

## BÜKLÜKALE IN THE HITTITE PERIOD

*Kimiyoshi MATSUMURA\* - Mark WEEDEN\*\**

### I. Introduction

The site of Büklükale (coordinates 39° 35' 0" N by 33° 25' 42" E) is situated in Kırıkkale province, central Turkey near the town of Karakeçili. The site lies on the western bank of the Kızıl Irmak (Red river), opposite the village of Köprüköy, on the river's western bend, at the modern crossing for the Bâla-Kırşehir road (D260). It is located c. 100km south-east of Ankara and about 50km west of Kaman-Kalehöyük (Fig. 1).

The city is about 500 m wide on the west-east axis and 650 m from north to south. At the eastern part of the city, there is a mound on a rocky hill, which is about 30 m high and 300 by 200 m in area (Fig. 2).

The location of Büklükale seems to have been important from a strategic perspective, because it is situated at the narrowest point of Kızılırmak and one of the most important crossing-points through the ages has been here. There is a Seljuk bridge (Çeşniğir Köprüsü) of the 13th century A.D. and beside it the remains of a Roman bridge.

The Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology (JIAA) carried out surveys at Büklükale in 1991, 2006 and 2008 under the directorship of S. Omura. In 2009 the first excavation began, directed by K. Matsumura.

---

\* Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology, Kaman, Turkey.

\*\* School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, England.

## **II. Background and Purpose of the Excavations at Büklükale**

Since 1986 the JIAA has been continuously excavating at Kaman-Kalehöyük in Kırşehir prefecture in Turkey under the directorship of Dr Sachihiko Omura. Object of the excavations up to now was the clarification of the settlement history of Central Anatolia from the 3rd Millennium B.C. to the Ottoman period. While Kaman provided a great opportunity to better understand the stratigraphy and occupation levels in Central Anatolia, sparse data about the second half of 2nd Millennium BC, the Hittite Empire period, have been brought to light. As such, understanding the cultural transformation that took place from the Hittite Empire period to the Early Iron Age (which is referred to as the “dark age”) has been very difficult.

In an effort to shed more light on the Central Anatolian occupation levels, the Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology has conducted surveys since 1986, and over 1,300 sites have been investigated and registered. Büklükale was specifically investigated in 1991 and 2006 (Omura 1993: 368, Büyükkaletepe; 2007: 50). According to the results of the surveys and of the excavations at Kaman-Kalehöyük, in connection with analysis of the pottery sherds collected from the surface at Büklükale, we believed that Büklükale was one of the important Hittite cities of the late 2nd Millennium BC. These facts clearly indicated that Büklükale was a suitable site to help us better understand the time period gap present at Kaman-Kalehöyük. For this reason, and to better understand Buklukale’s strategic role in the Hittite Empire period, a preliminary survey was conducted under the directorship of Dr. Omura in 2008.

## **III. Research History**

The site was visited in 1926 by E. Forrer (1927: 37, Pl. 29) and in the same year by H.H. von der Osten (1929: 144-5). Especially Forrer pointed out the existence of the lower town. On the rocky hill, he observed the wall with towers. Von der Osten described a lion statue that probably belongs to the Seljuk period. It is now in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations at

Ankara.<sup>1</sup> After that, S. Omura surveyed the site for the JIAA (see above). Furthermore, G. Barjamovic visited this site and discusses it in detail (2010: 18-22, Kapalikaya). He also reported an ancient paved road to the west of the rocky hill, supposed by him to be dated to the Seljuk period.

### **IV. Results of Recent Research Thus Far**

#### **IV-1. Preliminary Survey at Büklükale 2008**

The purpose of the preliminary survey was to prepare the future excavations and the following work was done:

1. Making the topographical map;<sup>2</sup> 2. Geophysical research; 3. Collecting surface finds; 4. Taking an aerial photograph. The results are summarized as follows:

1. Hittite Empire period and Late Iron Age were the predominant levels on the natural rocky hill at Büklükale, where pottery sherds of these two periods were found in the highest numbers. There are some Early Bronze Age pottery sherds.

2. The scatter of pottery sherds showed that there is a lower city around the rocky hill at a scale of 600m from north to south by 500m from east to west. It was occupied only during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Millennium BC, especially Hittite Empire period. There is no indication of an earlier and later occupation there.

3. On the surface at the north, east and south of the rocky hill, stone foundations consisting of large-faced stones were observed. In some places the height of the walls was over 2m. The result of the magnetic survey showed that these foundations extend further.

#### **IV-2. Results of the Excavations in 2009 - 2014**

After the results of the survey in 2008, the first excavation at Büklükale was undertaken. The first purpose of the excavations was to understand the

---

1 Information courtesy Mehmet Arlı in Ankara Ethnology Museum.

2 Courtesy Sabri Aydal.

stratigraphy at the highest point of the rocky hill (Fig. 3) and the results showed four cultural layers of Ottoman period, Iron Age, Middle to Late Bronze Age, and Early Bronze Age.

Besides this, a Byzantine coin was found which was dated to Constantine X (1059-1067 AD)<sup>3</sup>. There were also some Middle Iron Age pottery sherds, so-called Alişar IV painted pottery and some Early Iron Age pottery sherds, so-called “Dark Age” bichrome pottery that is typical for Kaman-Kalehöyük Stratum II. These pottery sherds indicate that Büklükale was also settled in the Early and Middle Iron Age (Matsumura 2011, Resim 9, 10). Also there are some sherds that can be dated to the late Middle Bronze Age, that is the Old Hittite period. In this way, the Chronology of Büklükale can be structured as follows:

1st Stratum: Ottoman and Byzantine period

2nd Stratum: Hellenistic and Iron Age (late, middle and early), and

3rd Stratum: 2nd Mill. BC. (Late and Middle Bronze Age)

4th Stratum: 3rd Mill. BC. (Early Bronze Age)

### **IV-3: Researches Relevant to the 2nd Mill. BC.**

From 2009 to 2014 settlements of the 2nd Mill. BC were found on the rocky hill and in the city area, which was investigated by geomagnetic research. In this article, the research on the Hittite period is presented.

#### **IV-3.1. City Area:**

At Büklükale, there is a city area to the west of the mound. Focused northwest of the city area, a geophysical survey was carried out in 2010 and revised in 2012 (Fig. 4)<sup>4</sup>. Results showed that there were at least three phases of the city walls. The last phase belongs to the Hittite period and there is a typical Hittite fortification wall that contained a “kastenmauer,” towers and city gate. The fortification wall suggests that the Hittite-period occupation at the city area can be dated to the 17th century BC or after (cf. Seeher 2010: 30).

---

3 Courtesy of Sena Mutlu at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara.

4 The geomagnetic research is conducted by Dr. Kazuhiro Kumagai.

Two other city walls seem to be older, likely dating to the Assyrian Colony Period. Since, almost all surface pottery collections at the city area belong to the 2nd Millennium BC, any settlement later than the 2nd Millennium BC is not likely there.

### **IV-3.2.Citadel:**

As for the excavations on the mound at Büklükale, one of the most impressive architectural features is a feature of cyclopean architecture. The wall is over 7m high on the hillside and up to now it has been traced over 50m in length (Fig. 5). The problem for the architectures of this period is the difficulty in dating, because later occupation levels mostly destroyed the upper structures including the floor above the foundation. Therefore in-situ materials above the floor are uncommon and they are not enough to date the architecture.

To understand the entire history of the Cyclopean Architecture, C14 samples were collected from the 3 meters of ash debris outside of it. The C14 samples were measured and analyzed with Bayesian statistics by Dr. Omori at the University of Tokyo, Japan. The results suggest that the cyclopean wall was first constructed in about 2000 BC, and it was abandoned around 1850 BC, possibly because of a conflagration. After the break in occupation, the architecture was rebuilt in about 1800 BC, but at the end it was destroyed again by fire in the first half of the 16th century BC (Fig. 6).

As maintained by the C14 dating, there are two occupation phases for the Cyclopean Architecture in the Assyrian Colony Period at Büklükale and each phase is almost comparable with Karum-Kaniş II and Ib. Furthermore, the dating results indicate that at Büklükale occupation continued during the gap from the end of the Assyrian Colony period to the beginning of the Hittite period. Future research will contribute to helping us better understand this unknown transitional period in the history of Central Anatolia.

### **Hittite Period**

As for the Hittite Period, up to 2012 no occupation layer was found, that could be dated to the Hittite Empire Period. However, a fragment of a Hittite cuneiform

clay tablet (Fig. 7: BK100147) was found in 2010 from the fill outside of the cyclopean wall. From the paleographic evidence, Dr. Mark Weeden proposed that it was written in the early 14th or late 15th centuries (Weeden 2013). This is the most westerly known discovery of any Hittite tablet. On the tablet, he found two interesting phrases: “these lands” and “your country”. So, it may be suggested that a diplomatic letter that might have been written between the great king of the Hittites and a king of the land, possibly in Western Anatolia.

Additionally, during the excavation at the northern edge of the rocky mound in 2012, three bullae with hieroglyphic signs were found in secondary contexts (Fig. 8: from left BK120173, BK120195, BK120150). The impressions seem to come from two seals, but share the same hieroglyphic signs, which show the woman’s name “Tarhundawiya.” And Dr. Weeden has tentatively dated these three bullae to the 15th century BC (Weeden in 2016).

According to the results in 2012, we extended the excavation area to the northwest in 2013 and we expected Hittite layers in this area (N4W2). Then we found a new burnt layer (Fig. 9) and it is likely dated to 15th century or later, because above the wall W228 in the burnt layer a second fragment of a Hittite tablet (Fig. 10: BK130111) was found. According to Dr. Weeden, a dating to the 15th or early 14th century is not excluded (Weeden in press). Although very few words are understandable, Dr. Weeden points out that there is probably a broken word “(My) sun”, meaning “my majesty”. According to this word, it is plausible that this tablet is a letter that was addressed to the Hittite king. Moreover, it suggests that the Hittite king was perhaps in residence at Büklükale on at least one occasion. Up to this point only discontinuous occupation was attested in the Hittite period of Büklükale.

In 2014 we searched for the continuation of the Hittite burnt layer to the north. But there, a half-basement styled house of the late Iron Age (R97) destroyed the most part of the burnt layer (Fig. 11). However, after removing it, we could identify two more architectural layers under the Hittite burnt layer, from which the fragment of a Hittite tablet was found (Fig. 12). These were provisionally numbered I to III. 1st one is the Hittite burnt layer, 2nd one is the unburnt architectural layer under it, and 3rd one is possible the same with the 1<sup>st</sup> one. The last two might belong to the Hittite period or earlier.

In addition to that, at Büklükale there are quite important philological finds, mostly from the secondary contexts. In 2014, during the removal of the Iron age fortification wall in N3E0, a seal impression of so-called anonymous Tabarna-style Seal (Fig. 13: BK140138) was found. According to the study by Dr. Mark Weeden, there is no king's name on it, but the following inscription: "Seal of xxx Great [King/Queen]. He who changes (it) will die." In the center there is a cuneiform sign that means "goodness." Its dating is a matter of argument. There were many changes in Hittite royal seals. The first type of the Hittite royal seal is the so-called anonymous Tabarna seal and according to the Land Donation tablets from Boğazköy, Tarsus and İnandık (Carruba 1993: Abb. 2; Goldman 1956: 253-4, Pl. 404.64, 408.64; Balkan 1973: Res. 1, 8), it was used under the reign of Zidanda to Telipinu, that is the later part of the Old Hittite period, in 16th century BC, but possibly used until the beginning of 14th century BC. It was also found at Ortaköy, Maşat Höyük and Kuşaklı (Süel 2009: Pl. XXI, Fig. 7, 8; Alp 1980: Abb. 2, Taf. 3; Müller-Karpe 1997: Abb. 18).

In 2014, one more important seal impression was found that attests the occupation of the 13th century BC at Büklükale. This is sealing with a hieroglyphic inscription, on it a winged female figure in profile, right-facing with a horned helmet (Fig. 14: BK140045). Her left leg is walking forward naked, while the right leg is covered by a skirt. Winged figures are rare in Bronze Age Hittite iconography, but at Yazılıkaya you can find a similar figure as Šauška=Ištar (Bittel et al. 1975: Taf. 23, 2. Relief 38). There are some examples from Nişantepe at Boğazköy (Herbordt 2005: Abb. 42 g, h, i). If you look carefully at the edge of the impression, then you can find out that its edge is not straight, but slightly curved. Such a curved edge is very similar to the edge of the signet ring. Examples are found at Ras Shamra, Ugarit (Boehmer 1975: Abb. 143g; Schaeffer 1956: Fig. 54), and also there is one gold example in the Ashmolean museum (Boehmer 1975: Abb. 337e). According to the hieroglyphic inscription, "Saluwanda, Great Shepherd" that is translated by Dr. Mark Weeden, this sealing is probably to be dated to the 13th century BC (Weeden 2016), and it may prove the occupation at Büklükale in that time period.

## **Conclusion:**

After 6 years of excavations, taking in combination, several types of finds, with help of philological finds, we have now obtained evidence for the occupation of almost the entire Hittite period at Büklükale. There is still a small quantity of evidence for Hittite occupation. In future seasons, we plan to excavate towards the northern part of the rocky hill to understand the Hittite history at Büklükale better.

## **Historical Büklükale: An Overview of the Epigraphic Finds.<sup>5</sup>**

Even before excavations at the site began the site of Büklükale on the Kızılırmak had been the subject of controversial debates regarding its place in the Old Assyrian and Hittite worlds, particularly with regard to its name during those periods. The two proposals for its identification are based on differing assessments of the spatial extent of Old Assyrian trade, and give different weight to the Hittite versus Old Assyrian evidence. Absolutely key here are the locations of Puruṣhattum and Durhumit in the Old Assyrian period. Traditionally Puruṣhattum has been located at Acemhöyük, while G. Barjamovic has it much further west in the region of Bolvadin.<sup>6</sup> For Barjamovic Büklükale is to be equated with Wahšušana, a key staging post between Puruṣhattum and Durhumit on the Assyrian copper-route, where there was supposed to have been a ferry.<sup>7</sup>

Forlanini on the other hand locates the city of Durhumit itself at Büklükale, and gives especial weight to the Hittite period evidence of a geographically organised list of offerings taken by the king for various religious institutions which lists cities belonging to the land of Durmitta (= Durhumit).<sup>8</sup> Included here (KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53) is the city of Nenassa, which is usually

---

5 For publication of the epigraphic finds from Büklükale from 2010 to 2014 with further discussion and documentation, see Weeden 2013 and 2016

6 Barjamovic 2010: 21-22; 2011: 357-378.

7 Barjamovic 2010: 18-22; 2011: 401-402. The cautious notes sounded *ibid.* fn. 1635 regarding the first results of the excavation are to be updated on the basis of the more recent findings of the excavations regarding the large building on the top of the mound which appears to have been founded around 2000 BC. There is no chronological obstacle to Büklükale being Wahšušana in the Middle Bronze Age. However, as we will see below, Büklükale would appear to have thrived during the Hittite period, whereas Wahsusana is only once mentioned in Hittite texts.

8 Forlanini 1977: 205-208; 2008: 68-74; 2009: 56-58; 2010: 135-139, older literature fn. 6



thought to be in the region of the south-western bend of the Kızılırmak.<sup>9</sup> Barjamovic, however, has Durhumit up in the north-east, in the region of Merzifon.<sup>10</sup> The issue of Nenassa he solves by positing that there are simply two or even more of these.<sup>11</sup> If homonymy can be invoked in the case of Nenassa, it might be possible to invoke it also in the case of Durmitta, although Barjamovic contends that homonymy decreases the more important the settlement is.<sup>12</sup> However, this “rule” does not seem to apply to the town of Hattusa known from the Sahurunuwa land-donation, which is reasonably clearly not the capital city Hattusa.<sup>13</sup> A western Durmitta would explain the other western associations of Durmitta in KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53 of which the most convincing are [Malli]daskuriya and Piddaniyassa, even though one of these is an albeit probable restoration and the other is located through equation with Lycaonian Pitnissos in Strabo, which is itself unclear in its location.<sup>14</sup> The adduced Luwian connections of Hittite Durmitta, such as the ritualists Mallidunna (CTH 403) and Zuwi (CTH 412) who are supposed to come from Durmitta, would also be unexpected, although not impossible, with a north-eastern location for the city.<sup>15</sup>

A detailed review of the Hittite evidence for the location of Durmitta is beyond the scope of this contribution, although a couple of further points can be made in support of a north-eastern Hittite Durmitta as well, both illustrating the dubious nature of the Hittite evidence. Barjamovic’s proposal fits a location of Durmitta that is suggested by

---

9 Barjamovic 2011: 323; 327-331. NB: correct “KUB 48.103+” in Weeden 2013.

10 Barjamovic 2011: 242-267.

11 Barjamovic 2011: 249-250.

12 Barjamovic loc. cit.

13 KUB 26.43 obv. 15 (Imparati 1977: 24). Imparati (ibid. 52) argues that Hattusa is here mentioned as a point of reference for the other place-names, but this does not seem evident from the text itself, where the mention of Hattusa is precisely in the same style as the other names listed. Similarly against this being the capital Hattusa are Forlanini 2012a: 137 and Gander 2014: 380 fn. 58.

14 Strabo’s account covers a wide area, so it is not necessary that Pitnissos would have been too far away to be included in the land of Durmitta if it were in this area (Strabo *Geography* 12.6.1). There is serious doubt attached to the identification of Uwalma from KUB 48.105+ obv. 31’ with the Ulama that was destroyed by Hattusili I, given that there are numerous places called Walma, but only one Ulama.

15 Hutter 2003: 249-250. According to Hutter the ritual of Mallidunna belongs to a Hattian cultural level, while Zuwi belongs rather to the Luwian sphere due to using Luwian phrases. The name Mallidunna at least appears to be Luwian, although Del Monte notes that this is an unexpected context for a Luwian name. (Del Monte 2002: 63).

the Treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Šattiwazza of Mittani. In this the “people/troops” (ÉRIN<sup>MEŠ</sup>) of Durmitta move into the land of Isuwa, i.e. into the region of Elazığ, something that they would only be able to do with great difficulty if they were coming from the western Kızılırmak.<sup>16</sup> However, this passage is still poorly understood and it is difficult to work out who is going into Isuwa from where, particularly as other areas with western associations are mentioned alongside those with eastern ones.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the unassigned historical fragment KBo 50.209, 6’ mentions Durmitta after Mount Sakduna in l. 5’. This may be identical with the Mount Sak(ka)dunuwa known from the Maşat letters, but it is unclear if the listing has any geographical relevance as the next paragraph mentions Attarimma and Hupisna in consecutive lines.<sup>18</sup> These are unlikely to have been neighbours, either to each other or to Durmitta.

There is no definitive resolution to either the location of Durmitta or the name of Büklükale in sight. One should never exclude that there are further possibilities than the two main candidates that have been proposed for the latter. The excavations at Büklükale have revealed extensive palatial remains for the period from around 2000 BC to the beginning of the sixteenth century, thus providing adequate evidence for occupation for the Middle Bronze Age. Although it is large by Anatolian standards Büklükale does not seem big enough to accommodate somewhere as important as Durhumit must have been in the Old Assyrian period, especially when compared with the vast mound of Yassihöyük some 60km to the south-east towards Kırşehir, or indeed the huge mound at Kırşehir itself.<sup>19</sup> Until recently Hittite architectural layers at Büklükale have been elusive, mostly having been destroyed by Iron

---

16 KBo 1.1 obv. 10-13 (Beckman 1999:43; Barjamovic 2011: 128; de Martino 2012: 379).

17 West: Arawanna, Kalasma, possibly Timna (KUR<sup>URU</sup>*tim-im-na* KBo 1.1 obv. 12, rather than Timana, thus unlikely to be Tummana). East: Alha, Hurma, Mt Harana, half of the land of Tegarama, Teburziya, Hazga, Armatana.

18 Alp 1991: 32-35.

19 To give an idea of this: the mound at Yassihöyük (625 x 500m) is roughly as large as the whole site of Büklükale (650 x 500m). It is also likely that Yassihöyük had a lower city beyond the mound. For a summary of mounds in the area see Barjamovic 2011: 398. This is not to suggest that Durhumit was located at any of these, but merely to give an idea of the settlement hierarchy in the area.

Age structures. This might support the Barjamovic identification, given that Wahšušana seems to have dwindled in importance during the Hittite period, only being mentioned briefly once in a fragmentary context.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, as explained above, the evidence for Hittite occupation levels is growing year by year. It is thus quite possible that neither identification is correct. The epigraphic finds thus far hint at a continued importance for Büklükale in the Hittite period, whatever its name was.

The two or three Hittite architectural layers that have been identified at the time of this conference are badly damaged, and the artefacts mostly found in secondary contexts. Thus it is good to start with the only possibly epigraphic artefact that does have a clear context and is also the earliest, belonging to the early 16th century BC, the last phase of the palatial building on the top of the mound that seems to have been built around 2000 BC. This phase belongs to the period before the two or three architectural layers that must belong to the Hittite period, and the dating of the find has interesting ramifications for our comprehension of the beginning of the Hittite period at Büklükale. This seal-impression, found on two objects, presents a glyptic style that accords closely with a group of seals and seal-impressions referred to as the Tyskiewicz group.<sup>21</sup> The most similar objects to this thus far are the Tyskiewicz seal itself, a seal-impression from Eskiyaapar excavated in 1974, and one from Boğazköy (Fig. 15).<sup>22</sup> It remains debatable whether this sealing actually represents hieroglyphic writing, although the symbols bear some resemblance to signs known later from the hieroglyphic sign-repertoire. More importantly, both this and the Tyskiewicz stamp-seal appear to contain symbols arranged in twos, one over the other, an arrangement which reminds us of the bipartite structure of so many Hittite names (e.g. Tarhunda-ziti). Later the model of writing a name in the centre of a seal on the vertical axis became the normal organisational principle for writing Hittite names. It would be interesting if we could see the earliest dated

---

20 KUB 23.116 obv. 7' (Del Monte and Tischler 1978: 471), in connection a journey from Mount Zippasla, see Barjamovic 2011: 350.

21 Alexander 1973-1976.

22 Esy 74-82 (Dinçol and Dinçol 1988: 88); SBo 2.187. The Boğazköy example shows much similarity in the inner decorative rim, but it is unclear whether it has one or two symbols in its centre.

example of this procedure here.

The Tyskiewicz group, specifically the Büklükale sealing and the stamp-seal on Tyskiewicz, are comparable to seal-styles that are found at Konya-Karahöyük, although the arrangement with the two symbols in the centre is not found there.<sup>23</sup> For this reason the Tyskiewicz group has been dated to the time after Konya-Karahöyük on the underlying assumption that stylistic developments in iconography proceed on a sequential basis.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, Konya-Karahöyük itself had been dated by some to the period after Kültepe Ib on similar grounds.<sup>25</sup> Whether this assumption concerning stylistic change through time corresponds to reality or not, it is interesting that we now have a carbon-date for this example of the Tyskiewicz group at least. A dating to the early 16th century BC would definitively place this seal-type, which can be argued to be an early form of typically Hittite seal-design, within the early Hittite period. Its close relationship with other seals and sealings from the central Hittite area demonstrates a tight iconographic unity over this space. This kind of similarity in iconographic practices over widely different topographical regions was not something new in Anatolia, but if one accepts that elements of hieroglyphic writing are beginning to be used, it would make it difficult to imagine that these similarities are not at this stage to be associated with the emergence of the nascent Hittite state.

It is unclear under what circumstances a building that used such sealings during its last phases would have been burned to the ground and not used again in the early days of Hittite statehood. One might speculate that this was to do with the unification efforts of Labarna or Hattusili I, but these seem a little early to correspond to the current interpretation of the carbon-data. Or one might think that this happened in the course of one of the many internal conflicts of the Old Hittite period. What is interesting, however, is not so much that this probable destruction might have been associated with one or the other historical event, but that the large building at Büklükale continued in use right through the end of the so-called Old Assyrian period

---

23 E.g. Alp 1968: Taf. 103, no. 294

24 Boehmer and Güterbock 1987: 35-40. Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 3.

25 Boehmer 1989; 1996; contra Alp 1993.

well into what can fairly confidently be identified as the Hittite era, with no destruction or otherwise remarkable change marking any transition between the two.

All other epigraphic finds from Büklükale come from secondary contexts. In some way they must be attached to the Hittite levels excavated thus far, although this is purely speculative at this stage. All but one of the finds probably belong on stylistic grounds to the period before the early 14th century BC and probably also later than the early 16th century, when the large building on the top of the mound seems to have gone out of use, but there are significant problems associated with obtaining a more precise dating within this period.

Three clay lumps with impressions of two seals are probably to be counted among the older finds (Fig. 8) bearing a hieroglyphic name in the centre, which were all found in Iron Age fill in the north-west of the mound (N7 W5). The name is written with the sign for the storm-god (L. 199), followed by the sign for the vine (L. 160) and must represent the name Tarhunda-wiya. This woman's name itself was not attested until recently in cuneiform sources from Anatolia but is now found on a Land Grant from the "Westbau"-archive at Boğazköy, which dates to the late years of Telipinu or the earlier years of Alluwamna.<sup>26</sup> However, there is no reason to think that there is any identity in the person, nor that the name would have been particularly rare or restricted to one period, as it is a completely normal formation. Its non-appearance in Anatolian cuneiform documents up until now must be an accident of discovery. As far as the dating of these sealings is concerned, the decorative rim appears to indicate an earlier dating, while the hieroglyphic centre appears to favour a later dating, depending on one's interpretation of the development of hieroglyphic sign-forms and orthography. Provisionally one might entertain a 15th century dating for this group.

Quite possibly from a similar or slightly later period is a cuneiform sealing of the type commonly referred to as "Tabarna(-style)". The appellation "Tabarna" for the Hittite Great King, or "Tawananna" for the Great Queen,

---

26 StBoT Bh 4: 22, 51, see Rüter and Wilhelm 2012: 144.

is either broken off or it was never there in the first place. In the last case this would mean that strictly speaking this is not a Tabarna or Tawananna-seal, but instead something much more rare. The central field contains the sign SIG<sub>5</sub> “goodness”, which sometimes occurs in combination with the cuneiform sign TI “life”, and appears to alternate with the hieroglyphic symbols triangle “goodness” and Ankh “life”. The Tabarna-sealings which are used on the Land Grants from Boğazköy never use SIG<sub>5</sub> in this way, it only appears on clay lumps, bullae and mushroom-shaped objects, which are thus more difficult to date. Examples have been found at Ortaköy-Sapinuwa, Kayalı Pınar-Samuha and Boğazköy-Hattusa.<sup>27</sup> Unusually for this kind of seal, however, the example from Büklükale also contains a curse formula: *ša uš-pa-aḥ-ḥu* BA.ÚŠ “whoever changes (it) will die”.

There is, however, a problem with interpreting this cuneiform sealing as a regular example of the impression of a Tabarna-seal. One would expect that all of the five fragmentary impressions on the clay object found at Büklükale came from the same seal. However, the impression on face B does not fit the regular sign-forms required for the expected writing <sup>NA4</sup>KIŠIB *ta-ba-ar-na/ta-wa-na-an-na* (MUNUS.)LUGAL GAL, “seal of the Tabarna/Tawananna, Great King/Queen”. The signs after the probable KIŠIB on the very fragmentary face B, especially when combined with the traces on face C, remind us only of a sealing found on a mushroom-shaped clay object that was excavated in at Kuşaklı-Sarissa 1998, which was published in 2014 (see Fig. 16).<sup>28</sup> Unfortunately here too the reading is disputed, partially due to damage, but also due to the fact that all proposals for its reading are completely unparalleled. In the publication A. Müller-Karpe presents two alternatives for reading the seal, the second of which originates with E. Rieken and J. Lorenz:

- (1) <sup>NA4</sup>KIŠIB *uš/iš-kán-t[a]* MUNUS.LUGAL GAL<sup>29</sup>  
“seal of the anointed one, the Great Queen”

---

27 Süel 2011: 404, 409-10; Müller-Karpe 2009 Plate XI fig. 17; SBo 1.76-83.

28 Müller-Karpe 2014.

29 Müller-Karpe 2014: 301-302, transliteration *uš/iš-kán-ta/ša*.

(2) <sup>NA4</sup>KIŠIB <sup>GIŠ</sup>PISAN ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL GAL<sup>30</sup>

“seal of the box of the Great Queen”

Müller-Karpe interprets the first reading, which is his own, as including a word which is a designation of the status of the Great Queen before she became Tawananna, the *\*iskanta*. This unattested word would be derived according to this theory from the Hittite verb “to smear, to anoint”, and would thus mean the “anointed one”. This interesting theory has the advantage that it allows us to read the text as indicating the seal of a person, but the disadvantage of constructing a good deal of albeit plausible social, political and linguistic content in order to be able to read the signs. However, it is certainly the case that all identifiable cases of texts on seals indicate the person who owns the seal rather than the object sealed by it. This is the disadvantage of the second reading, which fits the traces better when compared with face B of the sealed clay lump from Büklükale. In fact, we could go as far as to say that the traces on face B exclude reading (1). One way out of this impasse might be to assume that the “box-seal” is a specific type of seal belonging to the queen, but this is an ad hoc solution, and writings such as “seal of the box/basket” to denote a particular type of seal are not found either in Hittite texts or in Mesopotamia to our knowledge, although seals and sealed documents are often attested in connection with boxes or baskets.<sup>31</sup>

For the moment we can do no more than note the similarity to the sealing from Kuşaklı-Sarissa. In the case of the Büklükale sealing it is also impossible to say for sure whether this was actually a seal that belonged to the king or to the queen, although the only comparative evidence available points to it being the queen. It is possible that a better solution for the reading of both sealings is yet to be found. Whatever the reading, it is extraordinary that only these two examples of this text have thus far been found on a cuneiform seal. This, of course, makes it all the more difficult to date them. The Kuşaklı example comes from a level that has been dated to the end of the Middle Kingdom, thus presumably the late 15th or early 14th century. It is of

---

30 Müller-Karpe 2014: 302-303.

31 CAD P 422.

course possible that it could have been made a good deal earlier, but kept for many years. The fact that both sealings contain the curse formula and the lack of dividing lines between the outer and inner cuneiform rings may or may not indicate that they are slightly earlier than other cuneiform seals with central SIG<sub>5</sub> that have been found at Kayalı Pınar and Ortaköy, but the evidence is very slim. Again it is difficult to imagine a dating earlier than the 15th century and later than the early 14th century, with the late 15th century being possibly the best guess at the moment. The fact that it was found at the site in the first place makes us think that Büklükale played host to representatives of the royal family during the time of its use.

### **Clay Tablets**

Thus far two clay tablets with fragments of Hittite letters have been found at Büklükale. Neither of them was found in situ, one being excavated from Ottoman fill on the east side of the mound in 2010, the other being found in 2013 on top of the base of a burnt wall dated to the Hittite period by the find of the self-same Hittite tablet when considered along with the stratigraphy of the area between it and burned level of the early 16th century BC (Fig. 10). The tablet in this case itself is so fragmentary that a secure dating is hardly possible. Only the whole of the left edge of the obverse and some of the right edge of the reverse are preserved. However, it includes two features that may indicate that it should be earlier rather than later: the writing starts on an upper edge and the sign EN has a typically “Middle Hittite” form. However, tablets with writing beginning on the upper edge are attested, although rarely, in the later periods.<sup>32</sup> The use of the older sign-form could just as easily be the effect of the scribe having recently copied an older text or have some other ground that makes it irrelevant for dating purposes. A dating to the early 14th or 15th century is thus not excluded, however, with the only relevant dating criteria pointing in that direction, albeit not categorically.

Further interest is aroused by the very clear appearance of the signs <sup>D</sup>UTU just after the first line-divider after the greeting (see Fig. 4). It is tempting to restore this as <sup>D</sup>UTU-[ŠI] “my majesty”, which would thus appear in the nominative or vocative. If this restoration is correct we would here have a

---

<sup>32</sup> Waal 2010: 59.



letter that was addressed to his majesty either while he was at Büklükale, or was stored there for some reason. Either way, the appearance of this very fragmentary letter reinforces the impression that Büklükale was a strategically important site with royal connections.

The tablet fragment found in 2010 also appears to agree with the impression made by this even more fragmentary piece (BKT 1, see Fig. 7).<sup>33</sup> Again the evidence is slim, as the larger part of the tablet is not preserved, including the introductory address. However, there is sufficient text preserved to be able to make a provisional palaeographic assessment, which would concur with a dating to the early 14th or late 15th centuries (Weeden 2013). The language of the tablet also contains older features, among which one may mention the form *issumeni* “we will perform”, which was not previously attested but had been predicted by Hoffner and Melchert in their grammar.<sup>34</sup> The bulk of the text is very difficult to understand and open to interpretation, even as far as regards the tenor of the whole piece: whether a hostile exchange regarding detention of messengers or a relatively friendly piece of correspondence in the run-up to a diplomatic marriage or other international festivity. The international character of the letter is guaranteed by the isolated occurrences of *KUR-KA* “your country” and *kī KUR<sup>HI.A</sup>* “these countries” on the otherwise entirely broken reverse. We submit that in Hittite texts only a king or a god would say *KUR-IA* “my country”, therefore *KUR-KA* must be addressed to a similarly high person, either a foreign king (of the West?) or to the Hittite king himself.

### A final sealing

In 2014 a sealing was uncovered on a small clay lump (BK 1400045) in a secondary context at Büklükale (Fig. 14). The seal-face is rectangular although with slightly curved horizontal edges. It may derive from a signet ring, although it is a little large for this by contrast to other examples. Another reason for thinking it might not come from a ring is that the original seal seems to have been re-cut, as part of the surface is noticeably higher

---

33 Weeden 2013.

34 GHJ §13.15.

than the rest. Most signet rings are made of metal, in which case the original would in this case have to be made of a very soft metal such as gold, or not be a signet ring at all. The seal contains an extraordinary figure of a mostly naked winged goddess, right-facing with prominent vulva in the typical striding posture known from Syrian manifestations, but with an upper body arranged according to Hittite rather than Syrian iconographic norms. The seal-face is divided into boxes, the outer of which contain rosettes and similar decorative elements. In the middle there is another box to the right of the striding winged goddess, which consists of the raised portion which may have been re-cut. In this box we find hieroglyphs of a typically 13th century shape and form which we read:

L. 417-*tà* MAGNUS.PASTOR

*Saluwanta*, Great Shepherd

The sign L. 417 can be read as *SAL(U)*, following a suggestion by M. Forlanini which can now be augmented with further evidence.<sup>35</sup> Comparative evidence suggests the name might be *Saluwanta*, which is not attested as such as a personal name in Hittite cuneiform sources but belongs with Old Assyrian *Saluwanta* (Laroche Noms 1089), the eponymous mountain name attested in Hittite texts, as well as with names such as *Salu(wa)* now attested on a Land Grant.

However we date the iconography of the winged goddess, the hieroglyphs, especially the form of the sign *tà*, appear fairly clearly to be late, i.e. late 14th or 13th centuries BC. This is considerably later than any of the other epigraphic material from Büklükale appears to be. The mainly civilian official MAGNUS PASTOR has been thought to be identical with the mainly military title “Great Shepherd” (GAL NA.GAD).<sup>36</sup> While this overlap of civilian and military functions should not necessarily surprise us, it is clear that whoever held either title was an extremely high official.

---

35 Forlanini 1987: 74-76. See Weeden (2016) for collection of evidence, particularly the name *Salu(wa)* at KBo 32.136 obv. 6', and the name written L.417-*u(wa)* on seals from Kaman-Kalehöyük.

36 Bossert 1960: 441f.; Hawkins apud Herbordt 2005: 305. Cautious about the equation of the cuneiform and hieroglyphic titles: Imparati 1994: 317; van den Hout 1995: 234.

This remains a lonely indicator for the moment, presumably removed from its original context by Iron Age excavations, but nonetheless a possible hint that Büklükale continued to have some strategic and/or civil administrative importance during the later part of the Empire period, the later 14th and 13th centuries BC. It remains to be seen whether this continuity of iconographic and glyptic material through the Hittite period is matched by the dating of the individual architectural layers that are emerging at Büklükale.

It is currently impossible to align the epigraphic finds to attested architectural layers securely. However, a very preliminary schematic phasing might be suggested

Büklükale Provisional Hittite period	Artefact	Approximate date of artefact
Early-Old Hittite:	Tyskiewicz-style sealing	Early 16th century BC
Hittite phase III or II:	Tarhundawiya sealings	Early 15th century?
Hittite phase III or II:	Cuneiform sealing	Later 15th century?
	Cuneiform tablets	Later 15th/early 14th
Hittite phase I:	Saluwanta sealing	Later 14th/13th centuries

Naturally this extremely tentative sketch will have to change with the discovery of new layers, and hopefully of further artefacts with more secure contexts.

Abbreviations:

CAD: *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*. Published by the Oriental Institute. Chicago, Illinois. From 1956.

GHL: Hoffner, H.A. and Melchert, H.C. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Languages of the Ancient Near East. Winona Lake. 2008.

KBo: Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi. Leipzig/Berlin. From 1916.

KUB: Keilschrifturkunden aus Boğazköy. Berlin. From 1921.

SBo 1: H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy. Erster Teil. Die Königssiegel*

*der Grabungen bis 1938*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 5. Berlin. 1940. Re-print Osnabrück 1967.

SBo 2: H.G. Güterbock, Siegel aus Boğazköy. Zweiter Teil. Die Königssiegel und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 7. Berlin. 1942. Re-print Osnabrück 1967.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Alexander, R. L. 1973-1976

The Tyskiewicz Group of Stamp Cylinders. *Anatolica* 5, 141-215.

Alp, S. 1968

*Zylinder- und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya*. Ankara.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1991

*Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1993

Eine k̄arum-zeitliche Gußform und die Siegel von Karahöyük. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 185-198.

Balkan, K. 1973:

İnandık'ta 1966 Yılında bulunan Eski Hitit Çağına ait bir Bağış Belgesi. Ankara.

Barjamovic, G. 2010

Sites, Routes and Historical Geography in Central Anatolia. Singer, I. (ed.) *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Tel Aviv. 10-25.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2011

*A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period*. Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 25. Copenhagen.

- Beckman, G. 1999 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 7. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Bittel, K. et al. 1975 *Das Hethitische Festsheiligtum YAZILIKAYA*. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša IX. Berlin.
- Boehmer, R.M. 1989 Zur Datierung des Karahöyük. In K. Emre, M. Mellink, and N. Özgüç, (eds), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç / Tahsin Özgüç'e armağan*. Ankara. 39-44
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1996 Nochmals zur Datierung der Glyptik von Karahöyük Schicht I. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 46, 17-22.
- Boehmer, R.M. and Güterbock, H.G. 1987  
*Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy. Grabungskampagnen 1931-1939, 1952-1978*. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 14/2. Berlin: Mann.
- Bossert, H. Th. 1960 Ist die bildlische Schrift im wesentlichen entziffert? *Orientalia* NS 29, 423-442.
- Carruba, O. 1993 Zur Datierung der ältesten Schenkungsurkunden und der anonymen Tavarna-Siegel, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 71-85.
- Dincol, A. and Dincol, B. 1988  
'Hieroglyphische Siegel und Siegelabdrücke aus Eskiyapar'. Neu, E. and Rüter, Chr. (eds) *Documentum Asiae Minoris. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden. 87-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2008 *Die Prinzen- und Beamtsiegel aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy-Ḫattuša vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende der Grossreichszeit*. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 22.

Mainz am Rhein.

- Forlanini, M. 1977 L'Anatolia nordoccidentale nell'impero eteo. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 18, 197-225.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1987 Le mont Sarpa. *Hethitica* 7, 73-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2008 The historical geography of Anatolia and the transition from the Kārum-period to the early Hittite Empire. Dercksen, J.-G. (ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian period*. PIHANS 111. Leiden. 57-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2009 On the Middle Kızıl Irmak, II. Pecchioli Daddi, F., Torri, G. and Corti, C. (ed.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period. New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7-9 February 2007)*. Studia Asiana 5. Rome. 39-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2010 New Evidence and Recent Suggestions on the Anatolian Geography in the Old Assyrian Period. Dönmez, Ş. (ed.) *DUB.SAR É.DUB.BA.A. Veysel Donbaz'a Sunulan Yazılar/Studies Presented in Honour of Veysel Donbaz*. Istanbul, 135-142.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2012a The Historical Geography of Western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age: still an Open Question. *Orientalia* 81, 133–137.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2012b Review of Barjamovic 2011. *Biblioteca Orientalis* 69, 290-299.

- Forrer, E. 1927      *Ergebnisse einer archäologischen Reise in Kleinasien, 1926. Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft* 65, 27-44.
- Gander, M. 2014      Tlos, Oinoanda and the Hittite Invasion of the Lukka lands. Some Thoughts on the History of North-Western Lycia in the Late Bronze and Iron Ages. *Klio* 96(2), 369-415.
- Goldman, H. 1956      *Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus. Vol. II.* Princeton.
- Herbordt, S. 2005      *Die Prinzen-und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archive in Hattusa.* Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 19. Mainz am Rhein.
- Hutter, M. 2003      Aspects of Luwian Religion. H.C. Melchert (ed.) *The Luwians.* HdO I/68, 211-280.
- Imparati, F. 1977      *Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV.* *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 32. Paris.
- Hout, Th. van den 1995 *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung.* StBoT 38. Wiesbaden.
- Imparati, F. 1994      Mizramuwa. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie.* Bd. 8. Berlin: De Gruyter. 316-317.
- Martino, S. de 2012      Malatya and Išuwa in Hittite Texts: New Elements of Discussion. *Origini* 34, 375-383.
- Matsumura, K. 2011      Büklükale Kazısı 2009, 32. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı 4. Cilt, 411-420.

Monte, G.F. del and Tischler, J. 1978

*Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte.* RGTC 6. Wiesbaden.

\_\_\_\_\_2002

Sui rituali di Mallidunna di Turmita. Taracha P. (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday.* Warsaw, 63-75.

Müller-Karpe, A. 1997 Untersuchungen in Kuşaklı 1996. *MDOG* 129: 103-142.

\_\_\_\_\_2009

Recent Research on Hittite Archaeology in the "Upper Land". F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, C. Corti (ed.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period – New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7-9 February 2007).* Studia Asiana 5. Rome. 109-117, Plates VII-XII.

\_\_\_\_\_2014

Hethitische Großköniginnen Des Mittleren Reichs Im Spiegel Neuer Siegelfunde. In N. Çınardalı-Karaaslan, A. Aykurt, N. Kolankaya-Bostancı and Y.H. Erbil (eds) *Anadolu Kültürlerine Bir Bakış/Some Observations on Anatolian Cultures. Armağan Erkanal'a Armağan/Compiled in Honor of Armağan Erkanal.* Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 299-308.

Omura, S. 1993

1992 Yılı İç Anadolu'da Yürütülen Yüzey Araştırmaları. *KST* XI, 311-336.

\_\_\_\_\_2007

Preliminary report of the general survey in Central Anatolia (2006). *Anatolian Archaeological Studies* 16, 45-83.



- Osten von der, H.H. 1929 *Explorations in Central Anatolia. Season of 1926.*  
Oriental Institute Publications 5. Chicago.
- Rüster, Chr. and Wilhelm, G. 2012  
*Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige.*  
Studien su den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 4.  
Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaeffer, C.F.A. (ed.) 1956  
*Ugaritica III.* Paris.
- Seeher, J. 2010  
Wie viele Türme braucht eine Stadt? Überlegungen  
zum Aufwand der hethitischen Befestigungsanlagen  
in der späten Bronzezeit. In J. Lorentzen, F.Pirson,  
P. Schneider and U. Wulf-Rheidt (eds) *Neue  
Forschungen zu antiken Stadtbefestigungen im  
östlichen Mittelmeerraum und im Vorderen Orient,*  
BYZAS 10, 27-43.
- Süel, A. 2011  
Ortaköy-Şapinuva Tabarna-Mühürleri. Ş. Dönmez  
and A. Öztan (eds) *Knowledge Production from the  
Black Sea to the Euphrates. Studies Presented in  
Honour of Önder Bilgi.* 403-414.
- Waal, W. 2010  
*The Source as Object. Studies in Hittite Diplomats.*  
PhD Thesis. University of Leiden.
- Weeden, M. 2013  
A Hittite Tablet from Büklükale. *Anatolian  
Archaeological Studies* 18, 19-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2016  
Hittite Epigraphic Finds from Büklükale. *Anatolian  
Archaeological Studies* 19, 81-104.

FIGURES:

Fig. 1: Map Showing the Location of Büklükale

Fig. 2: Aerial Photograph of Büklükale

Fig. 3: Topographical Map of Büklükale

Fig. 4: Result of the Geomagnetic Survey

Fig. 5: Architecture of 2nd Mill. BC at Büklükale

Fig. 6: Results of the C14 Dating

Fig. 7: Tablet (BK100147)

Fig. 8: Bullae with Hieroglyphic signs “Tarhundawiya”

Fig. 9: Wall W228, on which the tablet (BK130111) was found

Fig. 10: Tablet (BK130111)

Fig. 11: The half-basement styled house R97

Fig. 12: Foundations that might belong to the Hittite period.

Fig. 13: Bulla of “Tabarna-style” seal

Fig. 14: Bulla with a Winged Goddess

Fig. 15: Comparison of the seal-designs in the Tyskiewicz-style

Fig. 16: Face B of the cuneiform seal from Büklükale and the sealing from Kuşaklı