmeyer, 78f).
As previously mentioned, Imamkulu does not lie on the direct route to the Gezbel pass. Halfway between Taşçı and Hanyeri a track leads through mountainous terrain to Imamkulu but the village is far more accessible from the north (Tomarza) and the west (Köseler). Evidence of an ancient settlement was reported by T. Özgüç between Imamkulu and Köseler but the period(s) of occupation is not specified (1948, 262). Equally unsatisfactory is the mention of a site in the valley of the Bey Dağ south of Imamkulu (Kohlmeyer, 81).

Unlike other Hittite rock reliefs which utilize rock faces, Imamkulu is carved on a large boulder. The tripartite arrangement of the relief depicts in the centre the Weather-god (of Heaven) standing on a chariot drawn by a bull, supported by three mountain deities. The group is flanked on the right by a winged deity above a tree-like element and on the left by a striding figure with bow and spear. Not only is the princely figure closely resembling the one shown at Hanyeri, but it also bears the same epigraph, Kuwalana-mu(wa) the prince, (Güterbock 1979, 238 and below).

The Hanyeri Relief.

The Hanyeri rock relief situated in the Gezbel pass lies on the left side of the road coming from Taşçı, but as the relief faces east it would have been more visible to the traveller approaching from the opposite direction.

The rock carving is dominated by a central figure dressed in a short kilt and carrying a bow and spear. The princely figure, striding to the left, faces a religious scene.

The hieroglyphic inscription consists of three distinct groups, of which two can be identified as names of princes: EXERCITUS-mu(wa) REX-INFANS (Kuwalana-muwa the prince) is the epigraph attached to the front of the figure and on the right the second name TONITRUS MANUS-mi/ma
REX.INFANS (Tarhuntami the prince), written twice antithetically. It is not clear whether the latter is also named at Hemite where the epigraph appears in two lines behind the figure of a prince, very similar to the one at Hanyeri.

The remaining group on the left facing the prince is not so easily interpreted (Fig. 2). Clearly visible is a bull resting its forelegs on the shoulders of a mountain god. Bossert claimed the existence of a second mountain god, less well defined and partly destroyed (1954, 130); not so Güterbock (1947, 69) and Laroche (1963, 282) who saw a rock cone supporting the hind legs of the bull. The mountain god facing the prince has an upright posture and is not the carrying type with bent torso as depicted at Imamkulu (see above). Instead, he appears as a god in his own right, holding his cartouche in his raised left hand.

The epigraph consists of two lines: The top line nearest to the bull reads REX.MONS.DEUS šarru+ma (Sarruma mountain king) and below next to the mountain god we have L 53 DEUS.MONS. ("x mountain god").

In the absence of any grammatical endings, it is difficult to decide as to how the two legends relate to each other. While it is clear from the composition that Sarruma, in the shape of a bull, is the main object of adoration and the second line may represent his epithet, one must agree with Laroche that the two legends should be read separately (1963, 262 n. 2), and not from the top to the bottom line as was done by Bossert (1954, 130) and others.

The only problematic sign in the above epigraph is L 53. There had been uncertainty as to whether L 53 represented a hand holding a vase or a dagger (see HH p. 35) but since Laroche has identified Yaz. No. 27 (Deus-L 53) as bU.GUR (=Nergal) the "sword god" among the procession of war gods at Yazilikaya (Laroche, RHA 27 (1969), 79f and n. 31), the reading of MANUS.CULTER ("hand + dagger") should also apply to Hanyeri.
L 52 appears to be the late form of L 53\textsuperscript{75} and occurs on Maras 4 (statue), an inscription by Halparuntiyas (II).\textsuperscript{13} Of the text is a mutilation clause and L 52 is used here logographically for the verb "to cut" (Hitt. kwer-).\textsuperscript{76}

The question is how MANUS.CULTER is to be interpreted in the context of Hanyeri. The reading of L 53 as U.GUR following Yaz. No 27 is unlikely since U.GUR(=Nergal) is never attested as a mountain god but belongs to the circle of chthonic and war gods (Laroche NDH, 105, 124). If, however, it could be demonstrated that L 53 stands for NIR.GAL = Hitt. mu(wa)talli- "strong, mighty" (which is doubtful), one could interpret the lower line as an epithet of Sarruma; Sarruma "the mighty mountain god". On the other hand the above epithet is normally attached to the Weather-god and is always written with L 28 which depicts an arm holding a spear and is quite distinct from L 53 (MANUS.CULTER).\textsuperscript{77}

There remains the possibility of connecting L 53 with kwer- or related forms "to cut" and interpret MANUS.CULTER DEUS MONS as a direct reference to the particular location in which the relief was carved, namely "the cut" through the mountain, i.e. the Gezbel pass.

Topographical and geographical terms based on the stem kwer- kur- were recently examined by F. Starke who identified the Glossenkeil word kursawar- kursawan-, hitherto of uncertain meaning, as "island" (1981, 142ff), with the sense of "that which has been cut" from the landmass by the sea.\textsuperscript{78} Starke concludes that Luw. kursa- and its nominal derivations do specifically refer to the "cutting" or "separating" of territory and land (ibid., 151).

How the Hittites would have perceived a mountain pass in physical terms is of course not known. An allusion to a pass is provided in a semi-legendary account of a mountain crossing en route for Aleppo (CTH 16, see ch.III.1) which tells of a mythological bull
who lifts up (karp-) the mountain\textsuperscript{\textdegree} to allow passage for the Hittite army.

While the above text implies a physical removal or parting of the mountain, it does not answer the question whether a pass was thought of as a "cutting" or "severing" of the mountain.

Nevertheless, with the arguments put forward above the following reading of the left hand legend could be suggested: "Sarruma mountain king, (of) the sacred mountain pass".

The Kizzuwatnanean connection with the Anti-Taurus rock reliefs does not only manifest itself at Fraktin with the epithet of Puduhepa as "daughter of Kizzuwatna", but also at Hanyeri where Sarruma "the mountain king" is the focus of the adoration scene. The pictorial and textual sources for Sarruma were comprehensively treated by Laroche who established the Anatolian, and more specifically Kizzuwatnean, origin of this god (1963, 277ff).\textsuperscript{81}

Sarruma makes his appearance in Hittite texts during the reign of Suppiluliuma I with the appointment of his son Telipinu as priest in Kizzuwatna (see ch.V.5).

Not surprisingly, Sarruma is particularly prominent in texts belonging to Puduhepa. In a series of dreams and vows the queen addresses Sarruma of Uda, Urikina and Laiuna, all towns connected with Kizzuwatnanean cults (KUB XV 1, Laroche op.cit., 288ff). Of special relevance to the Hanyeri relief is the dream in which Sarruma demands offering places in the mountains (II 43-44), $I$-$N\overline{A} ~ \overline{HUR}.SAG$-ma-wa-mu-kán ŋe-er 12 $AŠ$-$RU(44)a-da-an-na pa-a-i ...., "...up in the mountain give me 12 places to eat..." - In the same text Puduhepa addresses Sarruma of Uda as "Mountain\{x x x\}my lord" (I 20), once again emphasizing Sarruma's mountain characteristics.

A survival of his mountain attribute can be seen on a Malatya relief where his epithet is "Sarruma, king (of the) mountain", recalling the epigraph of Hanyeri. At Malatya, however, he is shown standing on a feline animal
opposite king PUGNUS-mi-li who pours libation (Delaporte 1940, Pl.XXIII 1).

The Dating of the Anti-Taurus Reliefs

While Fraktin and Taşçı can be attributed with some certainty to the reign of Hattusili III, the date of Imamkulu and Hanyeri is not known.

It is unfortunate that the names of the princes on the reliefs cannot be identified with royal sons of a particular Hittite ruler in the texts, which would provide a basis for their dating. Furthermore, one can only speculate on the motive of the princes for carving their names on rock faces. Was Kuwalana-muwa, author of Imamkulu and Hanyeri, a local governor and can the above reliefs be interpreted as boundary indicators?

Returning to the dating question, the presence of Sarruma on the Hanyeri relief makes a date prior to Suppiluliuma unlikely. All the onomastic evidence for Sarruma is attached to the Empire period and begins with Suppiluliuma I. The spread of Sarruma into the onomastica of N. Syria and Isuwa can be seen as a result of Suppiluliuma's expansionist policy in these regions. (Laroche 1963, 294ff). Sarruma rises to greater prominence in the later Empire period and the close relationship of Puduhepa with the god (see above) could be taken as an indicator for the date of Hanyeri and place the relief alongside Fraktin and Taşçı. This would also apply to Imamkulu if we accept that the two reliefs shared the same author, i.e. Kuwalana-muwa. On the other hand, if we identify Ku(wa)lana-muwa (see n.69) with the officer mentioned in the Mursili annals (Goetze AM, 26), a date to the above king or his successor Muwatalli cannot be discounted.

The conclusions that can be drawn geographically for Kizzuwatna from the Anti-Taurus reliefs are limited. All of the rock monuments, to our present knowledge, belong to the Empire period, at a time when Kizzuwatna no longer
existed as an independent state. The reference to Puduhepa as "daughter of Kizzuwatna" at Fraktin cannot necessarily be taken as evidence that the kingdom of Kizzuwatna stretched to the region south of Kayseri. Instead, the reliefs should be seen (at least in part) in the context of the expansion of Kizzuwatna as a cultural province which became prominent during the reign of Hattusili III and his Kizzuwatnean wife and continued with great intensity under their son Tudhaliya IV.

The frontiers of Kizzuwatna were, no doubt, largely dictated by the geographical features of the region and to what extent the Anti-Taurus formed an integral part of an independent state of Kizzuwatna depends partly on whether one accepts the identification of class. Comana (ṣar) with Hittite Kummanni (see ch.II.3). The series of treaties which Hatti concluded with Kizzuwatna, however, would indicate that Hittite access to Syria mainly depended on an allied Kizzuwatna and territories which made this possible were under Kizzuwatnean control.

An important aspect for Kizzuwatna's border defenses would have been the control of the Cilician Gates. The frontier description of the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5) does indicate that the Cilician Gates formed part of Kizzuwatnean territory and, indeed, it points to the same region which marked the border between Tuwana and Que (?) in the Iron Age, i.e. the Bolkardag (see sect.1(c), ch.IV.7).

The site of Porsuk/Zeyve Hüyük is said to have been heavily fortified and Dupré has made the suggestion that Porsuk functioned as a border-post town between Hatti and Kizzuwatna (1983, 42). Zeyve Hüyük is generally identified with Hitt. Tunna (see n.23) and belonged to Tarhuntassa according to the Ulmi-Tešub treaty (CTH 106). Since Porsuk is reported not to antedate the Empire period, it is likely that Kizzuwatna was already incorporated into Hatti, but the archaeological evidence confirms the information of the above treaty, regarding the role of Tunna as a border town of Tarhuntassa with Hatti.
The Anti-Taurus region to the east is traditionally a grey area and one suspects that it formed the main border territory between Hatti and Kizzuwatna which was subject to change (ch.IV.7).
Footnotes


4  J. Garstang, "Explorations in Cilicia", Mersin Neilson Expedition, LAAA XXIV No 1 (1937), 52ff; LAAA XXV Nos 1-2, 3-4 (1938), 12ff, see n.31 below.


6  Described in detail in the Admir.Hb., 134ff which noted modern and ancient harbour installations, also Erzen 1940, 10ff with classical references.

7  Magarsus = Dört Direkli, Cil.Surv., 154. See also Class. Map by Calder and Bean 1958.

8  Very recent maps show the Ceyhan as draining due
south, (east of Karataş) as well as to the west. - On the contradictory reports of the Pyramos estuary over the ages, see Erzen (1940, 21f) who supports the theory that the Pyramos divided at class. Mallos, one arm draining east, the other south.

9 The numbering of the mounds have been taken from Seton-Williams "Cilician Survey", AnSt 4 (1953) (Abbr. Cil.Surv.) where sites are catalogued alphabetically (pp.147-174) and according to numbers p.146f. They were also used on our map 2.

10 For routes of the northern approaches to the Cilician Gates see Hild 1977, 51ff and maps 2 and 3.

11 For a summary of survey work undertaken in this area (mod. Içel) see Orthmann, R1A V, 24ff.

12 Not to be confused with Domuztepe opposite Karatepe, near Kadirli. Large mound with commanding position and controlling route up the east bank of the Ceyhan, Cil. Surv., 128, 154.

13 Suggested by Garstang and Gurney, Geography, 61, but they also note the reservations expressed by the Cil.Surv. report, 171f.

14 On the Amanus region and routes across the Amanus chain see Alkim 1965, 1ff; 1969, 280f.

15 The Admir.Hb. describes an additional route (R.75) from Kadirli to Maraş which runs roughly parallel with the Ceyhan valley, via the Haç Bel (p.384ff). This route was, however, considered difficult, dangerous in parts and unsuitable for wheeled traffic.

16 For a general map of metal sources in south-east Anatolia see MTA 1981 (unpublished) in Yener and
KBo I 14, edited by Goetze, Kizz., 27ff with previous literature. For the interpretation of the term "good iron" (Akk. *parzillu damqu*) and a translation of the relevant passage (obv. 20-24) see J.D. Muhly et al., AnSt 35 (1985), 79.

The sources for iron in Hittite texts were collected by Košak, "The Gospel of Iron" 1986, 125ff. For iron in Hittite inventory texts see Košak 1982, 198ff.

"Iron from the land of Hume", Albright, BASOR 120 (1950), 22ff; Houwink ten Cate 1961, 27f.

For a map of major iron ore deposits in Turkey see Muhly et al., op.cit., 72.

However, see de Jesus 1980, map 13 which shows ancient lead and copper mines at Kayis Maden, east of Göksson.

Old gold-silver-lead workings are also reported at Bereketli Maden in the Aladağ, north-east of the Bolkardağ (de Jesus 1980, 272 and map 13). Other silver deposits in the Taurus occur at Bozkir, Ortakunuş and Yelmezköy (de Jesus, AnSt 27 (1978), 100).

I should like to thank Dr. Yener for allowing me to study the survey pottery collection as it stood in 1986. None of the sherds could be attributed to the second millennium with any certainty.

Cf. Hitt. ḪUR.SAG Dunna, sacred mountain in Taparuta and ḪUR.Dunna, border town of Tarhuntassa which has been equated with class. Tynna = Zeyve Hüyük (Porsuk), RGTC 6, 439. Cf. also Assyr. Atuna/Tuna which has been identified with class. Tynna as well (Hawkins, AnSt 19 (1969), 108). - For a discussion
on the problem in locating Atuna/Tuna in the light of the Bohçça inscription see Hawkins, AnSt 29 (1979), 166 and Editorial Note p.167.

Other Hittite mountain names which have been located in the Bolkardağ massif are ḤUR.SAG URU zaparasna which forms the border between Hatti and Kizzuwatna in KBo I 5 (Geography, 60) and ḤUR.SAG Sarlaimi "exalted mountain", RGTC 6, 353. ḤUR.SAG Sarlaimi is equated with ḤUR.SAG.GAL by Gonnet 1968, 152. Cf. RGTC 6, 162. See also Bo86/299 (Bronze Tablet) where ḤUR.SAG sar-la-im-mi-is (I 48) forms the border between Hatti and Tarhuntassa, (Otten 1988, 12, 35f).

Mount Muli can most probably be equated with Mount Muti mentioned in the Bulgarmaden inscription, see below. The alabaster source of Mount Muli points to the Bolkardağ area south of Ereğli, class. Kybistra = Hitt. Hupisna which is indicated by the Hitt. term for alabaster "Hupisna stone" (hubisnas NA₄-as), according to the trilingual RS 25.421, 26, Laroche, RHA 79 (1966), 177; Bing 1969, 176 and n.11; RGTC 6, 119.


26 Hawkins, see n.25 above.

27 Passage cited by Hawkins and Morpurgo-Davis, "Buying and selling in Hieroglyphic Luwian", 1982, 95. In Bulgarmaden the verb piya- "to give" is preceded by the logogram "L 257+DARE", i.e. "block(silver)+giving hand", "give for silver" = "to sell". For examples of L 257 "silver" as a commodity see citations pp.96-99.
Proposed by Mr. J.D. Hawkins (personal communication). The passage (§6) is by no means clear as it contains words of unknown meaning. A possible translation is: "In the country, by my justice and by my hatasa-X-m I erected (?) (it, i.e. the inscription) before the ziralam silver mine (?)" ("SCALPRUM.257"(-) su-ha-pa-na-ti).

Note also KBo VII 24, a list of tributes consisting mainly of tin (AN.NA) which in total amounts to 67 minas and 28 shekels (Koşak 1982, 85f). On the economic implications of metals, including, tin, in Hittite inventory texts see also Kempinski and Koşak 1977, 87ff. For a review of Anatolian metal sources and metal trade according to textual sources see also J. Yakar, AnSt 26 (1976), 120ff largely contested by de Jesus, AnSt 27 (1978), 97ff.

Tarsus was excavated under the direction of H. Goldman in the years 1934-1938 and 1947-1949 (Tarsus II and III). Work at Mersin took place in 1936-1939 and again in 1946-1947 under J. Garstang (1953). The Mersin material is to be re-published by D. French (personal communication). Excavations were preceded by surveys and various sondages in the plain. The American Expedition visited 41 mounds and dug a sondage at Zeytin (14), Kabarsa (71) Domuz Tepe (74) (Goldman, see n.3. The results were never published). The Neilson Expedition under Garstang investigated several sites and sunk trial trenches at Çavuşlu (81), Sirkelî (65) and Kazanlı (78) (see n.4).

At Tarsus building levels were not numbered but measured from a single datum point. The three habitation levels are said to be at c. 7.50m, 7.00-6.50m and 6.00m.

The 24 Old Assyrian tablets in the Adana Museum (Adana No.237 a-x, mainly unpublished) did not originate in Cilicia, but are thought to have come from Kültepe - personal communication from K. Hecker.

Whether the Assyrian trade routes touched on east Cilicia hinges largely on the location of Luhuzatia (Hitt. Lawazantiya) which is traditionally placed in the Elbistan plain but located by Mellaart in Cilicia on the approaches to the Bahçe pass. For a discussion see ch.III.1 and n.15.

This means that the reigns of Hattusili I and Mursili I still belong to MBA. The terminology of MBA/LBA has not been used by the excavators of Boğazköy where levels have been tied to historical periods; Büykk. IVd = karum period, IVc = Old Kingdom period, IVb-a = Older Hittite, III = Empire period, P. Neve, *Büükkale, Die Bauwerke*, Berlin (1982), 6 and Tab. 1.

They were also found at four sites during the Cilician Survey (*Cil.Surv.*, 133) and in the Göksu valley (D.French 1965, Figs. 8 and 9).


At Korucutepe Tarsus LB I has been correlated with Phase I which they date to c.1600-1400 B.C., Griffin 1980, 71f, Tab. 6.

A few fragments of this ware came from level VII and
VI at Mersin, G.M. Fitzgerald, LAAA XXVI (1939), Pl. LVII 20,22,24,27.

41 See M.-H. Carre-Gates, Alalah VI and V. A Chronological Reassessment, Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 4 (1981), 8, 33f, n.154. Carre-Gates argues that Nigmepea's palace defines the beginning of level IV; it follows that his father Idrimi reigned during the course of level V B. - The author's dating of Alalah level VI and V rests mainly on Cypriot Bichrome ware which was found in level VI B and V. Bichrome ware is considered to mark the onset of the Late Bronze Age and is dated to c. 1560-1460 B.C. (op.cit., 19ff) - See also the Cypriot Bichrome ware sherd from Tarsus (LB I context), described as Tel-el-Ajjul pottery by Goldman (Tarsus II, 183, Fig.315:1085).

42 On the historical context of Mycenaean III C pottery see Muhly in Cyprus at the Close of the Late Bronze Age, Nicosia (1984), 39ff, 43 who believes that the Mycenaean colonization of Cilicia was not lasting and is not connected with the collapse of the Hittite empire.

43 For a comprehensive study of Mycenaean wares in Anatolia see C. Mee, AnSt 28 (1978), 121ff. Based on the Cilician Surveys by Gjerstad and Seton-Williams he lists 21 sites in Cilicia, see map pp.122-123 and summary p.150.

44 Some of this typical Empire period pottery is discussed in more detail in the context of the Anti-Taurus survey pottery in the next section.

45 I am grateful to G.H. Brown for granting me permission to study the second millennium pottery of his survey with the view of publication. - The site numbers in the text (in brackets) and on map 3 are those of Brown (1967, Fig. 1 and list of sites.
Sherd numbers are those marked on the survey collection at the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara.

Hittite rock reliefs have been dealt with in some detail in two separate studies which makes a comprehensive treatment of the reliefs in the Anti-Taurus in this section obsolete. Apart from the archaeological context, the section concentrates on certain aspects of the hieroglyphic epigraphs of the reliefs (see Fig. 2).

The two studies referred to above are: J. Börker-Klähn 1982, 88ff, catalogue section with full bibliography (hereafter Börker-Klähn); K. Kohlmeyer 1983, 7ff (hereafter Kohlmeyer). The latter has the advantage that the author visited all the reliefs and was able to examine their contents in situ. The epigraphs of the Anti-Taurus reliefs were also read by J.D. Hawkins, see chapter on Cilicia in: "The Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions of the Iron Age", forthcoming.

Cf. Börker-Klähn who claims that Sirkeli is an inscription of Mursili III, p.99, 260 and n.3.

The results of the investigations by D. French of Roman milestones in the area, suggest that the Kaiseri-Comana route did not lead through the Kurubel. The Roman road on leaving Şar (Comana) turns west before going north towards the Kuruçaybel. - Cf. Harper and Bayburtluoğlu 1968, 149f.


Bittel (ibid., 567f), on the other hand, reported that most of the surface sherds collected was monochrome ware of the Hittite period, the area thus relating to the relief. This could not be confirmed by Özguc who did not find a single Hittite sherd

Börker-Klähn No.318, 260ff, Kohlmeyer, 67ff.

Discussed in the context of "daughter" in hieroglyphic Luwian texts by the second author.

MAGNUS+INFANS+FEMINA "great daughter" is attached to the name Kiluhpepa. See also the combination REX+INFANS+FEMINA "princess" with PN ha-pa-pi-i/a/ia on Tarsus No.17, Tarsus II, 249, Figs.401, 405.

Past part. of aza- "to love", similar Kohlmeyer, 71f, unsatisfactory reading by Börker-Klähn 1980, 39f, 44 á-x-za, $\uparrow = za$ is not attested for the Empire period, Hawkins 1975, 121.

Güterbock's reading of this group has a welcome parallel in the Kuzi-Tešub, king of Karkamš seal from Lidar Hıyük (D.Sürenhagen MDO6 118 (1986), p.183ff), established by the re-reading of Kuzi-Tešub's epithet by Hawkins as DEUS-nī-tī u-ni-mi-sa "recognized by the god(s)", Hawkins, AnSt 38 (1988), 99f.

The only visible traces of the cun. legend on Tarsus No.15 are ..ḥé-pāt DUMU $\overline{S}AL$. Cf. Gelb Tarsus II, 248 ..Pu-duḥé-pāt DUMU $\overline{S}AL$. The normal writing of Puduhepa is with -pa not -pāt, except in two letters of Ramses II to the queen, ʰPu-duʰḥé-pāt. For the various spellings of the names see Otten 1975, 11f.

Börker-Klähn Nos. 319-320, 262f, Kohlmeyer, 74ff.
For a good photo see Bittel 1976, 185.

Kohlmeyer reads below HEROS the sign $\bar{m}$ (L 387) (see
Fig. 2) and restores ti = mīti "servant". This would be the first attestation of mī (double crampon) in the Empire period. For a discussion of L 387 - L 319 (mī-tī) in connection with the Tarkondemos seal see Güterbock 1977, 14f, Fig. 7.

60 Discussed by Kohlmeyer, 75f, Figs. 27, 28.

61 Cf. Kohlmeyer who reads the names as Hutarla/i and Mana, ignoring in both names the zi/a sign, 77.

62 A reading of FILIUS is preferred by us.

63 The phonetic reading of L 326 as tu₄ is, to my knowledge, not attested for the Empire period which makes Kohlmeyer's reading of the group as PN suspect.

64 See also CTH 585 "U₄pihanu L₄DUB.SAR.GIŠ KARAS "U₄pihanu scribe-on-wood of the army/camp", Otten and Souček, StBoT 1(1965), 28, n.13. See also SBo II No.54 lu-pa-ki SCRIBA-la. For army scribes in N.Assyr. context see the relief of Sennacherib (B.M.124955), Wiseman, Iraq 17 (1955), Pl.III.2.

65 Börker-Klähn No. 315, 259, Kohlmeyer, 86ff.

66 We disagree with Kohlmeyer, 85f who states that the main route through the Gezbel led via Imamkulu and not Taşçi. One would expect the route to follow the course of the Zamantisu. Certainly in Byzantine times the itinerary from Kayseri to the Gezbel led via Fraktin and Bakırdağı (Taşçi), Hild 1977, 127f, map. 12.

67 On the possible identity of the goddess see Börker-Klähn, ZA 67 (1977) 71, Kohlmeyer, 85f.

68 Börker-Klähn No. 314, 258, Kohlmeyer, 86ff. - See Fig.2.
69 KARAS-muwa - to be read ku(wa)lana-muwa (M. Poetto Kadmos 21 (1982), 101ff) Name discussed by Hawkins in RIA VI, 398 under kuwatna-muwa.

70 For a discussion of both names and their relation to the princely figure see Börker-Klähn, 97.

71 See reading by Hawkins n.16, (for ref. see above n.46) -x TONITRUS REX.INFANS TONITRUS- DARE' REX.INFANS INFANS, "Tarhunta the prince, son of Tarhuntapiya' the prince."
Cp. Kohlmeyer, 94, ḏ-Ḏ prince ḏ-Ḏ-pi (Tarhundapiya prince, son). Father of the author Tarhundapiya is thought to be identical with a witness of that name in the Ulmi-Tešub treaty, CTH 106.

72 For a clear detail photo of this group see Laroche 1963, 283. Kohlmeyer's drawing, 88 Fig. 37 shows an altar, - see Fig. 2. Cp. the drawing in Börker-Klähn, Pl. No. 14b which shows two mountain gods but is overrestored and not very representative of the existing traces. In order to accommodate the second mountain god on the left, he is drawn wearing a scull cap instead of a conical headdress.

73 See also Yazilikaya No.42 which shows Tešub standing on two mountain gods, Bittel 1975, Pl. 25:3.

74 Börker-Klähn, 98, "König von x (toponym) des göttlichen Gebirges, Gott des göttlichen Gebirges, Gott Sarruma".
Cf. Bulgarmaden3 DEUS.MONS-ti-na mu-ti-na "sacred mountain Muti", (see sect. 1(c) above).

75 L 52 was corrected by Hawkins 1975, 143 (dagger not vase). The hand on the late sign is no longer attached to the dagger but written above it.

76 § 13 ...ARHA ("MANUS.CULTER") REL+RA/I-ha- ', "I cut
away" (the feet of the men) Hawkins forthcoming (see n.46 above).
Cp. also ("CULTER") partuni- "to sever" in Karkamiš Allc in the context of a curse, Hawkins 1975, 143.

77 Cf. Kohlmeyer, 88f who equates L 53 with L 28 and reads: "mighty king of the mountains, Sarruma". The above reading is based on the Ugarit seal RS 17.159 (right side) which was rendered by Laroche as ḫU NIR.GAL (L 28) ("mighty Weather-god"), Ugaritica III, 19, Fig. 24, 116f.

78 Kursawar- is the verbal noun of Luw. kursa- (Hitt.kwers-) "to cut, to sever" which is a sigmatised form of kwer-/kur-, Starke ibid, 149 and n.28.

79 Cp. also examples based on the Hitt. stem kur- kwer-, Ottinger 1979, 119f, kuera- piece of land, field, kuranna-, exact meaning uncertain but designates a terrain (Tischler, HEG, 645). The term occurs in an Instruction Text to the commander of the Border Guards (BĔL MADGALTI) KUB XIII 1 (Goetze,JCS 14 (1960), 69ff). The instructions containing the term Kuranna- are specifically addressed to the scouts (LŪMES[NI.ZU]): I 12 "Let the scouts of the main road[occupy] the look-outs ... (13) down from the town they search the kuranna...." I 30 "Let them search the kuranna well...".

80 The following clause is mutilated, Otten (1962, 161) restores: "... and[move] it[as]de (?)", KBo III 41+ obv. 18f (CTH 16). The Hanyeri relief cannot be directly linked to the above text as was done by Kohlmeyer, 90, since a Sarruma cult is not attested in the Old Kingdom period, see below.

81 For the aspects of Sarruma as a mountain god see V.Haas 1982, 78ff.
See now also from Meskene/Emar, Ari-Sarruma (No.11), Kili-Sarruma (No. 37) Laroche, *Akkadica* 22 (1981), 10f.

The greater importance of Sarruma is also reflected in his first appearance in the god list of the Ulmi-Tešub treaty (CTH 106) dated to Hattusili III and culminated in the reign of Tudhalia IV. At Yazilikaya Sarruma appears in three different forms, 1) as protective deity to Tudhalia (IV) (Yaz. 81), 2) as the son of Tešub and Hepat in the main procession (Yaz.44) where he is shown standing on a lion and 3) in the form of a bull calf in the same group with an epigraph which was read as "Sarruma calf of Tešub" (Laroche 1969, 67).

Börker-Klähn draws a parallel with the princely figure of Karabel and favours an earlier date for Hanyeri and Imamkulu than Fraktin and Taşçi, p.95,97.

A comparable situation existed in the Iron Age when the Anti-Taurus region constituted the border area between Gurgum, Que and Tabal (sect.1(c) above).
Chapter II

Some Problems in Kizzuwatnean Research

1. The Sources

The sources for Kizzuwatna\(^1\) are almost exclusively derived from Boğazköy records and consequently our research into the history, social and political structure of this region, must be regarded as incomplete.

Although Kizzuwatnean archives have not yet been located, references to them in Boğazköy texts are not uncommon. This is particularly well illustrated in the colophon of KUB XXXIV 116+ (a tablet of the hisuwa festival, CTH 628) which states that "When queen Puduhepa ordered the chief scribe UR.MAḪ.LÚ to search for the tablets from Kizzuwatna..." (Otten 1975, 14ff.).

There are also a striking number of references to wooden tablets (GIS.ḪUR, LE-UY)\(^2\) which contained ritual and festival texts deposited in the archives of Kizzuwatna and which were consulted by royal practitioners and priests, as indicated in the following excerpt from a birth ritual: "...how they perform the festival it is made on a wooden kurta tablet and it is (from) Kizzuwatna and I do not know the festival orally, by heart but I will fetch it from there" (Beckman 1983, 144f).

Most of the Boğazköy texts appertaining to Kizzuwatna belong to the religious sphere. The role of Kizzuwatna as a transmitter of Mesopotamian-Hurrian and Mesopotamian-Babylonian religious and literary traditions has long been recognized. It is generally thought that the first major wave of Hurro-Mesopotamian religious elements entered Hatti at the time of Arnuwanda/Asmunikal, followed by another main influx during the reign of Hattusili III and Puduhepa (Kammenhuber 1976a, 133).\(^3\)

It has been claimed that the second Hittite dynasty had its origin in Kizzuwatna, a theory mainly based on the Hurrian

\(^{1}\) Kizzuwatna

\(^{2}\) GIS.ḪUR, LE-UY

\(^{3}\) Arnuwanda/Asmunikal
aspects which are attached to the Early Empire rulers (Kammenhuber 1968, 41, idem. 1976a, 134). Dynastic connections may have existed but the only person who clearly traces her ancestry to Kizzuwatna is queen Puduhepa. In her titulary she is described as "daughter of Kizzuwatna/Kummanni" in a number of texts, as well as on the Fraktin rock relief (see ch.I.4).

With the assumption that the new Hittite dynasty originated in Kizzuwatna goes the theory that most Hurro-Mesopotamian religious and literary traditions reached Hatti via Kizzuwatna. There are, however, indications that there existed centres to the east which also transmitted these cultural elements to Hatti. The mention of Hurrian itkalzi ritual tablets as originating in the town of Sapinuwa (east of Mašat) is a good example to prove this point (see Haas 1985, 247ff.).

It is the symbiosis of Hurro/Luwian elements which is most characteristic of religious material from Kizzuwatna and where we are on safe ground on the question of origin, as for example the Hurrian rituals performed by functionaries with Luwian names or interspersed with Luwian phrases. The comprehensive corpus of religious texts with Kizzuwatnean affiliations has become subject to detailed analysis in more recent publications but, needless to say, is not considered here on the basis of its religious content.

References to Kizzuwatna outside the Boğazköy archives are sparse. In Egyptian sources it is only attested during the reign of Ramses II, according to Helck (1962, 289). Kizzuwatna (k'-d'-w'-dn) is mentioned in the list of Hittite allies who took part in the battle of Kadesh and twice in the Hattusili III-Ramses II peace treaty inscribed at Karnak. Here gods of Kizzuwatna are listed among the oath gods of Hatti and Egypt, and in the description of Puduhepa's seal (on the "silver tablet") where she appears as "daughter of Kizzuwatna" (Breasted, Anc.Rec. III, 138, 172, 174).
The name which occurs more frequently in Egyptian records k̄dj, Kode, is thought to be the more ancient name for Kizzuwatna, but it also appears among the list of countries destroyed by the "Sea Peoples" in the time of Ramses III (Smith 1922, 46ff; Helck, op.cit.). Kode must have been situated on the coast since it is referred to as a country which exported beer "from the harbour" as well as coniferous timber. Kode, if it can be equated with Cilicia, is of interest to the history of Kizzuwatna, since it is named as ally of "the Hurrian" (Mitanni) in the battle of Megiddo against Tuthmosis III during his first Asian campaign dated to 1461 B.C., and again as offering tribute to Egypt after the surrender of Megiddo (Breasted, Anc.Rec. II, 180, 186). Other references to Kode belong to records of Ramses II, among them the list of countries which formed the Hittite coalition opposing the Egyptians in the battle of Kadeš, although this list enumerates Kode (k̄dj) as well as Kizzuwatna (k̄-d̄-w̄-dn) (Helck 1962, 206). The identification of Kode with Kizzuwatna/Cilicia has been questioned by Weippert (1969, 35ff.) who has isolated a place-name in an Ugaritic text (qty) which he associated with Egyptian Kode. In his view Egyptian references link Kode geographically to N. Syria and not Anatolia. He favours a location north of Alalah and in the region occupied by Sam'al in the first millennium (op.cit., 37 and n.17). For the time being, the question of Kode's location remains unsolved, but the identification with Cilicia cannot be accepted without reservations.

Apart from the Egyptian references to Kizzuwatna, the only other occurrence outside Boğazköy comes from Ugarit. The text is a letter (RS 34.136, Ugaritica VII) sent by the king of Karkamis to the king of Ugarit in which the former complains about the inadequacy of gifts sent to Hatti by the latter. To lend weight to his complaint, the king of Karkamis relates that in the time of "your father" (i.e., father of the king of Ugarit) gifts (šulmanati) had been sent
to Hakpis and to Kizzuwatna (rev.29 URUKI-zu-wa-at-na). The mention of these cities point to the time of Hattusili III who was king of Hakpis during the reign of his brother Muwatalli II and to queen Puduhepa, whose connections with Kizzuwatna are well known (Otten 1975, 11ff.). The letter is consequently not relevant to Kizzuwatna as a political entity, since it falls into a period when Kizzuwatna had long been annexed into the Hittite state. The latest known reference to Kizzuwatna occurs in the annals of Shalmaneser III which report that the Assyrian king (in 839 B.C.) crossed the Amanus mountains into Que and conquered the fortified towns of Lusanda (Lawazantiya), Abarnani and Kizuatni (Kizzuwatna) (ch.IV.7).

The only primary sources for the history of Kizzuwatna consist of a series of treaties concluded with Hatti and with Alalah. They represent the oldest known treaties found in the Boğazköy archives and, although their state is often fragmentary (which means that the name of the Hittite king is frequently not preserved), they nevertheless provide an insight into matters which arise from a common border. A historical outline for Kizzuwatna has to be pieced together from a variety of secondary sources which make direct or indirect reference to Kizzuwatna or place-names that can be associated with the region of Cilicia.

2. The Etymology of the Name Kizzuwatna

The origin of the name Kizzuwatna is philologically unclear. Hurrian, Anatolian and Indo-European derivations have been suggested. Goetze (Kizz., 5 n.20) argued for a Hurrian origin, claiming that kizzu/i is a common element (of unknown meaning) in Nuzi texts and divides -(w)atna into -at- (as in Hepat) and -na (Hurrian pl.article). G. Neumann (1958, 113f) proposed a mainly Hittite etymology. He divides and interprets the name as follows: kez/kiz (abl. of Hitt. ka/ki), -wat- (abbreviated stem of watar, as seen in abl. witaz) plus Hurrian suffix -na/ni (as suggested
above by Goetze) which Neumann translates as meaning "the (land) this side of the water". He regards the statement in the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5) that Kizzuwatna extended to the sea as a confirmation of the above suggested etymology. Kammenhuber (1968, 96, n.292) favours a Hurrian origin to an Indo-European one, but herself classifies the name Kizzuwatna as south-east Anatolian, i.e., Hattian with a Hurrian admixture.

The most recent etymological suggestion comes from Laroche (1979, 76) in his discussion of the Lycian inscription of the Letoon trilingual. Laroche connects Lyc. wedri = country with watna, proposing a Luw. etymology for Kizzuwatna with the meaning "Low Country"; kez = low + watna = country (Hitt. katta + utne). Laroche's suggested Luw. etymology of watna with the meaning of "country" is by far the most satisfactory to date; however, the first element kez/kizzu-still poses a problem since a Luw. form of kez meaning low/under would still have to be confirmed. The naming of Cilicia as "Low Country" "Lower Land" would indeed make very good sense considering the topography of the region; a vast plain dipping towards the sea which is entirely framed by mountainous terrain (cp. mod. Çukur-ova = hollow/sunken plain).

Relevant to our discussion here is also the hieroglyphic writing of Kizzuwatna on the rock relief at Fraktin which reads: L 56-L 285-L 35 = Ka-zu(wa)-na REGIO (see Fig.2). The reading was first proposed by Laroche who had identified L 285 as zu with the help of Yazilikaya No.45 which depicts the goddess Allanzu (La-zu, RHA 27 (1969),89). The sign L 56 (ka/ga) is closely related to L 57 = INFRA/SUB, as indeed Laroche has pointed out. Both signs depict a hand with a downward pointing thumb but L 56 is drawn horizontally and L 57 vertically. The former only occurs in Empire context and the latter is only attested in first millennium inscriptions which does suggest that L 56 is the Empire version of L 57 and has also the logographic value of INFRA (+ ta = ka/kat-ta). Therefore the hieroglyphic writing of
Kizzuwatna at Fraktin may well indicate a meaning of "low" in its first element. For the present the Luwian etymology for Kizzuwatna = "Lower Country" put forward by Laroche, cannot be entirely substantiated, but is an attractive one, particularly in view of the fact that the appearance of Kizzuwatna in Hittite records seems to coincide with the region emerging as a politically independent unit, an area (or part of it) which had previously been referred to as Adaniya (ch.III.3).

If Kizzuwatna could be shown to mean "Lower Country" it may also provide an etymological link with Gr. Cataonia. The latter formed the south-east region of Cappadocia. Strabo described Cataonia as a broad hollow plain - watered by the Pyramos - which bordered in the south on the Cilician Taurus (of which the Amanus formed part), Melitene in the east and the Anti-Taurus (Tahtalı Dağları) in the west (Strabo XII.2.2-6). The area described by Strabo is therefore essentially that of the Elbistan plain with adjoining mountainous regions to the south and west, but other geographers describe a more extensive Cataonia. We are told that the inhabitants of Comana are Cataonians (Strabo XII.2.3) who are referred to elsewhere as having once been a distinct tribe who spoke a different language from the Cappadocians (Strabo XII.1.2). The above statement led to E. Meyer's suggestion that Cataonians may have been of Hittite (Luwian?) descent (Pauly-Wissowa, X.2 2478).

Forrer (1926, 41) had considered the possibility that the name Cataonia is an ethnicon formed with the adverb katta = "unten", Kataones = "die Unteren", Kataonia = "Underland", and he supported his theory by drawing a parallel with Lycaonia (ethnicon of Lukka), the province to the west of Cappadocia.

The case was argued more precisely by Laroche who traces Luw. ethnicon-wanni -unni Lyc. -(e)nni to Gr. ὄνην (-ην) as in Lycaonia, Cataonia. Both regions would have had a
Luwian population in the second millennium (BSL 1960, 171f).
The most recent etymological suggestion comes from Tischler
(HEG, 539ff.) who proposes katawani "unten liegend", on
account of Strabo's topographical description of Cataonia
as outlined above.

While the region of Cataonia did not occupy the area
which formed the essential part of Kizzuwatna, i.e., the
Cilician plain, it did lie in the mountainous territory of
the Anti-Taurus which is traditionally regarded as having
been part of Kizzuwatna.²¹ It is therefore conceivable
that Hitt. Kizzuwatna may have lived on in class.Cataonia.

A "Lower Country" is of course well attested in Hittite
records, written as a rule KUR ŠAPLITI, KUR kat-ti-ir-ri-(ya)
(KUB XXVI 9 I 6)²² appears to be the Hittite reading
(Kizz., 23 n.88). However it is clear from the texts that
the geographical area and political structure is not that
of Cilicia/Kizzuwatna. It has been widely accepted that
the "Lower Country" should be located in the Konya plain,
but recent evidence indicates a much larger area (RGTC 6, 455).²³

The transfer of the Hittite capital from Hattusa to the
"Lower Country" during the reign of Muwatalli II is reported
by Hattusili III in his autobiography (Otten 1981). He tells
us that Muwatalli gathered up the gods and took them to the
"Lower Lands" (KUB I 1 obv.I 78), but in another part of the
text he reports that the gods were taken to URU DJ-assa
(= Tarhuntassa) which he made his capital.²⁴

Güterbock (SBo I 38, n.81) had tentatively considered
the possibility that there may be a connection between the
Muwatalli rock relief at Sirkeli and the city of Tarhuntassa,
a suggestion which was more recently revived by Ünal who
argued for a location of that city at Sirkeli (1974,221).
However, this must be rejected, particularly in the light of
recent discoveries which are the hieroglyphic epigraphs at
Meydancik²⁵ (near Gülnar) in Rough Cilicia, reported to
belong to DKAL (Kurunta) king of Tarhuntassa and
Mu(wa)-ta-li as well as the boundary descriptions of the newly discovered treaty (Bronze Tablet 86/299) between Tudhaliay IV and Kurunta of Tarhuntassa. From the latter it is evident that the territory administered by Tarhuntassa included most of the Pamphilian coast and part of Lycaonia (Otten 1989, 15ff.). There is no doubt that Muwatalli on his campaigns, setting out from the "Lower Country" en route for N. Syria, would have crossed the Cilician plain. The significance of the Sirkeli relief lies most probably in the strategic position of the mound itself which marks an important crossing-point between western and eastern Cilicia (ch.I(b)).

3. Some Remarks on Kummanni

The texts mentioning Kummanni are almost entirely religious, consisting of rituals, oracles, prayers and festival texts.

For the etymology of Kummanni, Hurrian as well as Luwian derivations have been suggested. A. Goetze (Kizz., 5 n.21) believed that Kummanni contained the same element as in Kumme-/Kummiya and therefore linked Kummanni on philological grounds to the above, but not geographically. Kumme(ni) (Hurr./Akk.), Kummiya (Hitt.) is regarded as an epithet of Tešub, the city of his birth, attested in a Hurrian text as Tešuba(m) Kummnen (Mari 1, 34) and in Hittite as URU Kummiyas ĐU-aś (Laroche GLH, 154, Kammenhuber 1968, 97, n.294). A Luwian etymology was contemplated by Laroche in the lexical discussion on Lyc.kuma- = Luw. kummai- suggesting for Kummanni a meaning of "the sacred one" (= Hierapolis) (1979, 109 n.42). Similarly, R. Lebrun - Kumma/e + ni = "the sacred (city)" (1978, 165f, n.26, 1979, 131).

Mursili II in his annals reports that in the ninth year of his reign the halziya- festival for Hepat of Kummanni became urgent, so he went to the city of Kizzuwatna (AM, 108f). The above is just one of the examples which
illustrates the synonymous use of Kummanni with Kizzuwatna in Hittite texts, previously discussed in some detail by Goetze (Kizz., 9ff.). Furthermore, since the dating of Hittite texts began it has become clear that later copies of a particular text frequently substitute Kizzuwatna for Kummanni, clearly expressing a preference for the latter in the Empire period (see ch.V.4(b)). Indeed, according to the present evidence, only in the time of Mursili II was the name of Kummanni attested, and it became particularly prominent during the reign of Muwatalli (Otten 1975, 14, n.29; Kümmel RIA VI, 335). The latter in a prayer to Tešub (CTH 382) summons all the gods of Hatti to Kummanni, and in another prayer addressed to the Storm-god pihasassi (CTH 381) he enumerates the pantheon of the city as well as the country of Kummanni (Geography, 117). While the oath-god lists in treaties concluded by Suppiluliuma I only evoke the gods of Kizzuwatna, they refer now to deities of Kummanni (CTH 69, CTH 106, CTH 132, see ch.IV, n.2). Therefore, unless a "Middle Hittite" (or earlier) text mentioning Kummanni can be identified, it must be postulated that the use of Kummanni did not come in until after the reign of Suppiluliuma I. A. Goetze has linked the transfer of Kizzuwatna to Kummanni with the absorption of the region into the Hittite state (Kizz., 12). This raises the question as to what lay behind the introduction of Kummanni. The pantheon connected with this city is clearly that of Kizzuwatna (RGTC 6, 213ff., RIA VI, 335); mainly Hurrian in origin, headed by Tešub and Hepat with the occasional reference to all the gods and goddesses, mountains and rivers of Kummanni (CTH 132, CTH 381). There is no evidence of a newly-introduced cult to which one could attach the use of Kummanni. Any theory put forward for the introduction of the above name depends largely on which etymology one favours. If one comes down on the side of a Hurrian one, it would be possible to think in terms of a revival of
Tešub's epithet (Kumme(ni)) the town of his origin, (see above) which led to the naming of his cult centre in Kizzuwatna. Kummanni could then be a corrupt form of Hurr. Kummene/i (Lebrun 1978, 165, n.26). The development could also be connected with the increasing prominence which Tešub gained in the Hittite pantheon culminating in the reign of Hattusili III when he is established as head of the pantheon (Gurney 1977, 17). If, on the other hand, we take up the suggestion of Laroche that Kummanni has the meaning of "the holy city", we could draw a parallel with the situation of Comana which, on becoming a Roman colony during the reign of Caracalla (212-217 A.D.), received the name Hieropolis on the strength of its importance as a religious centre (H. Grothe 1911, 238, 248). Both theories are of course conjectural, but keeping in mind that the origin of the Tešub cult is tied to Kumme(ni), a town in Upper Mesopotamia, a Hurrian etymology for Kummanni, and consequently the first proposal, seems preferable.

As mentioned above, Kummanni is primarily found in religious texts, but there are a few fragments most probably of later date, in which Kummanni occurs in historical or administrative context. Unfortunately, because of their fragmentary state, the texts contribute little to the historical picture, and they certainly do not provide sufficient evidence to attribute a political role to Kummanni (Kümmel RIA VI, 335). KBo XXII 11 appears to be an account of Hattusili III (see KBo XXII Vorwort) on the military activities of his brother Muwatalli. The reference to KUR URU Kum-ma-an-n[i (obv.4) may be connected to the assembling of his military forces in the region of Kizzuwatna. However, the text clearly belongs to the period after Kizzuwatna's annexation and refers to KUR URU Kummanni in a geographical and not in a political sense. The land of Kummanni is named with Aššur and Alalah in KUB XXXVI 125 and with KUR URU Aššur, Nineveh and the sea in KBo XXVIII 145, but no consecutive sense can be made from
either fragment. KBo XXVIII 138 reads...)

LUGAL KUR URU Kum-ma-an-[ni (obv.1). The text (letter) may have dealt with cult administration involving the revival(?) of the cult for the sacred mountain Manuziya (Otten 1969, 251, n.40, also Vorwort in KBo XXVIII). The small fragment KUB XLVIII 81 mentions Kizzuwatnean towns; Ataniya (x+1), Arusna (3), Kummanni (6) in the context of a military conflict (Kizz. 57). Significant is that the text uses the old connective particle ṣu (Friedrich HE 1, 161). If the text were an original we would have here an attestation for Kummanni in the Old Kingdom. However, Otten has shown that later scribes frequently copied the conjunction ṣu (1973, Text B = KBo III 38, passim), therefore once again Kummanni may have come into the text at a later stage.

The mention of Arusna together with Adaniya and Kummanni indicates that Arusna was also a town of Kizzuwatna and should be located in the Cilician plain.

4. The Question of Kummanni and Classical Comana

The identification of Hittite Kummanni with classical Comana in Cataonia is widely accepted and has found a firm place in the literature on the subject of Hittite geography. This has been done on two accounts:

1. The philological connections of Comana with Kummanni, and

2. The theocratic status of Comana described by Strabo (XII.2.3-4) which has been linked to the importance of Kummanni as a religious centre in the Hittite period.

The village of Sar lies in a narrow secluded valley about 5km west of Kemer on both sides of the Göksu river. It has been clearly identified as Strabo's Comana Cappadociae, the location of a temple dedicated to Enyo/Mâ. It is said to have been on the direct route through the Anti-Taurus from Kayseri to Eski Malatya. The Roman
milestone which was found at Şar fits the information given in Itineraria Antoniana (R. Harper 1968, 149). More milestones from the Caesarea-Melitene road have recently been found which have established Comana as a caput viae (see ch.1.4).

The origin of classical Comana is uncertain, if one disregards the "folk-etymological" explanation by Strabo which links it to the "hair (komê) of mourning" deposited by Orestes and Iphigeniea at the site of Comana (XII.2.3). However an etymological link with Hittite Kummanni seems assured. The theocratic status of Comana is clear from Strabo's description of the city where the high-priest to the goddess Enyo/Mâ is said to have ranked second to the king of Cappadocia. He also states that the proceeds of the agricultural land surrounding the temple go to the priest who, we are told, is frequently a member of the royal family (XII.2.3). A. Goetze advocated a direct link between the religious rôle of Kummanni and that described by Strabo for Comana, to the extent that he rejected the theory that Kizzuwatna/Kummanni was the capital on the grounds of its sacred character (Kizz., 11f, n.49, 1957a, 103). The appointment of "priests" (LûSANGA) in the town of Kizzuwatna who also had secular functions, does indeed provide a parallel between classical Comana and the Hittite city. There is, on the other hand, no evidence that Kummanni/Kizzuwatna continued to be administered by priests after Telipinu and his predecessor Kantuzzili, the only two priests known to us (see ch.V.5). Telipinu, who was made priest in Kizzuwatna by his father Suppilulima I, is later known as king of Aleppo, and presumably fulfilled the same rôle of priest in that city which was renowned as a centre for the worship of Tešub and Hepat (GS I, 196f).

On the aspect of Kummanni's "sacredness", Otten has expressed reservations and noted that the term URU\textsuperscript{LUM} DINGIR\textsuperscript{LIM} (= Hierapolis) is never attached to Kummanni (1975, 14f). As sacred cities one could possibly describe
the great cult centres of Nerik, Arinna and Zippalanda which were granted special privileges in the Laws. According to §§ 50-51, the estate of the priest in the above cities was exempt from sahhan and luzzi (Archi 1975, 330). No parallel arrangements are known for Kummanni. There is consequently very little evidence for believing that Strabo's account of Comana is a reflection of practices in the Hittite period.

While on philological grounds an identification of Kummanni with Comana is attractive, there remains the problem of the archaeological evidence. The site of Şar was investigated by R. Harper in 1967, but apart from a preliminary report which describes mainly the architectural remains, the site is still archaeologically largely unknown (Harper 1968, 149ff.). Şar was also included in G.H. Brown's survey of the Anti-Taurus in 1965. However, not a single sherd predating the Hellenistic period was found during his investigations (1967, 160, 127, 156), but Brown considered the possibility that earlier occupation levels have been masked by heavy Hellenistic and Roman layers. J. Garstang and O.R. Gurney, who acknowledged the lack of evidence for a Hittite site at Comana/Şar, suggested that it lies "back some miles from the river on its western side" (Geography, 51). If there is a site, it was not located by Brown during his survey.

The mound of Yalak, a short distance to the east of Şar and located on the route from Göksun to Pinarbaşı, has yielded pottery from the prehistoric to the classical period and could be a possible candidate for the site of Kummanni, as suggested to me by J. Mellaart, but the mound is rather small (ch.I.3). One should at this point consider the potential of Şar as a second millennium site. Its secluded location in very mountainous terrain with limited agricultural lands in the vicinity and communication routes which were cut by snow during the winter months (see ch.I.1(a)), would make Şar a poor candidate, especially if we keep in mind that
the city of Kummanni/Kizzuwatna was not only a religious but also an administrative centre. Whether it was also the capital, assumed by Forrer (1937, 181f) and more recently by Haas and Wilhelm (1974, 4) and Gurney (1977, 16), but rejected by Goetze (Kizz, llf, n.49) remains uncertain, but is very likely. If one accepts Kizzuwatna/Kummanni as having been the capital city of the country/province by that name, the question that follows is, why a location in the Anti-Taurus should have been preferred to one in the Cicilian plain - to which there is no satisfactory answer. There are, however, a number of substantial mounds in the plain which are of archaeological importance and fulfil all the requirements for a Late Bronze Age site, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter.

It may be as well to remind ourselves here of the great climatic differences between the plain and the Anti-Taurus region which are responsible for a long tradition of seasonal movement and occupation (see above). When Puduhepa writes to the Egyptian king (KUB XXI 38 30-31) that her husband has gone down to Kummanni to winter, followed by a reference to his poor health, we can be certain that Hattusili took advantage of the mild Mediterranean climate of the plain and not the wintry conditions of the Anti-Taurus mountains.

While the toponym Kummanni appears to have lived on in classical Comana, it does not necessarily follow that the site of the former is identical with that of the latter; after all, Kummanni denotes not only a city but a whole geographical region which included areas in the Anti-Taurus. It may therefore be legitimate to abandon the traditional theory and seek Kummanni/Kizzuwatna elsewhere. A location in the eastern part of the Cilician plain would satisfy the archaeological requirements, and has also the advantage of being reconcilable with the information given in the annals of Shalmaneser III who conquers the town of Kizuatni in Que after crossing the Amanus mountains (see ch.IV.7). A similar location could be suggested for Lawazantiya which must have been situated in the same region (See ch.III.1, ch.I, n.35).
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44. Cp. also Assyrian Kummuh > classical Commagene, J.D. Hawkins R1A VI, 338.
CHAPTER III

Cilicia in the Old Kingdom

1. Cilicia during the Reign of Hattusili I and Mursili I

It has to be admitted from the outset that textual evidence for Kizzuwatna in the Old Kingdom is sparse; Kizzuwatna or Kummanni as a country or city does not occur in historical Old Kingdom texts (to my knowledge) except in the Telipinu-Ispatahsu treaty (CTH 21). Old Kingdom records do however contain place names which are known to have formed part of Kizzuwatna in later periods, e.g. Lawazantiya, Adaniya, Zunnahara and others. Therefore in examining Old Kingdom texts the main aim will be to gain a picture of the historical geography of the area in question and to isolate, as far as possible, the historical setting in which the formation of a state of Kizzuwatna could be visualized.

Old Kingdom texts strongly reflect the expansionist policy of Hittite kings into N.Syria and their frequent clashes with the Hurrians in the course of their activities. In referring to the Hurrians, a variety of terms are used: ERINMES hur-ri "the Hurrian troops" (KBo I 11 rev. 125, KUR ŠA URU hur-ri (KBo X 2 obv.24),3 LUGAL ERINMES hur-ri "the king of the Hurrian troops" (KBo III 54 8), or simply hur-la "the Hurrian" (KBo III 46 II 18,33, terms discussed in RGTC 6, 121f). According to various Old Kingdom sources the Hittite armies were confronted by a number of N.Syrian city states who at times acted jointly under the leadership of Aleppo against the Hittite invading forces (CTH 7, CTH 14, 15). The military events described in a series of historical fragments listed under CTH 14 and CTH 15 partly recall those of the Hattusili I annals and have been attributed to the above king (Klengel GS I, 146f, 159f and 1975,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hittite King List - Old Kingdom</th>
<th>Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattusili I</td>
<td>CTH 16 Semi-legendary account of a Taurus crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTH 4 Hattusili I Annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTH 7 Siege of Uršu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mursili I</td>
<td>CTH 13 (?) Annalistic account of campaigns in Anatolia frequently directed against the Hurrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hantili I</td>
<td>CTH 19 Telipinu Edict §§ 12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidanta I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammuna</td>
<td>CTH 18 Ammuna Chronicla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTH 19 Telipinu Edict §§ 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huzziya I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1500 B.C. Telipinu</td>
<td>CTH 19 Telipinu Edict §§ 24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTH 20 Campaign against Lahha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTH 21 Treaty of Telipinu with Isputahsu of Kizzuwatna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3
We learn that Yamhad (Aleppo) under the command of a certain Zukraši came to the aid of Hassu in the face of a Hittite attack. Also mentioned, unfortunately in broken context, are the rulers (LU) of Ebla (Tell Mardikh) and Emar (Meskene) who appear to have been part of the N.Syrian coalition who opposed the Hittites. The reference to Yarimlim with son Hammurabi (rulers of Aleppo) and Zukraši, a military official (UGULA UKU.US), has provided a valuable chronological link with Alalah VII where in AT 6 Yarimlim appears as overlord of Ammitakum of Alalah and Zukraši in the list of witnesses (Klengel GS I, 157ff).

One of the principal routes taken by the Hittites on their campaigns to N.Syria, certainly in their actions against Alalah, would have been via the Cilician Gates, across the Cilician plain and through the Amanus passes. Cilicia not only afforded the Hittites access to N.Syria but also to the Mediterranean sea, the importance of which is already stressed in the Telipinu Edict for the early Old Kingdom rulers. A semi-legendary text which reflects both these achievements is CTH 16 (Otten 1962, 156ff). The text alludes to campaigns which involve crossing the mountains and the conquest of the sea. The narrator states as follows: mān lahhieskinun nu-nas ḪUR.SAG-āš nakkiet "whenever I went on a campaign the mountain was difficult for us". The obstacle is removed by a mythological bull who lifted up the mountain (nu uni ḪUR.SAG-an karapta) and as a result the sea was conquered (arunan tarhuen, KBo III 41+KUB XXXI 4 obv.l7ff). Otten is surely right when he interprets this semi-mythological text as reflecting the attempt of the Hittites to pass through the Cilician Gates on their way to the Mediterranean sea and on to N.Syria (ibid.,166). This is confirmed by the next passage in the text which makes it clear that Aleppo was the ultimate aim of military ambitions when the Sun-god orders men to go to Halpa and attend the troops (20-21). Šuppiyahsu and Zidi (presumably the commanders of the Hittite troops) are reported to be at Halpa too. The campaign against Aleppo
alluded to in this text was obviously not crowned with success since we know from later records that Aleppo was not conquered until Mursili I (KBo III 57 II 10-20, KBo I 6 12ff). The above mentioned Zidi and a man by the name of Sarmassu, who occurred earlier in the text, feature also in the so-called Palace Chronicle (CTH 8) and the Inandik land donation (here Zidi only), both dated to Hattusili I, thus placing the events of this text in the time of Hattusili also (see below sect. 5).

What is expressed in mythologically veiled terms in CTH 16 becomes historical reality as we know it from the events described in the bilingual annals of Hattusili I (CTH 4). The annals give no direct information on the political history of Cilicia but Hattusili reports two campaigns to Alalah, in the second and in the fifth year, and the destruction of that city. In both instances Alalah is the first town reached with no encounters on the way. If one accepts the above proposed route taken by the Hittites in their exploits in the Amuq, the implication then would be that the territories which Hattusili crossed, including Cilicia, were under Hittite control.

Areas east of the Amanus appear to have been less secure. The frequent clashes with Hassu, Ursu and Hahha described in the annals and several other Old Kingdom texts (CTH 14, 15, CTH 7) indicate the Hittite attempt to maintain access to N. Syria, in which they seem to have succeeded in the early part of the Old Kingdom period.

After Hattusili's first attack on Alalah in the second year he continues his campaign against Ursu, Igakališ and Tešhiniya. Apparently only on his return to Hattusa does he destroy Ursu and carry its booty back to the capital. The encounter with Ursu cannot however be equated with the events described in the text known as the "Siege of Ursu" (CTH 7) since the latter text makes it clear that the king was not personally involved in the military action against Ursu but directed the siege from the city of Lawazantiya (see below).

The mention of the Puran(a) river in the annals
which Hattusili crossed on his way to Hassu(wa) is of
some interest since a river of that name can be found
in a number of texts connected with Kizzuwatna (Kizz., 69).
It occurs in the (h)isuwa Festival for Tešub of Manuziya
(see below) as šiya Purana (KBo XVII 98 V 28) and
Puruna (KUB XX 52+ IV 7) and in the land donation to
the priest and the priestess of the Ishara cult (KUB XL 2
I 8) as Purunaya.

There has been much discussion about the
identification of the Puruna/Puran(a) and consequently
the location of Hassu. The question is, whether the
Puruna designates the Euphrates, in spite of the fact
that in a later passage in the bilingual annals the
Euphrates is mentioned in the normally attested form,
i.e. as Puratta in the Akkadian (rev.18) and as Mala in
the Hittite version (III 29).

Giiterbock argued for an identification of the Puruna
with the Euphrates, pointing out the similarities of
attested forms for that river; Sum. Buranun(a), Hurr.
Puranti, Uratta, Akk. Purattu and consequently places
Hassu east of the Euphrates (1964, 3f, RIA IV, 137). The
above view was obviously shared by Tischler who in
RGTC 6, 543f has listed Puruna and Puratti jointly,
identifying both names as designating the Euphrates.¹⁰

Otten, on the other hand, seeks the Puruna in the
vicinity of the Euphrates (MDOG 1958, 82, n.24), so does
Goetze (JCS 16, 28) and both argue for a location of
Hassu west of the Euphrates.

If one accepts Giiterbock's view, the implication
would be that Kizzuwatna extended eastwards to the
Euphrates for which there is no supporting evidence,
either in the time of its political independence, or as a
geographical region. However, one of the main objections
seems to be the fact that the Euphrates should be
referred to by two different names in one and the same
text, in the Hittite as well as the Akkadian version of
the Hattusili annals.

The identification of the Puruna with the
Pyramos/Ceyhan proposed by Cornelius (1973, 25) and Laroche (GLH, 205) is an attractive solution to the problem, particularly if the chosen route led Hattusili via the Cilician plain which would have necessitated the crossing of this river. As for the location of Hassu(m) one should point out that in Old Babylonian records the city is linked with Uršu and Karkamīš suggesting that Hassu too should be located to the west of the Euphrates (see below).¹¹

The "Siege of Uršu" (KBo I 11, Güterbock, 1938, 99ff) has already been mentioned above but deserves a closer look, since it contains one of the earliest references in Hittite records to Lawazantiya, the city from which Hattusili directs operations against Uršu. Lawazantiya is the second most important city after Kizzuwatna/Kummanni itself, one of the great religious centres in Kizzuwatna and birthplace of queen Puḫuḫepa who is described as priestess of Ištar of Lawazantiya (Otten 1975, 11).¹²

The form of ῥ ῆ u-uz-za-an-di-ya (obv. '21)¹³ of this early Old Kingdom text is closest to ῃ u-za-ti-a and similar forms of the Old Assyrian records (Hirschfein, RIA VI, 433f) which becomes ῃ a-wa-(az)-za-an-ti-ya (BoTU 23A II 20, 21) in the time of Telipinu and ῃ s-a-an-da in the Neo-Assyrian period (Michel 1954-1959, 40).

Lawazantiya is to be located not too distant from the town of Kizzuwatna/Kummanni (KBo XVII 102 and 103, Lebrun 1979a, 205; Otten 1975 14) and Astuyara (KBo XXI 34+IBoT 11 7, Forlanini 1979, 170f). The town was situated on the river Alda but not, according to Lebrun (1983, 61f), on the river Tarmana as stated in RGTC 6 (238, 553) which he now reads ῃ tar-ma-an-na = Hurr. "spring, source" (cf. Lebrun 1979a, 198).

Lawazantiya's association with water is also clear from the ritual CTH 475 which states that when Palliya king of Kizzuwatna sets up the Weather-god of Kizzuwatna he takes ῆ hillya water from the seven wells of Lawazantiya (KUB VII 20 1-6, Carruba 1965, 77ff). A location of Lawazantiya in the Elbistan plain has been
favoured by a number of scholars but a location in Cilicia proper near the Bahçe pass (Amanicæ Pylæ) has also been suggested (for lit. see RGTC 6,238).

Astour's identification of lwzd with Lawazantiya in an Ugaritic letter (RS 18.40) which contains a brief military report, would favour the latter (1965a, 256f) and so indeed does the account of Shalmaneser III who reports that he crossed the Amanus (Kωρha-ma-nu) and descended to the towns of Lusanda, Abarnani and Kisuatni in the country of Que (Michel op.cit.). For the present the evidence of the Old Assyrian records which link Lawazantiya with Hurma and Salahsuwa favouring a location in the Anti-Taurus region, does not seem compatible with the evidence from Ugarit and the Shalmaneser annals which suggest a location of the city in the Cilician plain. The theory put forward by Astour, that Lawazantiya was transferred from the Anti-Taurus region to Cilicia (ibid.,157), does present a solution to the problem.

The siege against Uršu is led by a certain Sanda who regularly reports to the king at Lawazantiya on the various stages of events. The main theme of the text is the inefficiency and failure of Hittite military officials who allow frequent diplomatic contact between the besieged city and its Hurrian allies without being able to intercept them. Subjects of the "man" of Halap are reported as having entered the city five times and "the servant" of the king of Halap (IR DUMU ßIM rev.30) moves freely in and out of Uršu, while the men of Karkamiš are said to be sitting on a nearby mountain observing the scene (obv.23).

The Hittites seem to have suffered a series of setbacks, one of them being the breaking of the battering ram which is duly reported to the king. He orders that a new one should be built in the "Hurrian" manner with timber cut from the mountain of Hassu (obv.15ff). The above passage makes it clear that Hassu should be sought in the vicinity of Uršu and both places are most probably situated west or north-west of Karkamiš. The relative proximity of these cities is also clear from the Old
Babylonian records where Hassu, Uršu, Karkamiš (and Yamhad) are a geographical unit referred to as māt ebirtim (RGTC 3, 250).

In the Gudea of Lagas inscription Uršu is mentioned as a source of timber and said to be "in the mountains of Ibla" (Kupper 1949, 82). The archives of Ebla contain indeed references to Uršu and confirm the links between Uršu and Ebla.

From the Old Assyrian records Uršu is known as the seat of a karum and a bulla found recently at Acemhûyük testifies to Yahdunlim LUGAL māt Uršu (N. Özgüç 1980, 64f, Fig. III 3a-b).

Uršu, which occurs in the Hittite version of the Hattusili annals as Warsuwa, has been frequently equated with Urussa, the latter a town associated with Kizzuwatna according to CTH 133 and CTH 41, the Ismerika and Sunassura treaty respectively (see ch.IV.7). Kempinski and Košak have, with good reason, rejected the equation of the two place names particularly on the grounds that the form of Urussa is not attested in the Syrian records (1970, 213). It is interesting to note that Uršu (or similar forms) no longer occurs in Middle Assyrian and Babylonian texts (Nashef, RGTC 5) which would strengthen the case for not equating Uršu with Urussa. It is quite probable that Uršu (and possibly Hassu too) shared the fate of Ebla which after its destruction at the end of MBA was never rebuilt.

As mentioned above the siege of Uršu was directed from Lawazantiya and every development in the course of it is reported back to the king. If the operation was entirely conducted from Lawazantiya which is only mentioned once in the text, as the city Sanda is summoned to, Lawazantiya cannot have been too far away. The region which no doubt held the key to the movements between Uršu/Hassu and Lawazantiya must be the Islahiye valley, whether one seeks Lawazantiya in the Elbistan region or in eastern Cilicia. In a number of publications U.B. Alkim has stressed the strategic importance of the area between the Amanus and the Kurt Dağ which gave access to
Cilicia as well as Cataonia and in which he located some sixty settlement mounds (CRRAI 1964, 33f; AnSt 15, 30; 1969, 280ff).

Mursili's famous expedition to Babylon and the city's destruction is reported in the Telipinu Edict (§9) and was still remembered in later history as a unique feat by a Hittite king (Klengel 1979, 83ff). Unfortunately most texts ascribed to Mursili himself are very fragmentary (CTH 10-13) and, as yet, no annals bearing his name have come to light. However CTH 13, generally attributed to Mursili (for a different view see below), is partly phrased in the first person and has clear annalistic features (KBo III 46 obv.14 ...ta-a-ma u-it-ti "in the second year"). Although fragmentary the text reflects the widespread military activities of the Hittite king. A large number of place names which cover an area from Arzawa in the west to Hatra in the east, Ankuwa in the north and Cilicia in the south are listed but the context is frequently lost.

The city of Purushanda and its destruction features in year one (?) (obv.9). In the second year encounters with Hurrian troops and their capture (?) is reported around Hatra. The next place of action against the Hurrians is Hurma before the king proceeds to Lawazantiya (obv.24 UrUa-û-uz-za-an-ti-ya). Unfortunately the city is mentioned in broken context but the end of the next line reads ...hu-ul-li-it "he smote", which could be referring to a battle having taken place around Lawazantiya. Returning to Hurma line 32 has DINGIRMES UrUru-um-ma-an PAP-ah-ša-nu-ir "the gods protected Hurma". The above statement clearly indicates that Hurma was regarded as a Hittite city and it would appear that previously described clashes, involving Lawazantiya and Hurma, represent Hurrian attacks in Hittite held territory.

KBo III 54 11-17 (CTH 13C) enumerates a number of cities, among them UrUZunnahara (16) and UrUSinuwanta (17), the former a town of Kizzuwatna, situated most probably in the Cilician plain between Kummanni and
Adaniya. A passage which is most indicative of Zunnahara's location occurs in the hisuwa festival text (KUB XX 52 + KBo IX 123) dealt with by Goetze (Kizz., 54ff) which enumerates cities and their offerings to the Storm-god of Manuziya; Kumman (obv.I 10) Zunnahara(13) Adaniya (17) Tarsa (21) Ellipra (26).

Kempinski and Kosak (1982, 87ff) who presented the first complete edition of CTH 13 have proposed that the text is not an account of Mursili's campaigns in Anatolia but represents the extended annals of Hattusili I. They argue on the basis that there is no supporting evidence for Mursili campaigning in Anatolia (except against the Hurrians in the east) but that Hatti was consolidated on his succession which permitted him to concentrate on administrative matters (op.cit., 98). However, to reconcile the events described in the Hattusili annals and those of CTH 13 requires a reappraisal of the nature and purpose of the former.

In the opinion of Kempinski and Kosak the Hattusili annals "do not list a sequence of six years but are excerpts from an extensive edition from which the most important six years of his reign were chosen and written on the small golden statue..." (ibid., 109). The above theory is based on the statement of the Hittite version (KBo X 2 III 21-22) which says "This statue of gold I made for myself" and which is reported to have been placed before the Sun-goddess of Arinna.

A similar sentiment as to the character of the Hattusili annals was expressed by Houwink ten Cate who refers to it as a "triumph inscription" (1983, 100ff) and draws parallels with royal inscriptions of the Akkadian period on the one hand and the Anitta text which is said to have been inscribed at the gate, on the other. However, Houwink ten Cate does not draw any conclusions as to the sequence of historical events and the historical accuracy of the six year annals.

The theory of Kempinski and Kosak that the Hattusili annals do not represent six successive regal years but that events related were only a selected account of his
most important achievements, would however render the phrase "in the following year" at the beginning of a paragraph meaningless.  

In spite of the above view, the authors have attempted to correlate the events of both compositions. Although only a few place names occur in both texts (Arzawa, Ulamma/Ulma, Sanahuitta), the areas of operation are thought to be similar (for a discussion of the geographical regions which are mentioned in CTH 13 see ibid.,95f and 99ff). CTH 4 begins with the conflict of Sanauitta and Zalpa while CTH 13 has an account involving Purushanda. The divergence of the two texts is most evident, however, in the "second year". While events of CTH 13 are set in the south-east (including Lawazantiya) and military activities are directed against the Hurrians, CTH 4 relates for "the following year" the destruction of Alalah and Ursu, i.e. Hattusili's first Syrian campaign (ibid.,110f).

An Arzawa campaign is reported in both texts ("year three" in CTH 4, KBo X 2 I 22-45, CTH 13, KBo III 46+ II 42-56) but details diverge considerably. Indeed, the Arzawa campaign is described at greater length in CTH 4 than CTH 13. While CTH 4 gives a detailed account of the attack and destruction of Ulma (Akk. version Ulumma), CTH 13 reads ^Ulamma a-ar-ta ("he reached U.", II 45) and reports the death of the troop's commander. Col.III of CTH 13, which is badly preserved, deals with areas south of the Halys bend followed by Ankuwa and the north (Sanahuitta, Hakmis) which cannot be paralleled in CTH 4.

The main drawback of attributing CTH 13 to Hattusili I is that none of the Syrian cities the King campaigned against are mentioned, nor is the conflict with Hahha and Hassu(wa), which could, however, as Kempinski and Košak believe, have been recorded on the missing col.IV (p.111).

If CTH 13 are the extended annals of Hattusili I, then it would appear that CTH 13 was not the source from which excerpts were taken to compose the "six year annals"
since the details of the two texts vary too widely.

As for the historical picture reflected in CTH 13 - regarding Cilicia - the mention of Zunnahara is inconclusive as the context of this paragraph is lost.\(^29\)

A possible military encounter around Lawazantiya (II 24) would not fit well into the reign of Hattusili since we know from the "Siege of Uršu" text that Lawazantiya was a Hittite city from which the king directed the siege.

While the possibility that CTH 13 is an account of Hattusili's Anatolian campaigns cannot be discounted, in view of the reservations expressed above we should prefer to attribute the text to Mursili rather than Hattusili.

Summarizing briefly what can be gleaned from the texts discussed above about the political history of Cilicia in the time of Hattusili and Mursili the following can be said: During the reign of Hattusili, Hurrians are mainly encountered in N.Syria and he leads a number of campaigns against a confederation of local dynasts under the leadership of Yamhad. The frequency of his exploits in N.Syria and the fact that he meets no opposition before reaching his "Syrian" opponents suggests that Cilicia and areas south of the Halys were firmly in Hittite hands.

While it is a historical fact that Mursili campaigned in N.Syria in the course of which he destroyed Aleppo, it would seem however (if we attribute CTH 12, 13 to him) that Hurrians are increasingly encountered on Anatolian soil. Cilicia and the Anti-Taurus region still largely belong to the Hittite sphere of influence but are beginning to come under Hurrian pressure.

2. Cilicia in the Time between Mursili I and Telipinu.

After the annalistic and narrative accounts of Hattusili's and Mursili's I reign there is a gap of historical information in the Old Kingdom which is only filled by the historical resumée of the Telipinu Edict and a text known as the Ammuna Chronicle (CTH 18). The Telipinu Edict provides a valuable framework for the Old
Kingdom but lacks historical detail since the main purpose of the document was to lay down the rules for the succession of Hittite kings. The early years of unity within the royal family are contrasted with the unfortunate period of court intrigue and murder in later reigns. Military misfortunes of usurper kings are seen as divine punishment and are dealt with in great breadth, thus probably not always presenting a balanced view of historical events.

After the murder of Mursili by the two conspirators Hantili and Zidanta, the former ascended the throne. The passages dealing with Hantili's reign (§§12-17) are unfortunately badly preserved but they testify to his extensive campaigning south of the Halys bend and in N. Syria, mentioning Aštata (?), Hurpana, Karkamiš (the latter provided troops), a gathering of his army in Tegarama and an episode involving a queen in Sukziya.30

No information can be extracted concerning Cilicia but Hantili's widespread military activities in N. Syria would suggest that Cilicia was still administered by the Hittites, a situation which his successor Zidanta probably inherited.

In contrast to the lengthy description of Hantili's reign stands the brief reference to his son-in-law Zidanta (§19). The Edict merely reports Zidanta's usurpation of the throne, after having removed the descendants of Hantili and in turn his own death at the hand of his son Ammuna (§§18-20). Zidanta is of some interest to us as he may be the ruler who concluded the treaty with Pilliya, king of Kizzuwatna (CTH 25, see ch.IV). No other texts can be attributed to Zidanta and, since the Telipinu Edict only informs us about his accession and death, it is likely that his reign was very brief indeed.

The existence of a possible second Zidant(z)a who occurs in the so-called "Offering Lists" ('for deceased members of the royal family', Otten 1968, 123, Table III, lists B,C,E,I) after Telipinu has not been accepted by all scholars.31 Zidanta occurs in two of the lists with
wife Iyaya after Aluwamna and Hantili and before Huzziya (lists E,I).

However, the recently discovered land donation which bears a Tabarna seal with the name of Zidanza (Bo 84/417) further strengthens the case for a Zidant(z)a II. The seal belongs stylistically to the developed stage of Tabarna seals with the central rosette and shows close parallels with the new Muwatalli I seal (Bo 84/465), see ch.IV.8, Fig.6).

Since there is no supporting historical evidence for an independent Kizzuwatna in the time of Zidanta I and, in view of the events discussed below, a date of the Pilliya treaty (CTH 25) to Zidanta II seems more likely.\(^{32}\)

For the reign of Ammuna we have to rely once again on the Telipinu Edict but our knowledge about this king is supplemented by the Ammuna Chronicle (CTH 18) which reports on the first three years of his reign.\(^{33}\)

According to the Telipinu Edict Ammuna ascended the throne after killing his father Zidanta and the Edict proceeds to portray him as an ill-fated ruler during whose reign large parts of the Hittite realm revolted and were consequently lost (§20-21).

Among the provinces who became hostile are Adaniya,\(^{34}\) Arzawiya, Sallapa\(^{35}\) and Parduwata\(^{36}\). The following statement sums up the plight of the Hittite army and alludes to the serious set-back the Hittites had suffered: \(\text{lahha-ma kuwatta ERIN}^{\text{meg}}{\text{-us paizzi ne appa UL SIG}_{5}\text{-in ueskanta ( 21,col.II 3) "but wherever the troops went to battle they did not return well (in a good state)". Of particular interest to us is the mention of Adaniya as one of the countries which broke away from Hittite domination. At present this is the first occurrence of Adaniya in Old Kingdom records. The country of Ad/taniya formed part of Kizzuwatna according to the Sunassura treaty}^{37}\) and also features as a city in Kizzuwatnean ritual and festival texts (see above). Its location in the Cilician plain seems assured since Adaniya can surely be equated with
modern Adana, as Hittite Tarsa with class. Tarsus (Goetze Kizz., 56f; Laroche 1985, 86f; see ch.I.1(b)).

The Ammuna Chronicle does not confirm the events as related in the Telipinu Edict which is undoubtedly due to the fact that the Chronicle covers only the early part of the king's reign.

The opening lines of the text read: "Ammuna great king, I sat on the throne of my father and all my country I governed" (KUB XXXVI 98b rev.7-8) which does imply (if not taken as a stereotype phrase) that the realm as inherited from Zidanta/Hantili was still intact.

The majority of place names mentioned in the above document in connection with military operations must be located in the Upper Land, territories which during the Early Empire period fell to the Kaska (v.Schuler 1965, 25f). Cities referred to south of the Halys bend are Hahha and Parduwata, the latter mentioned here as a garrison town and not, as yet, as a city which revolted against Ammuna as in the Telipinu Edict. It would appear then that during the early reign of Ammuna, provinces to the south of the Halys were still under Hittite control which is also indicated in the following statement: \[\text{INA MU 3 KAM} \text{LUGAL-uš arunan arhan ISBAT...} \] "in the third year the king conquered the sea as border" (KUB XXVI 71 IV 14, v.Schuler ibid., 26, 185).

The sea referred to in the above passage is presumably the Mediterranean and more precisely the Cilician coast, since from the sea the king proceeds to \text{URUHa-ti[- and Hahha, the latter is generally located in the Elbistan or Malatya region.}

In conclusion one can say that Cilicia was still a Hittite province during the early time of Ammuna but was lost at a later stage of his reign, together with Arzawa and other places which constituted a major break-up of the realm in the Old Kingdom.\textsuperscript{37a}

Whether the loss of KUR \text{URUAdaniya} (which must have included most of the western Cilician plain) indicates the rise of an independent state of Kizzuwatna must remain
speculative. There is as yet no mention of Kizzuwatna in the Edict or any other historical document of that period.

If one accepts that the Hittites lost control of Cilicia, or part of it, for the first time during the reign of Ammuna, then it would be one more reason to discount Zidanta I as the king who made a treaty with Pilliya of Kizzuwatna, as indeed was done by O.R. Gurney (see above and n.32).

Considering that Adaniya is a Hittite province until the later reign of Ammuna, and Lawazantiya is still administered by Hatti in the time of Telipinu, it is unlikely that an independent Kizzuwatna existed before the time of Ammuna, since the territories between the two important centres represent a large portion of what became later the state of Kizzuwatna.

3. Cilicia during the Reign of Telipinu

For the reign of Telipinu three documents are particularly relevant to the Kizzuwatna question: § 24 and § 25 of the Telipinu Edict, two fragments listed as CTH 20 by Laroche and entitled "Campagne de Telipinu contre Lahha" and the Telipinu - Isputahsu treaty (CTH 21).

According to the Telipinu Edict, after ascending the throne, Telipinu's first campaign is directed against Hassuwa, the great adversary of early Old Kingdom kings which Telipinu claims to have destroyed. He reports that his troops were also in Zizzilippa and that a battle ensued around that city (§24). This town appears as Zazlippa in the Ismerika treaty (CTH 133) as a town of Kizzuwatna (see ch.V.2(c)). According to the Telipinu Edict Zizzilippa is situated between Hassuwa and Lawazantiya which suggests that the town may have been located in the Islahiye valley.

The following paragraph in the Telipinu Edict (§25, KBo III 1 obv.II 20ff) is of particular importance and is
worth quoting here:

20 ma-a-na-pa LUGAL-uš URULa-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya ú-wa-nu-un La-ah-ha-aš-mu LUKUR

21 e-š-ta nu URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya-an wa-ag-ga-ri-ya-at na-an[DINGIRING]

22 ki-iš-ša-ri-mi da-a-ir ha-an-te-iz-zi-ya-aš-ša UGULA LI-IM ....

"When I, the king, came to Lawazantiya, Lahha was [hostile to me] and he incited Lawazantiya to revolt".

The following sentence is commonly translated as: "The gods gave it (Lawazantiya) into my hand ...". 38

An alternative translation - "The gods gave him (Lahha) into my hand ..." - would be preferable and is suggested here 39 because the occurrence of Lahha in CTH 20 implies that he was indeed captured and brought before the pankus. 40

Furthermore the immediately following enumeration of high ranking officials in line 22 ("the leading (men were) the overseers of the Thousand...) who conspired against Telipinu suggests that Lahha belonged to the group of conspirators listed in lines 23-25. 41 Therefore inciting Lawazantiya to revolt appears to have been directly connected with the conspiracy against Telipinu.

The episode concerning Lahha and Huzziya (the latter became king after Amnuna) is told in greater detail in CTH 20 (KBo XII 8 and 9) which was dealt with by Carrubba in his article on Tahurwaili (1974, 77ff). 42 Unfortunately the text is rather broken and much of its contents can only be guessed at. Lines 9-13 could be interpreted as an encounter with Lahha on Telipinu's way south to Hassuwa (14) which here too he reports as having destroyed. As told in the Telipinu Edict, after the destruction of Hassuwa, Telipinu turns his attention to Lahha (16) and a reference to the latter being brought before the pankus is made (18) and possibly to his death.

The text continues with the Huzziya episode and reports that he, together with seven relatives, was put to death (20-26).

The fact that Lahha was summoned before the pankus
does suggest that he was a Hittite subject who was tried for his treachery. We are nowhere told of his rank but Carruba has proposed that Lahha was the local ruler or governor of Lawazantiya (p.75 n.6), in which case we can be certain of his royal connections, since the Telipinu Edict tells us that princes were sent to administer outlying provinces (§3).

In view of the internal strife during which Telipinu had to assert himself as ruler of Hatti, it is likely that the Lawazantiya/Lahha episode had as its consequence the loss of the territory around Lawazantiya. It remains speculative, however, whether the breaking away of Lawazantiya is directly connected with the emergence of Kizzuwatna as a political power since it cannot be shown that Lawazantiya formed part of Kizzuwatna in its early history, but it is not unlikely. Lawazantiya's attempt for independence may have been generated from an already autonomous Adaniya since the recovery of the Isputahsu seal impression at Tarsus implies that Tarsus (Hitt.Tarsa) was part of Kizzuwatna at the time of Isputahsu. The encounters of Telipinu with Hassu, and Lawazantiya belong to the beginning of his reign which would have allowed ample time for Kizzuwatna to appear on the political map and to enter into a treaty relationship with the Hittite king. We do know for certain that at some stage of Telipinu's reign he concluded a treaty with Isputahsu, king of Kizzuwatna, which provides a terminus ante quem for the existence of a Kizzuwatnean state (see ch.IV). No place names are preserved in this treaty, neither does the long list of sealhouses in the Telipinu Edict, as far as it has survived (§§ 37-38, Singer 1984, 103f), give any information on whether Cilician cities were still in Hittite hands which could in turn indicate the geographical extent of Kizzuwatna in its early history.
4. The Isputahsu Seal (T.1).^{43}

The discovery of the Isputahsu bulla at Tarsus was a welcome confirmation to Goetze's theory that Kizzuwatna should be placed in Cilicia.

Isputahsu calls himself LUGAL,GAL DUMU Pariyawatri in the cuneiform legend of his seal, a title which cannot be paralleled in the treaty fragments (CTH 21) where he occurs simply as LUGAL.^{44} The problematic hieroglyphic inscription in the central field of the seal, has been discussed by various writers (for lit. see HH, 1lf).

The seal depicts in its centre four hieroglyphic signs, of which two are well known symbols, already used on the Hittite Tabarna seals, the ankh (L 369) and the triangle (L 370)^{44a}, but the TONITRUS (L 199) and REX (L 17) signs are not.

The question is whether the Isputahsu seal is a true digraphic seal or whether all the hieroglyphic signs are to be understood as symbols.

If TONITRUS REX stands for a personal name it becomes apparent that it cannot be read in Luwian or Hurrian as Isputahsu (Luw. Tarhunta-hantawati^{7}, Hurr. Tešub-Šarri) and we therefore have to consider the possibility that the name written in the centre is not Isputahsu but another name. This was in fact attempted by Carruba who reads the two signs as Taru (Hattian Weather-god) + hassu (Hitt. "king") = Taruhsu and he identifies the seal bearer as Taruhsu of the Telipinu Edict, fellow conspirator of Tahurwaili who, Carruba claims, became ruler of Kizzuwatna after his banishment by Telipinu. Isputahsu of the cuneiform legend is considered to be the throne name of Taruhsu (1974, 90f).

Laroche, on the other hand, has totally rejected that personal names ending in -(a)hsu contain Hitt. hassu = "king" (e.g. Taruhsu = "king of Taru", "Taru is king"), but instead believes -(a)hsu to have the meaning of "offspring" (Noms, 299f; cp. Alp 1950, 16).^{44b}

Furthermore if we look into the ancestry of Taruhsu, according to the Telipinu Edict, it is very likely that he was the brother of Tahirwaili who is stated in §21 to
have been the son of Zuru the GAL MEŠEDI. The latter dispatched Tahurwaili to kill Tittiya as well as Taruhsu to murder Hantili and his descendants (§22). Therefore if Taruhsu was the son of Zuru, he could not be identical with Isputahsu whose father, according to the seal, was Pariyawatri.

Consequently Carruba's reading of T.1 and his theory on the identity of the seal bearer should be viewed with some scepticism.

Güterbock has remarked that in discussing the Isputahsu bulla, we should also consider SBo I 38 A (=Beran 250a), a seal of Muwatalli II (1953, 154) which previous writers on the subject have failed to do (see Fig. 4).

Apart from the name Muwatalli written on the left side, the seal depicts on the right, under a winged sun-disc the signs TONITRUS MAGNUS REX flanked by L 19 (Great King) on either side.

In contrast the "aedicula name" on other Muwatalli seals SBo I 39-41 has a different set of signs L 270 - L 318 - L 334 which is read as Ari-Tešub-ba by Güterbock who equates L 270 = L 66 = pi ("giving hand" = Hurr. ar-"give", 1973, 140 and n.17) and as Šarri-Tešub by Nowicki (1983, 114f).

The last author has made out a case for identifying L 270 with L 70 = SUPER = sarra by drawing a parallel with a sign occurring on the Karahüyük stele where the context does indeed favour a reading of sarra (ibid.,113).

According to Nowicki the reading of Šarri-Tešub does also apply to SBo I 38 by equating Tešub (L 318 - L 334) of SBo I 39-41 with TONITRUS (L 199) in SBo I 38. The element sarri expressed by L 70 equals MAGNUS REX in No 38 (ibid., 15).46

The above suggested reading could of course also apply to the Isputahsu seal, provided the signs are reversed, as was done by Nowicki for the Muwatalli seal No 38. However, unlike the Muwatalli seal where the
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argument is strengthened by the aedicula name of Nos. 39-41, there is no supporting evidence for the reading of Šarri-Tešub in the case of the Isputahsu seal. By drawing a parallel with the Muwatalli seal we need to consider that a) there is a substantial time gap (c.200 years) between the issue of the two seals, b) so far there is no evidence that rulers of the Old Kingdom bore Hurrian personal names as became customary in the Empire Period. If Isputahsu, whose name is thought to be partly Hattian by Laroche (Noms, 283, cp. Alp 1950, 16f), had adopted a Hurrian name on becoming king in Kizzuwatna (as a concession to being ruler of a Hurro/Luwian region) we would expect to find it with his title in the cuneiform legend. However, the possibility that it was written hieroglyphically in the centre of the seal can of course not be entirely excluded.

We should also mention a more recently discovered seal impression from Boğazköy which bears on the question of the Isputahsu seal. The Boğazköy example belongs to a scribe and the centre depicts REX and above it a sign which Güterbock thought to be a possible variant of TONITRUS (1975, 66 No 30, see Fig.4).

If the first sign is L 199 which seems possible then we have at least a firm indication that L 199 + L 17 can indeed be read as a personal name since it is not a royal seal but that of a scribe.

However, in the case of the Isputahsu bulla there is still the possibility - particularly in consideration of its early date (c.1500 B.C.) - that TONITRUS REX represents merely the title and titular deity, or that the group is a symbolic expression of the close relationship between the Weather-god and the king(ship) as indicated in IBoT I 30 1-8 (Goetze, JCS 1 1947 90f). The above theory was put forward by Alp in discussing the aedicula group of SBo I 38 (ArOr 18 (1950), 6; cp. Beran, 45).

Whichever way we interpret the Isputahsu seal, the fact remains that, in the use of hieroglyphic writing, it stands on its own among the royal seals of the Old
Kingdom. Hieroglyphically inscribed royal seals do not come in at Boğazköy until the early Empire period (with the exception of the two above mentioned symbols).

While the form and presentation of our seal is purely Anatolian, it was observed by Goetze that the sign forms used in the cuneiform legend are not those of Boğazköy (or N. Syria) but have strong affinities with the Cappadocian tablets (1936, 211), a possible indication that the traditions of the Old Assyrian script survived in some parts of Anatolia.

5. The Tarsus Land Donation (LS 28)

Of some importance to Kizzuwatna in the Old Kingdom is the Tarsus land donation (Goetze 1939, 1ff) and since its historical value largely depends on its date, land donations and their seal impressions from Boğazköy and Inandik are briefly discussed here. To the known corpus of land deeds (CTH 221-223) can now be added several more examples, recently recovered in Tempel VII and VIII of the Upper City at Boğazköy (Otten 1986, 21ff, see ch. IV.8).

The Tarsus land donation, unfortunately unstratified, was found in a sealed refuse pit at Mycenaean level (Tarsus LB IIb), together with a large number of hieroglyphically inscribed bullae, including the one belonging to queen Puduhepa. The excavators report that the contents do not represent a gradual accumulation of material but were buried as a whole since two pieces of Mycenaean ware, which were found to join, lay at the top and bottom of the pit (Goldman 1937, 281). The Mycenaean sherd has more recently been identified by E. French as belonging to the second phase of LH IIIB which is thought to be contemporary with Ramses II and not, as erroneously assumed by Goldman, as being of the "Granary Class" of the mainland. However, the date of a terminus ante quem of c.1250 B.C. for the pit, suggested by the excavators, would appear to be correct (1975, 72f).

The Tarsus land donation, which is unfortunately very fragmentary, records a royal donation of real estate and
personnel to the "House" of Idahakab and the "House" of Mantiya. Both names are considered Hurrian (Goetze 1939, 4).

Only the top half of the tablet has survived which means that the place of issue, normally to be found towards the bottom of the obverse or on the reverse, is lost.

The tablet is sealed with an anonymous Tabarna seal, characteristic of the Old Kingdom which means that the king who issued the donation is unknown.

An impression of the same seal also occurs on LS 7, a land donation found at Boğazköy and on another fragment listed as SBo I 88 A and B (88C = Tarsus 64) which ties our document to the Hittite capital. Güterbock, who compared the seal impressions, remarked on the identical details in the arrangement of signs and symbols which, he concluded, could only be due to the fact that the Boğazköy and Tarsus land donation were stamped with one and the same seal (SBo I p. 54). Both impressions show a positive imprint, the writing faces inwards (i.e. the heads of the verticals point outwards) and the central field, divided by a line from the legend, holds three symbols (see Fig. 5). The second land donation of interest to the Kizzuwatna questions is LS 6. [Lahu/Lawa]-za-an-di-ia (obv. 4) can be restored in a part of the tablet where one would expect the place name in or around which the land donation was made. The above deed bears the Tabarna seal SBo I 87 which endorses a large group of land donations from Boğazköy (see below).

Opinions concerning the dating of the anonymous Tabarna seals and consequently the land donations which they endorsed have differed widely. A. Goetze in the publication of the Tarsus deed dated it to the New Kingdom, after the annexation of Kizzuwatna on the grounds of the Hurrian personal names which he thought were unlikely to occur before the flourishing of Mitanni (1939, 3f). H.G. Güterbock who first published the Tabarna seals and the land donations available at the time dated them on palaeographic and archaeological grounds before the New Kingdom (SBo I p. 54f and n. 96), while K. Riemschneider
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considered a date of the anonymous Tabarna seals and their land donations before Telipinu, but not earlier than Hantili (1958, 328).

The discovery of the Inandik tablet (IK 174-66) published by K. Balkan in 1973 has reopened the discussion on the above group of land donations. The Inandik document is well preserved and its Tabarna seal is stylistically close to SBo I 87 which seals LS 3-6, 17, 18+20 and 1312/4, but not identical.

Balkan has suggested an absolute date for the Inandik land donation to Hattusili I, on the grounds of several personal names (Zidi, Pappa, S/Tandameis, Askaliya) which are also mentioned in the so-called Palace Chronicle (CTH 8)\(^5\) attributed to that king (p.72ff). In fact he favours a dating of all anonymous Tabarna seals to Hattusili I, stating that "Tabarna" does not denote a title here but refers to Hattusili I (op.cit. 75f).

More recently a new assessment of land donations and Tabarna seals was offered by D.Easton (1981, 3ff) where he not only takes account of internal and stylistic evidence but also considers, wherever possible, the historical context. The early Old Kingdom land donations (Easton's Group 1-2) benefit particularly from the author's extensive use of onomastic evidence which served to place the documents in a relative chronological order (pp.6-16, Table I). By far the largest group of land donations are sealed with SBo I 87 or are linked onomastically to the tablets which bear the above seal (Easton Group 2a-d, Table II).

As mentioned above, Balkan had underlined that the Inandik tablet contained personal names which occur also in the above group as well as in Old Kingdom texts attributed to Hattusili I. However, Easton makes out a case for dating all the LS of his Group 2 (and seal No.87) to Mursili I and only the Inandik tablet and LS 14 (Group I) to Hattusili I. His main arguments are: a) The witnesses of the Inandik donation are no longer found in the LS of Group 2.\(^5\) b) While S/Tandameis acts as an official in IK 174-66, his estate is disposed of in LS 3 and 1312/4.\(^5\) c) The scribe Askaliya who wrote the Inandik tablet and
possibly also LS 18+20 and 1312/u is thought to have survived into the next reign (p.9,23). Consequently LS 6 which names the city Lawazantiya as location for the donation would have been issued by Mursili I, according to Easton's theory.\(^5\)

To illustrate the stylistic development of Tabarna seals they have been set out in three sections (see Fig. 5).

I. The Inandik seal and SBo I 87 are stylistically related but not identical. Both are small and the writing is heavily executed.

II. In the second group the central field holding the three symbols is now divided by a double line from the cuneiform legend which has more elegant sign forms.

III In the next stage of development the three symbols make way for a single rosette. SBo I 89 (also anonymous should be placed between the Tarsus seal and that of Alluwamna No. 86. The latter is probably the first named Tabarna seal. Alluwamna ruled after Telipinu.

We can therefore say that SBo I 88, which is identical with our Tarsus seal, stands stylistically between the Inandik one and No. 87 on the one side and No. 89 and the Alluwamna seal on the other.

The stylistic evidence would appear to be borne out by the palaeographic evidence of the land donations themselves.

H. Otten (1971, 59f) has pointed out that the ductus of all land donations is old but he detects within this group of texts a development of script. The oldest examples associated with a more heavily executed script than LS 7 and LS 28 (Tarsus) with seal No. 88, whose ductus is less heavy and therefore probably of younger date (ibid., 62).\(^5\)

Thus from the stylistic and palaeographic point of view, the Tarsus land donation with Tabarna seal No 88 C being tied to LS 7 with No. 88B and seal No. 88A (not attached to a land donation) represents the second stage of development and should be dated after Mursili I. The
historical event which is no doubt of some importance to our land donation is the report in the Telepinu Edict that during the reign of Ammuna the Land of Adaniya, together with other outlying regions, was lost to the Hittites.

It can therefore be suggested that the issue of the Tarsus land deed falls into the time-span between the reign of Hantili and the loss of Adaniya which occurred at the time of Ammuna, most probably during the latter part of his reign (see above). A different conclusion was reached by D. Easton who attributes LS 7 and LS 28 (Group 3) to Huzziya I, on the grounds that SBo I 88 is similar to the Isputahsu seal (1981, 31).

However, in our view the latter is quite distinct from all Tabarna seals for the reasons outlined above (sect. 4). Apart from the early use of the hieroglyphic script, the large central field and single cuneiform legend distinguish the Isputahsu seal from known royal seals of the Old Kingdom.
Some Points of Conclusion

Summing up briefly the evidence for the political history of the areas connected with Kizzuwatna, from the time of Hattusili I until the reign of Telipinu, the following points can be made:

1. During the reign of Hattusili I the Cilician plain and the eastern region beyond the Ceyhan are largely under Hittite control. Hattusili goes to war against Alalah and meets no opposition on his way to N.Syria. Hattusili directs a campaign from Lawazantiya and possibly disposes of real estate in the same city (LS 6).

2. At the time of Mursili the area under discussion is still basically in Hittite hands but begins to come under pressure from the Hurrians on Anatolian soil. Fighting around Lawazantiya and Hurma is reported, possibly also in the Adana region (Zunnahara). Between the reign of Mursili and Ammuna a Hittite king still has the authority to make out a land donation in the Cilician plain (Tarsus LS 28).

3. In the time of Hantili, military encounters with Aštata and Karkamiš are reported, indicating that access to N.Syria was still achieved and provinces south of the Halys basin were still Hittite administered.

4. The Land of Adaniya is lost to the Hittites during the later reign of Ammunas. The above event most probably represents the crystallization of a separate political power in the Cilician plain.

5. During the time of Telipinu Lawazantiya revolts and is almost certainly lost, a development which may have been generated from an independent Adaniya. The creation of a state of Kizzuwatna is most likely to have occurred in that period. Telipinu concludes a treaty with Isputahsu who calls himself "great king", son of Pariyawatru on his seal.
Footnotes

1. For the main texts discussed in this chapter, see Fig. 3.

2. However see CTH 3, Otten 1973, 42, discussed in ch.II.3 n.32.

3. In the Akk. version, however, KUR URU Hanigalbat (KBo X 1 obv. 11), Astour 1972, 102ff.


5. For a complete edition of CTH 16 see now Soysal 1987, 173ff.

6. Cp. Soysal op.cit., 196, 203, who links the event with Arzawa and equates the mountain with the western Taurus and the sea with the Lycian coast. The above author comes out in favour of Carruba's suggestion that DUU-U-us stands for DUU = "majesty" and not Sun-god (p.188f).

7. KBo X 1 (Akk.), KBo X 2 (Hitt.), see F. Imparati and C. Saporetti 1965, pp.40-85.

8. Hitt. version obv. 17 writes Warsuwa, Ikakali, Tashiniya, on the different writing of place names in the Akk. and Hitt. version see Melchert 1978, 17f.

9. Note also Gurney's comment (CAH vol.II ch.VI, 245) that Hassu was not conquered until the 6th year, therefore the siege of Uršu must belong to a later date.

KUB XV 33a III 7  ID Pu-u-r[u with dupl.KUB XV 34 III 7 483)
\[\text{D Pu-u-r[u, interpreted by Güterbock 1964, 3, as} \text{II 7} \]
\[\text{D Pu-u-r[u, interpreted by Güterbock 1964, 3, as} \text{II 7} \]
occurring side by side - but as variant in RGTC 6, 543. Text edited by Haas and Wilhelm 1974, 194 n.f "Puruna as variant of Uratta uncertain". M. van Loon proposed the Urartian name for the Euphrates as Püranadi, Anatolian Studies, Fs Güterbock (1973), 192.

11 M.C. Astour, UF 3, 13 suggested the site of Tilmen Hüyük.

12 The sources for Lawazantiya, its history, religious significance and location have been discussed in some detail by Lebrun 1979a, 197ff; idem., 1983, 61f, see also Wegner in RIA VI, 435f.

13 Incorrectly listed as ḫuru-la-hu-uz-za-an-di-ya in RGTC 6, 237.

14 Bossert's identification of Lawazantiya with the country POCULUM (L 346)-ti-L 67 (MANUS+RA⁷) REGIO of the Karahüyük (Elbistan) stele rests on a dubious etymology with Hitt. lahhu(wai)- "to pour, libate" (1951, 320f). Cp. Malatya 9 - POCULUM-ta-URBS, a relief which depicts the king PUGNUS-mi-li libating before the Storm-god of the above city (Meriggi, Manuale II/2, 55f, Tab. Xa). Whether the two place names are connected is uncertain; neither name can be read at present. Lawazantiya is only attested as a city in Hitt. records while in the Karahüyük stele the name in question only occurs as a country referring most probably to the Elbistan plain itself.

15 Also advocated by J. Mellaart 1982, Fig. V; Kempinski and Kosak 1982, 103 who consider Anazarbus and Castabala-Hieropolis as possible candidates. We have noted that there are a number of important mounds on the approaches to the Bahçe pass such as Minareli, Tatarlı and Domuztepe to the north which may well qualify as a possible location for Lawazantiya (see
16 In KBo III 34 I 24 (CTH 8) Sanda is described as a palace official (DUMU E.GAL) from Hurma who lived in Hassu.

17 Thought to be a reference to the ruler of Uršu himself, Klengel GS I, 262.

18 ARM I rev. 4-6, ARM 24 rev.3,5-6. On māt ebirtim = territories to the west of the Euphrates see Finkelstein, JNES 21 (1962), 83f.


21 P.Matthiae 1977, 113 dates the end of Ebla to c.1650-1600 B.C. and suggests that the city was destroyed at the hands of Hattusili I or Mursili I.

22 Partial treatment of CTH 13 by Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 178ff, discussed below.

23 Cp. Arnuwanda annals KUB XXIII 21 II Zunnahara (4), Adaniya (5), Sinuwanda (6), the latter is usually equated with Sinanti (near Ivriz) RGTC 6, 359.

24 RGTC 6, 518, add KUR URU Zu [un] na-ha-ra KUB XXXI 122 +FHL 42 line 6, see ch.V.4(b) - in central Cilicia.
25 Ellipra = N. Assyr. Illubru, a town in Que or in Hilakku, R1A V, 60, equated with Byzant. Lampron (north of Mersin), Goetze 1962, 51 n.19, n.22.

26 The theory of Kempinski and Košak that the Hattusili annals were written "on a small golden statue" seems rather unlikely considering the length of the text. Although Houwink ten Cate also links the dedication of the statue with the text, his suggestion that it was inscribed on a gate seems more plausible (ibid., 101), or indeed it could have been written on a metal tablet which was deposited in the temple - see the recently discovered bronze tablet from Boğazköy, Otten 1988. On the above statue see also Otten 1968, 15 n.3.

27 Akk. version (KBo X 1) ana balat, Hitt. (KBo X 2 & 3) MU.IM.MA-an-ni, MU.KAM-an-ni, MU-an-ni, see F. Imparati 1965, 61; cp. Kempinski and Košak ibid., 110 n.6; Houwink ten Cate 1984, 63.

28 The Sanauitta and Zalpa affair is thought to have been written on col.I which is not preserved. This would mean that "year one" took up the whole of col.I and col. II 1-13.

29 Kempinski and Košak op.cit, 106 think that Zunnahara and Sinuwanda were possible allies of Purushanda but, since it was suggested that Zunnahara is to be located in central Cilicia, this would seem unlikely, see notes 23 and 24. It has been suggested that Purushanda should be located at the kārum site of Acemhüyük (Garelli 1963, 123 n.4).


31 Cornelius 1973, see Chronological Table p.352;

32 Otten 1951, 129ff dated the treaty to Zidanta I but came down on the side of Zidanta II in Fisch. Weltgesch. II 127f, (but cf. idem. 1971, 67 n.13), also favoured by Gurney CAH vol. II ch. XV, 661; Kümmel, RIA V, 628. See also Kühne 1982, 212f who dates the treaty to Zidanta II but postulates a Pilliya I as treaty partner of Idrimi and contemporary of Ammuna.

On the palaeography see Rüster StBoT 20, p.VIII who dated the treaty either before or after Telipinu. The tiny fragment KBo XVIII 61 which reads †Pal-li† (2) and †Pa-ri-ya-wa† (4), can hardly be used as a chronological indicator for the rulers of Kizzuwatna.

33 KUB XXVI 71 (version A) and KUB XXXVI 98b+(version B) are both preceded by the Anitta text which has prompted the suggestion that the chronicle belongs to an earlier Ammuna who reigned after Anitta, discussed by v. Schuler 1965, 25f and n.87; see also Gurney op.cit., 622f who attributes CTH 18 to Ammuna of the Telipinu Edict; Kühne 1982, n.45.

34 KUB XI 5 obv.14 KUR URU Adaniya but KBo VII 15 II 5 omits KUR.

35 Point of departure for Arzawa campaigns RGTC 6,333, see also Mellaart 1983, 345ff who proposes Yaraşlı Hillfort south-west of Gordion.

36 Most probably identical with Paduwanda in CTH 225 the Sahurunuwa land decree and to be located at Byzant. Podandos mod. Pozanti on the approaches to the Cilician Gates (Kizz.,53, 57; RGTC 6, 311).

37 KBo I 5 writes †URU A-ta-ni-ya throughout, see also the historical fragment KUB XLVIII 81 1 †URU A-ta-ni† (Kizz, 57; Forlanini 1979, 170ff. Adaniya survived
into the Iron Age as Adanawa-(city) in hier. Luwian in the Karatepe bilingual inscription where it is equated with Phoenician dnnym (people) and 'dn (toponym). The dnnym have been connected with the Danuna mentioned in the Amarna letter of Abimilki of Tyre (EA 151) and Egyptian dynn, one of the listed Sea Peoples. It has been suggested by J.D. Hawkins that the Danuna/Dnyn are the Phoenician and Egyptian terms for Adana and the Cilician plain (see chapter on Cilicia, forthcoming). It is, however, unclear who the king of the Danuna was, whose death was reported by Abimilki to Akhenaten, since Cilicia was already part of the Hittite Empire. On the Danuna and related problems see also Goetze 1962, 50ff; Astour 1965, 32ff.

37a The disastrous events under the reign of Ammuna have been linked with the statement by Idrimi that he raided seven towns of Hatti. Gurney op.cit., 661; Kühne 1982, 212. Cf. ch.IV.8.


39 See now also I. Hoffmann 1984a, 29.

40 The meaning and function of the pankus has recently been discussed in two articles; G. Beckman JAOS 102 (1982), 435ff; M.Marazzi, WO 15 (1984), 96ff.

41 However, Carruba believes that Lahha may be one of the 5 brothers of Huzziya (§23) ibid., 76f. Cp. Bin-Nun see n.45 below.

42. On the identity of Tahirwaili and events of this period see also the discussion in ch.IV.8.

42a. For a different interpretation of events cf. Gurney, CAH vol. II ch.XV, 665.
Tarsus II, 246f, Figs. 401, 405. See our Fig. 4.

For comment see Goetze 1936, 212; cp. Carruba 1974, 88.


But this may also be the etymology of hassu - "one born (of the family)", HEG, 207ff.

S.R. Bin-Nun interprets this passage rather differently. She makes Tahurwaili, Taruhsu and Tanuwa brothers of Huzziya (§26) but believes them all to be sons of Ammuna since in her view hassanassas DUMU-ŠU (II 6) does not refer to Zuru but to Ammuna (II 4) of the previous generation (1974, 115). For a different opinion see Easton 1981, 25f n.111.

The reading, however, does not account for MAGNUS.

Cp. Isputas-Inara, Noms No 474.

Seals where TONITRUS is the first element in personal names are fairly common - S. Alp 1950, 3ff; Neve, AA 1984, 360 Abb.34, 1986, 384, Abb. 19.


Cp. Easton op.cit., 16 who believes that the estate of Idahakab and Mantiya is being disposed of.

Cf. Balkan 1973, 76 and 61 n.57 thinks that SBo I 88A and B do not derive from the same seal (impression?), noting a difference in the rim impression. The essence of Balkan's argument however remains unclear to me. See also Easton ibid, 16. The impression of the Tarsus example (not examined by Balkan) was found to be deeply impressed leaving a rim
of c. 3mm deep.
It was noted by us while examining the tablet in the Adana Museum that most of the seal impression had been broken away in antiquity since only the upper part of the tablet was burned, leaving the seal and surrounding area unaffected. This could be an indication for Balkan's theory that fresh clay was inserted separately into the tablet and then sealed (p.60 n.57). See also Easton op.cit., 19f.

52 Drawn incorrectly in Goetze's publication of the Tarsus LS 1939, 2. See Fig. 5.

53 Except S/Tandameis. On the Palace Chronicle R.S. Hardy 1941, 189ff, see also O.Soysal 1987 passim, Table 1 and 2. On the problematic reading of S/Tandameis see Easton 1981, 6 n.15 and Soysal 1987, 241 n.194.

54 However, a different set of witnesses is also present in Group 2d (LS 5, LS 17, LS 27, ibid., 14f) also associated with SBo I 87. Note also 1Nu-ǔn-ǔ in LS 5 who features also in CTH 7,8.

55 It is however possible that S/Tandameis died or fell into disgrace during the lifetime of Hattusili I, as had a number of officials according to the Palace Chronicle; Zidi son-in-law of Tuttula in the Inandik tablet is put to death in CTH 8. Askaliya, Lord of Hurma was demoted to ĹAGRIG in CTH 8, Singer 1984, 101f. See also n.53 above.

56 The large number of LS which bear the seal SBo I 87 (or are onomastically connected with it) and which were all dated to Mursili I by Easton (Table II), prompt the question whether SBo I 87 may have served more than one king, particularly in view of the onomastic links to texts dated to Hattusili I, although plausible reasons for their survival were
given by Easton. The very fact that the Tabarna seals were anonymous would have made it unnecessary for the succeeding king to have a new seal cut on his succession and one could argue that anonymous Tabarna seals may have served as dynastic seals. Probably only the desire for stylistic change, damage or loss prompted the cutting of a new seal.

57 For a discussion on the sign forms and palaeographic development see Easton ibid., 34ff, Table III-V.
Chapter IV

The Kizzuwatna Treaties

1) The Treaty Texts:

Kizz.1

Telipinu-Isputahsu (CTH 21)
(Akk). KUB XXXI 82
KUB IV 76

(Hitt.) KUB XXXI 81
KBo XIX 36, 37

The Hitt. as well as the Akk. version are very fragmentary indeed, but part of KUB XXXI 82 can be restored from the Tahirwaili-Eheya treaty. The intelligible clauses include stipulations regarding the mutual return of captured towns, military assistance and exchange of fugitives. KBo XIX 37 is phrased in the 1st p.sing. and probably does not belong to the treaty text (see n.12).

Kizz.2

Zidanza-Pilliya (CTH 25)
(Hitt.) KUB XXXVI 108

Only the top part of the obverse is preserved consisting of c. 10 lines. The opening lines simply state that Zidanza (DUTUSI Lugal.Gal Lugal Kur URU Hatti) and Pilliya (Lugal Kur URU Kizzuwatna) made a treaty (taksul), followed by the stipulations which are mainly concerned with the mutual exchange of previously captured towns. Other fortified towns which were destroyed are not to be rebuilt. Kizz.2 may be an example of a partial treaty drawn up for a specific purpose (sect.7 below). (Photo of KUB XXXVI 108 in StBoT 20 (1972), Taf.III).
military assistance and duty to inform the treaty partner of potential plots. The king of Mitanni is mentioned as the potential enemy and Sunassura is not to allow passage through his country to the same. - Kizz.5 may represent the Hitt. version of the main Sunassura text KBo I 5.

**Kizz.6**

Sunassura - (CTH 41)

(Hitt.) KUB VIII 81 + KBo XIX 39

Fragment of a 2 column tablet of which part of the obverse (col.II) and reverse (col.III) are preserved. Laroche attributed this text to the main Sunassura treaty KBo I 5 (CTH 41). The treaty clauses are entirely concerned with fugitive matters; fugitives who have entered Kizzuwatna via another country, concealment of fugitives etc. The tenor of this fragment is more forceful than Kizz.5 as it uses imperatives in the stipulations for Sunassura.

**Kizz.7**

Sunassura - (CTH 41)

(Akk.) A. KBo I 5
B. KUB III 4
C. KBo XIX 40
D. KBo XXVIII 106 = KBo I 5 III 52-IV 1/2

Text fragments listed by Laroche under CTH 41 C (KBo XIX 41+) have been re-assigned to the Tahurwaili treaty as KBo XXVIII 109 and fragments 106/a; 2556/c can now be joined to additional fragments and have been assigned to KBo XXVIII 110= Kizz.8. KBo I 5 is the best preserved text among the Kizzuwatna treaties (cols. I-IV) which opens with a historical preamble, followed by the treaty stipulations, a formula well known from Empire period treaties. The name of the Hittite king in line 1 is not preserved. Kizz.7 was attributed to Muwatalli (II) by Weidner (PD,88) but is now generally dated to Suppiluliuma I or earlier.
Kizz.3

Tahrwaili-Eheya

(Akk.) 1. KBo XXVIII 108
2. KBo XXVIII 109
3. KBo XXVIII 107

(Kümmel, KBo 28, Vorwort, p.VII)

The introduction to the treaty is not preserved. The Hittite king is referred to as LUGAL.GAL but is named Ta-ḫur-wa-i-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR 乌鲁Hatti in a loyalty clause (KBo XXVIII 109 7). Treaty stipulations are repeated verbatim for Eheya indicating strict parity. Most of the preserved clauses are taken up with different types of fugitives and the procedure for their extradition (sect. 6 below). They have been restored from Kizz.4 which contains identical passages. Kizz.3 was sealed with the Tahrwaili Tabarna seal Bo 69/200 (Fig. 6).

Kizz.4

Paddatissu - (CTH 26)

(Akk.) KUB XXXIV 1 + KBo XXVIII 105a and b

Large fragment of a 1 column tablet broken at the top and bottom. The Hittite king, referred to throughout as LUGAL.GAL, is not known. Paddatissu appears without title. Apart from the extensive fugitive clauses which can be paralleled in Kizz.3, the treaty contains a series of unusual stipulations which deal with various border infringements and criminal offences for which fines and compensation are also specified (sect. 6(d)).

Kizz.5

Sunassura - (CTH 131)

(Hitt.) KUB XXXVI 127

Small 1 column fragment of approximately 30 lines. The Hittite treaty partner (ᵲUTUᵲ) is unknown. Apart from the familiar fugitive clauses which can be paralleled with Kizz.6, the preserved passages deal with mutual protection,
Kizz.8
Sunassura (?) -
(Akk.) KBo XXVIII 110
(Kümmel, KBo 28, Vorwort, p.VII)

A new treaty text of c. 80 lines which contains sufficient parallels with KBo I 5 to suggest that it should be attributed to Sunassura. Unlike all the other treaties in which the king of Kizzuwatna is always referred to by name in the various clauses, Kizz.8 phrases all the stipulations in the 2nd p. sgl. and omits the name. The breaks in Kizz.8 can be largely restored from Kizz.7. Although there are variants in the wording of the stipulations between Kizz.7 and Kizz.8, the contents of the clauses are identical: Kizz.8 6-18 = Kizz.7 I 30-44; Kizz.8 40-49 = Kizz.7 III 37-47; Kizz.8 63-73 = Kizz.7 IV 25-28, 32-39. - Kizz.8 breaks off with a curse formula which evokes a series of gods headed by the Sun-goddess of Arinna.

AT 3
Pilliya - Idrimi
(Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets, 1953, 31)

Treaty on the mutual exchange of fugitives (see sect.3).

2. Introduction
The political relationship between Hatti and Kizzuwatna is almost exclusively known from a series of treaties. No royal letters exchanged between the two countries are known to us, nor (with the exception of three Kizzuwatnean towns mentioned in the Arnuwanda Annals CTH 143) are there any references in the Hittite royal annals to military activities in Kizzuwatna/Kummanni.

A joint treatment of the Kizzuwatna treaties at this point seems desirable for two reasons:
1. To establish and discuss their specific character amongst the corpus of treaty tablets found at Boğazköy.
2. For chronological considerations since they cover a
period from the reign of Telipinu of the Old Kingdom to the end of the Early Empire period.

Most of the Kizzuwatna treaties from Boğazköy have come down to us either in Akkadian or in both versions, Hittite and Akkadian. Since all Hittite treaties with their Anatolian neighbours were drawn up in Hittite only and those of N. Syrian countries in Akkadian and Hittite one must assume that, from the Hittite point of view, Kizzuwatna belonged to the Syrian sphere of influence, i.e. to the region beyond the Anti-Taurus range.

In assessing the nature of the Kizzuwatna treaties one should at all times consider their fragmentary state which forbids, in many instances, final conclusions. What does, however, emerge even from the smallest fragment is the parity character of the treaty stipulations, a feature which sets the Kizzuwatna documents apart as a distinct group from the remaining Hittite treaties, all of which are vassal treaties with the exception of the Hattusili III - Ramses II treaty (CTH 91), the only true parity document in the Boğazköy archives.

The contents of the treaties are largely concerned with matters which result from a common border; mutual return of captured towns, the extradition of fugitives, provision of troop contingents, immunity of envoys etc.

The treaty corpus can roughly be divided into three groups. In the early group to which belong the Zidanza-Pilliya treaty (Kizz. 2) and AT 3, we do not find the fully developed treaty form as we know it from the Empire Period (introduction, historical preamble, treaty stipulations, list of gods, curses and blessings). Both documents lack the historical preamble and proceed to the stipulations after a brief introduction. Whether the above texts were drawn up for specific purpose only or whether they represent partial agreements of a larger document which has not survived, is a matter for discussion. The Tahurwaili-Eheya and Paddatissu treaties (Kizz. 3 and 4) form the intermediary stage between the early group and the fully developed treaty form of the main Sunassura text (KBo I 5) which, although not complete, stands much closer to
3. The Pilliya - Idrimi Treaty AT 3

The Alalah treaty between Pilliya and Idrimi (AT 3, Wiseman 1953, 31f) is of considerable interest, as it is the only document outside Boğazköy (apart from AT 14) which is relevant to the history of Kizzuwatna. It illustrates her strategic position between Hatti and the Hurrian sphere of N.Syria and underlines the fact that Alalah and Kizzuwatna shared a common border.

Doubts have been expressed as to whether Pilliya of AT 3 can be identified with the Kizzuwatnean king of the same name, on the grounds that his country and title are not mentioned in the document (Kammenhuber 1968, 40 n.92). In reply it can be pointed out that none of the three protagonists in the text, Pilliya, Idrimi and Parattarna bear any titles, nor are the countries over which they ruled mentioned. It is surely no coincidence that the name of a second Kizzuwatna king occurs in the Alalah records. In AT 14 (only partly preserved) Niqmepa brought a legal case against Sunassura before his Mitannian overlord Sauštatar, regarding a border dispute which involved the town of Alawari. (Wiseman ibid., 39; Klengel GS I, 220; sect.7 and 8 below).

AT 3 was found in the fortress area in level IV of the Alalah sequence (Wiseman ibid., 120). The physical appearance of the tablet sets it aside from the majority of the Alalah tablets which are formed of fine clay, well smoothed and when sealed, bearing a cylinder seal impression, the characteristic seal type of N.Syria (Collon 1975). AT 3, on the other hand, is made of coarse gritty clay and of a much larger size. What distinguishes it most of all, however, is a stamp seal impression on a raised surface in the centre of the tablet. Although badly preserved, traces of an outer cuneiform legend are still visible. The seal thus belongs to the type familiar not only from the royal seals of Boğazköy but also from the Isputahsu bulla found at Tarsus (see ch.III.4).
Wiseman in his note to AT 3 (ibid., 32) already considered the possibility that the above sealing belonged to Pilliya, as did Collon (ibid., 173). The suggestion is undoubtedly correct and it consequently follows that the tablet in question was most probably made out in Kizzuwatna itself, thus representing Pilliya's version of the treaty. The fact that Pilliya is named first in the opening lines lends support to the theory that AT 3 originated in Kizzuwatna and not in Alalah.

The treaty tablet which is complete is made out strictly on a parity basis. It deals solely with the exchange of fugitives (see below) and it concludes with a brief curse.

An interesting passage and commented upon by several writers are lines 40-42 which touch on the question of diplomatic activities by vassal states and indirectly on the political status of Kizzuwatna at the time of Idrimi.

40 i-na a-i-im-me-e UD-mi ²Pa-ra-tar-na
41 it-ti ²Id-ri-mi  ni-š DINGIRMEŠ
42 iz-ku-riš
"On whatever day Paratarna with Idrimi swore the oath."

The above lines have been interpreted in a variety of ways.9 Wiseman did not comment on the passage. Goetze (1957, 68 n.150) took it as a reference to a treaty between Idrimi and Parattarna and proceeded then to making Pilliya Parattarna's successor, thus seeing AT 3 as a treaty between Alalah and Hurri and not with Kizzuwatna. Klengel (GS I, 245 n.58) on the other hand thought that the above lines referred to the oath which raised Idrimi to kingship, giving him legal status to enter treaty relationships.

The passage under discussion could simply be understood as an indication that the document in question required ratification by Parattarna, in order to become legally effective, a procedure which would have been fitting to the vassal status of Idrimi.10 No mention is made of Pilliya in the proceedings which suggests that Kizzuwatna was not subject to Mitanni at the time (Klengel 1978, 108). Whether she enjoyed independent status we cannot say. It is, however, not inconceivable, considering
the degree of autonomy which Kizzuwatna possessed, as reflected in the treaties, that she would have been in the position of drawing up an agreement with her southern neighbour which confined itself to regulating the mutual return of fugitives, while at the same time being allied to Hatti. It is therefore possible that Pilliya of AT 3 was also the treaty partner of Zidanza II (Kizz.2), (see sect.8).

4. Terms for "Treaty"\textsuperscript{11}

The Hittite treaty terms used in the Kizzuwatna documents, as far as they have survived, are ishiul- (lit. bond)\textsuperscript{12} and in the case of the Zidanza-Pilliya treaty taksul-. The former term is commonly used in the vassal treaties of the Empire period as well as in decrees and the Instruction Texts.

As to the Akkadian evidence we find that AT 3 and Kizz.7 are identically phrased in the opening lines: rikšam ann\'ım ina berišunu irkušu "they contracted this treaty between them(selves)"\textsuperscript{13} (KBo I 5 obv.4; AT 3 obv. 4-5).

Kizz.2 states in the opening lines that Zidanza and Pilliya "made a peace (treaty)" - taksul ier (obv.1-2) and "they agreed the following" - kissan takser (obv.3).

H.Otten in the commentary to this treaty text briefly discussed taksul-and ishiul- but was non-committal on the question whether the two terms had different meanings or whether taksul- represents a more archaic word for "treaty" (1951, 130). G.F.del Monte, on the other hand, expresses the view that taksul- in Old Kingdom context has a judicial connotation and translates taksul iya- "to make a pact" (ibid., 207). In his view this sense is lost in the later period when taksul- has acquired a meaning of pax (p.209).\textsuperscript{14} To support his arguments he quotes the following examples (p.208):

\begin{itemize}
  \item KBo III 38 obv.8 ANA ABI ABI LUGAL taksul iyat\textsuperscript{15}
  \item KUB XXIII 28+ obv.17-18 ... Attaradus LUGAL-i[taksul iet
  \item KUB XXVI 35 4 ...LUGAL-i atti-mi kuit taksul iet\textsuperscript{16}
\end{itemize}

All the above examples occur in a context of conflict
between the Hittite king and an opponent. It is clear from the context of the above passages that the initiative comes from the other party, not the Hittite king who is the object of the proceedings which does not seem to fit the act of making a pact/treaty.\textsuperscript{17} The example quoted by Otten, although of later date seems to be a good indication of the sentiment which lies behind \textit{taksul iya-} KUB XIX 22 obv.7 ...nah\textsuperscript{2}ariayantat nu taksul ier, "...they were afraid and made peace" (ibid., 130).

From the context of the above given examples \textit{taksul iya-} suggests a form of submission by the opponent, to "make peace" was to avoid further conflict.

The only example for which a case could be made out that \textit{taksul} has a legal connotation (treaty/pact) is Kizz.2. Here both partners are equally involved in the action.

5. The Question of Parity

The most striking feature of the Kizzuwatna treaties is the degree of parity with which the documents were drawn up. Parity is largely observed in stipulations regarding fugitives (see below), supply of military aid, sharing of booty (Kizz.1,3,7,8), immunity of envoys (Kizz.3, 4,7) and exchange of previously captured towns (Kizz.1, 3).\textsuperscript{18}

Parity is expressed in two ways; either by repeating the entire paragraph verbatim for the other party (Kizz.3, 4 and 7) or by the mere statement \textit{ù ša PN gātamma} (Akk.) apenissan (Hitt.) "the same goes for PN", after each stipulation or set out in a separate paragraph (Kizz.1,\textsuperscript{19} Kizz.5 and 6).

The question which arises is whether one regards the statement "the same goes for PN" as an abbreviated form of expressing parity in a treaty document, or whether it served as a convenient device for scribes when drafting a treaty, in which case it would have been unnecessary to write out the same clause for the other party.\textsuperscript{20} It is probably significant that in the document which can be demonstrated to be an original, the Tahirwaili-Eheya treaty
(Otten 1971, 66), stipulations are repeated verbatim for Eheya and not just expressed in a brief phrase of reciprocity.

In spite of the overall symmetrical lay-out of the treaties, a closer analysis reveals that in a number of important points parity is not observed and stipulations favour the Hittite king. Furthermore non-parity is already implied by the royal titles; LUGAL.GAL in most instances for the Hittite king versus LUGAL for the Kizzuwaitna ruler.21

Central to the discussion of the Kizzuwaitnean treaty character has been the main Sunassura treaty (Kizz.7) which is the best preserved of the documents.

Korosec (1931, 6f) already pointed out a number of non-reciprocal sections and concluded that Kizz.7 was not a true parity treaty, a view which he reconfirmed in a paper titled "Über den nichtparitätischen Charakter des Sunassura-Vertrages (KBo I, 5)" (1982, 168ff).22

The most exhaustive study of Kizz.7, however, was presented by Liverani (1973, 267ff) who demonstrated clearly that the text is not homogeneous in concept by dividing the stipulations into symmetrical and asymmetrical clauses.

The aspect which underlines the non-parity character most clearly are sections dealing with foreign policy, i.e. relations with Hurri/Mitanni (the latter in Kizz.5 obv. 7ff). Sunassura will not receive messengers from Hurri (IV 28-31) nor will he ever turn to Hurri again etc. This particular clause is, however, omitted in Kizz.8 (KBo XXVIII 110 63-69), which is also attributed to Sunassura. Other clauses are skilfully phrased as to appear favourable to Sunassura,23 as characterized by the following statement: "The Hurrians call Sunassura servant, but now His Majesty proclaimed him a legitimate king..." (I 38ff).
6. **Fugitives**

Regulations regarding the extradition of fugitives belong to the group of standard stipulations in Hittite treaties.

In the Kizzuwatna documents a considerable part is taken up with setting out rules for the treatment of fugitives which has prompted a more detailed examination of the fugitive question, set out below.

The surviving clauses of Kizz.3 and 4 deal almost exclusively with fugitives of various types and they feature equally prominently in Kizz.5 and 6. Furthermore AT 3, as mentioned above, was drawn up solely for the purpose of regulating the extradition of fugitives.24

In the Kizzuwatna texts the capture and return of fugitives is on the whole dealt with on the basis of parity. This is not so in the vassal treaties of the Empire Period where the extradition clauses are made out purely in favour of the Hittite king, as stated in the Targasnalli of Hapalla treaty (CTH 67); "I (His Majesty) will not give him (the fugitive) to you, to return a fugitive from Hatti is not right" (KBo V 4 obv.38).

A brief note on fugitive terminology in Hittite texts:
The common term is $^{Lp}$pittiyan$^t$- (formed with part. of vb. piddai$^t$- = to run) which equals Akk. munnabtu (Kizz.3 and 4, AT 3). Another expression, but more rarely attested, is $^{Lp}$huiyant$^t$- (similar formation as above, huiya-/huwai$^t$- = to run, flee). The latter does not occur in treaties of state but in other types of historical documents as the Mita of Pahhuwa text (KUB XXIII 72 rev. 13,56) and the Madduwatta text (KUB XIV 1 obv.34). The occurrence of both terms side by side in the latter document,25 led Goetze (1928, 114) to the observation that $^{Lp}$pittiyan$^t$- and $^{Lp}$huiyant$^t$- were not alternative expressions for fugitive but were complimentary in their meaning: the person who flees to GN = $^{Lp}$pittiyan$^t$-, the person who flees from GN = $^{Lp}$huiyant$^t$-.

In contrast the vassal treaties from the time of Suppililiuma I onwards (CTH 49, KBo X 12 IV 6-7) only use the adverbial form of $^{Lp}$pittiyan$^t$-,26 the typical phrase
being: "mankan \textit{LúMUNNABTUM İSTU KUR URU} Hatti \textit{Lůpittiyanšili uizzi}, "when a fugitive comes from the land of Hatti in the manner of a fugitive" (SV, 58).

Kempinski and Košak (1970, 207) have pointed out that \textit{Lůpittiyanšili} is only attested in texts belonging to the period between Arnuwanda I and Suppiluliuma I and used its occurrence in the Ismerika treaty (CTH 133) as a dating criterion.

From the Kizzuwatna treaty texts we can isolate various types of fugitives, although their social grouping is not always clear. Most striking in our texts is the common law character of some stipulations regarding fugitives, to be found in Kizz.4-6, which have strong analogies with the Hittite Laws.

Fugitives of the Kizzuwatna treaties have been divided into four main groups under which they are discussed below.

6(a) Fugitive Conspirators (IR ....ana SAG.DU belišu ippalas)  
Kizz.4 1-10, 14-16\textsuperscript{27} 
Kizz.3 KBo XXVIII 108 15-22, 25-26 
Kizz.1 KUB XXXI 82 21-22\textsuperscript{28} 

The above passages deal with a group of fugitives who are presumably accused of conspiracy, possibly even murder. The text stipulates that if a subject/servant (IR) of the Great King/PN who (lit.) "looks to the head of his master"\textsuperscript{29} and he flees into Kizzuwatna/Hatti, the contracting partners will seize and return him.

While Kizz.1 only stipulates the return of the suspected conspirator, Kizz.3 and 4 expand on the treatment of this type of fugitive. Here, the respective paragraphs discuss the procedure in the case of the fugitive refuting the accusation (Kizz.3 17, Kizz.4 5-6). If he proclaims his innocence the matter then becomes subject to an oath sworn by the \textit{LU^MESSIG\textsubscript{5}} to the ruler in whose country the accused has fled before he is extradited.

The role of the \textit{LU^MESSIG\textsubscript{5}} whose country is stipulated as that of the fugitive, appears to be that of a guarantor.
Swearing an oath to the king of their host country presumably served to lend credence to their ruler's claim to the fugitive and may have entailed the identification of the accused before his final extradition. The case of the above fugitive is resumed in lines 14-16 of Kizz.4 and 25-26 in Kizz.3 where notifying the other party of a suspected conspirator is agreed.

As to the identity of the fugitive in question the following can be said: The fact that he is referred to as IR (as well as munnabtum) does not make him a slave, since IR has also the meaning of "servant" or "subject". It is clear from the text that the "criminal" intentions are directed against the royal person, when the respective king claims: "he (the fugitive) rebelled against me, I want him returned" (Kizz.4 7). We are therefore dealing with high-ranking individuals accused of conspiring against the king who can be classified as political fugitives.

6(b) The \textit{Lpittiyant-} (Hitt.) munnabtum (Akk.)

Kizz.5 rev. 8-17
Kizz.6 II 11-15, III 1-7, 9-12
AT 3 8-39

An interesting group of fugitive stipulations we encounter in the Sunassura fragments Kizz.5 and 6\textsuperscript{31} which show some affinity with passages in AT 3. The type of fugitive featured here is referred to as \textit{Lpittiyant-} in the Hittite text and munnabtum in AT 3.

The resemblance of these stipulations with sections of the Hittite Laws was noted by Goetze in his edition of KUB VIII 81 = Kizz.6 (1925, 11ff, 17) and Petschow (1962, 241ff) who made special reference to the legal aspects and analogies with § 95 and § 99 of the Hittite Laws.\textsuperscript{32}

The straight-forward mutual extradition of the \textit{Lpittiyant-} (Kizz.5 rev. 8-9, Kizz.6 II 11-13) is expanded on in the following lines which consider the offence of concealing a fugitive and the penalty and compensation which ensue. The stipulations (which are more detailed in
Kizz.5) distinguish between "someone" (kuiski) and a slave committing the crime of hiding a fugitive. In both cases the fine consists of "12 persons". As in the case of §95 and §99, the owner of a slave has the choice of compensating for the offence of his slave or not. If he does not pay the indemnity, then the slave is expelled (IR- pât pa-ra-a su-ú-i-e-iz-zi, Kizz.6 III 7).

Furthermore, failing to produce the "12 persons" (if the offender is not a slave) carried the death penalty (Kizz.5 rev.11). The implication therefore would be that the Lu̇̃ pittiyant- was an individual of some importance whose concealment was discouraged by severe punishment. His identity is largely tied up with the next fugitive group, discussed below.

The situation described in AT 3 is essentially different. Seizing and returning a fugitive to his "master" (bēlu) warrants a reward of 500 shekels of copper for a man and 1000 for a woman, to be paid by the bēlu to the finder of the fugitive (18-23). As in Kizz.5 and 6 the case of hiding a fugitive is considered, not, however, by an individual but by a town (36-37). There is no mention here of a fine for concealment, but similar to our first fugitive group, witnesses are called upon (here the Lu̇̃ hazannu = mayor and 5 Lu̇̃ SIGs) before extradition can proceed (38-39).

The involvement of the bēlu in AT 3 who, as the text makes clear, has claims on the fugitive would suggest that the munnabtum here represents a runaway slave. This is how Wiseman interpreted the treaty (1953, 31). Klengel (GS I, 246 n. 63), on the other hand, raised doubts whether slaves were the subject of the document and suggested that the fugitives were members of the aristocracy, adversaries of Idrimi, who had fled after his return from exile. Klengel does, however, leave the role of the bēlu unexplained.

The fact that slaves were subject of treaty regulations is clear from AT 2 (Wiseman ibid.,26ff), a treaty between Niqmepea of Alalah and Ir-Tešub of Tunip which states: "if a fugitive (be they) male or female slaves..." (22).
The overall evidence for AT 3 would suggest that Wiseman's interpretation of the fugitive clauses is to be preferred, particularly in view of the "masters" role in the proceedings. Runaway slaves were presumably a common occurrence. The prospect of improving their social status by fleeing into another country was, no doubt, an attractive one. Considering their economic importance in a feudal society it is not surprising to find them subject of extradition clauses in treaties.

6(c) The LU-lum (Akk.)

Kizz.3 KBo XXVIII 109 x+1-6
Kizz.5 rev.3-5, 6-7
Kizz.6 II 1-4

From the stipulations which precede the clauses featuring the \textsuperscript{L\textgreek{i}}pittiyant- in Kizz.5 and 6 it becomes clear that the above is contrasted with another type of fugitive. The relevant paragraphs are unfortunately too broken to reveal his identity.

Kizz.6 II 2-3 reads as follows: (2) ma-a-na-aš ta[me-da-az KUR-az I-NA KUR \textsuperscript{URU}Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni
(3) a-pa-ši-la pa-iz-zi... "if he himself goes from another country into Kizzuwatna..." (instructions for extradition follow).

The above passage is parallel to Kizz.6 III 10-12 where the possibility of a \textsuperscript{L\textgreek{i}}pittiyant- entering Kizzuwatna via another country is also considered.\textsuperscript{35}

As to the identity of the fugitive (referred to as apasila above) one may consider a series of stipulations which occur in Kizz.3, the Tahirwaili-Eheya treaty. This fragment was not considered by del Monte.

KBo XXVIII 109

x+1 \text{\textgreek{y}um-ma LU-lum ša KUR \textsuperscript{URU}Ha-at-ti (a-na ma-a-tim)
2 ni-il-la-ak-mi LU-lum[šu-ū a-ña\textsuperscript{URU}KUR\textsuperscript{URU}Ha-at-ti}
The overall sense of the passage is clear, although the second half of the lines are missing, including the verb of extradition. The fugitive mentioned here is simply referred to as a "man" or a group of "3 men".

The LU-lum stipulations of Kizz.3 can be paralleled to some degree with the fugitive clauses of the Hattusili III - Rameses II treaty (CTH 91, Weidner PD, 120ff) in as much as they refer to the fugitive as LU and, as in our treaty, consider the event of 1, 2 or 3 men fleeing into the country of the other party. Unfortunately, in the Boğazköy version of the treaty these passages are rather broken, but the Egyptian text is sufficiently close to establish that the "man" or a group of men are contrasted with a "great man" (Breasted, Anc.Rec.III, 170f).

In conclusion the following points can be made: all the treaties discussed above appear to make provision for two types of fugitives, the political sort who was presumably a member of the aristocracy and the ordinary "man" who is not defined in the Kizzuwatna documents but must have included artisans as well as slaves. In the Akkadian treaties Kizz.3 and 4 we have the IR/munnabtum ("who looks to the head of his master") contrasted with the LU-lum and in the Hittite texts Kizz.5 and 6 the LCpittiyant- (whose concealment is severely punished) with an undisclosed fugitive (LU?, kuiski?).
6(d) Fleeing Settlements -(URUKI....itebibi)

The Paddatissu treaty (Kizz.4) contains an unusual series of treaty clauses which concern the shifting of rural population and inter-territorial border offences like marauding herdsmen etc.

Lines 17-29 deal with the decampment of entire settlements (URUKI), including women, chattel and domestic animals who move into the territory of the treaty opponent. Partial decampment appears to be at the centre of lines 23-25 (28-29). The LU.SIG₃ swears an oath to the effect that not the entire settlement has decamped but some remained to attend the pastures. The women who did leave are returned.

It is fairly clear that seasonal activities by nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes who were shifting between their summer and winter pastures are referred to here (see ch.I.1(a) and below).

Kizz.4 continues with a number of stipulations regarding border infringements of a criminal nature. Lines 30-37 deal with thieving herdsmen (see below) and murder or bodily harm committed with various types of weapons. The penalty for the latter offence seems to be "a man for a man" (40) and in some instance death (43). Although reminiscent of sections in the Hittite Laws regarding murder (§§1-7) and bodily harm (§§7-18), none of the passages can be paralleled.

7. Geographical Aspects

The Kizzuwatna treaties provide relatively little information on the historical geography of Cilicia and the Taurus region during the period of Kizzuwatna's political existence.

No place names are preserved which would indicate the extent of Kizzuwatna in her time of independence with the exception of KBo I 5 (Kizz.7). This last of a long line of treaties includes a list of some fifteen geographical names which mark the western border between Hatti and Kizzuwatna. Unfortunately only two of these are attested elsewhere, the remainder being hapax legomena.
However, the frequent fluctuation of the borders between the two countries are alluded to in the treaties, which indicates that frontiers were rather fluid. One of the reasons for the unstable border situation, one may suggest, is that the frontier ran through territory which for topographical reasons was difficult to control from Hatti as well as Kizzuwatna. The area which springs to mind is, of course, the Taurus and Anti-Taurus region which presumably formed common border territory and was subject to border disputes.

In addition, we have in Kizz.4, quite clearly, references to traditional nomadic activities between the mountainous regions and the Cilician plain and the attempts by the two contracting countries to control these movements.

A section which concerns itself with thieving herdsmen in the same treaty provides a topographical hint (Kizz.4 30-37); while herdsmen from Hatti are said to "descend" into border territory of Kizzuwatna, -(30) ...i-na ZAG ša KUR Ṛ Ki-iz-zu-wa-ta-ni Ki Ṛ d-ur-ra-du..., the herdsman from Kizzuwatna "enters" (i-ir-ru-ub) into Hatti in the corresponding paragraph. The phrase of line 30 recalls the statement of Shalmaneser III; having crossed the Amanus mountain he "descends" to the towns (Lusanda, Abarnani, Kisuatni) of Kate of Que, ...ana URU MES-Š-ni ša ḫa-te-i KUR qa-ū-a-a at-ta-ra-da... (Michel 1954-1959, 40).

The implication, however tentative, would be that at least part of the Taurus and Anti-Taurus region was in Hittite hands in the time the Paddatissu treaty was concluded which necessitated a descent into Kizzuwatna, i.e. the Cilician plain. The border fluctuations referred to above are reflected in the exchange of previously captured towns which appear to have belonged to the standard stipulations, at least in the early treaties. The straightforward mutual return of previously conquered cities stipulated in Kizz.1 (KUB XXXI 82 7-8) and Kizz.3 (KBo XXVIII 108 5-6) is dealt with in more detail in Kizz.2. Here, after a brief introduction, the only
preserved paragraphs deal exclusively with border matters. After stating in §1 (obv. 3-4) that cities which Pilliya had conquered shall be returned to His Majesty and vice versa, §2 (obv. 6-9) specifies "built up" (fortified?) cities (uitantus URU^DI^DLI.J^I.A), belonging to either party, which have been deserted, and stipulates that they are not to be rebuilt. Disregarding the above ruling constituted breaking the oath (obv. 10).

The mere collective reference to towns without naming them may be an indication that the outline of the border towns had been laid down elsewhere. In this context the Zidanaza-Pilliya treaty, like AT 3, may indeed represent a partial agreement of a more comprehensive treaty document which was made out for the sole purpose of reaffirming formerly existing borders (see ref. to oath above), thus re-establishing the status quo. 38

The mention of cities which were not to be "rebuilt" links Kizz. 2 with Kizz. 7 where in the latter the towns of Lamiya and Aruna are stipulated as cities which the Hittite king will not rebuild (IV 42, 45). The geographical list of the Sunassura treaty KBo I 5 (IV 40ff) has been dealt with at length by Goetze (Kizz., 48ff) and Garstang and Gurney (Geography, 59ff) and there is little that can be added.

Goetze (Kizz., 49) first suggested that the boundary defined in the treaty was conceived in two parts: Lines 40-51, beginning "from the sea" and ending at Anamusta, represents the new outline of the frontier, while the rest of the geographical names (IV 52-66) reaffirms the old one. 39

It was convincingly demonstrated by the same author that the place names listed in the treaty formed the western border of Kizzuwatna. His arguments hinged mainly on the statement "from the sea" at the beginning of the list and the mention of the city Saliya (IV 45, 48) which has been located on the northern approaches to the Cilicia Gates (RGTC 6, 334; Kizz., 52ff). The fortress of Mersin which guarded the western approaches to Cilicia, has been equated with Pitura, a frontier-post by the sea which
belonged to the king of Kizzuwatna (Geography, 60). The fortress was first constructed in level VII (VIII) (LB I) and would have been in use during the period of Kizzuwatna as an independent state.

The second attested place name in the list is the province of Adaniya (ch.I.1(b), ch.III.2 n.37) which remains in the hands of Sunassura.

The river Samri (Kizz., 58) which was not to be crossed by either party, formed the physical border between Hatti and Kizzuwatna. The equation of the Samri with the Saros, modern Seyhan first suggested by Olmstead, is widely accepted (RGTC 6, 546).

As to the eastern border of Kizzuwatna, the treaties contain no tangible information. It has to be kept in mind that the Amanus range forms a natural barrier to the east which no doubt dictated political frontiers. The Islahiya region to the east of the Amanus and open to the south must have been largely under Syrian i.e. Hurrian influence (Alkim 1969, 280ff). On the other hand, if one accepts the identification of class. Aliaria with Alawari which was subject of a dispute between Niqmea and Sunassura (AT 14; sect.3), the implication is that Kizzuwatna at times controlled the eastern approach to the Bahçe pass (see Calder and Bean Class. Map of Asia Minor).

It is very evident from the treaties that Kizzuwatna, like Isuwa,40 formed a buffer state between Hatti and the Hurrian sphere. Instructions by the Hittite king regarding the conduct of Sunassura vis à vis Hurri/Mitanni forms a substantial part of Kizz.5, 7 and 8. From these stipulations it is clear that contact between Kizzuwatna and Hurri/Mitanni was discouraged by the Hittites and consequently they must have shared a common border. One of these passages occurs in the Sunassura fragment (Kizz.5, obv.7-10). Meyer (1953, 122) who first commented on the text, isolated a place name of KUR Suwanta41 (obv.8) which was also listed by del Monte in RGTC 6,371 where he translates obv.8-9 "...S. will not let him (the king of Mitanni) go through the land Suwanta...". 
However, in his article on the Kizzuwatna treaties (1981, 218f) the author transliterates (instead of KUR Šu-wa-
.ta)... ANA KUR-ŠU-wa'-an?-kân..., arriving at a translation "he (Sunassura) does not let him (the king of Mitanni) pass across his territory".

Although the new reading is by no means assured, it would fit the context well and eliminate a place name associated with Kizzuwatna which is otherwise not attested.

A difficult passage towards the end of Kizz.7 regarding inhabitants of the town of Urussa42 is of some importance to the eastern border question and deserves a mention here. The paragraph has been dealt with on three occasions by Weidner (PD, 106f), Goetze (Kizz., 41ff) and Garstang and Gurney (Geography, 58f), with as many variations in the translation and interpretation of the text. It is the first half of the section (IV 5-7) which is central to the understanding of the entire passage. It reads as follows:

Col. IV

5 mi-na-im-me-e ša KUR Hur-ri lu-ú]LU< mes DAM.GAR< mes
lu-ú NAM.LU.UL19.LU
6 ša URUU-ru-uš-ša ša i-na ma-ti13 Šu-na-aš-šu-ra
7 [y]-te-eš-ru a-na LUGAL Hur-ri EGIR ma-ti-im-ma ú-ul
a-na-an-din

"Whatever (whoever) of the land of Hurri, (be) they
merchants or people of Urussa who(m) (I?) xxed into the land of Sunassura I shall not give back to the Hurrian king".

The translation of lines 6-7 and a résumé of the interpretation of the entire passage by the three authors is as follows:

Weidner: "... who are left to the hand of S. ..."
Urussa was probably in Kizzuwatna, mainly settled by Hurrians (ibid., 106 note 1).

Goetze: "... whom they have released from S.'s country." Urussa had previously belonged to Hatti, now ceded to Sunassura (ibid., 42).44
Garstang-Gurney: "...whom I have released to the possession of S. .." Urussa had passed into the hands of Hatti at the time of the treaty, (ibid., 58).45

The remainder of the paragraph is a re-affirmation that any claims which the "Hurrian" may make the Sun will refute. The passage under discussion represents a rather pretentious concession to Sunassura by the Hittite ruler. It belongs to the type of clauses in Kizz.7 which give the outward appearance of being favourable to Sunassura but which in the final analysis are of no advantage to Kizzuwatna at all (I 38ff, III 50ff). The interpretation of the text hinges partly on the incomplete verb at the beginning end of line 7 which holds the key to the method by which Sunassura came into possession of the persons from Urussa.

It could be suggested that the people in question were fugitives who had crossed over to Kizzuwatna but, since Sunassura's treaty relationship with Hurri has come to an end, he is no longer bound by extradition regulations. Having allied himself to Hatti he has forfeited his rights to diplomatic contact with the Hurrian king (see IV 28ff). Any future extradition will be undertaken by his "overlord", the Hittite king, whose pledge not to do so is the essence of this paragraph.

The text appears to be clear on the fact that subjects of Urussa belonged to the Hurri Land. Since the Hittite King promises not to extradite inhabitants of Urussa held by Sunassura, the implication would be that the Hurrian king had some sort of claim to them. Therefore the inference is that Urussa belonged to Hurri at this stage. The town was probably situated in border territory between Hurri and Kizzuwatna as the other two occurrences of Urussa in Hittite texts (CTH 225, CTH 133) connect the city remotely to Kizzuwatna.

There appears to be no compelling evidence in this passage to suggest that Urussa belonged to Kizzuwatna and even less so that the city was in Hatti's possession.
8. The Dating of the Treaties

Little is known of Hittite activities in N. Syria shortly after the reign of Telipinu and the treaties may represent the attempts of Hittite kings to re-exert their influence in that region. Certainly by the time of Tudhaliya of the Aleppo treaty, Hittite involvement in Syrian affairs was resumed (CTH 75). The most important reason for the constant treaty relationship between Kizzuwatna and Hatti must be looked for in the rise of Mitanni to an ever more powerful state and Kizzuwatna's role as a buffer state between Hatti and the Hurrian states to the south and east. The parity stipulations and relatively lenient terms of the treaties suggest that Hatti was not acting from a position of great strength and they underline the delicate political situation in which Kizzuwatna, bordering on two major powers, played a decisive role in tipping the balance between Mitanni and Hatti by aligning herself with one or the other. Kizzuwatna's defection to Mitanni is well documented (Kizz.7, I 5-7, Kizz.8, 10-15), but occurred on more than one occasion which would partly explain the relatively large numbers of treaties recovered; each defection to Mitanni would necessitate the drawing up of a new document, once Kizzuwatna had returned to the Hittite fold.

Apart from the extensive corresponding passages of the Tahurwaili and Paddatissu treaties, there are additional ones which belong to Kizz.1. The total number of parallel passages has been summarized below:

Kizz.3 5-7 = Kizz.1 KUB XXXI 82 7-8
(mutual return of cities)
Kizz.3 8-14 = Kizz.1 KUB XXXI 82 9-12
(military assistance, sharing of booty)
Kizz.3 15-22 = Kizz.4 1-10 = Kizz.1 KUB XXXI 82 21-22
(exchange of political fugitives)
Kizz.3 23-24 = Kizz. 4 11-13
(immunity of envoys)
Kizz.3 25-26 = Kizz.4 14-16
(duty to inform)
The above list of corresponding paragraphs would suggest that Kizz.1, 3, and 4 should be relatively closely dated.\textsuperscript{47} It also shows that the treaty formula which is characteristic of the Kizzuwatna documents can be traced back to Telipinu and was kept alive in the following generations. Although the tenor of KBo I 5 (Kizz.7) is considerably altered from the earlier treaties, it still draws on the established treaty formula of earlier times (II 46-47, 49-51).

In a number of Kizzuwatna treaties the name of the Hittite king is not preserved (Kizz.4-8) which poses a major problem in placing the treaties in chronological order and ultimately in compiling a list of Kizzuwatnean kings.

Treaties in which both contracting partners are preserved:

1. Telipinu - Isputahsu
2. Zidanza - Pilliya
3. Idrimi (Alalah) - Pilliya
4. Tahurwaili - Eheya

Of the above treaties No.1 is the only firmly dated document. No.2 vacillates between Zidanza I and II. No.3 suffers from the uncertain dating of Idrimi. Tahurwaili, No.4 to whom no other text can be attributed, has not yet found a firm place in the Hittite king list.

It has been argued above (ch.III.2) that the Zidanza-Pilliya treaty should be attributed to Zidanza II, mainly on historical grounds. It was also suggested that Zidanza II and Idrimi were contemporaries and the Pilliya of the Zidanza treaty is identical with the treaty partner of Idrimi in AT 3 (sect.3 above). Gurney had contemplated this possibility, but rejected it on the strength of the relatively high dates for Parattarna and Sauštatar of Mitanni and the military activities of Tuthmosis III in Syria at this time (see below). He consequently had to create an earlier Pilliya (I) as contemporary of Idrimi (CAH vol.II ch.XV, 671 n.6, Chron.Table).\textsuperscript{48}

A number of recent studies have advocated the lowering of dates for Nuzi and Alalah which favour a date of Idrimi...
into the early to mid 15th century (Wilhelm 1976, 159ff; Oller 1977, 148ff; Collon 1975, 169).  The other reason for an early Idrimi date has been the Syrian campaigns of Tuthmosis III which were thought to have taken place after Idrimi's reign (which lasted 30 (+x) years), since there is no mention of Egypt in the Alalah IV records or on the Idrimi statue. However, Collon and Oller have convincingly argued that the Egyptian campaigns were probably only raids which did not result in political control of the region (Collon 1975, 168; Oller 1977, 167ff). An accession date of 1479 B.C. for Tuthmosis III is now favoured (Kitchen 1987, 40f) which dates his 8th campaign (33rd year) when he reached the Euphrates to 1446 B.C., an event which probably falls into the time after Idrimi's death and into the reign of his successor Niqmepa and Sauštatar of Mitanni.

For the history of Kizzuwatna the two synchronisms which exist between Alalah and Nuzi (Mitanni) are of great importance: 1) Idrimi with Parattarna (AT 3), 2) Niqmepa with Sauštatar (AT 13, AT 14) to which we can tie Pilliya (AT 3) and Sunassura (AT 14) of Kizzuwatna (see Chron. Table).

From the Alalah evidence a one generation separation between Idrimi and Niqmepa seems assured (Klengel GS I, 232), but relations of Parattarna with Sauštatar are less clear and a short reign of Parsatar has been postulated by some scholars (Wilhelm 1976, 157).

By dating the reign of Idrimi into the 15th century (i.e. after Telipinu), the claim of the Alalah ruler that he captured seven towns of Hatti (Oller 1977, 187ff), can consequently no longer be tied to the calamitous events during the reign of Ammuna mentioned in the Telipinu Edict (ch.III.2 and n. 37a).

In the Tahurwaili-Eheya treaty text we are fortunate in possessing an original sealed document (Otten 1971, 66) which therefore affords an examination on two levels: (a) A comparative study of its seal impression with the Tabarna seals of the Middle Kingdom which are characterized by a central rosette and double-ring cuneiform legend (see
Fig. 6) and (b) the palaeographic evidence of the text itself for a period from which not many original documents have survived.

In the publication of the Tahurwaili seal (Bo 69/200) in 1971 (p. 59) Otten set out a number of points which emphasized the close resemblance of the Tahurwaili seal with that of Huzziya (SBo I 85). The question which was posed at the time was whether SBo I 85 should be dated to Huzziya I or to the Huzziya II of the "Offering Lists" where he is placed after Telipinu. At the same time, it was noted that the seal of Alluwamna (who appears in the "Lists" immediately after Telipinu) SBo I 86 was much simpler in appearance and hence represented an earlier stage of stylistic development (Otten ibid., 59, 62).

The recent discoveries at Boğazköy of a number of land donations have thrown new light on the above question and, more importantly, they confirm the validity of the "Offering Lists" for the sequence of rulers in the period between Telipinu and Tudhaliya I/II (Neve, AA 1983, 447 Abb. 21, AA 1985, 333f, Abb. 11a&b; Otten 1986, 21ff).

The most surprising find among these documents has been the discovery of a land donation issued by a Muwatalli (1NIR.GAL Bo 84/465 = KBo XXXII 185), a hitherto unknown Hittite king for this period. The remaining land donations belong to Alluwamna, already known from two seal impressions (Beran No. 146a&b, not attached to a land donation), Zidanza (Bo 84/417 = KBo XXXII 184) whose seal is stylistically identical to that of Muwatalli, and Huzziya (?) to whom KBo XXXII 187 (seal broken away) has been attributed (Otten 1986, 24ff, Abb. 6).

On the strength of the new evidence provided by the land donations, in which the lists of witnesses at the end of the documents have played an important part, the Hittite king list for the time span between Telipinu and the beginning of the Early Empire period runs as follows: Alluwamna, Hantili II, Zidanza II, Huzziya II, Muwatalli I (see Chron. Table).

The omission of Muwatalli in the "Offering Lists" must
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be interpreted as damnatio memoriae, particularly since we know that he usurped the throne after killing Huzziya (KBo XVI 25+ IV 15), and he in turn was murdered by his own courtiers (Himuili and Kantuzili) according to KUB XXXIV 40 9-10 who also appear as witnesses in the Muwatalli land donation (Otten 1986, 29ff).

Although the "dark period" has been much illuminated by the recent textual finds, it does not solve our dilemma as to where the reign of Tahurwaili, who made a treaty with Eheya of Kizzuwatna, is to be inserted. What the new findings have done, however, is to narrow down the possibilities for a position of Tahurwaili in the king list.

If the succession of kings from Alluwamna to Huzziya and Muwatalli was an uninterrupted one, which appears to be the case, according to Otten's findings, then Tahurwaili can only be fitted in at the beginning or at the end of that sequence, i.e. before Alluwamna or after Muwatalli.

Historical arguments for placing Tahurwaili before Alluwamna were put forward by a number of writers; Carruba (1974, 73ff) and Bin-Nun (1974, 112ff) both identified Tahurwaili of Kizz.3 with Tahurwaili of the Telipinu Edict and claimed that he usurped the throne after Telipinu's death.

The Telipinu Edict states that Tahurwaili "the man of the golden spear" was incited by his father Zuru to murder Titti(ya) and his family. The event took place after the death of Ammuna and we must assume that Titti(ya) had been the legitimate successor to Ammuna(§21). The next paragraph speaks of a second murder, this time committed by Taruhsu who killed Hantili (next in line of succession) and his dependants and consequently Huzziya became king. The latter is thought to have been the brother of Tahurwaili by Bin-Nun (ibid., 114) and the brother of Titti(ya) and Hantili by Easton (ibid., 26). Certain, however, is that Huzziya was the brother-in-law of Telipinu who had married Istapariya Huzziya's sister of "first rank" (hantezziya-). A plot to murder Telipinu and his wife (who being of "first
rank" may have had a claim to the throne) was discovered and Telipinu banished Huzziya (§22).

Tahurwaili, together with Taruhsu and Tanuwa, is mentioned again in §26 where it is stated that the above men were condemned to death by the pankus but pardoned by Telipinu who made them "peasants". Thus Tahurwaili's activities stretch from the death of Ammuna to the reign of Telipinu.

Carruba (ibid., 80f) and Bin-Nun (ibid., 117ff) both consider the text KUB XXVI 77 (CTH 23) for the Tahurwaili question and both restore in line 18 Ta-hur-wa-i-li DUMU SALKAR.KID (Tahurwaili son of a prostitute) but they interpret the text differently. The fragment which is on the whole obscure makes reference to the banishment of Aluwamna and Harapsili but the context in which Tahurwaili's name occurs is not clear. Carruba argued that the text was compiled by a later king and that it was Tahurwaili who ordered the banishing of Aluwamna and his wife, after which he ascended the throne himself. However, Bin-Nun (ibid., 116) believes the author of the text to be Telipinu based mainly on the similar wording to the Telipinu Edict, a view shared by Easton (ibid., 27).

Against the plausible historical arguments for identifying Tahurwaili "great king" with Tahurwaili of the Telipinu Edict stands the stylistic evidence of the Tabarna seals. Prior to the discovery of the new land donations, the close resemblance of SBo I 85 (Huzziya) and the Tahurwaili seal impression had been recognized by all scholars and placing Tahurwaili before Aluwamna could only be achieved by dating SBo I 85 to Huzziya I. With the evidence of the new Tabarna seals of Zidanza and Muwatalli this attribution can no longer be maintained, and it is clear that SBo I 85 should be dated to Huzziya II (see Fig.6).

The seal which is even more pertinent to the Tahurwaili one is BO 84/465, the seal of Muwatalli. Apart from the external similarities they share an identically worded legend: Bo 69/200 NMKISHIB ta-ba-ar-na Ta-hur-wa-i-li
It follows, that only by disregarding the evidence of the Tabarna seals can we arrive at a place of Tahurwaili in the king list before Alluwamna and consequently a date of the Eheya treaty (Kizz.3) shortly after Telipinu. In our view this cannot be done and we have to consider the possibility of Tahurwaili ascending the throne after Muwatalli, probably also as a usurper since, like Muwatalli, he is not mentioned in the "Offering Lists", nor is he attested in any other text. He may have ruled for only a brief period, but long enough to conclude a treaty with Eheya of Kizzuwatna.

Otten has suggested that Tahurwaili came to the throne as husband of princess Nikalmati and later took the name of Tudhaliya (1971, 68). There is no supporting evidence for Otten's theory, but the textual sources surrounding Muwatalli and other members of the royal family which reflect a dynastic struggle (CTH 271/275, Carruba 1977, 175ff) may represent the historical background from which Tudhaliya I/II emerged as ruler of the new dynasty.

(b) Akkadian texts found at Boğazköy have so far been largely excluded from palaeographical studies by the Marburg as well as the Munich school. Otten did not comment on the script of the Tahurwaili treaty in his publication of the text, but remarked that the writing of LS 2 which bears the seal of Huzziya (SBo I 85) is more "grazil" than the heavy old ductus of LS 3-7 and therefore must be of later date than the bulk of the land donations (1971, 62; idem., 1986, 23f). The question of palaeography and particularly ductus in archaic texts has been reviewed by Neu (1980, p.XIV ff) and more recently by Starke (1985, 21ff).

Neu, as Otten has done (see above and KBo XVII, XX), subdivides the old ductus but advocates a uniform terminology by distinguishing between "Duktustyp I" which equals Otten's "typisch alter Duktus" and "Duktustyp II"
which covers largely Otten's term "alter Duktus" (älterer, relativ alter Duktus). Neu also observes that "Duktustyp II" is less heavy than "I" and that the former shows already some of the elegance of the Middle Hittite ductus (ibid., p. XVI).\textsuperscript{52}

The above author is non-committal on the Zidanza-Pilliya treaty which he merely refers to as being written in the old ductus and on the problem whether it should be dated to Zidanza I or II.\textsuperscript{53} However, he attributes KUB XXXI 81 of Kizz.1 to his "Duktustyp II" (1980, p. XVII and n.12).\textsuperscript{54}

No photographs of the Tahurwaili-Eheya treaty have been published which would allow a comparison with texts belonging to the "Duktustyp II" group.

The sign forms of the Tahurwaili text were, however, considered by Easton in his section on the palaeography of Hittite land donations (1981, 34ff, Tabs. III-V). In his discussion on the palaeographical development within the land donation texts he postulates a possible earlier date of Kizz. 3 than his Group IV which includes LS 2, 19, 22 (p.37 and Tab.II). However, Easton remarked that the evidence for an earlier date of the Tahurwaili treaty (i.e. before the Huzziya land donations) is very slight indeed, and it consequently does not outweigh the stylistic arguments put forward above, which would place Tahurwaili between Muwatalli I and Tudhaliya I/II.

The identical wording of Kizz.3 with the Paddatissu treaty (Kizz.4) has been underlined above and suggests a close dating of the two treaties (Otten 1971, 67; Kümmel R\textsuperscript{IA} V, 628).

As for the Paddatissu treaty itself, apart from its affinities with Kizz.3, little can be added to assist in dating the text more precisely. The name of the Hittite king who drew up the treaty with Paddatissu is unfortunately not preserved, but Kizz.4 has on occasions been assigned to the grandfather of Suppiluliuma I, based on the statement in Kizz.7 (I 5-6) that Kizzuwatna belonged to Hatti "in the time of my grandfather" (Gurney, CAH vol.II ch.XV, 676). Apart from the remaining uncertainty
regarding the identity of Suppiluliuma's grandfather, it has to be remembered that the evidence for dating Kizz.7 to this ruler is inconclusive, and in fact is unlikely, as will be argued in the next chapter.

All that can be said at present, is that the Paddatissu treaty (being tied to Kizz.3) could be attributed to Tudhalia I/II or to the predecessors of Tahurwaili, i.e. Muwatalli I or Huzziya II.

The second most vexed question regarding the dating of the Kizzuwatna treaties concerns Kizz.5 and 6 (del Monte 1981, 214ff). The problems of the Sunassura treaty texts are twofold: (a) Do the Hittite fragments Kizz.5 and 6 represent the Hittite version of the main treaty Kizz.7 or should they be attributed to an earlier king of the same name? (b) Who was the Hittite king or kings with whom Sunassura entered a treaty relationship? Kizz.5 and 6 are largely parallel in contents and wording. Both contain detailed fugitive clauses (see above) and stipulations regarding matters of foreign policy.

Laroche in CTH separated the two texts by listing Kizz.5 as CTH 131 under "Textes d'époque incertaine" and Kizz.6 as the Hittite version to the main treaty (CTH 41 II).

Scholars who have expressed views on the two fragments can be divided into two groups; the ones who argue that Kizz.5 and 6 represents the Hittite version of Kizz.7 and consequently they stipulate only one Sunassura of Kizzuwatna (Kammenhuber 1968, 37, 98 n.298; THeth 9, 68, 148; Kümmel RIA V, 628) and those who feel that either Kizz.5 or Kizz.6 or both belong to an earlier treaty concluded with Sunassura I (Goetze 1957, 71f; Houwink ten Cate 1970, 5 n.17; Košak 1980, 33 n.34; Kühne 1982, 220 but cf. n.235).

Since Meyer (1953, 121ff) who had already set out the two possibilities for Kizz.5 and 6, additional criteria have since been added to the discussion; those of language, orthography as well as palaeography. Houwink ten Cate included Kizz.5 in his linguistic analysis of Middle
Hittite texts (Group C) and remarked that Kizz.6 should be added to the same group (1970, 44 and n.16). He pointed to a number of archaisms in the two fragments and concluded that both texts belong to the Middle Hittite period.

The palaeography of Kizz.5 and 6 was considered in *THeth* 9 in which sign forms of both fragments were analysed as "early" (p.122, 148) and Starke has classified both texts as belonging to his Ductus Type IIc, dated to the early 14th century (1985, 24 n.54, 27). Kizz.5 and 6 can therefore be regarded as contemporary rather than later copies.

Having established that from the linguistic and palaeographic point of view the texts can be considered Middle Hittite, where do we stand vis à vis the Akkadian Sunassura treaty (Kizz.7)? No comments have been made on the script of KBo I 5, as Akkadian texts have so far been excluded from palaeographic analysis. However, examining the text by using the recognized diagnostic signs it was noted that Kizz.7 has early sign forms only (with the exception of du and zu) which, from the palaeographic point of view, suggests a similar date to Kizz.5 and 6.

Furthermore, Melchert who commented on the language of KBo I 5 described it as "Middle BoAkk" and suggested that it predated Suppiluliuma I (1978, 3 n.6).

For the internal evidence of Kizz.5 and 6 in relation to Kizz.7 the following points can be made:

1) All three texts and Kizz.8 refer to the Hittite king as "DU'TUŠI" (LUGAL.GAL in Kizz.7 in a few instances, LUGAL[Hatti once in Kizz.5]).

2) There are no fugitive clauses preserved in Kizz.7 or Kizz.8 which would allow a comparison with the extensive stipulations of Kizz.5 and 6.

3) The potential enemy in Kizz.5 is the country of Mitanni as opposed to Hurri in Kizz.7 and hurri in Kizz.8.56

Kizz.5 considers the event of Mitanni becoming hostile to Hatti or Kizzuwatna and mutual military assistance, but it is left to the discretion of either party if they provide troops or not (obv.7-12).57 In contrast military
matters in Kizz.7 (and to some extent in Kizz.8) are laid down in great detail, distinguishing between ERIN$^{MES}$ tillatu (auxiliary troops) (II 42-45) and ERIN$^{MES}$ huratu (h.troops) (II 63-66) which are mutually provided in the case of hostilities. However, the most revealing paragraph is IV 19-22 which states that, in the event of His Majesty mounting a campaign against Hurri or Arzawa, Sunassura is to provide 100 teams of horses and 1000 foot-soldiers. There is no reciprocal arrangement for Sunassura, nor is it left to the discretion of the Kizzuwatnean king whether he provides military assistance or not.

In conclusion it can be said that:

a) From the linguistic and palaeographic point of view Kizz.5 and 6 may represent the Hittite version of the main Sunassura treaty KBo I 5, but from the contents point of view, Kizz.5 and 6 could only be considered contemporary with Kizz.7 if the fragments represent earlier drafts, for the reason given above.

b) Kizz.5 and 6 may belong to a treaty concluded with Sunassura I, contemporary of Sauštatar of AT 14. However, on the basis of the palaeographic evidence this would now seem unlikely, since Starke has dated the two texts after Arnuwanda I (op.cit., 24 n.53, n.54). Even if we cannot attribute the treaty texts to an earlier Sunassura, we can nevertheless postulate a Sunassura I on the basis of AT 14, as was done by Kühne (1982, n.232).

We shall return to the dating question of KBo I 5 at the end of chapter V, after considering the historical evidence for the Early Empire period.
Footnotes

1 For easier reference in the discussion below, treaty texts have been numbered Kizz.1-8.

2 Laroche lists in the section "Textes d'époque incertaine" under CTH 132 KBo XII 31 as a treaty between a Hittite king and Kizzuwatna. The fragment is a god-list, evoking amongst others the male and female gods of "Kummanni. The inclusion of oath-gods from Kizzuwatna in treaties is well attested during the reign of Suppiluliuma I (CTH 51, CTH 42, CTH 136, PRU IV 17.340). However, it appears at present that Kummanni did not come into use until Mursili II (ch.II.3). It is therefore doubtful that the fragment is part of a Kizzuwatna treaty since Kizzuwatna had ceased to exist as an independent state by then. See now KBo XXVIII 110 = Kizz.8 rev.83 which evokes the gods of Kizzuwatna.

3 See G.F. del Monte's article "Note sui trattati fra Hattusa e Kizuwatna", OA 20 (1981), 203-221. The author offers transliterations and translations of the more recently edited treaty fragments, arranging them in a manner to underline the corresponding nature of the stipulations within the corpus. Fragments which could not be paralleled were not considered. There is a conspicuous absence of commentary notes to the transliterations presented and an overall lack of bibliographical information.

4 See treaty with Amurru CTH 49, treaty with Mitanni CTH 51, both concluded by Suppiluliuma I.

5 del Monte (1981, 203) put the treaties into three historical periods (1) period before Telipinu, (2) the immediate successors of Telipinu (3) Suppiluliuma I, thus committing himself to Zidanza I for the Pilliya treaty.
I am grateful to Prof. Wiseman for discussing the text with me.

Beran 1967, 70f, groups XV-XVII.

Wiseman ibid., 32 iz-ku-ur - traces suggest ru or ur.

See Oller 1977, 160 n.27 with previous literature.

The above conclusion had been reached independently from Oller (see note above) - also Wilhelm 1982, 36.

For the most detailed discussion see Korošec 1931, 21ff, also Kühne and Otten 1971, 24f; del Monte 1981, 206ff.

For a clear reference to Kizz.1 see catalogue tablet KUB XXX 42 rev.15-18, Laroche CTH, p.163, which refers to "1 treaty tablet" of Isputahsu king of Kizzuwatna and Telipinu king of Hatti, (18) GIM-an is-qi-ú-ul i-e-er QA-TI - "when they made a treaty, finished". Cf. KBo XIX 37 (1) ... DUB\[BA\] MÉS-IA is-qi-ú-li\[BU\].^A[ "my treaty' tablets..." (2) ...MA\+HAR Te-li-pi-nu Û is\[BU]\ pu-tah-ŠU. - The above fragment probably does not belong to the actual treaty text (Kümmel RIA V, 628).

Comparable to Hitt. mahhan ishiul istarni sumi ishiyat, DS 28 E IV 26, ref. to treaty with Kurustama, del Monte 1981, 206.

We know that taksul- in later texts has the meaning of "peace, friendship" since in the vassal treaties taksul- is frequently contrasted with kurur (enemy, hostile), terms discussed by Neu in Fs Meriggi (1979), 407ff.

Otten 1973, 9 translates "mit dem Grossvater des Königs Frieden machte er...".
"Attaradu made peace with the king" (Kühne, ZA (1972), 245). - "...because he made peace (a pact?) with the king, my father".

Quite opposed to ishiul iya- where the Hittite king (or both parties) is always the subject.

Kizz.2 suggests parity character but clauses are not repeated verbatim.

Kizz.1 alternates between LUGAL KUR ḫḫ Kizzuwatna KI.MIN (KUB XXXI 81, 6, 9) and ṣa LUGAL.GAL gatamma (KUB IV 76 8, 10).
Kizz.8 does not make use of either formula, but stipulations are freely formulated for either party in the same paragraph.

In the case of the Sunassura fragments (Kizz.5 and 6) which are almost identical in content, one could think in terms of drafts, particularly as one uses verbs in the indicative (Kizz.5 rev.9 appa pai "he will give back") and the other in the imperative (Kizz.6 II 13 appa pa-a-ū "let him give back"), Houwink ten Cate 1970, 60 n.20.

Kammenhuber's claim (1968, 98 n. 296) that Isputahsu bears the title of Great King not only on his seal but also in the treaty text (KUB XXXI 81 8) must be rejected. Thus also Kümmler RIA V, 628.

He divides the text into four sections: (1) I 1-40, introduction denotes parity. (2) I 49-III 36 largely symmetrical clauses. (3) III 37-IV 39 non-reciprocal paragraphs. (4) IV 40-66 border arrangements.

Liverani (ibid., 270f) speaks of "simmetria sarcastica", i.e. the pretence of symmetry, which forms the transition from the tradition of the symmetrical treaties based largely on parity to the
subordination of the other party as known from the vassal treaties.

24 For a general discussion on fugitives in the ancient Near East see Ebeling in RlA III, 88ff.

25 Also in the Mita of Pahhuwa text, rev. II 56, (Gurney 1948, 44).

26 For nominal and adverbial forms side by side see Kaska treaty CTH 137 (v.Schuler 1965, 138).

27 Line numbers given throughout are taken from Meyer's transliteration of Kizz.4 (1953, 112ff).

28 Largely restored from Kizz.3 and 4.

29 Meyer op.cit., translates "nach dem Haupte seines Herren trachten", equally Otten (1971, 66), CAD Q, 107 "he is attentive to his lord".

30 The LU.SIG₅ in military terms is thought to be a low-ranking officer (Alp 1947, 411), but in this context he is most probably a man of rank and of trustworthy character.

31 The main Sunassura treaty (Kizz.7) has no fugitive stipulations, nor does Kizz.8.

32 See also del Monte who offers a complete treatment of Kizz.5 and Kizz.6 (1981, 214ff). The following corrections should be made to del Monte's transliterations: Kizz.5 rev.13-14 nu-uš-ši-iš-ša-an is left out at the end of line 13 and restored at the beginning of line 14 (p.215); Kizz.6 II 6 read na-aš-ma-aš; Kizz.6 II 8 read na-an-kán (p.216).

33 In the Hittite Laws the fine for slaves is usually halved, see §§ 94-95 (Friedrich HG, 46f).
This phrase alternates with parnassea suwaizzi (§97). On this problematic expression most recently I.Hoffmann 1984, 123ff with previous literature.

Compare also Kizz.5 rev. 6-7 with 18-19.

The passages work presumably to the standard pattern we have in extradition clauses. - There are c.25 signs missing in each line but the restoration is uncertain as there are no parallel passages known - (3) a-na ma-a-tim is probably followed by ša 'Ta-hur-wa-i-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR UMU Ha-at-ti (cf. line 7) - (3) "If a man of Kizzuwatna[goes] to the land[of T. great king, king of Hatti..." - Verb in lines 2, 4 ni-il-la-ak-mi (saying) "we will go..." - since the context is lost it is not clear who is speaking here -followed by "this man to Hatti/Kizzuwatna they will return...".

The persons who flee are two classes "the great men" and "the men who are not known". For a translation of the Hittite and the Egyptian version see E. Edel in Texte aus der Umwelt des Altes Testaments, Vol.I (1983), 135ff.

Evidence for partial agreements can be found in the treaty with Tarhuntassa CTH 106 I 37 where reference is made to a separate military treaty (ŠA KARAŠ ishiul) which has come down to us in the form of ABoT 57 (CTH 97), see v. Schuler 1965a, 456; Otten 1988, 6. See also CTH 225 ša TUP-PI NAM.RA (KUB XXVI 43 rev.7) "tablet of deportee(s)".

The argument hangs on the interpretation of la-bar-ma-an-na (IV 52) - Weidner "in Zukunft" (PD, 109), Goetze "since ancient times" (Kizz., 51); CAD L, 12f - meaning uncertain.

See historical introduction to Kizz.7 and Sattiwaza-
Suppiluliuma treaty, also Liverani (1973, 285ff) who compares the political situation of Kizzuwatna with that of Isuwa.

41 Was also incorporated by Laroche (RHA 1961, 70) in his study of Anatolian toponyms.

42 On the Ursu/Urussa question see ch.III.1.

43 Weidner reads ka-ti, - traces support Goetze's reading of [m[a]-ti (Kizz., 41).

44 In Goetze's view (Kizz., 42 n.165) the passage implies that the Hittite king is now free to cede the city to Sunassura, after the treaty with Hurri was cancelled, cf. Goetze 1953, 70.

45 Theory mainly based on the idea of a Hittite corridor leading from the Anatolian plateau to N. Syria into which they place Ursu/Urussa.

46 Weidner PD, 106 n.2: II,2 of (m)ašāru - wuššuru = "to set free". Not listed by Labat (AkkBo).

47 Otten (1971, 67) dates Kizz. 3 and 4 into the late 15th early 14th century and considers a date before Telipinu unlikely.

48 Pilliya I as treaty partner of Idrimi before Telipinu is also favoured by Kühne 1982, 211f.

49 For the most recent study on the dating of Nuzi and Alalah see D.L. Stein, ZA 79 (1989), 36ff, who has re-accessed the Sauštatar letter (HSS 9 1 with Sauštatar seal) which formed the basis for dating Nuzi stratum II into the 15th century. The letter is now thought to have been sent by any of Sauštatar's successors (the date ranging between 1415 and 1370 B.C.). The archaeological assemblage associated with Nuzi II
occurs at Alalah towards the end of Palace level IV which on the basis of Cypriote Base Ring II and Mycenaean LH IIIA sherds is dated to c. 1425. The implication is that Nuzi ware (and associated material) at Alalah precedes that of Nuzi II (by one to four generations) and may have its origin in the west rather than the east as hitherto assumed.

For a detailed discussion on the Huzziya/Tahurwaili problem see Easton 1981, 24ff who argues convincingly for an attribution of SBo I 85 to Huzziya II.

The same wording is found on the Zidanza seal 84/417. Cf. the legend of the Alluwamna seal (SBo I 86, Bo82/162) NÂ4KIŠIB LUGAL. GAL ta-ba-ar-na Al-lu-wa-ma-na ŠA UŠ-PA-AH-HU BA.ÚS (Otten 1986, 34).

Cf. Starke 1985, 21ff who has devised a slightly different scheme to classify the various "duetus types". For a comparative table see ibid., 27.

See Rüster StBoT 20, Col.II, Photo Pl.III.

Kammenhuber HW², 167 s.v. appasiwatt- refers to KUB XXXI 81 as a copy; cf. Starke 1985, 24, n.54 "Middle Hittite".

Rüster op.cit. p.X; THeth 9, 98 - On the subject of using palaeographic criteria, employed for Hittite language texts, on Akkadian textual material see Beckman, JCS 35 (1983), 99 n.11, who feels that they should be applicable for Akk. texts written at Hattusa.

However, Kizz.8 seems to write Mitanni as well; KBo XXVIII 110 5 (see Kümmel KBo 28, p.XVII sub Ortsnamen) ...KUR URÜMi-taʔ-an-ni lu-ú qat-tam-ma-mi[ ] - the line recalls the passage in Kizz.7 I 25-29 which deals with the extradition of Isuwan subjects (see
ch. V.6(a)).

57 Akk.: šumma ŚA-šu inandin, šumma ul ŚA-šu la inandin (Kizz.1 and 3)

Hitt.: man assu nas ANA PN sardiya uizzi, man-ši UL-

ma assu nas UL uizzi (Kizz.5).
Kizzuwatna in the Early Hittite Empire

Any discussion of historical events in the Early Hittite Empire still suffers from a number of unsolved and disputed issues which have been subject of an extensive literature. They are:

1. The predecessors of Suppiluliuma I, that is to say, the uncertainties regarding the sequence of kings for the Early Empire period which are twofold. (a) How many Tudhaliyas became king and which Tudhaliya was the founder of the second Hittite dynasty. (b) Is there sufficient evidence for a Hattusili II and where should his reign be inserted in the list of kings.

The question as to how the events described in a series of fragments (listed under CTH 271/275) reflecting a dynastic struggle should be dated, has been partly answered by the evidence of the newly discovered land donations (ch.IV.8), although a re-assessment of their historical contents is still outstanding.

The above topics were highlighted once again in a number of publications in the late seventies. None of the authors who contributed to the discussion of Suppiluliuma's predecessors then, had the benefit of the Mašat evidence (see below).

2. The re-dating of a number of texts from the Late to the Early Empire period on linguistic and palaeographic grounds has considerably altered the historical picture for the time span under discussion in this chapter. However, not all Hittite scholars have accepted the re-dating of texts listed by Laroche under "Textes d'époque incertaine" (CTH 131-147).

Texts attributed to Tudhaliya and Arnuwanda some of which have been at the centre of the re-dating issue were listed and partly discussed by Carruba (1977, 137ff, Taf. I-III). The author also set out the various schemes for the predecessors of Suppiluliuma which have been proposed
by a number of scholars (schemes A-E, 140f), followed by Carruba's own list of kings (ibid., 147, hereafter F). To the above schemes should now be added Kammenhuber (1976, 183), and the new stemma suggested by Gurney (1979, 221) and Košak (1980a, 166).

1(a). How many Tudhaliyas became King?

The question regarding the identity of Suppiluliuma's father who had been left without ancestry since the discovery of Suppiluliuma II by Laroche (RA 47 (1953), 70ff), appears to have been settled at long last by the discovery of a clay bulla at Mašat (Mšt.76/15, Özgüç 1978, 65; Alp 1980, 56f, Taf.4, Abb.3).

The only partly preserved seal impression bears the hieroglyphically rendered name of Suppiluliuma in the centre, and a partly preserved genealogy which leaves little doubt that the father of the seal bearer was a Tudhaliya. The bulla was found in the Altar Building of level II (Özgüç 1982, 99). The archive of Mašat was recovered in the earlier level, level III, dated to c.1400 B.C. by the excavators (Özgüç 1978, 62f) and the texts are reported to be Middle Hittite (Alp 1980, 55). A date of c.1400 for level III receives additional support by the discovery of two letters (Mšt.75/39, 75/10) which bore the seal of a royal pair; Tudhaliya Great King and (SA)-Taduhepa Great Queen (Alp 1980, 53ff, Taf.1&2, Abb 1). Alp has rightly pointed out that stylistically the Mašat Tudhaliya seal represents an earlier stage of development compared to most of the Tudhaliya seals known from Boğazköy. Seal impressions attributed to Tudhaliya IV are quite numerous and the hieroglyphic rendering of his name and titles are also well attested from his stone inscriptions (Yazilikaya, Emirgazi, Karakuyu). An elaborate winged sun-disc and the Labarna sign (L 277) flanking his name are characteristic of his seals and inscriptions. Both features are lacking in the Mašat seal. Alp (1980, 54f) remarked on the close resemblance of the Mašat seal impression to a Tudhaliya seal from Boğazköy (Beran No.203 = SBo I 58). The latter also lacks the
winged sun-disc and L 277 but surprisingly was dated by Beran (1967, 677) to Tudhaliya IV.

The great prominence of the queen SA-Tà-tû-ha-pa MAGNUS REGINA on the Maṣat seal is indicated by an additional TI SAL.LUGAL written in cuneiform in the central field. A queen Taduhepa is well attested in the Boğazköy texts. She is known from the "lists" of queens where she appears between Ašmunikal and Henti (Otten 1951a, 57) but features most prominently in Hurrian itkalzi rituals with Tašmišarri (Kammenhuber 1976, 168ff; Haas 1984). Furthermore, she is known to have still reigned as Tawannanna in the early period of Suppiluliumas's rule (CTH 253, Laroche, RHA 61 (1957), 125f).

Of some importance in the discussion of the predecessors of Suppililiuma I has been the identity of Tašmišarri, who not only acts with his wife Taduhepa in Hurrian rituals, but is also associated with Ašmunikal. The latter fact had led Kammenhuber to identify Tašmišarri with Arnuwanda I and she argued that Taduhepa became his Tawannanna after Ašmunikal's death (1976, 162ff, 176). Kammenhuber's theory of equating Tašmišarri with Arnuwanda necessitated compressing the kinglist between the latter and Suppiluliuma I which she achieved by making Suppiluliuma the younger brother of Arnuwanda.

Gurney (1979, 219f) has argued against Kammenhuber's hypothesis on the grounds that Ašmunikal most probably survived Arnuwanda and, since he recognizes the historical reality of a king Tudhaliya (ibid.,215f Texts 3-6a) as an immediate predecessor of Suppiluliuma, Taduhepa would have been the latter's grandmother which Gurney thought unlikely. He therefore concluded that Tašmišarri whose wife was queen Taduhepa, must be Tudhaliya (III), not Arnuwanda (ibid., 220f).

Gurney's theory has now been confirmed on two accounts: 1) The Maṣat seal impression which testifies to a royal pair Tudhaliya/(SA)-Taduhepa. Not all the doubts have been removed regarding the name of the queen since the sa (L 104) preceding her name has not yet been explained but the evidence as it stands would favour an attribution of
the Maṣat seal to Taduhepa, partnered by Tudhaliya.
2) By a text with Hurrian phrases in which Ašmunikal is described as nera (Hurr.) "mother" of Tašmišarri (Haas 1985, 272). It follows therefore that Tašmišarri = Tudhaliya III acted as priest under Ašmunikal. He was the husband of queen Taduhepa and father of Suppiluliuma I. Taduhepa continued to act as Tawannanna under Suppiluliuma.

While the Maṣat evidence has considerably contributed towards solving the uncertainties of Suppiluliumas's ancestry, there remains the problem of which Tudhaliya was the founder of the second Hittite dynasty and the questions regarding the reign of a Hattusili II. With the exception of Kammenhuber (1976, 183), scholars have regarded Tudhaliya, husband of Nikalmati, as the founder of the second Hittite dynasty (Carruba 1977, 140f, schemes A-E + F). This assumption is based on the historical preamble of the Aleppo treaty (CTH 75) which states that "Tudhaliya Great King sat on the royal throne". The sentence is usually understood to imply that Tudhaliya's father was not king, hence Tudhaliya was the first ruler of the new dynasty. The following generation Arnuwanda/Ašmunikal is assured, being clearly affiliated in a number of texts and seals to the previous reign. Equally assured, is the co-regency between Tudhaliya and Arnuwanda since the re-dating of the Arnuwanda annals (KUB XXIII 21 26-27) which states "my father Tudhaliya Great king and I Arnuwanda Great King" (Houwink ten Cate 1970, 58; Carruba 1977, 177 n.7, Taf.II).

O.R. Gurney in the above mentioned article postulates an additional co-regency in the Early Hittite Empire (1979, 213ff). He examined the small fragment KUB XXXVI 119 which mentions the anointing of a Tudhaliya for kingship by a royal couple and later in the text a Tulpi-Tešup DUMU.DUMU-NI, "Tulpi-Tešup our grandson" (1.9).

The question as to which Tudhaliya was the subject of the anointing for kingship is the essence of Gurney's enquiry, in the course of which he presents a re-assessment of the available evidence for the predecessors of Suppiluliuma. Taking into account the texts which have
been crucial in the argument of how many Tudhaliya reigned before Suppiluliuma (ibid., 215, Nos. 1-6a&b) and testing the evidence against the different kinglists proposed (Carruba 1977, 140f, schemes A-E), Gurney concluded that Tudhaliya (+Nikalmati) was the most likely candidate for KUB XXXVI 119 and suggested that Hattusili II and Walanni could be the royal couple who performed the anointing. The placing of Hattusili II before Tudhaliya/Nikalmati, Gurney points out, has the advantage that Walanni who is always named before Nikalmati in the "Offering Lists" for queens can be fitted into her proper position (p. 220). Gurney's main reason for rejecting Tudhaliya (III) as the candidate for the anointing was the problematic relationship of Arnuwanda and Asmunikal who both claim descent from Tudhaliya, thus by all appearances were brother and sister. Therefore Tudhaliya III could only be Tudhaliya of the Anointing Text if Arnuwanda was married to Asmunikal, since they refer to Tulpi-Tešup as "our grandson".

A marriage between the royal pair would be feasible if, as has been suggested by Beal (1983, 116ff), Arnuwanda was an adopted son of Tudhaliya who, in accordance with the rules of the Telipinu Edict, in the absence of a male heir ascended the throne as a ḫantiyant- (a type of son-in-law) and hence was indeed Ašmunikal's husband. It has since been established that Gurney's "Anointing" fragment (KUB XXXVI 119) belongs to the text in which Tasmisarri is made priest in the presence of his "mother" Ašmunikal (Haas 1984, ChS I 1 No. 39, p. 5 n. 2). Consequently there is little doubt that Tudhaliya III was the subject of the anointing and the couple who performed it were Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal.

1(b). Hattusili II

Hattusili II owes his existence primarily to the mention of a Hattusili after Tudhaliya in the historical preamble of the Talmi-Sarruma treaty (CTH 75) where it is stated that Aleppo committed an offence against him. We also learn that Hattusili gave settlements which belonged
to Aleppo to the people of Āṣtata and Nuhaššē.

Otten (1968, 110) interpreted the reference to Hattusili as belonging to Hattusili I but later conceded that the statement could refer to a later Hattusili (ZA 27 (1971), 233). Güterbock observed that the historical events described in the Aleppo treaty which involved the people of Āṣtata and Nuhaššē and particularly the mention of Mitanni/Hanigalbat were not compatible with the historical setting of Hattusili I (1970, 74), an observation which was expanded on by Na'aman (1980, 38f).

The editing of an archaic text fragment KUB XXXVI 109 which makes reference to the nomination of Hattusili for kingship (as well as the pankus), has renewed the discussion on Hattusili II (Carruba 1977, 190). Carruba associated the above with Hattusili of the Aleppo treaty and postulated a Hattusili II as father of Suppiluliuma I (scheme F).

Otten, who has been sceptical about a Hattusili II throughout, remarked on the early sign forms of the text and has attributed KUB XXXVI 109 to Hattusili I (RIA IV, 174). This text fragment has been linked with a group of fragments, listed mainly under CTH 271 as "Protocole de succession dynastique (??)"; by Carruba (1977, 175ff, Taf. I) and also by Košak. The latter argued that the mention of the pankus in the texts indicates a date close to the Old Kingdom and he placed KUB XXXVI 109 and associated texts between Tudhaliya I and II (1980, 166, 1980a, 38).

If one gives credence to the statement in the Aleppo treaty and considers Gurney's argument regarding queen Walanni (see above), the reign of Hattusili II should be placed before Tudhaliya/Nikalmati. The latter scheme does, however, necessitate the creation of an additional Tudhaliya as founder of the second Hittite dynasty, as was indeed suggested by Gurney and Košak. The sequence of rulers proposed by both authors (Tudhaliya I - Hattusili II - Tudhaliya II - Arnuwanda I - Tudhaliya III - Suppiluliuma I) is identical but they have reached their conclusions by different arguments.
In the context of Hattusili II we should mention the important discovery at Boğazköy of a seal (impression) in the form of a Maltese cross which was recently published by Otten (1989, 25ff). The seal represents a unique find in the Hittite seal repertoire on account of its shape and epigraphic contents. It was found impressed on a series of lumps of clay (Neve, AA 1987, 400ff, Abb.19) and Otten established that it had an obverse and reverse side. The circular central field and the trapeze-shaped sides hold the names of Hittite kings and queens which stretch over a period of c.200 years. The "obverse" side names the antecedents of Suppiluliuma II and the "reverse" the predecessors of Mursili II (op.cit., Abb.2). On the latter which in the central field reads "Mursili" and "great queen" ga-su-la-wi-(ya), Otten has isolated a Hattusili as predecessor of Suppiluliuma I, thus confirming the stemma proposed by Carruba; Tudhaliya, (grandfather) Hattusili (father) Suppiluliuma (son), (scheme F).

The seal impressions have since been re-examined by J.D.Hawkins at Boğazköy who revised some of Otten's readings and re-confirmed the Maṣat evidence which established Tudhaliya as father of Suppiluliuma I. Furthermore, according to the traces as rendered by Hawkins, the royal sequence does not include a Hattusili amongst the predecessors of Suppiluliuma but suggests a succession of kings as proposed by Cornelius (scheme E):Tudhaliya/Nikalmati - Arnuwanda/Ašmunikal - Tudhaliya/Taduhepa - Suppiluliuma. Whether one can regard the information of the cruciform seal as the final answer in the quest for Suppiluliuma's ancestry should be left to future discussions and a reappraisal of the available historical sources. The shorter, simplified kinglist for the Early Empire does, however, represent an attractive solution.
2. The Re-dated Texts appertaining to Kizzuwatna

The re-dating of a number of Hittite texts from the Late to the Early Empire period (CTH 131-147, "Textes d'époque incertaine") has been the subject of numerous studies and of considerable controversy over two decades. The majority of scholars have, however, now accepted the re-allocation of texts to the earlier rulers of the Empire period, which as a consequence has considerably altered the historical perspective of the period. The new historical outline for the time of Suppiluliuma's predecessors is best summarized by Houwink ten Cate (1970, 57ff) and Carruba (1977, 137ff).

Kammenhuber, on the other hand, has consistently opposed the re-dating of the text group in question and has been largely followed in this view by Heinhold-Krahmer et al. in Probleme der Textdatierung in der Hethitologie, (THeth 9 1977). In this volume the writers examine palaeography, orthography and grammar of Hittite texts and present counter-arguments which are in the tradition of the Munich school for the re-dating of the text group CTH 131-147. An outline of studies published between 1952-1977 on the various aspects of Hittite text dating which led to the definition of Old, Middle and Late Hittite are presented in chronological order by Heinhold-Krahmer (op.cit. 2-50). The chapter conveniently summarizes arguments and counter-arguments (with previous literature) expressed over the years on the subject.

The re-dating of a number of crucial historical texts bears to some extent on the history of Kizzuwatna, its relations with Hatti, its status and geographical extension in the period involved. The texts appertaining directly to Kizzuwatna are: The Prayer to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna by Mursili II (CTH 376 C), the Arnuwanda Annals (CTH 143) and the Ismerika treaty (CTH 133).
2(a). Prayer to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna by Mursili II

KUB XXIV 4 + (CTH 376 C)

The Mursili Prayer to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna (CTH 376) has come down to us in a number of recensions (A-F). The C-version which takes the form of a Plague Prayer is of interest to us for historical reasons since Kizzuwatna is listed here as a country hostile to Hatti. The statement would imply that Kizzuwatna rebelled after the death of Suppiluliuma I (Goetze, JCS 14 (1960), 44f).

The text relates that the neighbouring kuriwanas countries, hurlas KUR-ε, Kizzuwatna and Arzawa have quarrelled, broken the divine oaths and continuously seek to injure Hatti (KUB XXIV 4+ 16-20). The wording of the A-version (KUB XXIV 3+) is almost identical but Kizzuwatna is omitted here, and instead of hurlas KUR-ε the text has Mitanni. This is the only reference to Kizzuwatna as a kuriwanas country. The exact meaning of the term is not certain but it has been rendered as meaning "protectorate" by Goetze (1957a, 98f) and "independent" by Otten (1969a, 28f). By contrast the text names a number of vassal countries (Kaska, Arawanna, Kalasp(m)a, Lukka Pitassa) which are also reported as having become hostile.

O.R. Gurney, who first presented the texts of CTH 376 in his study on Prayers of Mursili II, remarked on the distinctive features of the C-version (= Gurney D-version, 1940, 8f) and suggested that C may have been written before A (= Gurney C-version) since Kizzuwatna was omitted in the latter as it was probably no longer regarded as a kuriwanas country (ibid.,13 n.2).

The aspects of language and spelling were taken up by Carruba (1969, 239ff) and Houwink ten Cate (1970, 42, 83) who both concluded that KUB XXIV 4+ was a Middle Hittite text which was re-used by Mursili while KUB XXIV 3+ represents the up-dated version.

The text was identified as Middle Hittite from the palaeographic point of view by Neu and Rüster (1975, 3ff, Col.1) but Gurney expressed reservations on the result of the above analysis and thought it not unlikely that KUB
XXIV 4 was copied in the time of Mursili II (BiOr 34 (1977), 200). His view concurs with the findings in THeth 9 (p.248) where a date from Suppililiuma I onwards is suggested for the writing of the text.

Carruba turned his attention once again to the Mursili Prayer CTH 376 in a recent comparative study of the various recensions, the details of which cannot be discussed here. For our purpose it must suffice to note that the above article reiterates that the reference to Kizzuwatna as an enemy country does not reflect the historical picture in the time of Mursili II and that the origin of the composition predates Mursili by 100-50 years (1983, 3-27, 4).

The question which is of some interest here and was touched on by Carruba, is in which period the prayer was compiled since the indication is that it belongs to a time when Kizzuwatna was independent of Hatti and probably allied to Mitanni.

According to Carruba, not even the C-version is an original composition but harks back to an earlier recension since the mention of hurlas KUR-e has no historical synchronism with the hostile vassal countries (Arawanna, Kalaspa, Pitassa) listed below (obv. 27-28), but they do with Mitanni which is substituted for hurlas KUR-e later on in the text (obv.21). Hence the reference to hurlas KUR-e indicates a previous recension of the Plague Prayer which Carruba dates back to the time before Tudhaliya II/I, while the Middle Hittite C-version is thought to belong to the reign of Arnuwanda I or a little later, not only on philological grounds but also on the basis of the countries which are mentioned as hostile to Hatti (ibid.,5ff). Apart from the traditional enemy, the Kaska, the following lands - Arawanna, Kalasma and Pitassa - are known as troublesome subjects in texts attributed to the period of Arnuwanda I (CTH 147, CTH 260), Suppiluliuma's father (CTH 88, CTH 51, see sect. 3) and are still hostile in the early reign of Suppiluliuma himself (DS fr.18, CTH 51. See sect. 6(a)). Furthermore, according to Carruba (op.cit. 13f) the
calamitous tenor of our prayer has some analogies with the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375), although the latter deals specifically with the loss of Nerik to the Kaska and does not reflect a widespread dissent amongst Hittite subjects.

While the evidence for an older recension (pre C-version) in which Kizzuwatna together with hurlas KUR-e and Arzawa were regarded as enemy countries is not altogether conclusive, a date of the Middle Hittite C-version in which Kizzuwatna is listed as a hostile Kuriwanas country to the reign of Arnuwanda I, as suggested by Carruba, is historically feasible, particularly in view of the evidence of the other two texts discussed in this section below (CTH 143, CTH 133).

2(b). *The Arnuwanda Annals (CTH 143)*

The fragmentary Arnuwanda Annals, also known as the "Joint Annals" (Carruba 1977, 166; Gurney 1979, 214 n.10), since they feature joint campaigns of Arnuwanda with his father Tudhaliya, mention a number of Kizzuwatnean towns, but most of the context in which they occur is lost.

The surviving passages of CTH 143 deal mainly with campaigns in the west which partly recall events described in the Madduwatta text which has prompted the dating of the latter to Arnuwanda I (Otten 1969, 31).

The broken passage (KUB XXIII 21 obv. 3-11, Kizz.,56) mentions the cities Zunnahara, Adaniya (with bridge) and Sinuwanda, presumably in the course of a campaign as troops and chariots are also mentioned. On the other hand, the occurrence of the verb "I built" (d-e-te-nu-un, 3,7) may suggest that it was not entirely a punitive campaign which took Arnuwanda into the Cilician plain, on this occasion without his father Tudhaliya, in contrast to the following passage which speaks of a joint military campaign to Arzawa. At any rate Arnuwanda's involvement with territories that formed the essential part of Kizzuwatna belongs in his early reign when he acted as co-regent with his "father"
Tudhaliya, and could conceivably fall into the period when Kizzuwatna was still bound by treaty to Hatti.²²

2(c) The Ismerika Treaty (CTH 133)

The text in question (KUB XXVI 41, KUB XXIII 68+) is a treaty between a king Arnuwanda and the men of Ismerika who swear an oath of allegiance.

The treaty poses difficulties on two levels: (a) The archaic language and orthography which has prompted the re-dating of the text from Arnuwanda III to Arnuwanda I by some scholars, although this is disputed by others; (b) the interpretation of the treaty itself (rev. 11-24) as it is ambiguously phrased and therefore open to more than one interpretation.

The location of KUR URU Ismerika is uncertain but it has occasionally been identified with modern Siverek (RGTC 6, 149; Kizz., 48). Ismerika occurs in two other texts, both small fragments which contribute nothing to the understanding of its political status or its exact location. KUB XXVI 54 6 lists 10 NAM.RA of KUR URU Is-merika and URU Is-mi-ri-ka is mentioned together with URU Tupa²³ and possibly Irrita in a small annal fragment (KBo XIX 52 2).

The opening of the treaty (KUB XXVI 41) which mentions Arnuwanda is followed by a list of oath gods and curses after which the text breaks off. Kempinski and Košak postulated a gap of 15 lines between the above fragment and the main text (1970, 191).

The stipulations of the treaty, although fragmentary at times, contain regulations regarding matters of foreign policy, fugitives, duty to inform and military assistance. None of the clauses are reciprocal.

Two studies which considered the linguistic aspects of CTH 133 were both published in 1970; Kempinski and Košak (1970, 191ff) who offered the first complete edition of the treaty and stressed the Middle Hittite features in their commentary and Houwink ten Cate who included CTH 133 in his Group C of re-dated texts (1970,
The palaeography was dealt with by Rüster (StBoT 20 p.IX) in Col.VII of her sign list among the Middle Hittite texts. However, in THeth 9 it was established that the text has more new signs than old ones (p.143) and it is said to have been written in the period from Hattusili III onwards (p.248, 261). This would appear to be correct.

The Ismerika treaty has close parallels linguistically as well as in wording with the Madduwatta (CTH 147) and the Mita of Pahhuwa text (CTH 146), the former being one of the key texts in the re-dating argument (Otten 1969a). The concept of concluding a treaty with a group of men as opposed to a vassal ruler or member of the royal family can also be found in the Mita text where Elders of Isuwa and neighbouring provinces are put under oath, similarly in CTH 144 and CTH 139, treaties concluded with the men of Ura and Kaska respectively (Houwink ten Cate 1970, 27). The instruction to the Ismerikeans only to include "free men" in their troop contingent (no slaves or mercenaries) can also be paralleled in the Mita of Pahhuwa text.

While the understanding of the actual treaty clauses present no particular difficulties, the list of the men and cities which follows the stipulations (rev. 11-24) is obscure and consequently has been interpreted in a variety of ways.

The men who are put to the oath are listed in three separate sections. The first group are named individually and are all associated with the city of Wassukanni, while in the remaining sections the men are set out in groups of two and four and are attached to various towns. Most men are associated with more than one city, though the nature of that association is not at all clear. With the exception of persons in section three (rev. 22-24) all men are referred to as Ismerikeans but nowhere does the text disclose their rank or profession (Kempinski and Košak 1970, 212). All we learn in the preceding treaty clauses is that they used to raise 150 troops (ERINmax UKU.UŠ) which has now been reduced to 60 (rev.1-2).
Goetze had identified the majority of the personal names listed as Hurrian (Kizz., 46) in which he was followed by Garstang - Gurney (Geography, 53). Kempinski and Košak have, however, demonstrated that most of the listed names are in fact Luwian and only two could be clearly identified as Hurrian (ibid., 212f).

The paragraphs listing the men and their cities follow, on the whole, a set formula which consists of a series of nominal sentences, i.e verbs are omitted throughout. A standard clause reads as follows:

PN, the man of Ismerika, his town (is) the town of X but in the land of Kizzuwatna the city of Y (is) his town.

The most puzzling aspect of the text is that Waššukanni, the Mitannian capital, stands as a city of Kizzuwatna. In Goetzef's view the treaty "testifies to an extension of Kizzuwatna into the plains of Upper Mesopotamia where it included the cities Waššukanni and Urussa". He concluded that the event of an expanded Kizzuwatna which included Waššukanni took place prior to the rise of Mitanni and on those grounds he dated the treaty to Arnuwanda I (Kizz., 76). Goetze's view was largely shared by Garstang and Gurney who thought that the list consisted mainly of Hurrians who, after the conquest of Ismerika, are deported to various places in Kizzuwatna. They too believed that Kizzuwatna extended to Waššukanni which became the capital of Mitanni at a later date (Geography, 53). Gurney in CAH adhered to the view that the "list" (rev. 11-24) represented the resettlement of Ismerikeans in various cities of Kizzuwatna which had acquired part of Mitanni but that the whole territory was "under the effective control of the Hittite king". (vol.II ch.XV, 678f). He very rightly observed that at the time of Arnuwanda I Kizzuwatna was still a relatively independent state and doubted whether Arnuwanda I could have settled the men of Ismerika on his own authority. For the above reason Gurney favoured a date of Arnuwanda III but at the same time did not entirely exclude the possibility of an early date, and proceeded to consider the historical
implications for a date of Arnuwanda I and III.

Houwink ten Cate, on the other hand, saw no difficulties in an expanded Kizzuwatna in the early phase of Arnuwanda I when he says: "... Arnuwanda was still able to settle the men of Ismerika in various towns of Kizzuwatna purely on his own authority" (1970, 61).

The historical improbability of an enlarged Kizzuwatna under Hittite dominance at the time of Arnuwanda I was first voiced by Kempinski and Košak (1970, 214f) and to some extent overcome by their re-interpretation of the list of Ismerikeans and their towns (see above).

The authors suggested that the men who are associated with Waššukanni may have been Mitannian noblemen who are holding estates in Kizzuwatna as well as Ismerika. In their opinion the motive behind the treaty is a Mitanni/Kizzuwatna pact which threatened expansion towards Ismerika which the Hittite king attempted to halt by binding the Ismerikeans in a treaty (1970, 216).

The above interpretation of the treaty was echoed by Na'aman (UF 6 (1974), 270). He did however take the argument a step further by suggesting that the men of Ismerika were in fact subjects of Mitanni who, in accordance with Mitannian practice of allowing their vassals to conclude treaties with neighbouring states, entered a treaty relationship with Hatti. Na'aman's theory is however not compatible with Hittite practice which denied their vassals the right of making separate treaties. Since CTH 133 contains an oath of loyalty to the Hittite crown and the provision of troops which would most probably have been directed against the Hurrians, one must doubt whether even from the Mitannian point of view this treaty would have been acceptable.

Leaving aside the linguistic aspects of the Ismerika treaty which would favour an early date, what are the historical possibilities for attributing the text to Arnuwanda I-III? A date for Arnuwanda II was suggested by Cornelius (1973, 168) but considered unlikely by Gurney (CAH vol.II ch.XV, 679) who pointed out that
Sattiwaza, installed by Suppililiuma, most probably still occupied the Mitannian throne. We also know that soon after Arnuwanda's accession he died of the plague, therefore his reign must have been very short indeed.

Kammenhuber has advocated a date of the treaty to Arnuwanda III, more recently on the basis of a letter (KBo XVIII 25) which mentions Tukulti-Ninurta, Waššukanna and cities which were given to the king of Karkamiš (1976a, 134 n.11). Apart from the fact that Waššukanni was still in existence at the time of Tukulti-Ninurta (1244-1208) the letter does not confirm the situation described in CTH 133 which makes no mention of Karkamiš.

Klengel, on the other hand, has rejected a date to Arnuwanda III on the grounds of a powerful Assyria (GS I, 267 n.34) which emerged under Adadnirari (1307-1275) and reached its climax during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta (see also Munn-Rankin CAH vol.II ch.XXV).

Hanigalbat had already been annexed by Shalmaneser I (1274-1275) and it is unlikely that the Upper Habur region ever came under Hittite influence again.27

A date of CTH 133 to Arnuwanda I with an enlarged Kizzuwatna, which included the Mitannian capital Waššukanni, under Hittite control is historically difficult to visualize, considering Mitanni's political importance. Admittedly, sources for Mitanni's history are sketchy and have to be pieced together from the archives of neighbouring areas (Alalah, Nuzi, Hatti) as well as the Amarna Tablets and Egyptian inscriptions (Klengel 1978, 91ff).

The expansion of Mitanni is associated with the reigns of Parattarna and Sauštatar. The next Mitannian king who is known to us is Artatama (I) but there is no evidence that he was the immediate successor to Sauštatar (Klengel GS I, 236; Gurney CAH vol.II ch.XV, Chronological Table; Wilhelm 1976, 160). The Amarna correspondence which mainly fills the gap for Tušratta's predecessors would suggest that Mitanni continued to maintain its political status and was on friendly terms with Egypt from the time of Artatama I to the reign of
Tuṣratta. The latter boasts in EA 29 that the Egyptian pharaoh (Tuthmosis IV) had made seven requests to his grandfather Artatama (I) before he consented to giving his daughter in marriage. In the same letter Artatama's son Šuttarna (II) is also reported as having sent a daughter to the Egyptian court and EA 19 speaks of much gold which Amenophis III sent to the same king (Moran 1987; Kühne 1973, 23ff, 46f). Thus Egypt/Mitanni relations can be traced back over three generations; Tuṣratta - Šuttarna II - Artatama I which may approximately correspond to the three generations in Hatti of Suppiluliuma I - Tudhaliya III - Arnuwanda I. Therefore Arnuwanda's reign would have fallen into the period of peaceful relations between Egypt and Mitanni which, according to the Armarna evidence do not reflect a period of weakness allowing a Hittite conquest of Mitannian territories which included their capital. The historical evidence does therefore necessitate a new interpretation, as put forward by Kempinski and Kosoğak, for the motive of Arnuwanda I binding the Ismerikeans by oath as well as the meaning behind the "List". There is, after all, very little evidence in the "List" (in the absence of any verbs) which would compel us to adhere to the traditional view that the men were deported or resettled by the Hittite king who in fact is not mentioned in the relevant paragraphs.

**Points on the Geography of CTH 133**

There is some indication that the region of Ismerika was administered by a BĒL MADGALTI (obv. 10(?), 21, Kempinski Kosak 1970, 207) which indicates that Ismerika was Hittite border territory and most likely bordering on Hurri/Mitanni. The fact that Ismerika was not always under Hittite control is suggested by the NAM.RA list (see above) which mentions 10 deportees from Ismerika.

The place names mentioned in the treaty have been discussed on several occasions (Kizz.,47f; Geography, 54ff; Houwink ten Cate 1970, 61). The towns which are
said to be situated in Kizzuwatna are:

Zazlippa
Waššukanni
Arana
Terussa
Üriga
Urušsa

Of these Terussa and Üriga are not attested elsewhere. Zazlippa is most probably identical to Zizzilippa of the Telipinu Edict where it is mentioned in connection with Hassuwa (see above ch.III.3).

Waššukanni, according to Hittite records, is known as the Mitannian capital since Sauštatar (KBo I 3 obv.9), and was still in existence at the time of Tukulti-Ninurta (KBo XVIII 25 rev. 4).

Goetze who originally equated the Waššukanni of CTH 133 with the above (Kizz.,48), later believed that there was a second city of that name in the Commagene region where he placed the remaining towns which are said to be in Kizzuwatna (1953, 70). He appears to have returned to his original view, however, when he states: "The treaty of an Arnuwandas with the people of Ismerikka mentions Kizzuwatna in a way which is unthinkable after the creation of the Mitanni state by Sauštatar..." (1957, 58).

Urussa and Arana also occur in the Sahurunuwa land deed (CTH 225), the former as a district town and the latter is said to be in the vicinity of the city of Kizzuwatna (see ch.III.1 and n.20). Also mentioned are persons (names not preserved) from Irrita which is located between Karkamiš and Harran (RGTC 6, 144, cf. KBo XIX 52 above).

It becomes evident from the list of geographical names that the area outlined in the text lies to the east of the Amanus range and extended to the region of the Upper Habur. It does not include territories which could be considered as belonging to the heartland of Kizzuwatna. There is indeed no evidence that Kizzuwatna ever stretched to the east of the Euphrates at any time in its history. Why the author should place towns associated with Hurri/Mitanni, including Waššukanni, into Kizzuwatna is not at all clear.
but it is evident that the territories of the two countries were regarded as a geographical unit.

If one views the treaty as an attempt to counteract a Hurri/Kizzuwatna alliance as has been suggested, the writer may have tried to disguise that fact by referring to the area as Kizzuwatna, an old ally of Hatti, rather than Hurri/Mitanni. However, a satisfactory explanation for an "enlarged" Kizzuwatna does not present itself at present.

The oath of loyalty and provision of troops by the Ismerikeans no doubt formed part of Hittite policy in the eastern provinces into which we can also fit the events of the "Mita of Pahhuwa" text, CTH 146 (Houwink ten Cate 1970, 65f) where the elders of a number of towns in and around Isuwa are summoned and put under oath. Although the author of CTH 146 is not preserved, the similar wording of the text, as discussed above, have prompted its attribution to the reign of Arnuwanda I. The Mita text reflects general unrest in the east with references to military set-backs which (if the two documents are contemporary) would emphasize once again the unlikelihood of Hittite dominance over Mitanni as suggested by some scholars.

Of the three re-dated texts discussed above, two (2(b) and (c)) can be dated with some certainty to Arnuwanda I and CTH 376 C (2(a)), or parts of it, may have been originally composed during the reign of the same ruler, at a time when Kizzuwatna was regarded as a Kuriwanas country which had broken the oath.

Summing up the evidence for Arnuwanda vis à vis Kizzuwatna we can make the following points: 1) Arnuwanda's campaign into Kizzuwatna, which belongs to the period of his co-regency with his father Tudhaliya, would suggest that Kizzuwatna was probably not allied to Hatti at this time but the evidence is not conclusive. The historical picture for events in the east reflects instability and, as was suggested above, Arnuwanda attempts to counteract a Mittanni/Kizzuwatna alliance by binding Ismerikean dignitaries in a treaty. It is very likely that in the latter part of Arnuwanda's sole reign, into which the texts featuring the Tudhaliya tuhkanti (+Taduhepa) should be
placed, mark a renewed alliance with Kizzuwatna\textsuperscript{29} (see sect.1(a) above and sect.5 below).

3. The "Concentric Invasion"

For the political picture of Kizzuwatna pre-dating Suppiluliuma I we rely to some extent on sources compiled during the later Empire Period, amongst them the historical accounts written by Hattusili III, the historical preambles of a number of treaties and the occasional reference in the Armarna correspondence.

The most momentous political event before Suppiluliuma's reign which was still echoed in later historical texts was the massive invasion by neighbouring enemy countries which reduced the Hittite realm to its nucleus (CTH 88, Kizz.,26ff, Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 40ff).

Carruba (1977, 141ff) has coined the phrase "concentric invasion" for the large scale incursion into Hittite territory, an apt description for the account of Hattusili III in the historical introduction of CTH 88 (KBo VI 28) of what happened "formerly" (karu).

He enumerates six enemy countries and the cities to which they advanced and made their border (6-14):

- Kaska $\rightarrow$ Nenassa
- Arzawa $\rightarrow$ Tuwanuwa and Uda
- Arawanna $\rightarrow$ Kassiya
- Azzi $\rightarrow$ Samuha
- Isuwa $\rightarrow$ Tegarama
- Armatana $\rightarrow$ Kizzuwatna

Hattusili also states that when his grandfather Suppiluliuma came to the throne "he sent the enemy away from the Hatti lands" (17-18). The events of the "concentric invasion" therefore clearly belong to the reign of his predecessor Tudhaliya III (Kizz.,24). However, his statement that the recapture of lost territories only began after Suppiluliuma's accession appears to be incorrect since, according to the "Deeds", Suppiluliuma campaigned already together with his father against enemy countries.
which are mentioned in the Hattusili account (DS fr. 10-14). Equally, not strictly accurate may be Hattusili's comment in CTH 83 that Suppiluliuma needed 20 years to regain the Hittite homeland (KUB XIX 9 obv. 8-10). The text begins with a résumé of Suppiluliuma's military career which he appears to contrast with his own but particularly with the military successes of the GAL MESEDI Tudhaliya, his son and successor (Riemschneider, JCS 16 (1962), 115ff; Gurney 1983, 101).

Hattusili's statement that the Kaska attacked Hatti and advanced to Nenassa (CTH 88) would seem to have been confirmed archaeologically at Maṣat where level III, dated to Tudhaliya III on the strength of his seal impression was heavily burnt (Özgüç 1978, 54, 62f). Maṣat which has been identified with Hittite Tapikka (Alp 1980, 58) was a garrison town situated in border country guarding against the ever troublesome Kaska to the north. The letters recovered at Maṣat make frequent references to troop movements and incursions by the enemy into Hittite territory, plundering the harvest (Maṣṭ. 75/15, Maṣṭ. 75/13) and attacking villages (Maṣṭ. 75/43, Alp op. cit., 38ff), thus generally conveying the impending disaster during which the palace with its archive and store-rooms was completely destroyed.

A brief passage in the Amarna letter EA 31, exchanged between Amenophis III and Tarhundaradu of Arzawa has been frequently quoted as confirming the disastrous events of CTH 88 (Kühne 1973, 97f and n. 488; Houwink ten Cate, BiOr 20 (1963), 272; Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 53). However, the understanding of the text (lines 25-27) rests on the interpretation of two words with uncertain meaning.

The request of Amenophis for Kaska men to be sent to him is followed by the phrase "I have heard zinnuk everything" (Güterbock translates: "I have heard (that) everything (is) finished", RHA 1967, 145). The next line states "nu Haddusassa KUR-e igait" which has been usually translated as "the land of Hattusa is fragmented/ has gone to pieces".
F. Starke has recently re-examined the philological evidence of lines 25-27 and convincingly argues for a re-interpretation of the above passage. He translates: "I have heard everything which you said" (25-26) and "also the land of Hattusa is calm" (27) (1981a, 221ff). The new rendering of Amenophis's statement may put a new complexion on its contents but the fact that the Arzawaeian king maintained diplomatic links with Egypt in itself suggests that Hittite political influence in the west had reached a low ebb which fits the historical situation of CTH 88.

Returning to the "concentric invasion" text it is interesting to note that the enemy of Armatana is reported to have sacked the Hatti lands and made the town of Kizzuwatna his border.

The passage clearly implies that Kizzuwatna was considered Hittite territory, as indeed were all the listed towns to which the various enemy countries advanced (see list above). Furthermore, one looks in vain for an enemy attack coming from the south. Goetze had considered the mention of Kizzuwatna as a Hittite city in CTH 88 as an anachronism since the text was composed during the days of Hattusili III when Kizzuwatna had been incorporated into Hatti (Kizz.,26). There is, however, no longer the need to regard the passage as an anachronistic statement, in view of the evidence discussed below which suggests that Kantuzzili was already priest in Kizzuwatna during the lifetime of Tudhaliya III. The campaigns described in DS fr.2 and 3 and the annal fragment KUB XXIII 16 which feature campaigns of Tudhaliya and Kantuzzili in the east may well be connected with the events of CTH 88 (see sect. 5 below).

Armatana (RGTC 6, 38) whose men invaded Kizzuwatna seems to be mainly attested for the time of Suppiluliuma and his father. In CTH 88 it is listed after Isuwa (Elaziğ region) whose forces are reported to have advanced to Tegarama (= N.Assyr. Tilgarimmu = Gürün) and
should be located to the south (south-west) of Isuwa and Tegarama.\textsuperscript{34}

Armatana also occurs in the so-called "Isuwa List" of the Šattiwaza treaty (CTH 51) where it is named amongst a number of countries in the east which, according to Suppiluliuma, revolted "in the time of my father" and the people are reported to have fled into Isuwa.\textsuperscript{35} How far the events of the "concentric invasion" are reflected in the historical introduction of the Šattiwaza treaty is difficult to say. Whilst CTH 88 describes the invasion of the enemy countries, the episode related in the treaty (CTH 51) deals mainly with the subjects of these countries who had escaped into Isuwa (see sect. 6(a) below).

In the "Deeds" a campaign by Suppiluliuma against Armatana is mentioned in fr. 23 & 24. Guterbock had placed the two fragments before the Isuwa campaign (fr. 25) on the basis of the facts given in the Šattiwaza treaty (DS,119f).

4. Religious Activities in Kizzuwatna by Tudhaliya

Apart from the evidence which links Kantuzzili to Kizzuwatna (see sect.5) there are some additional texts which testify to the religious involvement of a Hittite ruler in Kizzuwatna before the reign of Suppiluliuma I. The king mentioned in the texts is a Tudhaliya.

4(a). The Transfer of the Black Goddess -

KUB XXXII 133 (CTH 482)

In the introduction to the ritual text CTH 482 (Kizz.,24f; Kronasser 1963, 58ff) Mursili II states that his ancestor (AB-BA-YA) king Tudhaliya removed (arha sarret) the Black Goddess (DINGIR GE\textsubscript{6})\textsuperscript{36} from the temple in Kizzuwatna and re-erected her (ha-an-ti-i i-ya-at) in a temple in Samuha.

The ritual which, according to Mursili had been neglected by the scribes and priests, is once again to be carried out correctly in accordance with the cult.
instructions and to be performed in the event of a royal visit to the temple of the Black Goddess.

The transfer of the same deity from an old to a new temple (presumably after her removal from Kizzuwatna) is the subject of another ritual which takes place over a period of seven days (CTH 481, Kronasser 1963). Here however, no mention is made of the city in which the transfer and accompanying ritual is to be carried out. Part of the ritual was set by the river which would certainly fit Samuha (RGTC 6, 339), but the Black Goddess is also known to have been venerated in the towns of Parnassa and Lahhurama (Lebrun 1976, 28).

The reason for the removal of the deity from Kizzuwatna and installation at Samuha is nowhere stated in the text but the event has been linked to the "concentric invasion" CTH 88 (Kizz., 25; Kümmel RIA, 629) and Tudaliya III is thought to have been responsible for the act. If the motif for the removal was to protect the goddess from invading forces, she would probably have been lost since Samuha was captured by the enemy of Azzi (KBo VI 28 obv.11-12).

Mursili's statement does however leave open the question whether the removal of the Black Goddess, presumably in the form of a statue, was a pious or military act. Equally uncertain is which Tudaliya Mursili referred to in the text. A Kizzuwatna allied to Hatti, exerting Hurro/Kizzuwatnean religious influences would fit well into the reign of Tudaliya III, in view of the evidence discussed below, but equally the possibility that an earlier Tudaliya introduced the deity into Hatti cannot be excluded. G. Wilhelm (1982, 44) and V. Haas (1985, 271) both remarked on the fact that Tudaliya resided at times in Samuha, according to the "Deeds" (DS fr.10-11) and they attributed the act to Tudaliya III, while Kühne (1982, n.233) linked the event to the victorious Tudaliya I/II who conquered Aleppo. In favour of the latter is the fact that in the "Deeds" Mursili consistently speaks of ABI ABI-YA "my grandfather" who we now believe to be Tudaliya (III), while in the introduction of the ritual CTH 482 Tudaliya is referred to as ABBA-YA "my ancestor" (CAD A I, 72), which
may suggest that Mursili was indeed referring to a more distant forebearer of that name. Thus the removal of DINGIR GE₆ probably occurred in the reign of Tudhaliya I/II.

4(b). The Restoration (?) of Shrines by Tudhaliya

KUB XXXI 122 + FHL 42 (CTH 832)
KBo XX 90 (CTH 525)

The text fragments listed above, whose author is a Tudhaliya, report on the reconstruction (?) of temples and monuments in Kummanni. The fragments were first noted by Kempinski and Kosak (1970, 200 n.17). Since then a join to KUB XXXI 122 has come to light and was recently published among Hittite fragments from the Louvre by J.M.Durand and E.Laroche (1982, 74ff, see below). KBo XX 90 is very closely worded and described in the introduction to KBo XX as a colophon (?) of a parallel text to KUB XXXI 122. The text with the join and restoration from KBo XX 90 reads as follows:

1 [UM^-MA] 'Du-ut-ha-li-ya LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR uruHa-at-ti

2 ka-ru-u ku-wa-pi [KUR uruKum-ma-an-ni [K]
3 nu EMES DINGIRMES hu-u-ma-an-du-uš (wa-a)r-nu-ir₄¹ C
4 nam-ma-mu ū-e-ir DINGIRMES na-ak-(ki-i)[--iš
5 EMES DINGIRMES hu-ma-an-du-uš (EGIR-pa)[ū-e-te-nu-un
6 I-NA KUR uru Zu^-un-na-ha-ra-ma x [Kub XXXI 142 + FHL 42 AO 7728*]
Translation:

1 Thus (speaks) Tudhaliya Great King, King of Hatti

2 When formerly (in) the land of Kummanni[^42]
3 all the temples they burned[
4 then they came to me and the important deities[I set up again
5 all the temples[I built]again
6 but in the province of Zunnahara[

(KBo XX 90 4 "in the third month in the town of Zunnahara" 5. ..."I consulted the oracle...").

Also mentioned, but in broken context, are huwasi stones (KBo XX 90 8) which may have been subject of restoration work too. The mention of Zunnahara clearly places the action in the Cilician plain. Although most of the verbs in the text are not preserved, the general sense of Tudhaliya's restoration activities after a calamitous event becomes clear.
Laroche has associated the text (KBo XX 90) with the reorganization of cults and the religious reforms of Tudhaliya IV, a fact well attested in the Boğazköy archives and Laroche attributed the fragment to that king (1975, 87ff, 90; Carter 1962, 24). Carruba on the other hand favoured an earlier Tudhaliya when he listed the text under Tudhaliya I/II (1977, Tafel I).

The destruction and consequent rebuilding of religious monuments in Kizzuwatna by Tudhaliya would certainly fit the historical context of the "Concentric Invasion" CTH 88 during which the town of Kizzuwatna was captured by the enemy forces of Armatana, but it equally fits the situation under Tudhaliya IV who reports on the ruinous cult centres (KUB XXXVIII 35 obv.1ff) and the priesthood having fled from their temples (KBo II 1).

Considering the palaeography of the fragments which show a number of archaic sign forms (li, nam, ni, ak, du) would, however, suggest that the text was composed by an earlier Tudhaliya.

The recension of older texts in the reign of Tudhaliya IV who was largely responsible for the reorganization of the archives at Hattusa is well attested (Laroche 1975, 89). It has been noted that scribes of that period frequently adhered to the old sign forms of the tablet which they were copying, as well as writing later sign forms (Neu and Rüster 1975, 4). A good example of this practice is in fact CTH 482 which, as we have seen belongs to the reign of Mursili II, but which we know to have been written in the time of Tudhaliya on account of the scribe named in the colophon (ibid., 8, Spalte VI; THeth 9, 132).

A later recension of our text KUB XXXI 122 + would also explain the mention of Kummanni as opposed to Kizzuwatna since the former was probably not in use in the period before Suppiluliuma I. If we have here a later copy of an earlier text, Kizzuwatna may well have been substituted for Kummanni, as was frequently the case in other text: (CTH 475, CTH 404, CTH 472, see ch.II.3).
5. Kantuzzili and the "Priests" of Kizzuwatna

KUB XIX 25, 26 (CTH 44)\textsuperscript{44}

The text in which Suppiluliuma, together with Queen Henti, Arnuwanda and Zida, installed his son Telipinu as "priest" to the triad Tešub, Hepat and Sarruma in the city of Kizzuwatna, proves a valuable insight into the functions of the chief priest in that city.

The document shows all the characteristics of a treaty (KUB XIX 25 9...\textit{ishiul kissan išiyauen ...} and\{we decreed\} the following treaty (instructions)) and belongs to the category of "family treaties" (v.Schuler 1965a, 463 n.74).

Matters of loyalty to the king are expressed in the familiar treaty terms but we also have a particular pledge of loyalty to Telipinu's brother Arnuwanda concerning his "lordship" (EN-UT-TIM), i.e. succession to the throne, in exchange for being acknowledged in his office as "priest" (10-12). Into this context also fits the statement that quarrels amongst the priest's brothers and sisters shall be subject to a royal (?) judgement (KUB XIX 26, rev.IV 1-3).\textsuperscript{45}

Apart from the religious duties of Telipinu which are not specified, in as far as the text is preserved, it becomes abundantly clear that the role of priest included a number of secular duties comparable to those of a local ruler or governor.

The priest's judicial functions are clear from the paragraph in which Telipinu is instructed to pass fair judgement on cases brought before him, including on subjects accused of disloyalty (obv. 12-16). The providing of a troop contingent seems to be the subject in lines 20-21 which fit the account by Mursili in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma (see below).

Thus, there is no doubt that holding the office of "priest" in Kizzuwatna carried with it political functions. Nowhere is Telipinu named king but his status as a Great Lord is not only clearly stated (\textit{zi-ik-ma-za BE-LU GAL ku-it} obv.19) but is also implied in a passage which lays down the code of conduct for the priest vis à
vis other Lords (rev. 4-11). Whether the priest administered the whole or part of Kizzuwatna is uncertain. The country of Kizzuwatna is mentioned later in the text, although in broken context, but Goetze thought that the lost passages may have dealt with fugitive clauses (Kizz..15 n.62).

The appointment to the priesthood in important cult centres or to the chief deities of the Hittite pantheon was an expression of royal approval for succession, according to Kümmel (1967, 43 and n.3), of which there are a number of examples; Tašmišarri (= Tudhaliya III) is made priest (LûSANGA iyauen) in Hatti, by Ašmunikal, about which a tablet was made (KBo IX 137 III 18ff = ChS 1 Nr.39, Haas 1984, 212), while a Tudhaliya is anointed for the priesthood in Hakmis and Nerik (LûSANGA-UT-TIM iskanzi, KUB XXXVI 90 15ff).

The appointment of Telipinu to the priesthood in Kizzuwatna signified his installation as local ruler, although the importance of Telipinu as a religious figure is evident from a number of sources in which he is consistently referred to as "priest". Mursili when describing Telipinu's involvement in the siege of Karkamis refers to him simply as, "the priest my brother" (DS fr.7) and in the "Offering Lists" he is entered as Telipinu LûSANGA (KUB XI 8+9 V 15). Telipinu, who became king of Aleppo (CHT 83, CHT 88) continued to bear the title of "priest" according to the hieroglyphic inscription (on the wall of the al-Qigan mosque) in Aleppo which reads: "...Talmi-Sarruma, king of Aleppo, son of Telipinu Great Priest..." (Laroche 1956, 131ff; Klengel GS I, 196f).

Goetze had expressed the view that the appointment of Telipinu to the priesthood in Kizzuwatna amounted to the break up of Kizzuwatna as an independent state and possibly to an outright annexation (Kizz.,12). The question which is of interest here is whether a prince of the previous generation became priest in Kizzuwatna and what the historical implications in such an event would be for the relationship between Hatti and Kizzuwatna.

According to a colophon (KUB XVII 22) Kantuzzili
was made priest of the Weather-god and Hepat in Kizzuwatna;

Kantuzzili as priest and royal prince also occurs in the catalogue entry KUB XXX 56 7 INIM Ḫán-tuz-zi-lî GAL LU₄ SANGA DUMU.LUGAL with reference to a ritual (Laroche CTH, p.181).

The same Kantuzzili is presumably also the author of the archaic prayer to the Sun-God CTH 373 (Lebrun 1980, 111ff; Kammenhuber 1976, 16f) in which he invokes ḪUTU to mediate between him and whichever god he may have sinned against. Kantuzzili's request to the deity to reveal himself through liver omen points, in Kammenhuber's opinion, to Hurro/Kizzuwatnean practices (ibid., 178).

The festival text (KUB XLV 47) which includes a ritual to the goddess Ningal features a queen with her sons (DUMU.NITA = IBILA "heir") Manninî, Pariyawatra, the Priest (IBILA SANGA) and Tulpi-Tešup. The text was subject of an article by Imparati who concluded that the anonymous queen who performed the rituals with the help of the above mentioned princes, was Nikalmati (1979, 169ff, 173).49

The unpublished fragments 1691/u with duplicate 577/u, recently referred to by E. Neu (1983, 394 n.10, 396) who attributes the fragments to CTH 375 (B version) of the Arnuwanda/Ašmunikal prayer on the subject of Nerik, does throw some light on the question as to the identity of the "queen" and where the above generation of princes is to be inserted.

According to Neu,50 the Middle Hittite text fragments name in 1691/u II 22ff...[Arnuwanda LUGAL.GAL] Ḫ
Ašmunikal SAL.LUGAL.GAL, ḪDuduhepa, ḪPariyawatra and in duplicate 577/u 6f ...tuhkanti[ ḪTudhaliya] and DUMU.NITA SANGA (priest).
The mention of Pariyawatra and the IBILA SANGA (already encountered in the ritual text above) together with Ašmunikal, Daduhepa and the tuhkanti suggests that the anonymous queen cannot be Nikalmati but is either Ašmunikal, if the persons named here represent two generations, or Taduhepa, if we are dealing with three generations. The latter possibility could be argued if Tulpi-Tešup who is one of the named princes in KUB XLV 47 (above), is identical with Tulpi-Tešup "our grandson" (of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal) in the "anointing" text (sect.1(a) above) and the Tulpi-Tešup putkis "son" in a Hurrian ritual text (Haas 1984,ChS I Nr.40).51

The other aspect which is of interest to us in KUB XLV 47 is the identity of the "priest" (IBILA SANGA) who is named with his brothers Manninni, Pariyawatra and Tulpi-Tešup.

Kammenhuber (1976, 178) identified him with Tašmišarri on the strength of KBo IX 137 (= Hass 1984, ChS I Nr.39) where the latter is sworn in to the priesthood in Hatti (ibid., 167), but the most likely candidate, already proposed by Imparati, is Kantuzzili (1979, 172) who, as we know, became "priest" in Kizzuwatna.

The Kizzuwatnean connection is indeed indicated in the ritual fragment KBo XX 62 in which we encounter once again the "queen", Manninni, Pariyawatra and the "priest" but in this text the city of Kizzuwatna is actually mentioned (rev.6). Further evidence for Kantuzzili the "priest" as contemporary of Tašmišarri and Taduhepa comes from the Hurrian ritual CTH 783 (= ChS I Nr.11, Haas 1984, 113ff), performed by Kantuzzili (INIM 1Kánš-li DUMU.LUGAL - "the word of Kanšuzzili, priest, prince", with reference to the above royal couple. The indication here would be that Kantuzzili, who officiated as priest, was of the same generation as Tašmišarri (later Tudhaliya III) and Taduhepa, rather than their son.

It is not clear at present if Kantuzzili the "priest", contemporary of Tudhaliya III and Taduhepa, can be identified with Kantuzzili named with Pariyawatra
and the latter as well as Tulpi-Tešup in texts of a secular nature. We know, however, from the evidence surrounding Telipinu that the office of "priest" in Kizzuwatna carried with it secular functions, including the role of military commander, and indeed in the latter sphere we can draw a direct parallel between the activities of the two "priests".

Telipinu's military actions against the Hurrians told by Mursili in the annals of his father Suppiluliuma can be paralleled with campaigns carried out by Kantuzzili under his brother(?) Tudhaliya. It is probably no coincidence that both princes are reported to have fought against Arziya. Mursili relates how his brother the priest (Telipinu) successfully repelled a Hurrian attack and the lands around Arziya and Karkamiš made peace with him, but during the priest's absence in Hatti the Hurrians encircled the Hittite troops stationed at Murmuriga (near Karkamiš, DS fr.28).

In the annal fragment by a Tudhaliya KUB XXIII 16, now generally attributed to Tudhaliya III (Carruba 1977, 162f; Gurney 1979, 217; Košak 1980a, 164), the king tells of a successful campaign with Kantuzzili against the Hurrian commander Muwa. Kantuzzili also features with Tudhaliya in DS fr.2 (=BoTU 31) and on his own in DS fr.3 (=BoTU 32) where it is reported that he smote the town of Arziya and carried away its booty (DS, 59f).

The evidence at present would suggest that two generations of Hittite princes became priests in Kizzuwatna; Kantuzzili followed by Telipinu. We learn from CTH 44 that Suppiluliuma appointed his son Telipinu as priest together with queen Henti who was his second reigning queen after Taduhepa (his mother) and before Tawannanna, a Babylonian princess who still acted under Mursili II. At what exact point in time Kantuzzili was appointed priest in Kizzuwatna is impossible to determine but we would expect that he was installed by the latter part of Tudhaliya III and Tudahepa's reign and continued
to hold the office of priest in the early reign of Suppiluliuma I. He was succeeded by Telipinu at some later stage of Suppiluliuma's rule when Taduhepa was no longer alive.

6(a). The Question of Kizzuwatna's Annexation and the Dating of the Sunassura Treaty (KBo I 5)

It is generally accepted that the annexation of Kizzuwatna into the Hittite state took place during the reign of Suppiluliuma I as a direct result of the ruler's widespread campaigning in Syria which precluded an independent Kizzuwatna.

Certainly records regarding Kizzuwatna's political activities cease with the conclusion of the Sunassura treaty and do not appear to have been revived before the collapse of the Hittite Empire.

The assumption that the annexation took place in Suppiluliuma's time has been based on a) the appointment of his son Telipinu as priest in the city of Kizzuwatna (CTH 44) and b) the assigning of the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5 = Kizz.,7) to the same king.

The first text which leaves us in no doubt as to the political importance of that appointment has been interpreted as an indication for the break-up of Kizzuwatna as an independent state and possibly her outright annexation (Kizz.,12; Kümmel RIA IV, 629). Both issues are briefly re-examined here in the light of the evidence discussed earlier in this chapter.

It was argued above that Kantuzzili, a prince of an earlier generation, already became priest in Kizzuwatna before Telipinu. Although there is no documentary evidence regarding his secular duties, as set out for Telipinu in CTH 44, Kantuzzili's military activities can be paralleled with those of his successor and it is very likely that Kantuzzili, like Telipinu, acted as local ruler, particularly if, as suggested, he is identical with the Kantuzzili of KUB XXXVI 118 and KUB XXXIV 58 (see nts.
Additional evidence to the effect that the city of Kizzuwatna was in Hittite hands in the time of Tudhaliya III comes from CTH 88 (sect.3) and if we attribute KUB XXXI 122 + to the same Tudhaliya as proposed, the Hittite king restored temples and shrines in the country of Kizzuwatna (sect.4(b)). There is thus cumulative evidence for Hittite presence in Kizzuwatnean territory in the period prior to Suppiluliuma's reign. The historical picture for Tudhaliya III is as yet incomplete. Until recently our assessment of Suppiluliuma's predecessor whose identity was uncertain, rested mainly on the accounts of Hattusili III and the historical introduction of the Šattiwaza treaty both of which portray his rule as a period of great instability. However, with the Māṣat evidence as well as the cruciform seal (sect.1(a) and (b) above) which firmly established Tudhaliya as the ruler who preceded Suppiluliuma, there is now some scope to widen and possibly correct the historical perspective for his reign.

Apart from the "Deeds" which relate joint campaigns of Tudhaliya with Kantuzzili (DS fr.2) and Suppiluliuma (DS fr.10-14), indicating the reconquest of territories lost in the "concentric invasion", a few additional texts are now attributed to Tudhaliya III (Košak 1980a, p.164f; sect.3, sect.5 and n.39).

However, a re-assessment of Middle Hittite texts naming a Tudhaliya is still outstanding. Particularly effected will be the Tudhaliya annals which were re-allocated from the Late to the Early Empire (CTH 142.1-3). They have been attributed to Tudhaliya I(=II), founder of the new Hittite dynasty by Gurney (CAH vol.II ch.XV, 677), by Houwink ten Cate (1970, 57f, 62) and Carruba (1977 Tafel I, 148, 156f). Košak, on the other hand, has very rightly pointed out that KUB XXIII 27 (CTH 142.1) cannot belong to the founder of the new dynasty since the Tudhaliya of this fragment makes reference to his father's death (and his own succession) and he proposes a date to Tudhaliya III which was in fact
already contemplated by Carruba (1977, 157 n.1).\textsuperscript{58}

The dating of the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5 = Kizz.,\textsuperscript{7}) is obviously crucial to the understanding of relations between Hatti and Kizzuwatna, as it is the last in a series of treaties concluded between the two countries.

Whether the impending annexation of Kizzuwatna is indicated by the re-drawing of her western border, as has been suggested, is open to interpretation (see ch.IV.\textsuperscript{7}).

Unfortunately the name of the Hittite king in the introduction of the treaty tablet has broken away, but it is widely accepted that KBo I 5 was concluded in the reign of Suppiluliuma I, as first suggested by Forrer (1926, 39) which has been followed by other scholars ever since.\textsuperscript{59}

There is no doubt that the expansionist policy of Suppiluliuma which manifested itself in two major Syrian campaigns\textsuperscript{60} provides the most likely political scenario for a final absorption of Kizzuwatna into the Hittite state. Nevertheless, the concluding of the treaty which preceded the annexation must be of earlier date in view of the historical evidence regarding Kizzuwatna outlined above, as well as the palaeographic and linguistic evidence discussed in the previous chapter.

The Sunassura treaty contains the only historical preamble known to us from a Kizzuwatna treaty. Unfortunately, we learn very little about the previous relationship between the two countries as most of the historical introduction is taken up with matters involving Isuwa and Hurri. However, noteworthy is the statement that in the time of His Majesty's grandfather Kizzuwatna belonged to Hatti but later it detached itself from Hatti and turned to Hurri (obv.I 5-7).\textsuperscript{61} The implication clearly is that during the reign of the author's father Kizzuwatna was not allied to Hatti. The previous alliance of Sunassura with Hurri is referred to later on in the text when it is stated that an existing oath (\textit{tuppu ša niš}
\textit{DINGIR}^\textsuperscript{MÊŠ}) will be extinguished and the word of the
"Hurrian" cast aside (IV 25-26).

The Isuwa episode and the role of Hurri, which feature prominently in the preamble of KBo I 5, have been frequently linked to the accounts in other documents which mention clashes with Isuwa and they have been associated with Isuwan encounters of Suppiluliuma I (Houwink ten Cate, BiOr 20, 271 Klengel 1968, 65ff). The evidence is briefly re-examined below.

The purpose of including events involving Isuwa in a treaty for Sunassura served presumably as a diplomatic precedent but more importantly attempted to show Mitanni in an unfavourable light (Klengel op.cit., 66).

The content of the account is summarized below:

§3 (I 8-13)
The country of Isuwa became hostile. His Majesty went into battle and vanquished it. Isuwans fled before him and descended into Hurri. At the request of the Hittite King to return his subjects the Hurrian's answer was "no".

§4 (I 14-19)
In the time of the grandfather the Isuwan cities came and settled in the Hurri country. Later they went back to Hatti as refugees. But now "the cattle have chosen their stable and they have come to live in my country" (Hurrian King speaking).

§5 (I 20-24)
The Hurrian did not return the king's subjects. Instead he attacked Isuwa behind His Majesty's back and plundered Isuwa. The booty was taken to Hurri.

§6 (I 25-29)
The Hurrian is said to have broken the oath. In answer to the reproachful question by the Hittite king how he (the king of Hurri) would feel if his subjects shifted allegiance, the Hurrian king replies "Indeed the same".

The main points which emerge from the above
paragraphs are: (1) The dispute between the Hittite and the Hurrian king centres around Isuwan subjects who fled into Hurri. (2) Isuwa was and remains in Hittite hands. (3) Diplomatic exchanges between Hatti and Hurri are maintained throughout, indeed a treaty between the two countries is alluded to (I 25).

Suppiluliuma's encounters with Isuwa are described at some length in his treaty with Šattiwaza of Mitanni (KBo I 1). We learn that Isuwa revolted "in the time of my father" and that Hittite troops intervened (I 10-11). There follows a list of 16 towns and regions, the so-called "Isuwa List" (among them Arawanna, Kalasma and Armatana known from CTH 88, see sect.3) who had also revolted during his father's reign. Suppiluliuma reports that he smote them but some of the people escaped into Isuwa "where they dwelt in the midst of the enemy". The indication is here that Isuwa was under the authority of Mitanni (I 11-16).

It becomes clear that the events described in the Sunassura treaty and those of the Šattiwaza treaty regarding Isuwa are not the same. - Subject matter of KBo I 5 are the Isuwans who flee into Hurri (Isuwa belongs to Hatti), while KBo I 1 speaks of a revolt of Isuwa and Hittite subjects fleeing into Isuwa (Isuwa belongs to Mitanni).

The discrepancy of the two accounts was already noted by Klengel but he attributed it to imprecise reporting on the part of the Sunassura treaty (1968, 66).

The events of the Šattiwaza treaty (KBo I 1) which occurred "in the time of my father" and which are probably connected with the "concentric invasion" must belong into the late reign of Tudhaliya III since it falls to Suppiluliuma to recapture the Hittite subjects who had fled, and to finally subdue the country of Isuwa.62

If we attribute the Sunassura treaty to Tudhaliya III who seems the most likely candidate,63 the Isuwa episode related here should be placed into the early part of his reign when Isuwa was still part of Hatti. A date for the concluding of KBo I 5 in the earlier time of Tudhaliya's
reign would also explain why in the time of the "concentric invasion" Kizzuwatna was regarded as Hittite territory. Whether at this point in time Kizzuwatna was already annexed into Hatti and Kantuzzili installed as priest, or the treaty was still in force and she remained loyal, cannot be established.

6(b). KUB XL 2 (CTH 641).

The text KUB XL 2, first referred to by Forrer (1937, 184f), is a reaffirmation by an unknown Hittite king of a donation made in favour of a priest and priestess entrusted with the cult of the goddess Ishara and other deities.

Apart from mentioning a number of place names associated with Kizzuwatna the text also refers to Sunassura.

Goetze, who presented and discussed KUB XL 2, followed Forrer in isolating an additional Kizzuwatnean king by the name of Talzu as predecessor of Sunassura (Kizz.,61f). Goetze associated the text with the appointment of Telipinu as priest in Kizzuwatna and dated it to Suppiluliuma I (ibid., 70, also Imparati 1979, 176 n.40).

It seems therefore appropriate to include a brief discussion of KUB XL 2 in the context of Kizzuwatna's annexation since, by implication, the latter was entirely or at least partially incorporated into Hatti when the donation was reissued.

The text is not easily classified as it reads partly like a land donation in which villages and agricultural land are given to various individuals but is equally concerned with the cult aspects of Ishara of Nerisa as well as the deities Muwanu, Muwatalli and the Fire-god.

The numerous place names mentioned in the text, most of which are not otherwise attested, were discussed at some length by Goetze (Kizz.,69f). A valuable geographical indicator is the mention of Hulassa,
described here as being situated "near Tarsa" (\textsuperscript{URU}Tarsa maninkuan) placing at least part of the landed properties to the west of the Seyhan.\textsuperscript{66} Indeed a large portion of the territory in our text appears to have been located in mountainous regions, judging from the description of the terrain in which the donated land parcels were situated (\textsc{INA} \textsc{HUR.SAG} Ishara-pät \textsc{ser}, "up in the mountain Ishara..." obv.14, see also 29, rev. 2,3,4,6). The above evidence fits the character of Ishara in her capacity as a mountain goddess which is clearly stated in the Hattusili III-Rameses II treaty where she appears amongst the oath gods as "Ishara, lady of the mountains and rivers".\textsuperscript{67}

Virtually nothing is known about the three gods (Muwanu, Muwatalli and the Fire-god) who were also worshipped in the region outlined in KUB XL 2.

The first section of the text which contains a mythological account, unfortunately too broken to be intelligible, names the country of Kummanni and the river Puruna (see ch.III.1). The following paragraph (§2) refers to the establishing of cults by Talzu, the setting up of 3 huwasi stones and the making of cult images by the same king (obv. 12-24).\textsuperscript{68}

The land parcels of the donation are listed in three parts. Most of the villages and agricultural units enumerated in §2 which included Hulassa ("near Tarsa") are said to belong to the estate of Utti (26-34). The same person is also mentioned with Sunassura (rev.15) under whose rule the donation was either reconfirmed or possibly reversed.\textsuperscript{69} Utti's function or status is not stated but he was probably the priest in the time of Talzu and Sunassura, as the following section (§3) begins: "These villages belong to the \textsc{ENTU} priestess and to the priest formerly/of old (\textsc{karuilius} obv.35). The statement is followed by a summary of landed property and its borders (36-38).

The main beneficiary of KUB XL 2, however, is a certain \textsuperscript{SAL}DANITI who received as a gift (\textit{iwaru}) most of the listed land parcels in §3 (obv.39-rev.7) and who poses
a number of problems for the interpretation of our text.

Goetze understood from the text that the donation to SALDANITI had originally been made by Talzu and was later reissued by the Hittite king. The statement "I found them (the villages) on a tablet of Talzu" (rev.9) does support Goetzef's view but, whether this is a reference to the estates given to the temple and its priests in general, or to SALDANITI in particular is not altogether clear. As mentioned above, § 3 began with the statement that the villages belonged formerly to the ENTU and the priest and it ends by saying: "... to the SALENTU/SALdaniti] and to the priest I gave[them]back" (rev.10-11).

The remaining sections (before the text breaks off) make provisions for various items to be given every third year to the goddess Ishara, the ENTU and by the chief merchant to the priest."

The fact that SALDANITI occurs again together with the priest in the context of future arrangements suggested, in Goetze's view, that Daniti was still alive at the time the deed was renewed and he concluded that Suppiluliuma I must have been the king responsible for the reissue (see above).

A suggestion which was recently made could, however, put a rather different complexion on KUB XL 2. J.D.Hawkins in the commentary on the hier. Luw. text Tell Ahmar I proposed that (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA) ta-ni-ti- (§24) has the meaning of "hierodule". The context in which daniti- appears in the Tell Ahmar text has close parallels in cun. Hittite (1980, 151).

KUB LVI 19 which deals in part with aspects of childbirth and mentions the activities of various females provides the most striking example for the above theory:
II 13 "because my father had installed his
daughter as a taprišassi women for

15 "He who says 'she was S[AL]daniti to a deity'
But he who says 'she was S[AL]daniti
to Sarruma...'

26-27 "To that Storm-god also I shall put a
S[AL]daniti".  

Since daniti- can be regarded as a Luvism in Hittite
(Hawkins op.cit.) its occurrence in Kizzuwatnean context
(KUB XL 2) fits particularly well. F. Starke takes
S[AL]daniti- as the cun.Luw. reading for Akk. S[AL]ENTU (KZ
1987, 249 n.24), the implication being that the text uses
the terms ENTU and daniti alternately.  

However, the possibility that the daniti- stands for
separate religious office with the sense of "hierodule" as
opposed to high-priestess, suggested by J.D.Hawkins,
cannot be excluded. 

The fact that religious functionaries were recipients
of real estate, is well known from KBo V 7, a LS issued by
Arnuwanda/Ašmunikal in which the hierodule (SUHUR.LAL)
Kuwatalla receives land parcels and personnel.

If S[AL]daniti- in KUB XL 2 is not to be taken as a PN,
then the deed could have been renewed at any later date
since we are no longer tied to the theory that a certain
Daniti was a contemporary of Talzu as well as the Hittite
king who confirmed her estate. 

On the point of text dating one should note that
KUB XL 2 is a late Empire text (Kammenhuber 1968, 99),
therefore if it was written in the time of Suppiluliuma I,
as suggested by Goetze, then KUB XL 2 has come down to us
as a later copy. 

In support of a late date one could argue that the
cults dealt with in KUB XL 2 had fallen into disuse and
were revived by a late Empire king who had "found them on
a tablet of Talzu". The Hittite ruler who springs to mind
is Tudhaliya IV whose religious reform and revivals are
well documented in the archives.

If we re-interpret KUB XL 2, as was proposed here,
then our text is no longer relevant to the question of Kizzuwatna's annexation, since daniti- is not a particular individual who was a contemporary of Talzu, Sunassura and the Hittite king, but refers to a religious functionary, be it a hierodule or an entu priestess.

The importance of KUB XL 2 lies mainly in the disclosure of an additional king of Kizzuwatna by the name of Talzu who preceded Sunassura. There are no other textual references to Talzu, but in our scheme he would have been a contemporary of Arnuwanda I.
There is still no uniformity in the nomenclature of the period between the Old Kingdom and the Empire Period, i.e. Telipinu - Suppiluliuma I: Gurney CAH vol.II ch.XV= "Middle Kingdom"; Otten 1969a, 3f = "Mittelhethitische Periode". To denote the beginning of the new Hittite dynasty, starting with Tudhaliya I up to the reign of Suppiluliuma I, the use of Early Empire period has become common, Houwink ten Cate 1970; Hawkins, Anatolica 4 (1971/72), 180; Košak 1980a. The disadvantage is that it leaves the time span between Telipinu and Tudhaliya I without specific designation and that it does not tie up with the linguistic stage of "Middle Hittite" which covers approx. the period from Telipinu to Suppiluliuma I.

For more recent studies on the historical aspects of the Early Empire period see V. Haas, "Betrachtungen zur Dynastie von Hattusa im Mittleren Reich (ca. 1450-1380)", AoF 12 (1985), 269ff, (I thank Prof. Gurney for drawing my attention to this article); J. Freu, "Problèmes de Chronologie et de Geographie Hittites Madduwatta et les Debuts de l'Empire", Hethitica VIII (1987), 123ff.

I. Hoffmann (1984, 46f) has attempted to cast doubts on the dating of level III. She claims that Özgüç has dated level III on the strength of the Middle Hittite character of the tablets only, which in her view show all the characteristics of the Empire period, and she proceeds to conclude that the Suppiluliuma seal impression recovered in level II should be attributed to Suppiluliuma II not I. Hoffmann has failed to consider the archaeological evidence, nor does she discuss the Tudaliya/(SA)Taduheap seal which seals two documents of the archives and which stylistically can hardly be dated to Tudaliya IV.
Another characteristic of seals from the Early Empire period - Cf. Beran Nos. 203 (=SBo I 58), 162 (=SBo I 60), 202 (=SBo I 5), but the latter is dated by Beran to Suppiluliuma II, (p.88).

Kammenhuber does not altogether exclude a Tudhaliya between Arnuwanda I and Suppiluliuma I but she claims that if he became king his reign was short, or that Suppiluliuma usurped the throne from his nephew Tudhaliya (1976, 179f).

See also Goetze JAOS 72 (1952), 71, who considered Tudhaliya/Daduhepa as a royal pair.

The sign L 104 (head of a gazelle) is used in the writing of Šaušga, Yazilikaya No.38 and seals SBo II No. 8, 67.

Legend of seal SBo I 60 on LS 1 (CTH 223) "Seal of Tabarna Arnuwanda Great King, son of Tudhaliya ... Seal of Tawannanna Ašmunikal, Great Queen, daughter of Nikalmati, Great Queen and daughter of Tudhaliya".

This was in fact already proposed by Kühne 1982 n.221.

This information was kindly communicated to me by Prof. Gurney.

Carruba (1971, 75-94) presented miscellaneous text fragments which he considered belonged to Hattusili II. Cf. Košak 1980a, 163.

On the pankus see Beckman 1982, 435ff. Discussed also is the problem of interpreting pankus = "assembly" as opposed to its adjectival use with the meaning of "all" (436 and n.21), pankus = "assembly" in Middle Hittite texts only in KUB XXXVI 109 (441 and n.73). According to Beckman "the assembly" continued to exist into the later Empire period.
Mr. J. D. Hawkins kindly provided me with this information. The new readings of the cruciform seal in conjunction with a re-assessment of Suppiluliuma's predecessors by Hawkins and Wilhelm, is at present in preparation.

There is however a degree of consensus on aspects of palaeography. See lists of diagnostic early sign forms in StBoT 20, p.X; THeth 9, 98.

On the term kuir-/kuriwanas see also Gurney 1940, 94f - cf. Lebrun 1980, 175; Tischler HEG, 647f with previous literature.

There have been a number of analytical studies on the structure and dating of Hittite prayers (CTH 372-376). For a full bibliography see Carruba 1983, 26f.

Mursili II reports that Kalasma was a subject of Hatti during the time of his father and grandfather and that it became hostile to him (AM, 161).

For transliteration and translation of CTH 143 and additional annal fragments of Arnuwanda see Carruba 1977, 166-174.

Cf. Hoffmann 1984, 34ff who denies any connection between the two events.


Cp. O.K. annal fragment CTH 13 (2BoTU 17β), see ch.III.1.

See Kühne 1982, 223f who believes that Kizzuwatna at this time was under Hittite administration, thus also Wilhelm 1982, 44.
23 RGTC 6, 144 correct Tupanta (Tupa anda, KBo XIX 52 7), cp. AT 11, AT 367 \textit{urutu} Tu-ba\textsuperscript{KI}.

24 There is no dividing line between rev. 13-14 as shown by Goetze (Kizz., 45).


26 Cp. ch.IV.3 (AT 3). Na'aman maintains this theory in spite of recognizing the Hittite evidence (ibid., 273 n.39).

27 For the historical picture towards the end of the Hittite Empire see Otten 1976, 22ff; Singer 1985, 100ff.

28 Saustatar is reported to have sacked Aššur and carried off a silver and gold gate to Waššukanni (Weidner PD,3).

29 For the chronological grouping of texts attributed to Arnuwanda I see Houwink ten Cate 1970, 57f. Add now three more fragments; KBo XXII 130, 130a, KUB XLVIII 85, Kosak 1980a, 165.

30 Doubts on the accuracy of Hattusili's statement was also expressed in a recent study on the chronology of Suppiluliuma's reign (Wilhelm - Boese 1987, 90f, see n.60). Apart from the chronological problems which a 20 year period of Anatolian campaigning presents, the authors have also convincingly argued that "20 years" is not to be taken literally but is a general expression to indicate a "long period of time" for which other examples in Near Eastern texts are quoted.

31 Güterbock interpreted zinnuk as an adverbial form of zinna- "to finish" and compared it to Akk. gamāru "to annihilate".
32 Rarely attested verb, igae- HW = "zerspringen", "zerbersten". On this passage see Kühne (1973, 97 n.483 with lit.); Hoffner, JCS 24 (1971), 34; Puhvel 1984, 257 "the land of Hattusa is paralysed"; cf. Starke who links it to ega = ice, igae = Eg. qbb = "to be cool" (1981a, 225).

33 Starke has made use of Egyptian linguistic evidence and he argues that Egyptian idiomatic expressions were translated into Hittite here. He identified zinnuk as a relative form of the Eg. verb "to say" (ibid.228f).

34 Possibly identical with hier. Lá/i-kara/i-ma URBS, as one of three cities in the unidentified country POCULUM- ti-L 67 of the Karahüyük Elbistan stele (line 10), Laroche HH, 162; cf. Masson 1979, 238. See ch.III n.14.

35 The "List" enumerates some 16 "lands", including Arawanna and "half the land of Tegarama" (KBo I 1 Obv.I 10ff), Geography, 44f.

36 For a discussion on the identity of DINGIR GE, see Kronasser 1963, 38ff; Lebrun 1976, 29ff. The latter believes her to be synonymous with Ištar of Samuha. Her characteristics as a Moon-goddess is clear from onomastic evidence, Noms, 40f.

37 In the ritual CTH 481 the making of a golden image of the Black Goddess for the new temple is mentioned, followed by the description of other religious paraphernalia (Kronasser ibid., §§ 2-5).

38 The verb arha sarra- can denote a degree of forcefulness, HW, 184 "losreissen, rauben".

39 BoTU 31 = DS fr.2 Tudhaliya ABI ABIVYA, see also KBo XII 10, Gurney 1979, 219 n.27 suggests that the text belongs to DS fr.14, similar Košak 1980a, 164 with
transliteration. - Cf. Tischler 1981, 58 who attributes the fragment to Hattusili III; Hoffner, Or 49 (1980), 316 to CTH 83.

Laroche has, however, separated the two fragments and listed KBo XX 90 under CTH 525.9 "Recensements de sanctuaires par Tudhaliya IV", CTH Premier Supplément, RHA 30(1972) - text partly translit. by Laroche 1975, 90 n.11.


It is not clear if Kummanni is the subject or object here. For examples of the loc. without preposition see Friedrich HE 1 (§ 204); in Old Hittite context, Starke StBoT 23, 61, 65.

Some old sign forms, however, continue to be in use even in texts composed in the time of Tudhaliya IV, Gurney, BiOr 34 (1977), 200.

Transliteration and translation by Goetze Kizz.,12ff.

Similar wording in the instruction text to the BEL MADGALTI regarding judicial functions (KUB XIII 2 21-24). Difficult cases are to be brought before His Majesty (v. Schuler 1957, 48).

See also the cult text KUB XXVII 13 IV 4,7 which mentions "the palace" of Kantuzzili, "the palace" of ḫSANGA (Telipinu) in the order which we would expect but cf. Imparati 1979, 176 n.26, also Gurney 1980, 198.

There are possibly three persons of that name: 1) Kantuzzili, contemporary of Himuili who killed Muwatalli, to be dated before Tudhaliya I (see ch.IV.8). - 2) Kantuzzili, contemporary (brother?) of
Tudhaliya III; DS fr.2, 3; CTH 211.6, possibly also CTH 373, 279.1, 275, 500 (see below). A Kantuzzili is listed with Walanni, followed by Takisarruma and Asmusarruma in the "Offering Lists" D and E and with Telipinu and Šarri-Kušuh in the latter only (Otten 1968, 124). Imparati equated him with the above (No.1) (1979, 172f), cf. Gurney who believes him to be a son of Suppiluliuma I (1980, 198). Bin-Nun thought that Kantuzzili may have been a Hittite king and linked Kantuzzili of the "prayer" (CTH 373) to the one listed with Walanni in the above "Lists" (1975, 263f). There is, however, no evidence that Walanni who appears with Kantuzzili in list D and E and the Walanni in the "list of queens" are one and the same person (Gurney 1979 n.32). Bin-Nun's claim that Laroche identified Kantuzzili with Hattusili II seems to be solely based on his list of rulers in Ugaritica III, 120, where he lists a king Hattusili with queen Walanni. Nowhere (to our knowledge) has he argued the case that Kantuzzili and Hattusili could be identical. 3) Kantuzzili mentioned in the Mursili annals (AM, 86) as military commander may be the same as father of Ura-Du in the time of Hattusili III (CTH 224). Fragmentary in KBo XXII 23, 24. On Kantuzzili sources see also Houwink ten Cate 1970, 69 n.83.

48 It is uncertain whether Sarruma occurred in the break of 1.3, or had not yet been introduced into the pantheon in Kizzuwatna. However, the fact that in 1.2 after Hepat the tablet is left blank may be an indication that Sarruma did not yet feature among the gods until Telipinu became priest (CTH 44). On the god Sarruma see ch.I.4.

49 Reviewed by Neu, AfO 31 (1984), 99 who identifies the text as Middle Hittite, and Gurney 1980, 198. For a comment on DUMU.NITA = IBILA "heir" in this text, see Bin-Nun 1975, 264f.
I am indebted to E. Neu for making the relevant passages of 1691/u and 577/u available to me. The fragments will be published by Neu in conjunction with the Kaska treaties in a forthcoming StBoT volume. - II 24 $\text{Du-ù-du-he-pa}$. First two signs are in the break according to Neu.

Gurney has identified this Tulpi-Tēsup with the unfortunate Tudhaliya TūR who was murdered by Suppiluliuma (1979, 216). Gurney favours Asmunikal as the queen in the ritual KUB XLV 47 and considers the possibility that Tulpi-Tēsup may have been of a younger generation and acted in the ritual with his uncles (personal communication). - Tulpi-Tēsup also appears as a witness in CTH 223. The possibility that there is more than one Tulpi-Tēsup can of course not be excluded.

In KUB XXXVI 118 Kantuzzili and Pariyawatra appear as recipients of estates (4...$\text{piyan}$) and the phrases "let them be great...", "let them govern...." (10-11) would imply that the two princes are here confirmed as local rulers.

Kantuzzili, Pariyawatra and Tulpi-Tēsup occur in KUB XXXIV 58 (CTH 275) together with two females, Lalantiwasha and Muśuhepa. The fragment contains mainly passages of mutual friendship ($\text{genzu har-}$) and is phrased alternatively in the 1st prs. sing. and pl. Meriggi suggested that Kantuzzili and Muśuhepa were the authors of the text (I 4 $\text{ammuk-za mahhan}$ Kantuzzili$\text{[}$, II 1 $\text{nu-za ammuk mahhan}$ Muśuhepa, WZKM 58 (1962), 97f. Carruba, on the other hand, makes Kantuzzili and Muśuhepa object in his translation ("as Kantuzzili is to me well disposed ...") and interprets the text as a temporary settlement among groups of families with predominantly Kizzuwatnean names (1977, 177). - Muśuhepa probably also in the above mentioned frgt. 1691/u II 25 (Neu 1983, 396 n.14).
The filiation of Tudhaliya/Kantuzzili is not preserved in the annal text (BoTU 31 line 20) but has been restored with DUMU "son" of Tudhaliya (Gurney 1979, 215 n.14), but if we equate this Kantuzzili with the "priest", as we have done, a restoration of ŠES "brother" would be required.

Cf. Otten 1986, n.43 who attributes this annal fragment to Tudhaliya I/II and links this Kantuzzili to the one of the Muwatalli affair (see n. 47 above). However, in view of DS fr.2 and 3, a date to Tudhaliya III seems preferable, see note above.

This has at times been explained with a Hittite "corridor" in the east which allowed the Hittites access to Syria (Geography, 59).

But see now E. Neu, "Zum mittelhethitischen Alter der Tudhaliya Annalen (CTH 142)", Fs Oberhuber (1986), pp.181-192. This article was not available to me.

The analysis by Neu of the annal texts belonging to CTH 142 (see note above) may clarify as to how the main fragments KUB XXIII 11 and 12 (CTH 142.2, 3) relate to KUB XXIII 27 (CTH 142.1) and which Tudhaliya the fragments should be attributed to.

Goetze Kizz.,36 n.141; Gurney 1952, 78; del Monte 1981, 220; Kümmel RIA V, 628; Mcqueen 1986, 46, 55.

See now Wilhelm and Boese (1987, 74ff) who have lowered the accession date of Suppiluliuma I by 40 years to 1340 and argue for one, not two Syrian campaigns by the same king. The last argument rests on the re-interpretation of the wording in the Šattiwaza treaty (p.84f).

Houwink ten Cate (1970, 60) and Kühne (1982, n.223) understood this statement as referring to Kizzuwatna's
annexation into Hatti but this seems over-interpreting the sentence - col.I 5f ...Kizzuwatni Șa KUR URU Hatti ip-pa-si...) lit. "K. was belonging to Hatti". This must surely refer to a previous alliance, particularly in view of the many surviving treaties concluded with Kizzuwatna.

According to KBo I 1 Suppiluliuma was obliged to mount a second campaign against Isuwa, during which he transferred the people and lands back to Hatti. - See also DS fr.25 + KUB XL 8, discussed by Klengel 1968, 66ff.

A date to Tudhaliya III of KBo I 5 was already suggested by Wilhelm 1982, 43 but not argued historically to any extent.

Laroche has listed KUB XL 2 under CTH 641 "Organisation du culte d'Ishara". KBo XXI 42 (CTH 641.2), CTH Premier supplément (RHA 30 1972) describes the autumn festival for the goddess Ishara. For a duplicate of the above see Güterbock 1979a, 139ff.

For corrections to Goetze's readings see C. Kühne, ZA 62 (1972), 241f. Kammenhuber is sceptical about king Talzu (1968, 99).

The donation described in §3 includes property "on the road to Wastissa (RGTC 6 478f).

Ishara is also evoked in the Pilliya-Idrimi treaty AT 3. The mountain goddess Ishara in Hittite texts and her Syro-Mesopotamian origin is discussed by V. Haas 1982, 99. See also Ammihatna of Kizzuwatna, purapši priest of Ishara. On the above see Gurney 1977, 45 n.6 where he suggests that purapši is the possible reading of AZU.
Presumably dedicated to the three deities - Muwanu, Muwatalli and the Fire-god.

The verb is missing at the end of rev.15.

Similarly Forrer 1937, 185.

Goetze restores [na-at A-NA SAL-EN-TI] (ibid. 64).

Rev.35 SAL-da-a-ni-ti-is-ma Lg SANGA-ya The last lines are rather broken but appear to deal with code of conduct towards the priest and daniti (?)

HW Erg.I, 20 - cult functionary.

Obv.II 1-16 treated by G. Beckman 1983, 256f. Lines 16, 26f quoted by Hawkins op.cit. For a comment of the above passage see also J.M. Pringle, BiOr 42 (1985), 659.

According to Pecchioli-Daddi 1982, 419 the ENTU occurs in only one other text KUB XX 1 II 11 ... E-EN-TU Lg SANGA-ya a-da-an-na e-ša-an-ta-[ri. However, the NIN.DINGIR (= Akk. entu) is well attested but she is thought to be a priestess reserved to the Hattian cult only (Archi and Kammenhuber Thesaurus 6, 304, also Bin-Nun 1975, 191f).

While discussing KUB XL 2 J.D. Hawkins suggested that daniti- may be a corrupt form of Akk. naditu, a woman dedicated to a deity (on the naditu see RIA IV, 391ff). The hier. logogram FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA would indeed suggest a cult function similar to the naditu.

SAL daniti- occurs in two other texts;
1. KUB LIV 67 obv. 6 SAL-da-ni-ti-is ku-is IS-TU which deals with festival instructions and cult administration.
2. The ritual fragment KBo II 20 (CTH 470) which

78 The sign forms are predominantly late. Use of annali-(rev.8) from Mursili II onward, HW²,74.
Conclusions

The study of the archaeological remains of Cilicia and the Anti-Taurus areas have, beyond doubt, established the greater importance of the Cilician plain over the mountainous region of the Anti-Taurus, a pattern which persisted over millennia.

The archaeological data for the Late Bronze Age present us with a rich settlement pattern for the Cilician plain and the surrounding foothills which should be interpreted in the light of the historical geography connected with the kingdom and (later) Hittite province of Kizzuwatna/Kummanni.

The most prominent mounds like Domuztepe, Minareli, Sirkeli, Misis and others no doubt feature in our records, but to attempt their identification with the present state of our knowledge, would be unwise and serve little purpose. The itinerary Kummanni-Zunnahara-Adaniya-Tarsa (KUB XX 52 + and similar sequences) clearly indicates a crossing of the Cilician plain from east to west, following a route which one suspects differed little from today's. Tarsa can, of course, be equated with the large mound at Tarsus although, surprisingly, the textual attestations for Tarsa are but few.

All the archaeological information then suggests that the focal point, i.e., the cultural and economic centre of Kizzuwatna, lay in the Cilician plain, which was already indicated by Seton-Williams (Cil.Surv., 143). This information is of course not reconcilable with a location of Kizzuwatna/Kummanni in the Anti-Taurus, whether one seeks the city at Comana/Şar or at a neighbouring site. Other objections for the equation of classical Comana with Kummanni were outlined in chapter II.

It has been pointed out that Kizzuwatna/Kummanni was not only a great religious but also a secular centre. This is particularly evident from the records of Hattusili III and Puduhepa when Kizzuwatna comes clearly into focus as an economic and administrative centre (CTH 173, KUB XIII 33,
KUB XLVIII 106), which is a contributing factor for the argument that the city of Kizzuwatna (most likely the capital) is to be located in the Cilician plain. The most likely location would be in the eastern part, and in particular the triangle which controlled the routes to the north and south as well as the Bahçe pass (see map 2).

At the same time interrelations of Cilicia with the Taurus and Anti-Taurus were vital and played an important part on two accounts: (a) the seasonal movements of nomadic and semi-nomadic people who shifted between their summer pastures in the mountains and winter pastures in the plain (irrespective of political borders as indicated in the Paddatissu treaty), and (b) the existence of rich mineral resources in the mountain ranges. The latter probably constituted a major factor in the Kizzuwatnean economy of which the Hattusili III letter (CTH 173), referring to iron in the storehouse of Kizzuwatna, is a good indication. The exploitation of metal sources in the Taurus may also have been the underlying reason for the continued interest in Cilicia in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian period.

From the archaeological point of view relations between Cilicia and the Anti-Taurus could not be clearly defined with the available data, except for the observation that the Anti-Taurus region probably did not share the MBA Syro-Cilian painted pottery tradition of Cilicia and the Amuq. Furthermore, it has been shown that the Elbistan plain was culturally mainly orientated towards the east in the second millennium.

The Hittite rock reliefs in the Anti-Taurus which outline an east-west route are clearly linked to Kizzuwatna, not only by Puduhepa's epigraph "daughter of Kizzuwatna" at Fraktin, but also by the religious content of the remaining reliefs. However, all the rock reliefs were created after the annexation of Kizzuwatna and consequently cannot be used as a geographical indicator for the extent of the kingdom of Kizzuwatna.
The influx of monochrome wares with central Anatolian affinities at Tarsus and Mersin in LB I have been connected with Hittite expansionist policy in areas south of the Taurus and into N. Syria which is well documented for the reigns of Hattusili I and Mursili I, and it was demonstrated that Cilicia remained under Hittite control for most of the Old Kingdom period. The break-up of Hittite supremacy over Cilicia is suggested by the report in the Telipinu Edict that Adaniya was lost to the Hittites in the time of Ammuna, and the loss of Lawazantiya in the following reign (Telipinu) sets the scene for the formation of a separate state. With the conclusion of a treaty between Telipinu and Isputahsu (Kizz.1) Kizzuwatna is firmly established on the political map.

The history for the kingdom of Kizzuwatna remains at present sketchy, due to the lack of primary sources. Nevertheless, a historical outline can now be drawn up from the sources discussed in this study which bring it into much clearer focus (see Chronological Table).

The second documented alliance between Hatti and Kizzuwatna after Telipinu/Isputahsu, falls into the reign of Zidanza II who concluded a treaty with Pilliya (Kizz.2) which is mainly concerned with the mutual exchange of previously captured towns. This Pilliya of Kizzuwatna also drew up a treaty with Idrimi of Alalah in which they agreed on the exchange of fugitives, hence only one Pilliya has been postulated in the Kizzuwatna king list. Unlike Idrimi, Pilliya was not a subject of the Mitannian ruler Parattarna, and Kizzuwatna probably enjoyed relative independence.

The synchronism between Alalah and Mitanni (Idrimi/Parattarna (AT 3) - Nigmepa/Sauštatar (AT 14)) and the one-generation gap document at Alalah would suggest that the reigns of Pilliya and Sunassura (I) may also represent two generations.

AT 14 indicates clearly that Nigmepa and Sunassura were both subjects of Sauštatar who is called upon to arbitrate
in a border dispute between the two countries, therefore Kizzuwatna had switched alliance to Mitanni. This is consistent with the political picture for the period in which Mitanni appears as the dominant factor in N. Syria. The Hittite fragments of the Sunassura treaty (Kizz. 5 and 6) can no longer be attributed to Sunassura I of AT 14, since, on the basis of palaeography, they have been dated after Arnuwanda I and the fragments can therefore be regarded as contemporary with the main Sunassura treaty KBo I 5 (Kizz.7). There is consequently no longer evidence for a Hittite alliance with Kizzuwatna in this period.

If one accepts the identification of Egyptian Kode with Cilicia/Kizzuwatna, the reference by Tuthmosis III that Kode was an ally of "the Hurrian" at the battle of Megiddo (1461 B.C.) would presumably fall into the same period of Kizzuwatna's dependence on Mitanni.

A defection of Kizzuwatna to Mitanni in the second half of the 15th century B.C. does indeed fit in well with the new historical scenario for Hatti which suggests a period of political instability due to dynastic upheavals. We now know that Muwatalli (I), a previously unknown Hittite king, murdered his predecessor Huzziya (II), and he in turn met the same fate at the hands of his courtiers Kantuzzili and Himuili. Hittite influence south of the Taurus had obviously waned, a situation which was successfully exploited by Mitanni.

The circumstances for a renewed alliance of Kizzuwatna with Hatti are not known. Tahurwaili, who made a treaty with Eheya, has been placed by most scholars at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom by identifying him with the Tahurwaili of the Telipinu Edict. It was, however, argued here, on the basis of the stylistic evidence of his seal and wording of the cuneiform legend which is closest to that of Muwatalli (I) and Huzziya (II), that his reign should
be inserted after Muwatalli I. Whether he is identical with Tudhaliya (+ Nikalmati) as once suggested by Otten, cannot be decided at present (ch.IV.8).

There is no question that in the time of Tudhaliya I (=II) who revived Hittite political aspiration in N. Syria and conquered Aleppo, Kizzuwatna would have been allied to Hatti. The documentary evidence for this alliance would be the Paddatissu treaty (Kizz.4) which is almost identically worded to the Tahirwaili treaty (Kizz.3) which precedes it. Having attributed the Sunassura treaty (Kizz.7 and 8 (Akk.), Kizz.5 and 6 (Hitt.)) to Tudhaliya III, the "grandfather", in whose reign Kizzuwatna belonged to Hatti (according to Kizz.7), would be Tudhaliya II if we adopt Gurney's sequence of kings and Tudhaliya I (=II) (of the Aleppo treaty) in the shortened king list, as now indicated by the epigraphs of the cruciform seal. In the light of this latest evidence we should favour the latter scheme, although this entails the elimination of Hattusili II. The "grandfather" of Tudhaliya III should then be Tudhaliya I (=II), conqueror of Aleppo, and treaty partner of Paddatissu of Kizzuwatna.

The statement in KBo I 5 that Kizzuwatna belonged to Hatti "in the time of my grandfather" does seem to imply that this was not so during the reign of his father, i.e., Arnuwanda I, and indeed a subsequent switch to Mitanni is referred to in the text (I 5-7). Contrary to the view of some scholars, a defection by Kizzuwatna to Mitanni in the time of Arnuwanda has been argued here, mainly on the basis of the reinterpretation of the Ismerika treaty and the historical setting which conveys political instability in northern and eastern Anatolia. These events would then belong to Talzu (to whom no texts can be attributed), predecessor of Sunassura II.

The Hurro/Kizzuwatnean religious elements attached to Tudhaliya tuhkanti (=Tašmišarri) and his wife Taduhepa in the lifetime of Arnuwanda/Aśmunikal, indicates close
connections with Kizzuwatna which were most likely based on a renewed alliance, or even on dynastic links between the two countries.

The concluding of the Sunassura treaty and subsequent annexation of Kizzuwatna must fall into the earlier part of Tudhaliya III's reign, since later events of his rule suggest Hittite control over Cilicia.

After her annexation Kizzuwatna was governed by "priests". Kantuzzili was appointed to the priesthood in the time of Tudhaliya III and his consort Taduhepa, and probably continued to hold this office until the early reign of Suppiluliuma I. He was succeeded by Telipinu who was installed as priest and local governor by his father, Suppiluliuma I, and queen Henti.

Historical records for Kizzuwatna now cease and there is no evidence that the political fortunes of Kizzuwatna were ever revived before the collapse of the Hittite Empire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. Date</th>
<th>Hatti</th>
<th>Kizzuwatna</th>
<th>Alalah</th>
<th>Mitanni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500 B.C.</td>
<td>Telipinu ← Kizz.1</td>
<td>Pariyawatri (king?) → Isputahsu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Šuttarna I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alluwamna (SBo I 86)</td>
<td>Isputahsu</td>
<td>Ilimilimma I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hantili II ← Kizz.2</td>
<td>Pilliya ← AT 3</td>
<td>Idrimi ← AT 3</td>
<td>Parattarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zidanza II (Bo 84/417)</td>
<td>Sunassura I ← AT 14</td>
<td>Niqmea ← AT 14, AT 13</td>
<td>Saustatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huzziya II (SBo I 85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muwatalli I (Bo 84/465)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahirwali (Bo 69/200) ← Kizz.3</td>
<td>Eheya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudhaliya I/II ←--</td>
<td>Paddatissu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hattusili II?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tudhaliya II?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Arnuwanda I ← Kizz.7,8</td>
<td>Talzu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Artatama I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudhaliya III ← Kizz.5,6</td>
<td>Sunassura II</td>
<td></td>
<td>(EA 29 Tuthmosis I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suppiluliuma I ← CTH 44</td>
<td>Kantuzzili (Priest)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Šuttarna II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telipinu (Priest)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(EA 19 Amenophis I (Artašumara Tušratta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(EA 17-25 Amenophis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(EA 26-29 Amenophis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----- treaty partner uncertain

Chronological Table
Addendum I

The historical chapters of this study which aimed at a reappraisal of the sources for Kizzuwatna, had been largely completed when the article by R.H. Beal, "The History of Kizzuwatna and the Date of the Sunassura Treaty", Or 55 (1986), 424ff, came to my attention. Since Beal makes use of much of the textual material and bibliographical sources gathered here, to include the author's findings would have entailed a fundamental rewriting of this dissertation which we were unable to do. In his article, Beal summarizes the history of Kizzuwatna from its Old Kingdom beginnings to its annexation, and he conducts most of his more detailed arguments in extensive footnotes. For anyone not familiar with the subject matter this makes at times demanding reading.

Although there are a number of aspects where views expressed here coincide with those of Beal, on some of the most important points he has reached rather different conclusions from us (see Chronol. Table here and Beal p.443). Not all the topics touched on by Beal can be taken up, and we shall restrict our comments to the aspects responsible for the diverse results which were obtained in interpreting the textual material relevant to the kingdom of Kizzuwatna.

In essence, Beal has placed all the Kizzuwatna treaties into the period between Telipinu and Tudhaliya (I/II) of the Aleppo treaty, hence the existence of Kizzuwatna as an independent kingdom falls into the time span for which the records at present suggest Hittite non-involvement in Syrian affairs until the reign of Tudhaliya I/II to whom the author attributes the Sunassura treaty (KBo I 5) and Kizzuwatna's annexation into the Hittite state.

Like Carruba and Bin-Nun, but not Easton (ch.IV.8), Beal has inserted the reign of Tahurwaili before Alluwamna, although he does not argue the case, and consequently in his scheme the Tahurwaili-Eheya treaty follows that of Telipinu-Isputahsu (p.428). This has been rejected here
on the grounds of stylistic criteria of Tahurwaili's seal which stands closest to that of Muwatalli I three generations later (see Fig. 6).

Similar to our scheme, Beal has attributed the Zidanza-Pilliya treaty (Kizz.2) to Zidanza II, and he also believed that there was only one king Pilliya (p.428ff). However, Beal's interpretation of AT 3 lines 40-42 which refers to an oath between Parattarna and Idrimi (see ch.IV.3), leads him to argue that only Pilliya was a subject of Parattarna at the time, not yet Idrimi, since, in his view, it was unlikely that a tributary (i.e. Idrimi) could make a treaty with a foreign power (i.e. Kizzuwatna) (p.429 n.26). Beal has overlooked the fact that AT 3 was not made out by Idrimi, but was issued by the king of Kizzuwatna, which considerably weakens his argument. Furthermore, we can point to AT 2, a treaty between Ir-Tesub king of Tunip and Niqmepa of Alalah which deals with similar fugitive matters as found in AT 3, and which also makes reference to an oath to the Hurrian overlord (1. 74 "the oath of the king of the Hurrian troops my Lord"). While the document clearly states that Niqmepa was a subject of Sauštatar (see above), there is no indication that the king of Tunip was also a tributary. Therefore, drawing up an agreement on matters resulting from a common border with an independent state was obviously within the jurisdiction of a tributary of Mitanni. In our view the passage in AT 3 referred to above, indicates the dependence of Idrimi on Mitanni but not of Pilliya (thus also Klengel 1978, 108).

The interpretation by Beal of the Ismerika treaty differs widely from the views which were expressed here (ch.V.2(c)). The fact that in the scheme proposed by Beal the Sunassura treaty falls to Tudhaliya I/II left him with little option but to interpret the Ismerika treaty in the way he did, since in his opinion Kizzuwatna had already been annexed by Arnuwanda's predecessor Tudhaliya, although this is not the
order of Beal's arguments (p.437f). The treaty can of course be understood in the way that Beal and others have done, but the historical probabilities for a conquest by Arnuwanda of eastern territories, including the Mitannian capital, resulting in an enlarged Kizzuwatna, seem unlikely and objections for this interpretation were already given by Kempinski and Košak in which we follow (see above). Apart from other historical sources for Arnuwanda which suggest political instability, the capture of the Mitannian capital Waššukanni would have been an important historical event, which we would expect to be echoed in later records, as for example, the historical preamble of the Šattiwaza treaty. We are also in disagreement with Beal's claim that the BËL MADGALTI mentioned in the Ismerik treaty is a high-ranking official in Kizzuwatna. The treaty stipulations are surely applicable to the region of Ismerika, not Kizzuwatna, and the BËL MADGALTI must be a Hittite official in Ismerika who administered the area.

One of Beal's main arguments for only one Sunassura as contemporary of Tudhaliya II (=I) and Sauštatar (AT 14) is the annal fragment KUB XXIII 14 (p.434 n.49). Carruba, who edited the text (1977, 172) restores ḫṣušatar? (obv. II 1) and Ar[nuwanda (rev. III 3). As the text mentions "my father" we may presume that the fragment belongs to the "joint annals"of Tudhaliya/Arnuwanda (see ch.V.2(b)). If the restoration of Sauštatar is correct, the implication then is that the Mitannian king was still alive at the time of Arnuwanda which makes his reign very long indeed, and would leave a relatively short time span for the reigns of Artatama I and Šuttarna II. One should also note that Hittite treaty and annal texts as a rule do not mention Hurrian rulers by name, but refer to them anonymously as "king of Hurri/Mitanni", "the Hurrian", or similar forms. (The mention of Artatama and Tušratta in the historical preamble of the Šattiwaza treaty is the exception, but this can be explained
by the fact that Ṣattiwaza, who is installed as vassal king in Mittani, was a direct descendant of Tušratta.) Historical accounts do, however, occasionally mention the names of military commanders of the Hurrian enemy forces (KBo III 46 obv. II 34, 37) which could be the case here and a restoration of the name beginning with Šaušga- or PN Saussili (Noms, p.161) could be suggested. There remains, consequently, a degree of doubt as to Carruba's restoration of "Saustatar" and the historical implications for this text.

Beal has made use of the information in the Aleppo treaty regarding Hattusili (II?) to underpin his argument of continued Hittite political dominance in N. Syria (after Tudhaliya I/II), but he offers no explanation where he is to be inserted and omits him from his king list (p.443). Indeed, a Hattusili II does not fit Beal's scheme since he only postulates two Tudhaliyas as predecessors of Suppiluliuma I (p.441f and n.87).

The most unsatisfactory aspect of Beal's scheme, however, concerns the question of the "grandfather" of the author of KBo I 5 during whose reign Kizzuwatna belonged to Hatti. There seems at present no reason to abandon the theory that Tudhaliya of the Aleppo treaty was the founder of a new dynasty (ch.V.1(a)). The ancestry of Tudhaliya as devised by Beal (Zidanza II = "grandfather", Huzziya II = "father", p.444) is now even more uncertain in view of the events preceding his reign. The circumstances in which Tudhaliya came to the throne must be connected with the dynastic upheavals, during which two Hittite kings were murdered, and therefore would strengthen the case for the theory that Tudhaliya's father had not been king (p.156ff above). This would exclude him as the treaty partner of Sunassura in KBo I 5, whose author was of direct royal descent.
Addendum II

The following article by G. Wilhelm on the dating of the Sunassura treaty has just appeared: "Zur ersten Zeile des Sunassura-Vertrages", Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae, Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag, 1988, 359ff. Wilhelm, who has collated the text in Istanbul, believes that the traces of the first line of KBo I 5 can be restored to "Tudhaliya". He dates the treaty to Tudhaliya II following Gurney's king list, which makes the "grandfather" of KBo I 5 Tudhaliya I of the Aleppo treaty and founder of the new dynasty. But cf. Addendum note p.370.
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Appendix

Second Millennium Anti-Taurus Survey: The Pottery Groups

Among the second millennium Anti-Taurus survey material the following pottery groups or wares could be distinguished (see ch.I, n.45).

1) Karum or Hittite red-slip ware
Paste fine/very fine, well levigated clay with small inclusions but often no visible tempering. Colour orange/buff often with grey core. Surf.: thick red, red-brown slip and burnish. All body sherds from closed shapes (not illustrated).

Occurrence:
(11) Sariz 9
(13) Yalak 13
(15) Pinarlar 3
(17) Yassi H. Tanir 50, 51
(26) Poskoflu 26

2) Grey ware
Fine, dense fabric with tiny white grits or no visible tempering. Colour grey throughout. Surf.: slipped or self-slipped and burnished. Frequently wheel-marked on the inside.

Occurrence
(9) Fraktin 16
(11) Sariz 8
(17) Yassi H. Tanir 6
(28) Iğde 6
(29) Karahüyük Elbistan 3, 4, 9, 56

Comments: Occurs in the Elazığ region, Korucutepe Phase G "gray wheel-marked ware", Griffin 1980, 4. Not included in this group is Fraktin 16.
3) "Hittite" plain ware
Medium to medium fine fabric with 15-20 per cent tempering consisting of fine sand or white grits. Occasionally some chaff tempering. Colour: orange buff, light brown, pink-buff, some with grey core but on the whole well fired. Surf.: both surfaces are generally treated the same, simply smoothed to eliminate wheel-marks. Firing high-medium high.

Occurrence:
(9) Frakin 20, 15, 26, 21, 25, 27, 33
(14) Damlali 19
(11) Sariz 1
(29) Karahüyük 43, 44, 46, 42, 35
(26) Poskoflu 16

4) "Hittite" orange ware
Paste similar to "Hittite" plain ware. Colour: orange, orange/buff in some cases pink. Surf.: slipped or self-slipped and well burnished. Open shapes slipped and burnished on both sides, closed shapes only to the rim. Firing high-medium high.

Occurrence:
(10) Şahmelek 24
(11) Sariz 13
(14) Damlali 10, 25, 31
(17) Yassi H. Tanir 1, 13, 27, 28
(19) Emirilyas 6
(21) Aristil I 12, 13
(24) Afsin 1, 8, 14, 15, 9, 16
(25) Tilafsin 43, 49
(26) Poskoflu 17
(28) Iğde 31, 36, 44
(29) Karhüyük 33, 39, 40, 45
5) **Red/brown burnished or smoothed wares**
Paste similar to "Hittite" plain ware. Larger vessels have heavier tempering which includes grey and white particles (Fraktin 13, Yassi H. Tanir 60). Surf.: red, red-brown, brown slip and well burnished, burnishing usually more pronounced on exterior surfaces. The brown slips frequently contain mica. Some sherds with grey core but on the whole well fired.

**Occurrence:**
- (9) Fraktin 13
- (17) Yassi H. Tanir 60, 23
- (27) Mehre 10, 14, 16
- (15) Pinarlar 7
- (28) Iğde 33
- (25) Tilafsin 22, 41
- (29) Karahüyük 47

6) **Chaff-faced ware**
Paste medium fine. Tempering consists of small white grits and 5-10 per cent chaff (indicated by small holes in section), but most of the chaff temper was applied to the surface of the vessels. Colour buff, orange-buff usually with greyish core. Surf.: covered with cream wash, smoothed. Both surfaces treated in the same manner. Chaff-face marks cover 20 per cent of the surface. Firing medium-low.

**Comments:** Reported from Korucutepe in LBA context (Griffin 1980, 6) and by R. Whallon, *An Archaeological Survey of the Keban Reservoir of East-Central Turkey*, Ann Arbor (1979), 41f.

**Occurrence:**
- (17) Yassi H. Tanir 19, 29, 36, 40
- (29) Karahüyük 22, 24, 41, 65
7) Brown/black gritty cooking ware

Two groups can be distinguished. (1) Thin-walled brown/black
ware. Paste of medium texture, very sandy plus white
grits and mica making the inclusions c.40 per cent.
Surf.: matt, rough to touch, visible wheel marks.
(2) Paste coarse with 50 per cent stone and crushed shell
tempering. Surf.: smoothed and some wheel burnishing
marks. Occasionally brown slip is applied. Firing
low-medium.

Occurrence:

(9) Fraktin 7, 8, 10
(10) Şahmelek 21, 26
(13) Yalak 19
(15) Pinarlar 6
(25) Tilafşin 30
(26) Poskoflu 12
(29) Karahüyük 10, 18

List of Illustrated Pottery (Plates 1-9)

1. (9) Fraktin 27 - "Hittite" plain ware.
2. (9) Fraktin 26 - "Hittite" plain ware.
3. (29) Karahüyük 46 - "Hittite" plain ware.
4. (15) Pinarlar 7 - Brown burnished ware.
5. (29) Karahüyük 43 - "Hittite" plain ware.
6. (29) Karahüyük 44 - "Hittite" plain ware.
7. (28) Iğde 44 - "Hittite" orange ware (smoothed).
8. (10) Şahmelek 27 - "Hittite" plain ware (self-slipped)
9. (29) Karahüyük 40 - "Hittite" orange ware (smoothed
   and burnished)
10. (29) Karahüyük 33 - "Hittite" orange ware (smoothed
    and burnished).
11. (17) Yassi H. Tanir 27 - "Hittite" orange ware
    (self-slipped and wheel burnished).
13. (28) Iğde 33 (lid?) - Brown burnished ware (brown wash).
14. (9) Fraktin 16 - Grey ware (burnished on rim and
    exterior).
15. (9) Fraktin 7 - Black gritty cooking ware.
18. (9) Fraktin 10 - Black gritty cooking ware.
19. (9) Fraktin 8 - Black gritty cooking ware.
20. (11) Sariz 1 - "Hittite" plain ware (cream slip, vertical smoothing marks).
21. (9) Fraktin 6 - "Hittite" plain ware (orange wash and burnishing marks).
22. (17) Yassi H. Tanir 60 (closed shape) - Red burnished ware (orange/red slip medium burnish - incised symbol).
23. (9) Fraktin 25 - (miniature cup) "Hittite" plain ware (crudely made, surface untreated, string-cut).
25. (10) Şahmelek 24 (bowl rim with ledge handle) - "Hittite" orange ware (smoothed).
27. (19) Emerilyas 6 - "Hittite" orange ware (very fine fabric, self-slipped and burnished).
MAP 3 - THE ANTI-TAUROS REGION
Distribution of MBA/LBA sites
(G.H. Brown - AnSt 1967)