

CORPUS OF HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Volume I, Part 1

Introduction, Karatepe, Karkamiš, Tell Ahmar, Maraş, Malatya, Commagene

Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen
Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft

Studies in Indo-European Language
and Culture

Neue Folge / New Series

herausgegeben von

Roberto Gusmani, Anna Morpurgo Davies
Klaus Strunk, Calvert Watkins

8.1



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
2000

CORPUS OF HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Volume I

Inscriptions of the Iron Age

Part 1: Text

Introduction, Karatepe, Karkamiš, Tell Ahmar, Maraş,
Malatya, Commagene

by

John David Hawkins



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

2000

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung des Förderungs- und Beihilfefonds Wissenschaft der VG WORT

⊗ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier, das die US-ANSI-Norm über Haltbarkeit erfüllt.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication-Data

Corpus of hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions.
v. <2>: ill. ; 32 cm. – (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft ; n.F., <8.2> = Studies in Indo-European language and culture ; new ser., <8.2>)
“Plan showing the disposition of the inscriptions of the North Gate” (1 folded leaf of plates) in pocket of v. 2.
Includes bibliographical references (v. 2, p. [xvii]–xxiii) and index.
Contents: – v. 2. Karatepe-Aslantas : the inscriptions – facsimile edition / by Halet Çambel.
ISBN 3-11-010864-X (v. 1 : alk. paper) – ISBN 3-11-014870-6 (v. 2 : alk. paper)
1. Inscriptions, Luwian–Turkey–Karatepe Site. 2. Inscriptions, Phoenician–Turkey–Karatepe Site. 3. Inscriptions, Hieroglyphic. I. Çambel, Halet. II. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft ; n.F., 8.

P950.C67 1999
491'.998–dc21

98-038764

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – Cataloging-in-Publications-Data

Hawkins, John David:
Inscriptions of the iron age / by J. D. Hawkins. – Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter
(Corpus of hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions ; Vol. 1)
ISBN 3-11-010864-X
Pt. 1. Text introduction, Karatepe, Karkamis, Tell Ahmar, Maras, Malatya, Commagene. – 2000

© Copyright 2000 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Typesetting and printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin
Plate production: JUP Industrie- und Presseklischee GmbH, Berlin
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer-GmbH, Berlin

To the Memory of my Parents

CONTENTS

Part 1

Preface	ix
Inscriptions listed alphabetically	xii
Abbreviations I: General	xviii
Abbreviations II: Bibliographical	xx

INTRODUCTION

A. General	1
B. Inscriptions and Script	6
C. The Corpus	17
D. Principles of Transliteration	23
E. Appendices 1–3	35

I. CILICIA

The Historical Context	38
The Inscriptions	
Karatepe-Aslantaş	45
Other	68

II. KARKAMIŞ

The Historical Context	73
The Inscriptions	
Archaic group	80
House of Suhis	83
House of Astiruwas	123
Genealogical fragments	165
Non-royal inscriptions	171
Miscellaneous	188
Fragments	197

III. TELL AHMAR

The Historical Context	224
The Inscriptions	227

IV. MARAŞ

The Historical Context	249
The Inscriptions	
House of Laramas (Palalam)	252
Non-royal and miscellaneous inscriptions	265

V. MALATYA

The Historical Context	282
The Inscriptions	
Archaic	288
House of Kuzi-Teşub	295
Other Genealogies	314
Miscellaneous	325

VI. COMMAGENE

The Historical Context	330
The Inscriptions	
House of Suppiluliumas (Uşpililume)	334
Miscellaneous	351

Part 2

VII. AMUQ

The Historical Context	361
The Inscriptions	365

VIII. ALEPPO

The Historical Context	388
The Inscriptions	391

IX. HAMA

The Historical Context	398
The Inscriptions	
House of Urhilina	403
Other	415
Epigraphic material from excavations	419

X. TABAL

The Historical Context	425
The Inscriptions	
Western (Hartapus) group	
Northern group	433
Rulers' and their servants' inscriptions	442
Non-royal inscriptions	483
Miscellaneous and uncertain	495
Lead strips	503
Southern (Tuwana) group	
Rulers' and their servants' inscriptions	513
Non-royal and unattributable	528

XI. ASSUR letters

The Texts	533
---------------------	-----

XII. MISCELLANEOUS

556

XIII. SEALS

Rulers' seals	574
Kubaba seals	576
Ownership seals	580
Name seals	583
Miscellaneous	585

Appendix 4. ALTINTEPE pithos inscriptions	588
---	-----

Addendum. II.74. KARKAMIŞ frag. a/b	590
---	-----

INDICES

Inscriptions listed alphabetically (repeated)	593
Location of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions	599
Concordance	609
List of Signs	617
List of Logograms transcribed into Latin	621

Index of words discussed	625	7. Lycian	639
1. Hieroglyphic Luwian	625	8. Lydian	639
2. Hittite	636	9. Greek	639
3. Hittite-Luwian	637	10. Latin	639
4. Cuneiform Luwian	638		
5. Akkadian	639	Part 3	
6. Cuneiform logograms	639	List of Plates	

PREFACE

The Genesis of the Corpus

The present Corpus has been many years in the making. The idea of its desirability goes back to my first visits to Turkey and its museums from 1965 onwards. Inspection of the wealth of Hieroglyphic monuments on display showed me how inadequate their state of publication frequently was, and how the provision of more reliable texts was an urgent desideratum. By the beginning of the 1970's, I had begun collecting photographs and making drawings ("copies") of these inscriptions. *Pari passu* with this "fieldwork" on the texts, I began research on the language in which they were composed, namely "Hieroglyphic" Luwian. This work produced a series of textual and philological articles published from the 1970's onwards, and in this I enjoyed the pleasure and privilege of an extended collaboration with Anna Morpurgo Davies.

The idea that it might be possible to produce a complete corpus of these inscriptions gradually came to appear realistic. This required work primarily in Turkey where the great majority of the inscriptions are physically located, but also in Syria (Aleppo), and major European and American museums. My assessment of the possibility of access to the original inscriptions was to prove considerably over-optimistic. It was not until the year 1987, in which the XXXIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale was held in Istanbul, that I was able to bring work in Turkish museums near to a satisfactory conclusion, and even since then further study trips for work on specific groups of material have been necessary.

The Corpus existed already in draft form by 1985, the year in which I was finally able to visit Berlin to study the small but significant group of Hieroglyphic inscriptions held by the Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the Staatliche Museen. At the same time, while staying in the then West Berlin, I was able to visit the firm of Walter de Gruyter and to submit the draft Corpus to them for consideration, which was rewarded by their provisional acceptance.

My available research time in 1988–90 was occupied in writing and revising the Corpus into its final form and having it typed. I was able to deliver the completed manuscript to de Gruyter in September 1990, and the illustrations (photographs and drawings) in July 1991. A work of this size and complexity demanded lengthy preliminary work from de Gruyter, and it was four years before I received the first set of proofs, which reached me in sections in the course of 1994, though I

was not able to proceed seriously with proof correction until the long vacation the following year. The various stages of proof, paged proof and plates corrections have been my primary preoccupation for the long vacations 1995–98.

The idea of publishing Halet Çambel's *Karatepe-Aslantaş* in a companion volume to the present Corpus, actually designated volume II, goes back to a discussion between Hans Güterbock, Halet Çambel and myself at the time of the XXXIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in İstanbul. This had the happy result that Halet Çambel contacted Walter de Gruyter, completed her preparation of the material and submitted it to the publishers in 1994. Its final appearance was greeted at the beginning of this year, anticipating the appearance of my part of the Corpus, volume I, parts 1–3, which at the time of writing still looks likely to bear the same year date, 1999.

The long gestation period of nine years, from the submission of my manuscript in 1990 to the final appearance of the Corpus, volume I, cannot but have affected the character of the work. The academic field does not stand still: new inscriptions appear, and fellow researchers publish their contributions advancing our knowledge and refining our perceptions. A considerable problem for me has been to what extent new advances since 1990, and more especially since the first proofs in 1994, could be incorporated into the text. In general, I have restricted the addition of new material to items of the most immediate concern. A rather extreme example is the appearance in July 1994 of the important inscription TELL AHMAR 5, communicated to me very rapidly by the kindness of its excavator Guy Bunnens. Since this appeared before the proofs had been paged, it did prove possible to include it, as its importance warrants. Smaller observations of most immediate relevance have been added where possible without disturbing the typeset text. These additions have been enclosed in square brackets, [...], to signal their nature as addenda and to warn that they may contradict, or at least not harmonize with their immediate contexts. But it must be admitted that many contributions to Hieroglyphic studies and its background from the last decade have not been noticed in this work. Doubtless reviewers will make good these deficiencies.

One development in the field which could not be integrated with the present Corpus was the colloquium held in Procida, Italy, in June 1995 to discuss and stand-

ardize the transcription of Hieroglyphic. This was because the Corpus was already in proof by the time of the colloquium. The modifications of transcription agreed there are not very extensive in relation to the system used here. They include principally greater refinements of detail (e.g. the distinction by means of diacritical numbers between Hieroglyphs showing merely the head or the whole animal, and the additions of further transcriptions into Latin particularly of signs restricted to the Empire period inscriptions and seals,

which of course do not appear in the present volume. The Procida colloquium will shortly appear in print, probably before the present Corpus, under the title *Il Geroglifico Anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca a venti anni dalla sua "redecifrazione"*, edited by M. Marazzi in collaboration with Natalia Bolatti-Guzzo and Paola Dardano. The system introduced by this volume is represented in this Corpus in the Indices at the end of Vol. I, part 2, under the headings *List of Signs*, and *List of Logograms transcribed into Latin*.

Acknowledgements

In a work like the present, assembled over the period of some thirty years, the number of people and institutions to whom I owe gratitude and thanks is enormous. My research in these years has been supported financially particularly by my own institution the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, specially in the provision of funds for work abroad. Over the years, I have enjoyed much support from the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, particularly under the Directorship of David French, and it has always served as my base for work in Turkey. Other working trips to Turkey were funded by the British Academy from their Small Research Grants scheme. Also in earlier days, I received several grants from the Central Research Fund, London University.

In acknowledging personal debts, I should perhaps start in Turkey where the bulk of the material is located, and thus where most of the work has been done. The regional museums and their holdings of Hieroglyphic inscriptions are listed in the index "Location of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions", and include those of Adana, Adiyaman, Aksaray, Ereğli, Gaziantep, Kayseri, Maraş, Niğde and Sivas. In all these I have worked on the inscriptions, sometimes on more than one occasion, and have been received generally with courtesy and not unusually with great helpfulness and hospitality by the Directors and museum staff of the day. Of the national museums, I have worked extensively on the holdings in İstanbul, the Ancient Oriental Museum, and must acknowledge with gratitude, the help of two Directors, the late Necati Dolunay and Alpay Pasinli, as well as that of Edibe Uzunoğlu. In Ankara I have had several long spells of work on the great collection of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations and must record my deep indebtedness to my friend İlhan Temizsoy for his invaluable support and many kindnesses.

I have enjoyed relations over many years with Turkish academic colleagues who have given me extensive

help in the Hieroglyphic field: Tahsin and Nimet Özgüç who have always encouraged me and apprised me of many new finds from their areas of archaeological research; Sedat Alp, whose generosity with Hieroglyphic material is acknowledged elsewhere; and especially my old friend Mustafa Kalaç with whom I have enjoyed a long collaboration on new Hieroglyphic discoveries; also Ali and Belkis Dinçol with whom it is always a pleasure to discuss progress. My debt to Halet Çambel for our collaboration of Karatepe needs no further elaboration here.

Outside Turkey, I have also worked in all the museums and institutions holding Hieroglyphic inscriptions: in the National Syrian Museum, Aleppo, then directed by Shawki Shaath, the Hama Museum, Syria, and the Beirut Museum, then under the late Emir Maurice Chehab. In Europe I worked in the Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the Staatliche Museen, with every help from Liane Jakob-Rost and Evelyn Klengel, and in the Louvre Museum with the help of Pierre Amiet, Béatrice André-Salvini and Dominique Beyer; in the National Museum, Copenhagen, on the excavation material from Hama at the generous invitation from P. J. Riis; also in the Biblioteca Bodmeriana, Geneva. Visits to Israel have enabled me to work on the inscriptions in the Bible Lands Museum, Jerusalem, where I had assistance from Joan Goodnick Westenholz. At home I have worked in the Ashmolean Museum with the help of Roger Moorey; and of course in the British Museum, Dept. of Western Asia, particularly under the Keepership of Terence Mitchell. In this context, I must remember much early encouragement in my project from the late Richard Barnett. In the U. S. A. I have worked on the two Maraş inscriptions in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and in the Oriental Institute, Chicago, I was enabled to work on the material collected by the Institute's Syrian-Hittite Expedition in the Plain of Antioch by the good offices of Hans

Güterbock and with every assistance from the Director Robert Adams.

My debt to Hans Güterbock extends much more widely, and over the years in discussion and correspondence I have relied on him for so much support, encouragement and advice. A similar debt I owe to Oliver Gurney, with whom I entered Hittite studies in the first place, and also first explored the Hieroglyphic inscriptions, as recorded elsewhere. Not only have I always been able to draw on his deep knowledge and experience of all things Hittite, but he has also provided the invaluable assistance of proof-reading the entire text of the Corpus, thereby eliminating many errors and infelicities. The other person who has rendered similar yeoman service is my old friend Maurits van Loon, whose proof-reading and corrections are also gratefully acknowledged. Another force behind the Corpus whose contribution can never be adequately acknowledged, is of course Anna Morpurgo Davies. Our many years of collaboration in Hieroglyphic studies have culminated in input into the Corpus which is unquantifiable but without which it would be much diminished. Our own collaboration with Günter Neumann marks a step in the decipherment of Hieroglyphic, and his close involvement in the subject and interest in the progress of this Corpus have benefitted me much over the years.

Many scholars have helped me with photographs and even drawings which I could not otherwise have obtained. As recorded elsewhere, the late Ignace Gelb gave me free access to his well-organized photographic collection; and reference to acknowledgement of photographs throughout the work attests my debt to him. Hatice Gonnet also appears frequently in this context. As an indefatigable traveller in her native Turkey with an unrivalled knowledge of its monuments, she can always be relied on to produce a good photograph of even the most evasive inscription. But my debt to her extends far beyond the many photographs which she has provided to years of help and advice in very various Turkish situations. Here I must remember too the late Friedrich Karl Dörner, who gave me much help on the Commagenian material. Others have provided me with photographs and even drawings of inscriptions which I have not myself been able to see. In particular for Syria, I am indebted to Alfonso Archi and Ali Abu Assaf; for Ain Dara photographs and information to Elizabeth Stone and Paul Zimansky; and for recent Tell Ahmar discoveries to Guy Bunnens and Stephanie Dalley. For

Ch. XIII, Seals, I have been fortunate to have special help including illustrations from Dominique Collon, Sir John Boardman, Gary Beckman, Harald Hauptmann, Massimo Poetto, Marie-Louise Vollenweider and Alfred Brown.

Discussions and correspondence with academic colleagues have naturally played a large part in forming the Corpus. Machteld Mellink, the doyenne of Anatolian archaeology, has always taken a close interest in the project and given advice and support. A long and fruitful correspondence with Frank Starke is recorded elsewhere, and more recently I have enjoyed a similar collaboration with Craig Melchert. Another contact of now many years standing is Massimo Poetto, whose work on Hieroglyphic complements my own. And it is always a pleasure to discuss Hieroglyphic among other Hittitological matters with Itamar Singer and Theo van den Hout, both of whom are generous with ideas. I would also like to acknowledge the contribution of the organizers of the Procida colloquium, Natalia Bolatti-Guzzo, Massimiliano Marazzi and Clelia Mora.

Penelope Mountjoy assisted me with the drawings at a critical moment in Berlin, tidying them up and drawing in the scales. Catherine Lawrence drew the Map (part 3, inside back cover).

Invaluable practical help has been given by Sanna Aro Valjus, who studied Hieroglyphic with me before completing her Helsinki doctorate. She too read my proofs, making many corrections, and in the summer 1998 gave me essential assistance in preparing the preliminary matter (title page, etc.), bibliography, indices and concordance which she typed on to disc. Without her efforts the appearance of the Corpus would have been even longer delayed. I remember also the contribution of Joan Woods, who undertook the horrific task of turning my handwritten manuscript of the whole Corpus into clean typescript with unruffled patience and good humour.

Finally, I would like to thank all at Walter de Gruyter who have seen this work through the press: the late Heinz Wenzel, who was my first contact at the printing house and who accepted the Corpus; Brigitte Schöning, who has supervised it through press; Wolfgang Konwitschny and Marion Jung, who were first to process my material; and Monika Wendland who has carried it through to its conclusion.

J. D. H.
June 1999

INSCRIPTIONS LISTED ALPHABETICALLY

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
[ADANA, unpublished	I.8.	71]	
ADIYAMAN 1	VI.4.	344	169–70
ADIYAMAN 2	VI.11.	351	177–78
AFRIN	VII.11.	386	207–208
AIN DARA	VII.10.	385	206
AKSARAY	X.16.	475	264
ALEPPO 2	III.5.	235	97–98
ALEPPO 3	XII.6.	562	320
ALİŞAR ostrakon	XII.13.	568	327
ALTINTEPE pithoi	Appendix 4	588	
ANCOZ 1	VI.5.	345	171–172
ANCOZ 2	VI.6.	348	173
ANCOZ 3	VI.7.	348	174
ANCOZ 4	VI.8.	348	174
ANCOZ 5	VI.9.	349	175–176
ANCOZ 6	VI.10.	350	173
ANCOZ 7	VI.16.	356	185–186
ANCOZ 8	VI.17.	358	187–188
ANCOZ 9	VI.18.	359	187–188
ANCOZ 10	VI.19.	359	187–188
ANDAVAL	X.42.	514	291
ANKARA (formerly “CARCHEMISH”)	XII.4.	559	318
[ANTAKYA, unpublished	VII.12.	387]	
ARSLANTAŞ (Tell Ahmar)	III.10.	246	103–105
ARSLANTAŞ (Elbistan)	V.23.	329	
ASMACIK	XII.8.	564	322
ASSUR letters <i>a–f+g</i> (“ATHENS”: see İSTANBUL)	XI.1–6.	533	306–313
‘AZAZ	VII.9.	385	205
BABYLON 1	VIII.1.	391	209–210
BABYLON 2	VIII.2.	394	211
BABYLON 3	VIII.3.	396	212
BEIRUT stone bowl	XII.3.	558	317
BOHÇA	X.17.	478	265
BOR	X.44.	518	296
BOROWSKI 1	XII.1.	556	314–315
BOROWSKI 2	XII.2.	558	316
BOROWSKI 3	III.2.	230	93
BOROWSKI seal 1	XIII.6.	578	330
BOROWSKI seal 2	XIII.14.	583	333
BOSSERT seal	XIII.19.	586	333
BOYPEYPINARI 1	VI.1.	334	165
BOYPEYPINARI 2	VI.2.	334	165
BULGARMADEN	X.45.	521	297–299
BURUNKAYA	X.8.	437	243
ÇALAPVERDİ 1	X.28.	497	278
ÇALAPVERDİ 2	X.29.	497	279
(“CARCHEMISH”: see ANKARA)			
CEKKE	II.27.	143	42–43
ÇİFTLİK	X.11.	448	248–249
DARENDE	V.5.	304	145–146
DE CLERCQ seal	XIII.16.	584	333

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
DELAPORTE seal	XIII.5.	577	331
DOMUZTEPE 1	I.6.	71	
DOMUZTEPE 2	I.7.	71	
DÜLÜK seal	XIII.17.	585	333
EĞREK	X.23.	492	274
EĞRIKÖY	X.26.	495	276
(EKİNVEREN: see TİLSEVET)			
[EREĞLİ, unpublished	X.52.	531]	
ERKİLET 1	X.24.	493	275
ERKİLET 2	X.25.	493	275
GAZİANTEP	XII.7.	563	321
GAZİANTEP seal	XIII.18.	585	333
GELB	XII.12.	567	326
GELB seals	XIII.11a–c.	580	332
GULBENKIAN seal	XIII.10.	580	331
GÜRÜN	V.2.	295	135–138
HACİBEKELİ	IV.15.	277	129
HAMA 1	IX.8.	411	221–222
HAMA 2	IX.9.	411	221–222
HAMA 3	IX.10.	411	221–222
HAMA 4	IX.1.	403	213
HAMA 5	IX.2.	406	215–216
HAMA 6	IX.11.	412	223
HAMA 7	IX.12.	412	224
HAMA 8	IX.6.	409	214
HAMA 9	IX.7.	410	219–220
HAMA frag. 1	IX.15.	419	229
HAMA frag. 2	IX.16.	420	230
HAMA frag. 3	IX.17.	420	230
HAMA frag. 4	IX.18.	420	231
HAMA frag. 5	IX.19.	421	232
HAMA frag. 6	IX.20.	421	232
HAMA frags. 7–10	IX.21a–d.	422	233–235
HINES	IX.5.	408	218
HİSARCIK 1	X.19.	483	268–269
HİSARCIK 2	X.27.	496	277
HOGARTH seal 1	XIII.8.	579	331
HOGARTH seal 2	XIII.9.	579	331
HOGARTH seal 3	XIII.15.	584	333
İSKENDERUN	IV.3.	259	110–111
İSPEKÇÜR	V.4.	301	142–144
İSTANBUL (formerly “ATHENS”)	XII.5.	561	319
İVRİZ 1	X.43.	516	292–295
İVRİZ 2	X.46.	526	300
İVRİZ frags. 1–3	X.50.	529	304
IZGIN 1 and 2	V.15.	314	153–154, 160
JISR EL HADID frags. 1–3	VII.5.	378	199
KARABURÇLU	IV.13.	276	127
KARABURUN	X.18.	480	266–267
KARADAĞ 1	X.6.	436	240–242
KARADAĞ 2	X.7.	437	240–241
KARAHÖYÜK (Elbistan)	V.1.	288	133–134
(KARAPINAR: see TOPADA)			
KARATEPE 1	I.1.	45	
KARATEPE 2	I.2.	68	

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
KARATEPE 3	I.3.	68	
KARATEPE 4	I.4.	68	
KARATEPE fragments	I.5.	71	
KARKAMIŞ A1a	II.6.	87	6-7
KARKAMIŞ A1b	II.7.	91	8
KARKAMIŞ A2	II.13.	108	18-19
KARKAMIŞ A3	II.14.	108	20-21
KARKAMIŞ A4a	II.28.	151	44
KARKAMIŞ A4b	II.1.	80	1
KARKAMIŞ A4c	II.48.	186	67
KARKAMIŞ A4d	II.10.	100	12-13
KARKAMIŞ A5a	II.45.	181	64-65
KARKAMIŞ A5b	II.46.	185	66
KARKAMIŞ A6	II.22.	123	31-33
KARKAMIŞ A7a-j	II.23.	128	31-35
KARKAMIŞ (A8 =) A11a	II.9.	94	10-12
KARKAMIŞ (A9 =) A11b	II.11.	101	14-15
KARKAMIŞ (A10 =) A11c	II.12.	101	16-17
KARKAMIŞ A12	II.15.	112	22-23
KARKAMIŞ A13a-c	II.36.	167	54-55
KARKAMIŞ A13d	II.16.	115	24-25
KARKAMIŞ A14a	II.5.	83	3-5
KARKAMIŞ A14b	II.4.	83	3
KARKAMIŞ A15a	II.50.	188	68-69
KARKAMIŞ A15b	II.24.	130	36-37
KARKAMIŞ A15c	II.51.	189	70
KARKAMIŞ A15d	II.60.	197	78
KARKAMIŞ A15e	II.38.	170	57
KARKAMIŞ A16a	II.52.	190	71
KARKAMIŞ A16b	II.21.	122	30
KARKAMIŞ A16c	II.2.	82	2
KARKAMIŞ A16d	II.61.	197	78
KARKAMIŞ A16e	II.62.	198	78
KARKAMIŞ A16f	II.49.	187	
KARKAMIŞ A17a	II.53.	191	72
KARKAMIŞ A17b	II.41.	175	60
KARKAMIŞ A17c	II.54.	192	73
KARKAMIŞ A17d	II.55.	193	74
KARKAMIŞ A18a	II.56.	193	74
KARKAMIŞ A18b	II.63.	199	78
KARKAMIŞ A18c	II.64.	199	
KARKAMIŞ A18d 1	II.3.	83	2
KARKAMIŞ A18e	II.57.	194	75
KARKAMIŞ A18f	II.47.	186	67
KARKAMIŞ (A18g =) A4a	II.28.	151	(44)
KARKAMIŞ A18b	II.44.	180	63
KARKAMIŞ A18i	II.65.	200	78
KARKAMIŞ A18j	II.58.	195	76
KARKAMIŞ A19	II.67.	201	80-81
KARKAMIŞ A20a 1-2	II.19.	118	28
KARKAMIŞ A20b 1-13	II.32.	157	48-49
KARKAMIŞ A21b+a (= A22b+a)	II.31.	157	48-49
KARKAMIŞ A22c	II.33.	164	50-51
KARKAMIŞ A23	II.17.	116	26-27
KARKAMIŞ A24a 1-22	II.25	133	38-39

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
KARKAMIŞ A25a 1-4	II.20.	121	29
KARKAMIŞ A25b	II.30.	156	46
KARKAMIŞ A26a 1-2	II.18.	117	26-27
KARKAMIŞ A26b-e	II.68.	206	90
KARKAMIŞ A26f	II.37.	169	56
KARKAMIŞ A27	II.69.	207	82-83
KARKAMIŞ A27c	II.39.	171	57
KARKAMIŞ A27e frags. 1, 2	II.35.	165	53
KARKAMIŞ A27u	II.34.	165	52
KARKAMIŞ A28	II.70.	215	84-85
KARKAMIŞ A29	II.71.	217	86-87
KARKAMIŞ A30	II.72.	221	88-89
KARKAMIŞ A30b	II.42.	177	61
KARKAMIŞ A31 (= A32)	II.26.	140	40-41
KARKAMIŞ B33	II.59.	196	77
KARKAMIŞ B39a	II.66.	200	79
KARKAMIŞ sherd	II.73.	223	90
KARKAMIŞ stone bowl	II.25a.	139	47
KARKAMIŞ frags. a/b	II.74.	590	
KAYSERİ	X.15.	472	262-263
KELEKLİ	II.8.	92	9
KEŞLİK YAYLA	X.51.	531	305
KHORSABAD bullae	XIII.13.	583	332
KIRÇOĞLU	VII.8.	383	203-204
KIZILDAĞ 1	X.1.	433	236
KIZILDAĞ 2	X.2.	433	237
KIZILDAĞ 3	X.3.	433	237
KIZILDAĞ 4	X.5.	435	238-239
KIZILDAĞ 5	X.4.	435	239
KÖRKÜN	II.40.	171	58-59
KÖTÜKALE	V.3.	299	139-141
KULULU 1	X.9.	442	244-245
KULULU 2	X.21.	487	272
KULULU 3	X.22.	490	273
KULULU 4	X.10.	445	246-247
KULULU 5	X.20.	485	270-271
KULULU 6	X.33.	500	283
KULULU 7	X.35.	502	285
KULULU 8	X.34.	501	284
KULULU lead strip 1	X.36.	503	286
KULULU lead strip 2	X.37.	503	287
KULULU lead strip 3 + frag. 2	X.40.	503	289
KULULU lead frag. 1	X.38.	503	288
(KULULU lead frag. 2 (joined to lead strip 3))	X.40.	503	289)
KULULU lead frag. 3	X.39.	503	288
KÜRTÜL	IV.9.	271	122-123
KURUBEL	X.32.	500	282
(“LENINGRAD”: see MARAS 6)			
LİDAR bullae	XIII.1.	574	328
MALATYA 1	V.16.	318	155
MALATYA 2	V.21.	327	163
MALATYA 3	V.18.	321	156
MALATYA 4	V.17.	320	155
MALATYA 5	V.6.	306	147-148
MALATYA 6	V.7.	307	147-148

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
MALATYA 7	V.8.	308	147–148
MALATYA 8	V.9.	309	149
MALATYA 9	V.10.	310	150
MALATYA 10	V.11.	311	150
MALATYA 11	V.12.	312	151
MALATYA 12	V.13.	313	151
MALATYA 13	V.22.	328	164
MALATYA 14	V.14.	313	152
MALATYA bulla (MALATYA 15)	XIII.2.	575	329
MALPINAR	VI.3.	340	166–168
MARAŞ 1	IV.4.	261	112–113
MARAŞ 2	IV.10.	273	124
MARAŞ 3	IV.6.	267	116–117
MARAŞ 4	IV.2.	255	108–109
MARAŞ 5	IV.7.	269	118–119
MARAŞ 6 (LENINGRAD)	IV.16.	278	129
MARAŞ 7	IV.17.	279	130
MARAŞ 8	IV.1.	252	106–107
MARAŞ 9	IV.11.	274	125
MARAŞ 10	IV.18.	280	131
MARAŞ 11	IV.8.	270	120–121
MARAŞ 12	IV.12.	275	126
MARAŞ 13	IV.14.	276	128
MARAŞ 14	IV.5.	265	114–115
MARAŞ 15	IV.19.	281	132
MARAŞ 16	IV.20.	281	
MEHARDE	IX.13.	415	225–226
NİĞDE 1	X.41.	513	290
NİĞDE 2	X.47.	526	301
(“NIMRUD”: see HAMA 9)			
NIMRUD	XII.15.	570	327
NINEVEH 1	XII.10.	566	324
NINEVEH 2	XII.11.	567	325
NINEVEH seal	XIII.7.	578	331
NINEVEH bullae 1–7	XIII.12.	581	332
PALANGA	V.20.	325	161–162
PERSEPOLIS	XII.16.	570	327
PORADA seal	XIII.4.	576	330
PORSUK	X.48.	527	302
QAL'AT EL MUDIQ	IX.4.	408	218
RESTAN	IX.3.	407	217
SAMSAT 1	VI.12.	352	179
SAMSAT 2	VI.13.	353	180
SAMSAT 3	VI.14.	353	180
SAMSAT frags. 1–10	VI.15.	354	181–184
SHEIZAR	IX.14.	416	227–228
ŞIRZI	V.19.	322	157–159
SULTANHAN	X.14.	463	258–261
SUVASA	X.13.	462	254–257
TEKİRDERBENT 1	X.30.	498	280
TEKİRDERBENT 2	X.31.	498	281
TELL AHMAR 1	III.6.	239	99–100
TELL AHMAR 2	III.1.	227	91–92
TELL AHMAR 3 (Louvre)	III.7.	243	94
TELL AHMAR 4	III.4.	234	94

Inscription	Corpus no.	Page nos.	Plate nos.
TELL AHMAR 5	III.3.	231	95–96
TELL AHMAR frags. 1–9	III.8.	244	101–102
TELL AHMAR frag. 10	III.9.	245	94
TELL TAYINAT 1	VII.1.	365	189–192
TELL TAYINAT 2	VII.2.	367	193
TELL TAYINAT 3	VII.3.	375	194
TELL TAYINAT fragments	VII.4.	375	195–198
TİLSEVET (alias EKİNVEREN)	II.43.	178	62
TOPADA	X.12.	451	250–253
TRAGANA (Locris)	XII.14.	569	327
TULEIL 1	VII.6.	381	200
TULEIL 2	VII.7.	382	201–202
TÜNP 1	II.29.	154	45
TÜNP 2	XII.9.	565	323
VELİİSA	X.49.	529	303
VOLLENWEIDER seal	XIII.20.	586	333
YALE seal	XIII.21	587	333
ZİNCİRLİ signet	XIII.3.	576	329

ABBREVIATIONS I: GENERAL

Abb.	Abbildung	imp.	imperative
abbr.	abbreviation	inf.	infinitive
abl.	ablative	instr.	instrumental
abstr.	abstract	intrans.	intransitive
acc.	accusative	iter.	iterative
ad loc.	ad locum	Kap.	Kapitel
adj.	adjective	l./ll.	line(s)
adv.	adverb	lev.	levha
Akk.	Akkadian	lg.	length
anc.	ancient	lit.	literally
Anm.	Anmerkung	loc. cit.	loco citato
Bo.	Inventory number of Boğazköy tablets, excavations 1906 ff.	log.	logogram/logographic
c.	circa	Luw.	Luwian
caus.	causative	Lyc.	Lycian
cf.	confer	Lyd.	Lydian
ch.	chapter	LW	loanword
cit.	citation	m.	metre
conj.	conjunction	max.	maximum
Cun.	Cuneiform	med.	medium
dat.	dative	med.-pass.	medio-passive
dem.	demonstrative	MF	masculine-feminine
denom.	denominative	mod.	modern
det.	determinative	N	Neuter
dir. obj.	direct object	n./nn.	note(s)
disj.	disjunctive	(n.)	noun
DN(N)	divine name(s)	no(s).	number(s)
EA	El Amarna	nom.	nominative
ead.	eadem	num.	numeral
ed.	editor/edited	obj.	object
e. g.	exempli gratia	obv.	obverse
esp.	especially	Oct.	October
<i>et al.</i>	<i>et alii</i>	op. cit.	opere citato
etc.	et cetera	p./pp.	page(s)
eth.	ethnicon	part.	participle
euphem.	euphemism	Phoen.	Phoenician
excav.	excavation	pl(s).	plate(s)
f./ff.	following	plur.	plural
fact.	factitive	PN(N)	personal name(s)
fig(s).	figure(s)	postpos.	postposition
frag(s).	fragment(s)	prec.	preceding
gen.	genitive	pres.	present
GN(N)	geographical name(s)	pret.	preterite
Gr.	Greek	prev.	preverb
ht.	height	prohib.	prohibitive
Hier.	Hieroglyphic	q. v.	quo vide
Hitt.	Hittite	rev.	reverse
ibid.	ibidem	sc.	scilicet
id.	idem	Sept.	September
i. e.	id est	sing.	singular

Sum.	Sumerian	X, x	broken or undeciphered sign (logogram, syllabogram)
s. v.	sub voce		
Taf.	Tafel		word-divider
Tav.	Tavolo		line-end
th.	thickness	ı	personal determinative
trans.	transitive	[]	partly broken signs
(v.)	verb	[]	(in transliteration) broken/missing and restored signs
var.	variant		
vs.	versus		(around passages of English) late additions to text
w.	width		
wr.	writing/written	< >	omitted by scribal error
		« »	erroneous inclusion
		*	(before word) word not attested, reconstructed
Symbols in the Transliterations and Translations			
§	section, clause	*	(before numeral) number of Hier. sign in Laroche's <i>HH</i> .
?	uncertain reading		

ABBREVIATIONS II: BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

- | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| <i>AAAS</i> | <i>Annales archéologiques arabes syriennes.</i> | <i>ANEP</i> | see Pritchard, <i>ANEP</i> . |
| <i>ABL</i> | R. F. Harper, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum I–XIV</i> (London and Chicago, 1892–1914). | <i>ANET</i> | see Pritchard, <i>ANET</i> ³ . |
| <i>Acme</i> | <i>Acme.</i> Annali della Facoltà di Filosofia e Lettere dell'Università statale di Milano. | <i>Annali Pisa</i> | <i>Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa</i> , classe di lettere e filosofia, serie III, vol. VIII/3 (Pisa, 1978). |
| <i>Acta Jutlandica</i> | <i>Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen à l'occasion de son soixantedixième anniversaire, 7 avril 1937</i> (<i>Acta Jutlandica</i> 9/1; Aarhus, 1937). | <i>An. St.</i> | <i>Anatolian Studies.</i> Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. |
| <i>ADD</i> | C. H. W. Johns, <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents I–IV</i> (Cambridge, 1898–1923). | <i>Antike Welt</i> | <i>Antike Welt.</i> Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte. |
| <i>AHw</i> | see von Soden, <i>AHw</i> . | <i>AOAT</i> | <i>Alter Orient und altes Testament.</i> |
| <i>AJK</i> | <i>Archiv für Keilschriftforschung</i> (continued as following). | <i>AOATS</i> | <i>AOAT</i> , Sonderreihe. |
| <i>AJO</i> | <i>Archiv für Orientforschung.</i> | <i>AoF</i> | <i>Altorientalische Forschungen.</i> |
| <i>AJA</i> | <i>American Journal of Archaeology.</i> | <i>AOS</i> | <i>American Oriental Series.</i> |
| <i>AJSL</i> | <i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.</i> | <i>APES</i> | see Ward, <i>APES</i> . |
| <i>AKA</i> | see King, <i>AKA</i> . | <i>ARAB</i> | see Luckenbill, <i>ARAB</i> . |
| <i>Akkadica</i> | <i>Akkadica.</i> Périodique bimestriel de la Fondation Assyriologique Georges Dossin. | <i>Arch. Anz.</i> | <i>Archäologischer Anzeiger.</i> |
| Akurgal, <i>AH</i> | E. Akurgal, <i>The Art of the Hittites</i> (London, 1962). | <i>ARET</i> | <i>Archivi reali di Ebla, Testi.</i> |
| Akurgal, <i>BGA</i> | E. Akurgal, <i>The Birth of Greek Art: the Mediterranean and the Near East</i> (London, 1968). | <i>ARI</i> | see Grayson, <i>ARI</i> . |
| Akurgal, <i>SBK</i> | E. Akurgal, <i>Späthethitische Bildkunst</i> (Ankara, 1949). | <i>Ar. Or.</i> | <i>Archiv Orientalni.</i> |
| <i>An. Bib.</i> | <i>Analecta Biblica.</i> | <i>ARRIM</i> | <i>Annual Review of the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project.</i> |
| <i>Anadolu</i> | <i>Anadolu.</i> Revue annuelle des études d'archéologie et d'histoire en Turquie (continued as <i>Anatolia</i>). | <i>ARU</i> | J. Kohler and A. Ungnad, <i>Assyrische Rechtsurkunden</i> (Leipzig, 1913). |
| <i>Anadolu Araştırmaları</i> | <i>Anadolu Araştırmaları.</i> Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschungen. | <i>AS</i> | <i>Assyriological Studies.</i> |
| <i>Anatolia</i> | <i>Anatolia.</i> Revue annuelle d'archéologie. Journal of the Institute for Research in Near Eastern Civilizations and Languages. | <i>Assur</i> | <i>Assur.</i> Monographic Journals of the Near East. |
| <i>Anatolian Studies</i>
<i>Güterbock</i> | <i>Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday</i> , ed. K. Bittel <i>et al.</i> (Istanbul, 1974). | Astour,
<i>Hellenosemitica</i> | M. Astour, <i>Hellenosemitica.</i> An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece (Leiden, 1965). |
| <i>Anatolica</i> | <i>Anatolica.</i> Annuaire international pour les civilisations de l'Asie antérieure. | <i>Athenaeum</i> | <i>Athenaeum.</i> Studi periodici de letteratura e storia dell'antichità. |
| Andrae, <i>AiS V</i> | W. Andrae, <i>Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli V. Die Kleinfunde aus Sendschirli</i> (Berlin, 1943). | Aynard, <i>Le prisme du Louvre</i> | J. J. Aynard, <i>Le prisme de Louvre AO 19.939</i> (Paris, 1957). |
| | | <i>BANEA</i> | <i>British Association for Near Eastern Archaeology.</i> |
| | | <i>B.A.R.</i> | <i>British Archaeological Reports.</i> |
| | | <i>BASOR</i> | <i>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research.</i> |
| | | Belck,
<i>Forschungsreise</i> | W. Belck, <i>Forschungsreise in Klein-Asien</i> (<i>Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte</i> , Jahrgang 1901, pp. 452–522). |

- Belleten* Türk Tarih Kurumu, *Belleten*.
- Beran, *Heth. Glyptik* I T. Beran, *Die hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy I* (*WVDOG* 76; Berlin, 1967).
- Bildbeschr.* C.-G. von Brandenstein, *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten* (*MVAeG* 46/2; Leipzig, 1943).
- Bing, *Cilicia* J. D. Bing, *A History of Cilicia during the Assyrian Period* (University Microfilms; Ann Arbor, 1973).
- Bi. Or.* *Bibliotheca Orientalis*.
- Bittel, *Die Hethiter* K. Bittel, *Die Hethiter. Die Kunst Anatoliens vom Ende des 3. bis zum Anfang des 1. Jahrtausends vor Christus* (Munich, 1976).
- Bittel–Güterbock, *Boğazköy* 1 K. Bittel and H. G. Güterbock, *Boğazköy. Neue Untersuchungen in der hethitischen Hauptstadt* (Berlin, 1935).
- BKO* *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Orients*.
- BMR* *Bulletin des Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire*.
- Börker-Klähn, *Bagd. Forsch.* 4 J. Börker-Klähn, *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (Baghdader Forschungen 4; Mainz, 1982).
- Boğ. III* K. Bittel et al., *Boğazköy III. Funde aus den Grabungen 1952–1955* (Berlin, 1957).
- Borger, *Asarbaddon* R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarbaddons Königs von Assyrien* (*AfO* Beiheft 9; Graz, 1956).
- Bossert, *Altanatolien* H. Th. Bossert, *Altanatolien. Kunst und Handwerk in Kleinasien von den Anfängen bis zum völligen Aufgehen in der griechischen Kultur* (Berlin, 1942).
- Bossert, *Asia* H. Th. Bossert, *Asia* (Istanbul, 1946).
- Bossert, *HKS* H. Th. Bossert, *Ein hethitisches Königssiegel* (Berlin, 1944).
- Bossert, *ŠuK* H. Th. Bossert, *Šantaš und Kupapa* (*MAOG* VI/3; Leipzig, 1932).
- Braidwood, *OIP* 48 R. J. Braidwood, *Mounds in the Plain of Antioch* (*OIP* 48; Chicago, 1937).
- Bron, *Recherches* F. Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe* (École Pratique des Hautes Études; Geneva, Paris 1979).
- BSL* *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*.
- Buchanan and Moorey, *Catalogue* III B. Buchanan and P. R. S. Moorey, *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum* III. The Iron Age Stamp Seals (Oxford, 1988).
- Bull. Mus. Beyrouth* *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*.
- Burton and Drake, *Unexplored Syria* R. F. Burton and C. F. T. Drake, *Unexplored Syria. Visit to the Libanus, the Tulul et Safā, the Anti-Libanus, the Northern Libanus and the 'Alāh, I–II* (London, 1872).
- CAD* *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1956–).
- CAH* *The Cambridge Ancient History*.
- Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş* H. Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş. The Inscriptions: Facsimile Edition* (*Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions* II; Berlin, New York, 1999).
- Carchemish* I see Hogarth, *Carchemish* I.
- Carchemish* II see Woolley, *Carchemish* II.
- Carchemish* III see Woolley, *Carchemish* III.
- Carter, *Cult Inventories* C. W. Carter, *Hittite Cult Inventories* (Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1962).
- Cavaignac, *PH* E. Cavaignac, *Le problème hittite* (Paris, 1936).
- Ceram, *NPBM* C. W. Ceram, *Narrow Pass, Black Mountain* (London, 1956).
- Charles, *HI* B. B. Charles, *Hittite Inscriptions* (Cornell Expedition to Asia Minor; Ithaca, New York, 1911).
- CHD* *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1980–).
- CIH* see Messerschmidt, *CIH*.
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.
- Contenau, *MAO* G. Contenau, *Manuel d'archéologie orientale* (Paris, 1931).
- CRAIBL* *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris).
- CRRAI* *Compte rendu de la ... Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*.
- CT* *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*.
- CTH* see Laroche, *CTH*.
- De Clerq, *Catalogue* L. de Clerq and J. Ménéant, *Collection de Clerq, Catalogue I–II* (Paris, 1885, 1888, 1890, 1903).
- Delaporte, *Catalogue* L. Delaporte, *Catalogue des cylindres orientaux des cachets et pierres gravées de style orientale de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1910).
- Delaporte, *Malatya* L. Delaporte, *Malatya-Arslantepe I. La porte des lions* (Paris, 1940).
- Diakonoff, *PAP* I. M. Diakonoff, *The Prehistory of the Armenian People* (New York, 1984).

- Donner and Röllig, *KAI*² H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (second edition, Wiesbaden, 1962–64).
- DTCFD* *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* (Ankara).
- EA* J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 2; Leipzig 1915).
- EH* (*EH*²) see Wright, *EH*.
- Eranos* *Eranos. Acta Philologica Suedana*.
- Essays Mellink* *Ancient Anatolia. Aspects of Change and Cultural Development. Essays in Honor of Machteld J. Mellink*, ed. J. V. Canby *et al.* (Wisconsin, 1986).
- Felsefe Arkivi* *Felsefe Arkivi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Felsefe Bölümü*.
- Forlanini, *Atlante Storico* M. Forlanini and M. Marazzi, *Anatolia: L'Impero Hittita (Atlante Storico del Vicino Oriente* Fascicolo 4.3., ed. M. Liverani, L. Milano and A. Palmieri; Rome, 1986).
- Forrer, *HBS* E. Forrer, *Die hethitische Bilderschrift* (Chicago, 1932).
- Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung* E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (Leipzig, 1921).
- Frankfurt, *AAAO* H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (Harmondsworth, 1954).
- Friedrich, *HWb* J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1952–1954).
- Friedrich, *HWb*, J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 1–3 Erg. Ergänzungshefte (Heidelberg 1957, 1961, 1966).
- Friedrich, *SV* J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, I II (*MVAeG* 31/1 and 34/1; Leipzig, 1926, 1930).
- Friedrich–Kammenhuber, *HWb*² J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (2nd ed.; Heidelberg, 1975–).
- Fs* *Festschrift*.
- Fs Alp* *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, ed. H. Otten *et al.* (Ankara, 1992).
- Fs Bittel* *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, ed. R. M. Boehmer and H. Hauptmann (Mainz am Rhein, 1983).
- Fs Eissfeldt* *Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt*, ed. J. Fück (Halle, 1947).
- Fs Friedrich* *Festschrift Johannes Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag am 27. August 1958 gewidmet*, ed. R. von Kienle *et al.* (Heidelberg, 1959).
- Fs Houwink ten Cate* *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. T. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos (Uitgaven van het Nederlands historisch-archeologisch Instituut de Istanbul 74; Istanbul, 1995).
- Fs Matouš* *Festschrift Lubor Matouš*, ed. B. Hruška and G. Komoróczy (*Assyriologia* IV; Budapest, 1980).
- Fs Moortgat* *Vorderasiatische Archäologie. Studien und Aufsätze Anton Moortgat zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*, ed. K. Bittel *et al.* (Berlin, 1964).
- Fs Neumann* *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Tischler (Innsbruck, 1972).
- Fs Otten* (1) *Festschrift Heinrich Otten*, ed. E. Neu und C. Rüster (Wiesbaden, 1968).
- Fs Otten* (2) *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Neu and C. Rüster (Wiesbaden, 1988).
- Fs Risch* *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter (Berlin, New York, 1986).
- Fs Röllig* *Ana šadī Labnāni lū allik. Beiträge zu altorientalischen und mittelmeerischen Kulturen. FS für Wolfgang Röllig*, ed. B. Pongraz-Leisten, H. Kühne and P. Xella (*AQAT* 247; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1997).
- Fs Szemerényi* *Festschrift für Oswald Szemerényi*, ed. B. Brogan-yi (Amsterdam, 1979).
- Fugmann, *Hama II/1* E. Fugmann, *Hama. Fouilles et recherches 1932–1938, II. Les premiers habitants et la ville préhellénistique de Hamath 1. L'Architecture des périodes pré-hellénistiques* (Copenhagen, 1958).
- Gartsang, *HE* J. Garstang, *The Hittite Empire* (London, 1929; revised edition of Garstang, *LH*).
- Garstang, *LH* J. Garstang, *Land of the Hittites* (London, 1910).
- Garstang and Gurney, *Geography* J. Garstang and O. R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (London, 1959).
- Gelb, *HH* I. J. Gelb, *Hittite Hieroglyphs I–III* (Chicago, 1931, 1935, 1942).
- Gelb, *HHM* I. J. Gelb, *Hittite Hieroglyphic Monuments (OIP* 45; Chicago, 1939).
- Genge, *NSR* H. Genge, *Nordsyrisch-südanatolische Reliefs. Eine archäologisch-historische Untersuchung, Datierung und Bestimmung* (Copenhagen, 1979).

- Gibson, *TSSI* J. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, 2. *Aramaic Inscriptions*, 3. *Phoenician Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1975, 1982).
- Glotta* *Glotta*. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache.
- Goetze, *AM* A. Goetze, *Die Annalen des Mursiliš* (*MVAeG* 38; Leipzig, 1933).
- Goetze, *Kleinasion* A. Goetze, *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasien*, 2nd edition (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III,2.; Munich, 1957).
- Goetze, *Tunn.* A. Goetze, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (*AOS* 14; New Haven, 1938).
- Goetze, *NeueBr* A. Goetze, *Neue Bruchstücke zum großen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexen* (*MVAeG* 34/2; Leipzig, 1930).
- Grayson, *ABC* A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, New York, 1975).
- Grayson, *ARI* A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions I–II* (Wiesbaden, 1972, 1976).
- Grayson, *RIMA 1* A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 1)*; Toronto, 1987).
- Grayson, *RIMA 2* A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114–859 BC) (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 2)*; Toronto, 1991).
- Grayson, *RIMA 3* A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC) (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3)*; Toronto, 1996).
- Grazer Beiträge* *Grazer Beiträge*. Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft.
- Grothe, *Vorderasienexpedition* G. Grothe, *Meine Vorderasienexpedition 1906 und 1907*, Band I (Leipzig, 1911).
- Gs* *Gedenkschrift*.
- Gs Bossert* *Anadolu Araştırmaları (JKF)* II/1–2 (Istanbul, 1965).
- Gs Kretschmer* MNHMHŞ XAPIN. *Gedenkschrift P. Kretschmer*, ed. H. Kronasser (Vienna, 1956).
- Gs Kronasser* *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. E. Neu (Wiesbaden, 1982).
- Güterbock, *Boğazköy IV* H. G. Güterbock, *apud* K. Bittel *et al.*, *Boğazköy IV. Funde aus den Grabungen 1967 und 1968* (Berlin, 1969).
- Güterbock, *Kanišunwar* *Kanišunwar, A Tribute to Hans. G. Güterbock*, ed. H. A. Hoffner and G. M. Beckman (Chicago, 1986).
- Güterbock, *SBo* H. G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy*, I–II (*AfO* Beiheft 5, 7; Berlin, 1940, 1942).
- Güterbock, *Yazılıkaya* H. G. Güterbock, *apud* K. Bittel *et al.*, *Das hethitische Felsheiligtum Yazılıkaya* (Boğazköy-Hattuša IX; Berlin, 1975), Die Inschriften.
- Gurney, *Hittite Religion* O. R. Gurney, *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion* (The Schweich Lectures, 1976; Oxford, 1977).
- Hagenbuchner, *TdH 15* A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (*TdH* 15; Heidelberg, 1989).
- Haines, *OIP 95* R. G. Haines, *Excavations in the Plain of Antioch, II: Structural Remains of the Later Phases* (*OIP* 95; Chicago, 1972).
- Hatt.* see *StBoT* 24.
- Hawkins, *IX TTK* J. D. Hawkins, Rulers of Karkamiš; the House of Astiruwas. (in *IX Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Ankara 1981: *Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, I. Cilt (Ankara, 1986), pp. 259–271).
- Hawkins, *Mesopotamia 8* J. D. Hawkins, Late Hittite Funerary Monuments (in *Death in Mesopotamia*, ed. B. Alster (Copenhagen, 1980), pp. 213–225).
- Hawkins, *StBoT Bh. 3* J. D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. With an archaeological introduction by Peter Neve (*StBoT* Beiheft 3; Wiesbaden, 1995).
- Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, and Neumann, *HHL* J. D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo Davies and G. Neumann, Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 6 (1973), pp. 143–197).
- Hb. Or.* (1969) J. Friedrich *et al.*, *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen* (*Handbuch der Orientalistik* 1/II, 1–2, 2; Leiden, 1969).
- HChI* see König, *HChI*.
- HED* see Puhvel, *HED*.
- Helck, *Beziehungen* W. Helck, *Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden, 1979).
- Herzfeld, *AMI* E. Hertzfeld, Hettitica (*Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 2 (1930), pp. 132–164, 165–203).
- Hesperia* *Hesperia*. Journal of American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Hethitica* *Hethitica*. Bibliothèque des cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain.
- HH* see Laroche, *HH*.
- HHL* See Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies, and Neumann, *HHL*.

- HHM* see Gelb, *HHM*.
- Historia* *Historia*. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte.
- Hoffmann, *TdH* 11 I. Hoffman, *Der Erlaß Telipinus* (*TdH* 11; Heidelberg, 1984).
- Hoffner, *Al. Heth.* H. A. Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven, 1974).
- Hogarth, *Carchemish I* D. G. Hogarth, *Carchemish. Report on the Excavation at Djerabis on Behalf of the British Museum I*. Introductory (London, 1914).
- Hogarth, *HS* D. G. Hogarth, *Hittite Seals* (Oxford, 1920).
- Houwink ten Cate, *LPG* P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden, 1961).
- Hrozný, *IHH* B. Hrozný, *Les inscriptions hittites hiéroglyphiques I–III* (Prague, 1933, 1934, 1937).
- HT* *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the British Museum* (London, 1920).
- Humann and Puchstein, *Reisen* K. Humann and O. Puchstein, *Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien* (Berlin, 1890).
- HWb* see Friedrich, *HWb*.
- HWb²* see Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *HWb²*.
- IBoT* *Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri I–III* (Istanbul, 1944, 1947, 1954).
- ICC* see Layard, *ICC*.
- IEJ* *Israel Exploration Journal*.
- IF* *Indogermanische Forschungen*. Zeitschrift für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Ingholt, *Rapport* H. Ingholt, *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie* (Copenhagen, 1940).
- Iraq* *Iraq*. The British School of Archaeology in Iraq.
- Ist. Mitt.* *Istanbuler Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*.
- Jacobsen, *OIC* 19 T. Jacobsen, A Hittite Hieroglyphic Inscription from Hines (*OIC* 19; Chicago, 1935, pp. 101–103).
- Jacob-Rost, *TdH* 2 L. Jacob-Rost, Das Ritual des Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (*TdH* 2; Heidelberg, 1972).
- JANES* *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of the University of Columbia*.
- JAOS* *Journal of American Oriental Society*.
- JCS* *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.
- JEA* *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.
- JEOL* *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"*.
- JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- JIES* *Journal of the Indo-European Studies*.
- JKF* *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschungen*.
- JNES* *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.
- JRAS* *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.
- Kadmos* *Kadmos*. Zeitschrift für vor- und frühgriechische Epigraphik.
- KAH* *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*.
- KAI²* see Donner and Röllig, *KAI²*.
- Kalaç *IX TTK* M. Kalaç, Hiyeroglif Araştırmaları (in *LX Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Ankara 1981: *Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler I Cilt* (Ankara, 1986), pp. 255–258).
- Kammenhuber, *Hipp. Heth.* A. Kammenhuber, *Hippologia Hethitica* (Wiesbaden, 1961).
- Kaniššumar* see Güterbock, *Kaniššumar*.
- KAT³* see Schrader, *KAT³*.
- KBo* *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*.
- King, *AKA* L. W. King, *The Annals of the Kings of Assyria* (London, 1902).
- King, *Bronze Reliefs* L. W. King, *Bronze Reliefs from the Gates of Sbalmaneser, King of Assyria* (London, 1915).
- Klauber, *PRT* G. Klauber, *Politisch-religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit* (Leipzig, 1913).
- Klengel, *GS* H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v. u. Z. I–III* (Berlin, 1965, 1969, 1970).
- Knudtzon, *AGS* J. A. Knudtzon, *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott I–II* (Leipzig, 1893).
- König, *HChI* H. W. König, *Handbuch der chaldäischen Inschriften (AfO Beiheft 8; Graz, 1955, 1957)*.
- Koldewey, *WVDOG* 55 R. Koldewey, *Die Königsburgen von Babylon II* (*WVDOG* 55; Leipzig, 1932).
- Kratylos* *Kratylos*. Kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionorgan für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kronasser, *Umsiedlung* H. Kronasser, *Die Umsiedlung der schwarzen Gottheit: Das bethitische Ritual KUB XXIX 4 (des Ulippi)* (*Sitzungsberichte, Öst. Ak. Wiss.* 241.3; Vienna, 1963).

- KUB* Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.
- Kupper, *Nomades* J. R. Kupper, *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (Paris, 1957).
- KZ* (Kubns) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 1–100 (1952–1987), renamed *Historische Sprachforschung* (1988–).
- LAAA* *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*.
- Lajard, *Mithra* M. F. Lajard, *Introduction à l'étude de culte publique et des mystères de Mithra en orient et en occident* (Paris, 1847).
- Landsberger, *Fauna* B. Landsberger, *Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamiens* (Leipzig, 1934).
- Landsberger, *Sam'al* B. Landsberger, *Sam'al. Studien zur Entdeckung der Ruinenstätte Karatepe* (Ankara, 1948).
- Langdon, *NBK* S. Langdon, *Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften* (Leipzig, 1912).
- Laroche, *CTH* E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris, 1971).
- Laroche, *DLL* E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris, 1959).
- Laroche, *FdX V* E. Laroche, Les epitaphes lyciennes (*apud* P. Demargne, *Fouilles de Xanthos V* (Paris, 1974), pp. 123–149).
- Laroche, *FdX VI* E. Laroche, L'inscription lycienne (*apud* H. Metzger *et al.*, *Fouilles de Xanthos VI* (Paris, 1979), pp. 49–127).
- Laroche, *Gloss. Hour.* E. Laroche, Glossaire de la langue hourrite, 1–2 parties (*RHA* XXXIV–XXXV (1976–1977)).
- Laroche, *HH* E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites* (Paris, 1960).
- Laroche, *Noms* E. Laroche, *Les noms des hittites* (Paris, 1966).
- Laroche, *Noms, suppl.* E. Laroche, *Les noms des hittites*, supplement (*Hethitica* 4 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1981), pp. 3–58).
- Laroche, *Recherches* E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (*RHA* VII/46; Paris, 1947).
- Layard, *ICC* A. H. Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments* (London, 1851).
- Levine, *TNASI* L. D. Levine, *Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran* (Art and Archaeology Occasional Paper 23; Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, 1972).
- Lie, *Sargon* A. G. Lie, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria* (Paris, 1929).
- Lloyd, *EHPA* S. Lloyd, *Early Highland Peoples of Anatolia* (London, 1967).
- Luckenbill, *ARAB* D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia I–II* (Chicago, 1926, 1927).
- Luckenbill, *Sennacherib* D. D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (*OIP* 2; Chicago, 1924).
- von Luschan, *AiS* F. von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, II, III, IV (Berlin, 1898, 1902, 1911).
- Lyon, *Sargon* D. G. Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons, Königs von Assyrien* (Leipzig, 1883).
- Malli* see Jacob-Rost, *TdH* 2.
- Manuale* see Meriggi, *Manuale*.
- MAOG* *Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*.
- MDOG* *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*.
- MEE* *Materiali epigrafici di Ebla*.
- Meijer, *Natural Phenomena* D. J. W. Meijer (ed.), *Natural Phenomena. Their Meaning, Depiction and Description in the Ancient Near East* (Amsterdam, 1992).
- Mélanges Dussaud* *Mélanges syriens offerts à monsieur René Dussaud par ses amis et ses élèves* (Paris, 1939).
- Mélanges Laroche* *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, ed. E. Masson and Cl. Brixhe (Paris, 1979).
- Melikišvili, *UKN* G. A. Melikišvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi* (Moscow, 1960).
- Meriggi, *Glossar* P. Meriggi, *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar* (Wiesbaden, 1962).
- Meriggi, *Manuale* P. Meriggi, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico* I, II/I, II/2–3 (Rome, 1966, 1967, 1975).
- Meriggi, *MVAeG39/1* P. Meriggi, Die längsten Bauinschriften in "hethitischen" Hieroglyphen (*MVAeG* 39/1; Leipzig, 1934).
- Meriggi, *Schizzo* P. Meriggi, Schizzo grammaticale dell'Anatolico (*Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Serie VIII, 24/3 (Rome, 1980)).
- Mesopotamia* *Mesopotamia*. Copenhagen Studies of Assyriology.
- Messer-schmidt, *CIH* L. Messerschmidt, *Corpus Inscriptionum Hethiticarum* (*MVAG* V/4–5; Leipzig, 1900).
- Messer-schmidt, *CIH*¹ L. Messerschmidt, *CIH*, Erster Nachtrag (*MVAG* VII/3; Leipzig 1902).
- Messer-schmidt, *CIH*² L. Messerschmidt, *CIH*, Zweiter Nachtrag (*MVAG* XI/5; Leipzig 1906).

- Messerschmidt, *VŠ* L. Messerschmidt and A. Ungnad, *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin I* (Leipzig, 1907).
- Met. Mus. Studies* *Metropolitan Museum Studies*.
- Meyer, *RKC* E. Meyer, *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter* (Berlin, 1914).
- MFO* *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale*, Université St.-Joseph (Beyrouth).
- Minerva* *Minerva*. The International Review of Ancient Art and Archaeology.
- MIO* *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*.
- Moortgat, *BK* A. Moortgat, *Die bildende Kunst des Alten Orients und die Bergvölker* (Berlin, 1932).
- Mora, *Glittica Anatolica* C. Mora, *La glittica anatolica del II millennio a.C.: classificazione tipologica I. I sigilli a iscrizione geroglifica. (Sammlung hieroglyphischer Siegel, Band II, Studia Mediterranea 6; Pavia 1987).*
- MSS* *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*.
- Muscarella, *Ladders to Heaven* O. W. Muscarella (ed.), *Ladders to Heaven. Art Treasures from Land of the Bible* (Canada, 1981).
- Le Muséon* *Le Muséon*. Revue d'études orientales.
- MVAeG* *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*.
- MVAG* *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (continued as *MVAeG*).
- NABU* *N.A.B.U. Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*.
- ND* *Field numbers of tablets excavated in Nimrud*.
- Neve, *Boğazköy-Hattuša XII* P. Neve, *Büyükkale. Die Bauwerke. Grabungen 1954–1966*. (Boğazköy-Hattuša XII; Berlin, 1982).
- Nougayrol, *PRU IV* J. Nougayrol, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit IV. Textes accadiennes, archives sud* (Paris, 1956).
- OA* *Oriens Antiquus*.
- Oettinger, *Stammbildung* N. Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des bethitischen Verbuns* (Nürnberg, 1979).
- OIC* *Oriental Institute Communications*.
- OIP* *Oriental Institute Publications*.
- OLZ* *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*.
- Or. Ex.* *Oriens Extremus*.
- Or. NS* *Orientalia, Nova Series*.
- Oriens* *Oriens*. Journal of the International Society for Oriental Research.
- Orthmann, *USK* W. Orthmann, *Untersuchungen zur spätbethitischen Kunst* (Bonn, 1971).
- von der Osten, *OIC 2* H. H. von der Osten, *Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor (OIC 2; Chicago, 1927)*.
- von der Osten, *OIC 6* H. H. von der Osten, *Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor 1927–28 (OIC 6; Chicago, 1929)*.
- von der Osten, *OIC 8* H. H. von der Osten, *Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor 1929 (OIC 8; Chicago, 1930)*.
- von der Osten, *OIC 14* H. H. von der Osten, *Discoveries in Anatolia 1930–31 (OIC 14; Chicago, 1933)*.
- von der Osten, *OIP 6* H. H. von der Osten, *The Alishar Hüyük: season of 1927, part I (OIP 6; Chicago, 1930)*.
- Otten, *StBoT Beiheft 1* H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV (StBoT Beiheft 1; Wiesbaden, 1988)*.
- Özgülç, *Kültepe* T. Özgüç, *Kültepe and its Vicinity in the Iron Age* (Ankara, 1971).
- Parpola, *N-AT* S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms (AOAT 6; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970)*.
- Parpola, *SA I* S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I. Letters from Assyria and the West (State Archives of Assyria I; Helsinki, 1987)*.
- Parpola, *SA II* S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths (State Archives of Assyria II; Helsinki, 1988)*.
- Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri* F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita (Incunabula Graeca 79; Rome, 1982)*.
- Pecorella, *Malatya III* P. E. Pecorella, *Malatya III. Rapporto preliminare delle campagne 1963–1968. Il livello eteo imperiale e quelli neoetei. (Oriens Antiqui Collectio 12; Rome, 1975)*.
- PEFQ* *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*.
- Peiser, *HI* F. E. Peiser, *Die bethitischen Inschriften: ein Versuch ihrer Entzifferung* (Berlin, 1892).
- Perrot, *Exploration* G. Perrot, E. Guillaume and J. Delbet, *Exploration de la Galatie et de la Bithynie (d'une part de la Mysie, de la Phrygie, de la Cappadoce, et du Pont)* (Paris, 1872).
- Perrot and Chipiez, *HA IV* G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, Tome IV* (Paris, 1887).
- Piepkorn, *Ashurbanipal* A. C. Piepkorn, *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (AS 5; Chicago, 1933)*.
- PJB* *Palästina-Jahrbuch des Deutschen Evangelischen Instituts ... zu Jerusalem*.

- Poetto, *Stud. Med.* 3 M. Poetto and S. Salvatori, *La collezione anatolica di E. Borowski* (*Studia Mediterranea* 3; Pavia, 1981).
- Pokorny, *IEW* J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin–Munich, 1959, 1965–69).
- Pottier, *AH* E. Pottier, *L'Art hittite* (Paris, 1926).
- Porada, *Corpus I* E. Porada, *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections I. The Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Washington, 1948).
- Postgate, *FNALD* J. N. Postgate, *Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents* (Warminster, 1976).
- Postgate, *NARGD* J. N. Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (*Studia Pohl: Series Maior* 1; Rome, 1969).
- Postgate, *TCAE* J. N. Postgate, *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire* (*Studia Pohl: Series Maior* 3; Rome, 1974).
- Pritchard, *ANEP* J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near East in Pictures relating to the Old Testament* (2nd edition, with Supplement; Princeton, 1969).
- Pritchard, *ANET*³ J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (3rd edition, with supplement; Princeton, 1969).
- PRU* IV see Nougayrol, *PRU* IV.
- PSBA* *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology*.
- Puglisi and Meriggi, *Malatya I* S. M. Puglisi and P. Meriggi, *Malatya I. Rapporto preliminare delle campagne 1961 e 1962* (*Orientalis Antiqui Collectio* 3; Roma, 1964).
- Puhvel, *HED* J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, 1. Words beginning with A; 2. Words beginning with E and I; 3. Words beginning with H (Berlin, New York, Amsterdam, 1984, 1991).
- P-W, *RE* *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*.
- QdGB* *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Glottologia* (Bologna).
- RA* *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*.
- RAI* *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*.
- RB* *Revue Biblique*.
- Recueil* *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*.
- RGTC* *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* (Wiesbaden).
- RGTC* 1 D. O. Edzard et al., *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der prä-sargonischen und sargonischen Zeit* (1977).
- RGTC* 2 D. O. Edzard and G. Farber, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Zeit der 3. Dynastie von Ur* (1974).
- RGTC* 3 B. Groneberg, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit* (1980).
- RGTC* 4 K. Nashef, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altassyrischen Zeit* (1991).
- RGTC* 5 K. Nashef, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittellassyrischen Zeit* (1982).
- RGTC* 6(1) G. F. del Monte and J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* (1978); 6/2, *Supplement* (1992).
- RGTC* 8 R. Zadok, *Geographical Names According to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts* (1985).
- RGTC* 9 I. M. Diakonoff and S. M. Kashkai, *Geographical Names According to Urartian Texts* (1981).
- RHA* *Revue hittite et asianique*.
- Riemschneider, *WdH* M. Riemschneider, *Die Welt der Hethiter* (Stuttgart, 1954).
- Riis, *Hama* II/3 P. J. Riis, *Hama. Fouilles et recherches 1931–1938* II.3. *Les cimetières à crémation* (Copenhagen, 1948).
- Riis and Buhl, *Hama* II/2 P. J. Riis and M.-L. Buhl, *Hama. Fouilles et recherches de la fondation Carlsberg 1931–1938* II.2. *Les objets de la période dite syro-hittite (âge du fer)* (Copenhagen, 1990).
- RIMA* see Grayson, *RIMA*.
- Ritter, *Kleinasien* C. Ritter, *Die Erdkunde von Asien* IX. *Kleinasien*, Theil 1 (Berlin, 1858).
- RLA* *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und der vorderasiatischen Archäologie*.
- Rossner, *Heth. Felsreliefs* E. Rossner, *Die hethitischen Felsreliefs in der Türkei. Ein archäologischer Führer*. (2nd enlarged edition; Munich, 1988).
- Rost, *Tiglatpileser* P. Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III*. (Leipzig, 1893).
- RSO* *Rivista degli studi orientali*.
- SAAB* *State Archives of Assyria. Bulletin*.
- Salonen, *St. Or.* 38 E. Salonen, *Die Gruß- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen* (*Studia Orientalia* 38; Helsinki, 1967).
- SANE* *Sources of the Ancient Near East*.
- SBo* see Güterbock, *SBo*.
- Schizzo* see Meriggi, *Schizzo*.

- Schrader, *KAT*³ E. Schrader, *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament* (3rd edition; Giessen, 1903). *StBoT* 8
- Schramm, *EAK* W. Schramm, *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften, II. 934–722 v. Chr.* (*Handbuch der Orientalistik*; Leiden, 1973). *StBoT* 9
- Schramm, *Tukulti-Ninurta* W. Schramm, *Die Annalen des assyrischen Königs Tukulti-Ninurta II* (*Bi. Or.* 27 (1970), pp. 147–160). *StBoT* 16
- Schroeder, *KAH* II O. Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*, Zweites Heft. (*WVDOG* 37; Leipzig 1922). *StBoT* 18
- Schroeder, *KAV* O. Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (*WVDOG* 35; Leipzig, 1920). *StBoT* 22
- SCO* *Studi classici e orientali*. *StBoT* 23
- von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer. Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien*. (*UAVA* 3; Berlin, 1965). *StBoT* 24
- SEb* *Studi Eblaiti*. Missione archeologica italiana in Siria. *StBoT* 27
- Semitica* *Semitica*. Cahiers publiés par l'institut d'études sémitiques de l'Université de Paris. *StBoT* 29
- Sitzungsberichte, Öst. Ak. Wiss.* *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. *StBoT* 30
- SMEA* *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*. *StBoT* 31
- von Soden, *AHw* W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch I–III* (Wiesbaden, 1958–1981). *StBoT* Bh. 3
- Sommer, *HLAB* F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I* (Munich, 1938). see Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3
- Sprache* *Die Sprache*. Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft. Sterrett, *Epigraphical Journey* J. R. S. Sterrett, *An epigraphical journey in Asia Minor. The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor* (*Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 3 (Boston, 1884–85 [1888])).
- Starke, *Stammbildung* F. Starke, *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (*StBoT* 31; Wiesbaden, 1990). Streck, *Assurbanipal* M. Streck, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's I–III* (Leipzig, 1916).
- Starr, SAA* IV I. Starr, *Queries to the Sungod. Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria* (*State Archives of Assyria* IV; Helsinki, 1990). *Studi ... Levi della Vida* II *Studi orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida* (Rome, 1956).
- StBoT* *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* (Wiesbaden). *Studi Pugliese Carratelli* *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, ed. F. Imparati (Florence, 1988).
- StBoT* 3 H. M. Kümmel, *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König* (1967). *Studia Meriggi* *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata I–II*. *Studia Mediterranea* 1, ed. O. Carruba (Pavia, 1979).
- StBoT* 4 R. Werner, *Hethitische Gerichtsprotokolle* (1967). *Studia Naster* *Archéologie et religions de l'Anatolie ancienne. Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Paul Naster*, ed. R. Donceel and R. Lebrun (*Homo Religiosus* 10; Louvain-la-Neuve, 1984).
- StBoT* 5 E. Neu, *Interpretation der hethitischen medio-passiven Verbalformen* (1968). *Studia Naster II* *Studia Paulo Naster oblata II*, ed. J. Quaegebeur (*Orientalia antiqua, Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 13; Leuven, 1982).
- StBoT* 7 H. Otten and W. von Soden, *Das akkadisch-hethitische Vokabular KBo. I 44 + KBo. XIII 1* (1968). *Studies Cowgill* *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill. Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*, ed. C. Watkins (Berlin, New York, 1987).
- H. Otten and V. Souček, *Ein altheithitisches Ritual für das Königspaar* (1969).
- K. K. Riemschneider, *Babylonische Geburtsomina in hethitischer Übersetzung* (1970).
- C. Kühne and H. Otten, *Der Šausgamuwa-Vertrag* (1971).
- E. Neu, *Der Anitta-Text* (1974).
- N. Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter* (1976).
- F. Starke, *Die Funktionen der dimensionalischen Kasus und Adverbien im Altheithitischen* (1977).
- H. Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung* (1981).
- I. Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part One* (1983).
- G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals* (1983).
- F. Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte im Umschrift* (1985).
- see Starke, *Stammbildung*
- see Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3

- Studies Lacheman* *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of Ernest R. Lachemann* (Winona Lake, 1981).
- Studies Oppenheim* *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (Chicago, 1964).
- Studies Nimet Özgüç* *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, ed. M. J. Mellink, E. Porada and T. Özgüç (Ankara, 1993).
- Studies Tahsin Özgüç* *Anatolia and the Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*, ed. K. Emre et al. (Ankara, 1989).
- Studies Watkins* *Mir Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Olivier (Innsbruck, 1998).
- STT* O. R. Gurney and J. J. Finkelstein, *The Sultan-tepe Tablets I–II* (London, 1957, 1964).
- Sumer* *Sumer. Journal of Archaeology and History in Iraq*.
- Symbolae Böhl* *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl dedicatae*, ed. M. A. Beek et al. (Leiden, 1973).
- Syria* *Syria. Revue d'art orientale et d'archéologie*.
- TAD* *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi*.
- Tadmor, Azriyau* H. Tadmor, Azriyau of Yaudi (*Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), pp. 232–271).
- Tadmor, Introductory Remarks* H. Tadmor, Introductory Remarks to a New Edition of the Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III (*Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2 (Jerusalem, 1968), pp. 168–187).
- Tadmor, Tiglath-Pileser III* H. Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria*. Critical Edition, with Introductions, Translations and Commentary (Jerusalem, 1994).
- TdH* *Texte der Hethiter*.
- Tel Aviv* *Tel Aviv. Journal of the Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology*.
- Thompson, Report* R. Campbell Thompson, *Report on the Excavation at Carchemish April 20–July 4 1911* (unpublished notebook in British Museum).
- Thureau-Dangin, VIII campagne de Sargon* F. Thureau-Dangin, *Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon (714 av. J.C.)* (Musée de Louvre – département des antiquités orientales, tome III; Paris, 1912).
- Thureau-Dangin, Til-Barsib* F. Thureau-Dangin and M. Dunand, *Til-Barsib* (Paris, 1936).
- Tischler, HEG* J. Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck, 1977–).
- TL* *Tituli Lyciae* (Vienna, 1901).
- TPS* *Transactions of the Philological Society*.
- TSBA* *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*.
- TTAED* *Türk Tarih, Arkeologiya ve Etnografya Dergisi*.
- UAVA* *Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie. Ergänzungsbände zur ZA*.
- UF* *Ugarit-Forschungen*.
- USK* see Orthmann, *USK*.
- VBoT* A. Götzte, *Verstreute Boğazköi-Texte* (Marburg, 1930).
- Vieyra, HA* M. Vieyra, *Hittite Art 2300–750 B.C.* (London, 1955).
- VO* *Vicino Oriente. Annuario dell'Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente*.
- Vollenweider, Catalogue* M.-L. Vollenweider, *Catalogue raisonné des sceaux cylindres intailles et camées, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire de Genève I* (Geneva, 1967).
- VT* *Vetus Testamentum*.
- Ward, APES* H. Ward, *The Hamath Inscriptions* (*American Palestine Exploration Society*, second statement; September, 1873).
- Ward, Cylinders ... Pierpont Morgan* H. Ward, *Cylinders and other Ancient Oriental Seals in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (New York, 1909).
- Ward, Seal Cylinders* H. Ward, *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia* (Washington, 1910).
- WdO* *Die Welt des Orients. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*.
- Weidner, PD* E. Weidner, *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien. Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boğazköi*. (*Boğazköi-Studien* 8 und 9; Leipzig, 1923).
- Weidner, Tukulti-Ninurta* E. Weidner, *Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I. und seiner Nachfolger* (*AfO Beiheft* 12; Graz, 1959).
- Weitenberg, HUS* J. J. S. Weitenberg, *Die hethitischen u-Stämme* (Amsterdam, 1984).
- Winckler, Sargon* H. Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen I–II* (Leipzig, 1889).
- Wiseman, CCK* D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (626–556 B.C.)* (London, 1961).

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Woolley,
<i>Carchemish</i> II | C. L. Woolley, <i>Carchemish. Report on the Excavations at Jerablus on Behalf of the British Museum</i> II: The Town Defences (London, 1921). | <i>WZKM</i>
<i>ZA</i> | <i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.</i>
<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie.</i> |
| Woolley,
<i>Carchemish</i> III | C. L. Woolley, <i>Carchemish. Report on the Excavations at Jerablus on Behalf of the British Museum</i> III: The Excavations in the Inner Town; R. D. Barnett, <i>The Hittite Inscriptions</i> (London, 1952). | <i>ZDMG</i>
<i>ZDPV</i> | <i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.</i>
<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.</i> |
| Wright,
<i>EH, EH²</i>
<i>WVDOG</i> | W. Wright, <i>The Empire of the Hittites</i> (London 1884; 2nd edition, London, 1886).
<i>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.</i> | <i>Zgusta, Personennamen</i>
<i>Zuntz, Ortsadv.</i> | L. Zgusta, <i>Kleinasiatische Personennamen</i> (Prague, 1964).
L. Zuntz, <i>Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien arha, para, piran als selbständige Adverbien und in ihrer Verbindung mit Nomina und Verba</i> (Munich, 1936). |

INTRODUCTION

A. GENERAL

1. Background and terminology
2. Date of the origin of the Script
3. Character and techniques of the Inscriptions
4. Nature, formation and usage of the Script

B. INSCRIPTIONS AND SCRIPT

1. Discovery and Publication
 - Earliest stage
 - Period 1900–1914
 - Karkamiš excavation and publication
 - Period 1920–1940
 - Karatepe: discovery and publications
 - Recent work
2. Decipherment and Interpretation
 - General problems
 - First attempts
 - Successful entry
 - The bilingual and after
 - The “new readings”
 - Recent progress

C. THE CORPUS

1. Definition of the Corpus
 - Empire and Late Periods
 - The Seals
 - Separation of the Empire Period corpus
 - Intermediate inscriptions

2. Arrangement of the Inscriptions
 - Groups
 - Order
 - Summary of results

3. Presentation of the Inscriptions
 - Photographs
 - Copies
 - Karkamiš
 - Transliteration and translation
 - Commentary
 - Bibliography

4. Present Corpus and further volumes

D. PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLITERATION

1. Order of the Signs
2. The Logograms
3. The Syllabograms
 - The Regular Syllabary
 - Corrections
 - Modifications
 - Alternative Syllabograms
 - Values and modifications
 - Empire Period syllabic values only
 - Discarded values

E. APPENDICES

1. Boğazköy Hieroglyphic inscriptions on stone
2. *HH* no. 448 *sü*
3. *HH* no. 462
- (4. The ALTINTEPE pithos inscriptions)

A. General

1. Background and Terminology

The inscriptions which are the subject of this book are written in a script termed *Hieroglyphic*. This designation, taken from that of the Hieroglyphic script proper – Egyptian – is a convenient way of characterizing other such scripts which are pictorial (pictographic) in appearance. Early on in its rediscovery, the script was correctly linked with the Hittites,¹ and the designation “Hittite Hieroglyphs” (or “Hieroglyphic”) remains a perfectly valid term of reference.

The Hittites took their name from the Central Anatolian land of *Hatti*,² which they dominated for most of the IInd millennium B. C. Their history as known to us falls into two main periods: first, that of the Old Kingdom and Empire, *c.* 1650–1200 B. C., during which they ruled Hatti from their capital Hattusa (mod-

ern Boğazköy), and then conquered and ruled Syria from the city Karkamiš on the Euphrates;³ and second, a subsequent period, after the destruction of Hattusa and the dissolution of the Empire, when a number of independent “Neo-Hittite” states lacking the control of a paramount capital are found stretching from the south-east Anatolian plateau and northern Syria as far as the west bank of the Euphrates.⁴

1 By Sayce in 1876: see below p. 6 and n. 42.

2 See Güterbock, *RLA* IV/4–5 (1975), s. v. Hethiter, Hethitisch.

3 See *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. II, parts 1–2 (3rd ed., 1973, 1975): Gurney, *Anatolia c. 1750–1600* (ch. VI); id., *Anatolia c. 1600–1380* (ch. XV (a)); Goetze, *The Struggle for the domination of Syria (1400–1300 B. C.)* (ch. XVII); id., *Anatolia from Shuppiluliumash to the Egyptian War of Muwatallish* (ch. XXI (a)); id., *The Hittites and Syria (1300–1200 B. C.)* (ch. XXIV); Drower, *Ugarit* (ch. XXI (b)).

4 *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. III/1 (2nd edition, 1982): Hawkins, *The Neo-Hittite States in Syria and Anatolia* (ch. 9).

During the period of the primacy of Hattusa, the Hittites are best known from their royal library and archives excavated at that site, written in the Cuneiform script on clay tablets,⁵ a script and medium borrowed from Mesopotamia.⁶ These archives, comprising many thousands of tablets, contain every kind of royal chancellery document: annals; edicts, treaties and laws; verdicts, protocols and administrative texts; letters; and a large number of religious texts, rituals and festivals. The Cuneiform script was used throughout its history to write a number of different languages, and the Hattusa archives are composed for the most part in their writers' own language, generally termed by us "Hittite", but by them "Nesite",⁷ i. e. the language of Nesa or Kaneš (modern Kültepe), which had presumably been an earlier Hittite centre, before Hattusa in Hatti. This Hittite language on its decipherment in the years 1915–17⁸ unexpectedly turned out to belong to the Indo-European language group, of which it is the oldest known representative.⁹ The Hittites also used the language Akkadian ("Babylonian" to them) as the international language of communication.¹⁰ Besides Hittite and Akkadian, smaller groups of texts in other languages are found in the archives, mostly of ritual and mythological content. These include Hattian, the pre-Hittite language of Hatti,¹¹ and Hurrian, the language of the Hittites' eastern neighbours,¹² also Luwian¹³ and Palaic,¹⁴ languages closely related to Hittite, spoken by their kinsmen dwelling respectively to the south and south-west, and to the north-west of Hatti, and constituting with Hittite the IIInd millennium B. C. section of the Anatolian group of Indo-European.¹⁵

Unlike the Mesopotamians, the Hittites did not use their borrowed Cuneiform script for writing monumental inscriptions on stone. For this purpose instead they used Hieroglyphic. The two scripts, Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic, only appear together on one type of document, the royal seals, where the King's name is written in the centre in Hieroglyphic and in a circular ring around it in Cuneiform.¹⁶

Most of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Hittite Empire period on seals (from c. 1500 B. C. onwards) and stone monuments (from c. 1350 B. C. onwards) are simply names of persons or gods, and thus are not composed in any specific language. The surprise is however that the few historical and dedicatory inscriptions on stone of Hittite kings of this period are written not in the language Hittite but in Luwian, a curious fact for which various explanations have been offered.¹⁷

The Hittite Empire collapsed c. 1200 B. C. and the capital Hattusa was destroyed. The Hittite tradition of writing in the Cuneiform script on clay tablets ended with this collapse, but there are other indications of cultural continuity rather than an absolute hiatus. The Neo-Hittite states, from Tabal and Tuwana on the Anatolian plateau to Malatya and Karkamiš on the Euphrates, preserved many of the characteristic features of

Hittite civilization, notably its architecture¹⁸ and its sculpture.¹⁹ They also continued the practice of writing monumental stone inscriptions in the Hieroglyphic script; indeed they considerably expanded it, since for the post-Empire period, c. 1200–700 B. C. very many more Hieroglyphic inscriptions are found than for the Hittite Empire period. Each state seems to have developed its own tradition of monumental inscriptions. The evidence of a handful of letters and economic documents written on strips of lead suggests that by this period the Hieroglyphic script had been developed for writing such every-day administrative documents which

5 See E. Laroche, *Catalogue des Textes Hittites* (Paris, 1971); with supplement, *RHA* XXX (1972), pp. 94–133.

6 T. V. Gamkrelidze, The Akkado-Hittite syllabary and the problem of the origin of the Hittite script (*Ar. Or.* 29 (1961), pp. 406–418).

7 See most recently *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* vol. 3/4 (1989), s. v. *nīšili*.

8 See J. Friedrich et al., *Hb. Or.* (1969), part III: A. Kammenhuber, Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, und Hieroglyphenluwisch, 1. Forschungslage.

9 ead., *ibid.*, 3. Das indogermanische Erbe im Hethitisch-Luwischen; see also the symposium *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, E. Neu and W. Meid ed. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 25; Innsbruck, 1979).

10 R. Labat, *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köi* (Bordeaux, 1932).

11 Kammenhuber, *RLA* IV/2–3 (1973), s. v. Hattier, Hattisch; Laroche, *Catalogue*, ch. XI, A. Hatti.

12 Edzard and Kammenhuber, *RLA* IV/6–7 (1975), s. v. Hurriter, Hurritisch. Note the series *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler* I. Die Texte aus Boğazköy (Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo – Anatolici); also *Hurritologische Studien* (*AOAT* 3, *AOAT* 31, 36 etc.); and for recent discoveries, E. Neu, *Das Hurritische: eine altorientalische Sprache in neuem Licht* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, 1988/3); id., *Neue Wege im Hurritischen* (XXIII Deutscher Orientalistentag; Steiner, 1989).

13 E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris, 1959); F. Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (*StBoT* 30; Wiesbaden, 1985); id., *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (*StBoT* 31; Wiesbaden, 1990).

14 O. Carruba, *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon* (*StBoT* 10; Wiesbaden, 1970); Laroche, *Catalogue*, ch. XI, B. Pala.

15 Kammenhuber, loc. cit. (nn. 8–9), 2. Die Verwandtschaft zwischen dem Hethitischen, Palaischen und Luwischen; B. Rosenkranz, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der altanatolischen Sprachen* (Mouton, 1978).

16 H. G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy* I–II (*AJO* Beiheft 5, 7; Berlin, 1940, 1942); T. Beran, *Die hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy* (*WVDOG* 76; Berlin, 1967); R. M. Boehmer and H. G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy* (Berlin, 1987). Also C. Schaeffer, E. Laroche, H. G. Güterbock, *Ugaritica* III (Paris, 1956), ch. 1.

17 E. g. that Luwian was the vernacular language (*Umgangssprache*) of the bulk of the population, while Hittite was only the chancellery language (*Amtssprache*). The theory was stated by Rosenkranz in its most extreme form, *IF* 56 (1938), pp. 265–284. Alternatively, it is possible that the script was invented by Luwians for their own language and borrowed as such by the Hittites without ever being adapted to write Hittite. Cf. Hawkins, *Writing in Anatolia* (*World Archaeology* 17 (1986), pp. 363–376).

18 R. Naumann, *Architektur Kleinasiens* (2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1971).

19 W. Orthmann, *Untersuchungen zur spät-hethitischen Kunst* (Bonn, 1971), explores the derivation of Neo-Hittite art from that of the Empire Period.

would normally have been written on a perishable material, wood, leather or papyrus, and thus that the Neo-Hittite states practised a high degree of literacy, most of which has been lost for ever. They probably wrote in this way all the types of text that the Hittite Empire wrote in Cuneiform on clay, and we should remember that references in the Cuneiform clay documents of Hattusa to wooden documents and “scribes on wood” suggest the existence of a parallel lost corpus of literacy during the Empire period.²⁰

With the destruction of the Hittite Empire, the land of Hatti ceased to exist in central Anatolia, but the term “Hatti” continued to be applied to the former provinces of the Empire in south-east Anatolia and north Syria where the cultural descendants of the Hittites survived, hence our term “Neo-Hittite”.²¹ But the observation made for the Hittite Empire is even more clear for the succeeding period, namely that the language of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions is not Hittite but Luwian. The evidence of the letters and economic documents on lead as well as the personal names from these and from other sources combine to suggest that the bulk of the population, not only the ruling dynasties of the Neo-Hittite states, was Luwian-speaking. We may however note that no self-designation of the land, the people, or the language (whether as “Hatti” or “Luwia” or anything else) is found in the Hieroglyphic inscriptions.

Our terminology “Hieroglyphic Luwian” as applied to these inscriptions should now be clear, designating first the script and second the language; similarly the use of “Hittite” as a general cultural term for the whole civilization rather than narrowly for the specific language Hittite (i. e. “Nesite”). Finally we may state that there is almost no indication that the Hittite Hieroglyphic script was ever used to write any language other than Luwian.²²

The bulk of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of the Late Period may be dated to the 9th and 8th centuries B. C. It has been supposed that the 12th and 11th centuries, following the fall of the Hittite Empire, were a complete dark age with no surviving monuments or written sources, and that these begin again during the 10th century. Recent evidence however is now tending to suggest that more of the monuments and inscriptions are to be dated to the period 1200–900 B. C., and that these point to greater continuity and less of a cultural break. This is one of the historical problems addressed in the relevant parts of the present book.

2. Date of the origin of the script

Historically the Hieroglyphic script’s first common appearance is on royal seals of the 14th century B. C., specifically all seals of the kings of Hattusa from Arnuwandas I onwards, when the characteristic “digraphic” royal seals come into use, on which the name is written in Hieroglyphs in the centre surrounded by one or

more rings of Cuneiform rendering the same name.²³ The earliest datable example of such a seal is an isolated find excavated at Tarsus, an impression of the seal of Ispuḫḫus, king of Kizzuwatna, a contemporary of Tiliyinu, thus dating c. 1500 B. C.²⁴ Earlier seals and also graffiti on objects may show the odd sign later incorporated into the Hieroglyphic script system, especially the TRIANGLE and ANKH signs representing “good” and “life”. There is however no indication that these formed part of a regular writing system already in existence before 1500 B. C.²⁵

The appearance of the Hieroglyphs in monumental inscriptions as epigraphs to sculpture, though by no means precisely datable, would seem to be an extension from their use on seals. Substantial monumental inscriptions of the Empire Period on stone cluster round two of the latest kings of the Hittite Empire, Tudhaliyas IV and his son Suppiluliumas II. The earliest approximately datable example is ALEPPO 1,²⁶ the work of Talmi-Šarruma king of Aleppo, grandson of Suppiluliumas I, thus c. 1300 B. C., the generation of Muwattallis II and Hattusilis III.

To what extent Hieroglyphic was used for writing non-monumental documents remains, in the absence of any such discoveries, uncertain. Hier. graffiti on the paving stones and orthostats of the Great Temple, and on a boulder in the Lower City Gate, which give personal names and the sign for “scribe”,²⁷ suggest the existence of a group of public scribes. References in Cuneiform texts to “scribes on wood” and wooden documents and writing boards, as mentioned above, attest to a literate tradition parallel to that of the clay tablets. While some at least of these documents were written in Cuneiform,²⁸ it may well be that others were written in Hieroglyphic.

20 D. Symington, *An. St.* 41 (1991), pp. 111–123, examines this question in the context of the publication of an article on the writing-board recovered from the Ulu Burun (Kaş) shipwreck off the southern coast of Turkey.

21 Hawkins, *RIA* IV/2–3 (1973), s. v. Hatti: the 1st millennium B. C.

22 This statement is not invalidated by the use of Hieroglyphic to write Hittite, Hurrian and Semitic *names* on the seals from Boğazköy, Ras Shamra and Meskene. Note also that the Hier. epigraphs of the gods at Yazılıkaya include phonetically written Hurrian divine names and even two Hurrian words as a title.

23 See the publications of the seals cited above, n. 16.

24 See Klengel, *RIA* V/3–4 (1977), s. v. Ispuḫḫu. The reading of the Hieroglyphic on the seal remains problematic.

25 See Laroche, *RIA* IV/4–5 (1975), s. v. Hieroglyphen, hethitische, § 5.2 (*De l'âge des hiéroglyphes*, with Bibliography); also S. Alp, *Zylinder- und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya* (Ankara, 1968), ch. X, Der Beitrag der Funde von Karahöyük zur Geschichte der Schrift; and most recently, C. Mora, Sull' origine della scrittura geroglifica anatolica (*Kadmos* 30 (1991), pp. 1–28).

26 See below, p. 19.

27 See most recently Poetto, *OA* 26 (1987), pp. 187–189, quoting Bittel's publication and his inferences from the graffiti. The writing *pa-ti-si-na* represents the Hurrian name *Bentešina*.

28 See I. Singer, *StBoT* 27 (1983), pp. 33, 40–43. The Hittite word appears to be *gulzattar* (loan from Luwian): see Starke, *Stammbildung* §§ 271–272.

3. Character and techniques of the inscriptions

The Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions survive mainly as monumental inscriptions on rock faces or dressed stone, often accompanying sculpture. The dressed stone elements may be orthostat slabs or blocks serving as wall-facings and door-jambes; free-standing stelae in various shapes; and statues ranging from colossal to small; bases for these monuments and other podia; tomb-stones and personal memorials of various types; objects of dedication, particularly stone bowls; and scarcely shaped boulders. As representatives of other types of written document the inscribed strips of lead have already been mentioned, as has also the use of Hieroglyphs on seals, though not many of these can be specifically characterized as Luwian.

The Hieroglyphs themselves are rendered in two main ways: either in relief, with the background cut away; or in linear forms incised into a smoothed surface. Generally the relief forms are rendered in a more elaborate and pictorial style which may be termed “monumental”, and the incised forms in reduced, non-pictorial shapes to be characterized as “cursive”. The boundaries between the categories are not however sharp: many relief inscriptions include cursive forms, as many incised ones include monumental forms. Nor is the distinction entirely a question of date. Though on the whole, Empire Period inscriptions are in relief, there are already examples of incised ones. In the Late Period, relief and incised inscriptions coexist from earliest to latest, though it does appear that the trend was towards ever-increasing use of incised forms. This phenomenon is probably to be explained by the supposition that incised stone inscriptions, like the “cursive” sign forms, do reflect a parallel tradition of handwritten documents using linear forms, though no examples of such are preserved until the above-mentioned lead documents, which belong to the latest stage of the script.

The signs comprising the inscriptions are normally arranged in horizontal lines separated by horizontal rulings (“line-dividers”), relief or incised according to the character of the inscription. These lines run alternately leftwards (“sinistroverse”) and rightwards (“dextroverse”), so that the inscription follows a snaking course known as *boustrophedon* (“as an ox turns (in ploughing a field)”). In each line the non-symmetrical signs turn to face the beginning of the line (i. e. against the direction of reading the inscription), which is specially noticeable in the case of the human and animal heads. Inscriptions more commonly start in the upper right corner and run sinistroverse, although there are plenty of examples of the opposite. The most regular inscriptions are those placed on a single flat surface, but it is common for inscriptions to run around corners and

often, in the case of free-standing elements, to encircle them completely around all four sides. Indeed inscriptions are sometimes placed across very irregular surfaces, especially in the case of inscribed statues. For the purpose of publishing in drawing form on a sheet of flat paper, these inscriptions can be opened up and flattened out, and in cases which entirely surround an object, the left and right edges of the flattened inscription will of course represent different sides of the same vertical dividing line.

Within each line, the individual words are written with their component signs arranged in one or more vertical columns from top to bottom. Thus a short word may be rendered by 2–4 signs in one column, while a longer one will extend into a second column. But the signs come in a variety of shapes, long and slender, wide and flat etc., so that the scribe-mason executing the inscription had to exercise considerable ingenuity in arranging them. A problem for us is that it is by no means always clear in what order the signs are to be read. In the Late Period, a special sign was used as a word-divider (**ic**) placed normally at the top of the line at the beginning of a new word and used with greater or lesser consistency depending on the inscription – some inscriptions do not use it at all. When, as frequently happens in some inscriptions, words are begun not at the top of the line, the word-divider seems to be more often used, as one may understand to have been necessary.

4. Nature, formation, and usage of the script²⁹

The script resembles most of the other deciphered scripts of the Ancient Near East in its component parts. The signs may be divided into two main categories, the word-signs or *logograms*, and the sound-signs or *syllabograms*. A special group of logograms constitute a subcategory, that of *determinatives*, which serve as aids to reading by allocating the words to which they are attached to classes: “god”, “person”, “city”, “country”, etc. As a convention in this work, determinatives are enclosed in parentheses.

Logograms may be *pictograms*, i. e. stand very obviously for what they represent either in whole or in part: e. g. HORSE-HEAD = “horse”; FOOT = “foot” – although often these are so schematized that they may

29 This topic is examined in detail by Günter Neumann in his study “System und Aufbau der hethitischen Hieroglyphenschrift” (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1992 Nr. 4, pp. 25–48). Evidence for most of the points made in this section will be found in Neumann’s treatment.

or may not be recognizable to us. Logograms may also be *ideograms*, i. e. suggest a word or idea without actually representing it: e. g. POINTED HAT = “king”; schematic PAIR OF EYES = “god” (concept of “all-seeing”); FOOT = “go, walk, run, etc.”. Thus ideograms are particularly used to write verbs, which of course cannot be actually drawn. Often the connection between the sign and its significance is by no means obvious to us or at best is an object of speculation. Why should the LITUUS be used, as it apparently is, to determine verbs of perception, why a POT, as it may be, to determine parts of the body?

The probability is that Hieroglyphic, like other neighbouring ancient scripts, such as Cuneiform and Egyptian Hieroglyphic, originated as a purely logographic script, although this stage of its development is lost to us. It is certainly the case that the Empire Period inscriptions remain preponderantly logographic, although as far as we can judge, a fairly complete syllabary had been evolved by that date. This process, again to judge from neighbouring parallels, was probably achieved by using logograms to represent single syllables which coincided with the stem of the word denoted, often reduced to the necessary minimum. Thus e. g. GIVING HAND = “give”, Luw. *pīya-*, syllabic *pī*; OX = “ox”, Luw. *uwa(wi)-*, syllabic *u*; TONGUE = “tongue”, Luw. *lala-*, syllabic *la*. The comparatively small number of syllabograms in the regular syllabary, the origin of which can be identified in this way, does however suggest that other formative devices may also have been at work. In particular it is uncertain to what extent acrophonic formation was used, i. e. the isolation of the first syllable of a polysyllabic word to form a syllabogram. The few clearly established examples permit the speculative identification of many others.³⁰

The regular syllabary, as tabulated on p. 29, comprises besides the three vowel signs *a*, *i*, *u* (with a second *a* (*á*), used only initially) syllabograms of the type consonant+vowel (C+V) only, in a three-vowel series *Ca*, *Ci*, *Cu*. The script, like Cuneiform in Hittite usage, does not distinguish voiced and unvoiced consonants. Consonants registered are *p*, *k*, *t*, *s*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r* (not initial), *h* (of uncertain quality), *z* (= *ts*?), *w*, *y* (partially). Some syllables are written by common alternative signs, a practice for which we can discern no special reason: e. g., *ni* and *ní*, *ha* and *há*, *nu* and *nú*.³¹ Only in the *s*- and *t*-series are there more than two common alternatives, thus *sa*, *sá*, *sà*, *sa₄*, *sa₅*; *ta*, *tá*, *tà*, *ta₄*, *ta₅*. This accumulation of apparent homophones is presumably to be explained in terms of original distinctions either lost or not yet established by us: e. g. it may be suspected that *ta₄* and *ta₅* actually represent *da* or *di* [see now Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3, Appendix 5].

It will be clear that the syllabary cannot easily render consonant clusters or final consonants. Where necessary, the vowel of a CV syllable is disregarded, and in

this case it is normally the *a*-series which is used: e. g. *-s* and *-n* (nom. and acc. sing. MF endings) are written *-sa*, *-na*. Where a closed syllable ends in *-n*, this is omitted: e. g. *-(a)nti* and *-(a)nta* (3 plur. pres. and pret.) are written *-Ca-ti* and *-Ca-ta*, though these are indistinguishable from *-(a)ti* and *-(a)ta* (3 sing. pres. and pret.). Such a script leaves many ambiguities and problems of interpretation.

Besides the “regular” syllabary, a number of inscriptions employ a greater or lesser number of alternative signs for common values, tabulated below, p. 32. The inscriptions which do this are mostly a relatively restricted group of Tabalian (south-east Anatolian plateau) inscriptions, all late in the period, and significantly the important bilingual of KARATEPE shows similar tendencies in a more marked degree.

In addition to the regular syllabary of syllables of the type CV, occasional syllabograms are used of the type CVCV: e. g. *tara/i*, *ara/i*, *hara/i*, *TANA*, *TALA*, and others. For further consideration of these, see below, p. 31.

The way in which logograms and syllabograms are combined in the practice of writing is comparable to that of other contemporary scripts. The earliest stage shows a predominantly logographic script with a sparing use of syllabograms, principally to write occasional noun and verb endings and words which cannot easily be rendered logographically, above all clause connectives and their attached particle chains, also pronouns, demonstrative and relative. The next stage is to add to the logographically written nouns and verbs not only their grammatical ending but also a phonetic complement indicating the end of the stem: e. g. *DEUS-ni-zī* (= **masani-(i)nzi*), “gods” (nom./acc. plur. MF); *REGIO-ni-ia*, (= **utniya*), “countries” (nom./acc. plur. N). This trend can lead to the full phonetic writing of a word, in which cases the original logograms may or may not also be written: e. g. *la-la-ha*, “I took”; *á-zī/a-tá*, “he loved”; (*273) *mu-wa/i-ha*, “I conquered”.

All such writings are found together already on Empire Period inscriptions, and continue throughout the Late Period. The Late Period added the device of “logogram-markers”, special small signs which identified logograms as such, and like the word-dividers are used more or less consistently according to the inscription. It is noteworthy that full phonetic writings, without but also with the logogram, are particularly characteristic of the latest group of Tabal inscriptions. Curiously, the latest Karkamiš inscriptions show a marked archaizing style, in which the earliest largely logographic practice is consciously affected. Two points

30 See Neumann, op. cit.

31 It will be observed that homophonic signs are distinguished by diacritical marks following the practice of Cuneiform: ‘ for the second homophone of a series, ‘ for the third, and thereafter small inferior numerals; thus *sa*, *sá*, *sà*, *sa₄*, *sa₅* etc.

here should be noted: first, that once a writing system had evolved an adequately working syllabary, logograms could be entirely eliminated, though ancient scripts, including Hieroglyphic, hardly ever took this logical step;

second, writings of the type logogram + full phonetic writing, though common in Hieroglyphic, are rare in Cuneiform both in the Mesopotamian and Hittite usage.

B. Inscriptions and script

1. Discovery and Publication

Earliest stage

Discovery and publication of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions have since the 1870's gone more or less hand-in-hand. Thus European and American travellers who first observed these inscriptions usually had the interest to publish them in their home journals and so to make them available to western scholarship without any great lapse of time.³²

Formally priority of discovery³³ goes to the "Hamathite stones" (HAMA 1–4), observed by Burckhardt as early as 1812, though not reported by him until 1822, and not published until 1872 by Burton and Drake.³⁴ In the meantime, the recognition of this genre of inscription was heralded during the middle years of the 19th century by the observation and reporting of rock reliefs with associated Hieroglyphic inscriptions on the Anatolian plateau. We may cite here the earliest appearances: YAZILIKAYA, published in 1839, 1842 and 1872, also NIŞANTAŞ in the last year;³⁵ KARABEL, published in 1843;³⁶ İVRİZ 1, published in 1858 and 1876;³⁷ and SIPYLOS, published in 1880 onwards.³⁸ Also at the same time these Hieroglyphs began to be found on seals and seal-impressions: the group of NINEVEH bullae excavated by Layard in 1851 and published in 1853;³⁹ and the famous "Tarkondemos" seal, which became known at the beginning of the 1860's.⁴⁰ Along with the first publication of the Hamathite stones in 1872 came that of the Aleppo mosque inscription, ALEPPO 1.⁴¹

It was on the basis of this nascent corpus that Sayce, in a lecture to the Society for Biblical Archaeology delivered on 2 May 1876 on the subject of "The Hamathite Inscriptions",⁴² felt able to apply the term "Hittite" to these inscriptions. He took this term from its Old Testament occurrences (Hebrew *ḥitym*), but based his observations more particularly on the then recently deciphered records of the Egyptian New Kingdom and the Middle and Neo-Assyrian Cuneiform texts. These showed the presence of a country *Hatti* (Cuneiform; Egyptian *ḥt*; , sometimes transcribed *Kheta*) in Syria during the later IIInd and early Ist millennia B. C., which could plausibly be identified as the source of Hieroglyphic inscriptions.

From this point on, discovery and publication proceeded at a more rapid pace as scholars followed in the footsteps of missionaries in south-east Anatolia and north Syria, and the first archaeological expeditions (or antiquities hunts) were mounted. Typical of the latter were the 1878–1881 British Museum operations at Karkamiš conducted by Henderson, the British Consul in Aleppo, which acquired an early collection of Karkamiš sculpture and inscriptions for its sponsors.

The expanding corpus can be followed in the publications. Rylands, the Secretary of the Society for Biblical Archaeology, in a preliminary study of the inscrip-

32 In this section the sign * placed before the name of an inscription indicates that the *editio princeps* of the inscription appears in the work discussed at that point. By *editio princeps* I understand the first full presentation of an inscription by clear photograph(s) and/or copy.

33 "Discovery" from the point of view of western (including Turkish) scholars, covers various degrees of cognizance from personal excavation to being shown a piece long known to local inhabitants. The point of "discovery" nowadays is most commonly when a piece is brought by villagers to a local Turkish museum, or even when it simply appears on the international antiquities market. Thus information on the provenance of a piece may not extend very far back towards its actual appearance in modern times. Examination of the information listed in the bibliography of each inscription under the heading "Discovery" will amplify this point.

34 See HAMA 4, Discovery, and Publication, for details.

35 By Texier, Hamilton and Perrot: see Bittel *et al.*, *Das hebr. Felsheiligtum Yazılıkaya* (Berlin, 1975), p. 13 f. with nn. 9, 12, 15. These were all engraved drawings. A photograph of NIŞANTAŞ was published by Perrot, pl. XXXV.

36 By Kiepert: see Messerschmidt, *CIH*, p. 37 (note that the rediscovery of the monument by Renouard should be dated 1839, not 1859 as it is there misprinted).

37 By Ritter and Davis: see İVRİZ 1, Publication.

38 The monument has been described in various publications from 1880 onwards, but the presence of inscriptions was only gradually established: see Messerschmidt, *CIH*, p. 36.

39 See XIII.12, NINEVEH bullae, Discovery, Publication. A seal found by Layard was published later: see NINEVEH seal, here XIII.7.

40 Seal now in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, U.S.A.: see recently H. G. Güterbock, *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977), pp. 7–16, with historical survey of reading attempts and new proposals; also H. Nowicki, *Fs Neumann* (1982), pp. 228–232; and note also now n. 130.

41 By Burton and Drake: see also below, n. 47.

42 Published in *TSBA* 5 (1877), pp. 22–32.

tions published in 1882,⁴³ presented new and comparatively clear drawings from casts of the Hamathite stones,⁴⁴ and photographs and drawings of the recently acquired Karkamiš (“Jerabis”) material.⁴⁵ He also included a fanciful sketch by Sayce of the SIPYLOS inscription, his own drawings of Layard’s NINEVEH bullae, and a photograph of a cast of the “Tarkondemos” seal. Rylands’ work was reproduced in Wright’s *Empire of the Hittites* (1884),⁴⁶ and the latter added a group of fairly unsuccessful attempts to copy ALEPPO 1,⁴⁷ Davis’ drawing of İVRİZ with collations from Ramsay, Ramsay’s copy of *BOR (upper half only), drawings (by Rylands) and photographs of some 18 seal impressions in the possession of Schlumberger,⁴⁸ and a photograph of KARABEL with Sayce’s rendering of the inscription. In the second edition of *Empire of the Hittites* (1886), Wright was able further to add the remainder of the British Museum KARKAMIŞ fragments drawn by Rylands in 1885,⁴⁹ Perrot’s drawings of YAZILIKAYA,⁵⁰ the Babylon bowl (BABYLON 2) drawn by Rylands, and engraved photographs of the Maraş lion (*MARAŞ 1).⁵¹ The corpus by this point comprised some twelve substantial pieces⁵² and twenty-one fragments,⁵³ besides the epigraphs⁵⁴ and the seals.⁵⁵

In the ensuing years travelling scholars added many new inscriptions as well as improved editions of already known texts: Humann and Puchstein, travelling in 1883, publishing in 1890 *MARAŞ 3, *MARAŞ 7, *MARAŞ 8, *SAMSAT 1;⁵⁶ Ramsay and Hogarth travelling in 1890, publishing in 1891 and 1893, *ANDAVAL, *BULGARMADEN, *GÜRÜN, *FRAKTİN, *MARAŞ 6, *IZGIN, *PALANGA;⁵⁷ Hogarth, travelling in 1894, publishing in 1895, *MALATYA 1, *MALATYA 2;⁵⁸ Anderson, travelling in 1900, publishing in 1901, *KARABURUN.⁵⁹

Large scale excavations in the area of the Hieroglyphic inscriptions were undertaken at Zincirli by von Luschan between 1888 and 1902, but though he found much architecture and sculpture executed in the Hittite style, along with alphabetic Phoenician-Aramaic inscriptions also clearly modelled on the Hieroglyphic inscriptions,⁶⁰ the dynasty of kings who bore both Semitic and Hittite names did not employ the Hieroglyphic script, except in the case of a single signet ring.⁶¹ Conversely Koldewey excavating at Babylon found unexpectedly in 1899 and published the following year a well preserved Hieroglyphic stele, *BABYLON 1. Later he found also a stone bowl with inscription, BABYLON 3.

Meanwhile museum collections of Hieroglyphic inscriptions and related sculpture were beginning to form. Beside the British Museum’s collection of the Karkamiš material, the Imperial Ottoman Museum in Istanbul was receiving the pieces collected by scholars, and stray finds such as İSKENDERUN (sent in 1890). Peiser usefully listed the Museum’s holdings at the end of 1897.⁶² The Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the Berlin Museum already had MARAŞ 3, acquired by Puchstein

in 1893, and KIRÇOĞLU, already in the Museum by 1898. The Metropolitan Museum, New York, had the stele MARAŞ 2 and fragment MARAŞ 7, apparently donated in 1890 by the widow of Rev. Henry Marden (alias Marsden), a missionary working in Maraş at the time of the visit by Humann and Puchstein.

Messerschmidt’s *Corpus*

Such was the extent of the monuments when Messerschmidt produced his *Corpus Inscriptionum Hettitarum*

43 The inscribed stones from Jerabis, Hamath Aleppo, etc. (*TSBA* 7 (1882), pp. 429–442). Confusingly, the plates are only partially numbered, and the Hamathite stones as a separate series from the Karkamiš material.

44 Numbered H I (HAMA 1), H II (HAMA 2), H III (HAMA 4 side B), H IV (HAMA 3), H V (HAMA 4 side A).

45 Photographs: [plates I and II], *KARKAMIŞ A23, *KARKAMIŞ A21*b*; engraved drawings: plate III, *KARKAMIŞ A31; plate IV figs. 1–2, *KARKAMIŞ A26*a2*; fig. 3, *KARKAMIŞ A28*b*; fig. 4, *KARKAMIŞ A28*k*; plate V, *KARKAMIŞ A20*b11* (along with Sayce’s drawing of the SIPYLOS epigraph, and Layard’s NINEVEH bullae); plate VI (figs. 1–2, sculpture fragments); fig. 3, *KARKAMIŞ A20*b9*; fig. 4, *KARKAMIŞ A21*a*.

46 Following the technology of the time, these were reengraved from Rylands’ photographs and engraved drawings.

47 Of Drake, from Burton and Drake, *Unexplored Syria* II (1872), p. 186; of Clermont-Ganneau, from *PEFQ* 1873, p. 73; of Boscawen (unpublished); of Crawford, redrawn by Rylands, from *PSBA* 6 (1884), p. 132*f*; of George Smith, from his unpublished notebook.

48 Also (drawing only) of DELAPORTE seal (here XIII.5).

49 Pls. XIX–XXI, along with some sculpture fragments, the rest of *KARKAMIŞ A28 also *A30*c*, *A20*b12*; pl. XXII, *KARKAMIŞ A26*f*, *KARKAMIŞ A22*c*.

50 Of the epigraphs only the cartouches of Tudhaliyas are really visible (pl. XXIV).

51 Reported in *Empire of the Hittites* (1st edition), with general photograph of lion on *kale* gate of Maraş (pl. [III]); see 2nd edition, pls. XXV–XXVII.

52 HAMA 1, HAMA 2, HAMA 3, HAMA 4; ALEPPO 1; KARKAMIŞ A23, KARKAMIŞ A21, KARKAMIŞ A31; İVRİZ, BOR (upper), BABYLON 2, MARAŞ 1.

53 KARKAMIŞ A20*b9*–12; KARKAMIŞ A22*c*; KARKAMIŞ A26*a2*; KARKAMIŞ A26*f*; KARKAMIŞ A28*a*–*n*, KARKAMIŞ A30*c*.

54 SIPYLOS, KARABEL, YAZILIKAYA.

55 SCHLUMBERGER impressions, DELAPORTE seal (included in the present corpus, see XIII.5).

56 *Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien* (Berlin, 1890).

57 Pre-Hellenic Monuments of Cappadocia (*Recueil* 14 (1891), pp. 74–94; 15 (1893), pp. 89–97).

58 Note on Pre-hellenic finds (*Recueil* 17 (1895), pp. 25–27).

59 A new “Hittite” inscription (*JHS* 21 (1901), pp. 322–324).

60 Uniquely among Semitic alphabetic inscriptions the letters are executed in relief with the background cut away, in the manner of relief Hieroglyphic inscriptions, instead of the letters being incised.

61 The ZINCİRLİ signet of Bar-Rakib, included in this corpus as XIII.3.

62 *OLZ* 1 (1898), pp. 6–9. The Hieroglyphic inscriptions were stored in a small room in the *Çinili Köşk* along with Aramaic, Palmyrene, and South Arabian antiquities. The collection comprised at this date HAMA 1–4, MARAŞ 1, MARAŞ 2, BOR (upper fragment), MALATYA 1, MALATYA 2, IZGIN, İSKENDERUN.

in 1900,⁶³ a work of grandiose name but modest proportions, comprising some twenty-six substantial inscriptions,⁶⁴ twenty-eight fragments,⁶⁵ also epigraphs,⁶⁶ and a now growing collection of seals.⁶⁷ Messerschmidt was dependent almost entirely on previous publications or on photographs and/or squeezes, from which he made his own hand copies. These are fair when the texts were clear, but not very helpful in the numerous dubious areas. He included only a single photograph (MARAŞ 1 lion). In his two supplements he was able to offer improved texts. In *Erster Nachtrag*,⁶⁸ following a visit to the British Museum in the summer 1901, he revised the KARKAMIŞ inscriptions, and from squeezes IZGIN and MARAŞ 1, and added the recently published KARABURUN. In *Zweiter Nachtrag*,⁶⁹ following a visit to Turkey to work in the Ottoman Museum, he revised PALANGA, MARAŞ 2, EĞREK (with poor photograph), BOR (with recently acquired lower part), İVRİZ (which he visited during the making of the cast), and he added the recently acquired HİSARCIK 1, EMİRGAZİ block, EMİRGAZİ altar B, *MARAŞ 4 (with poor photograph), *NİĞDE 1, also from a squeeze *BOHÇA, and from a squeeze and cast with a poor photograph, the Louvre's acquisition, MALATYA 3. The supplements thus added six substantial inscriptions to the corpus (and one fragment – EMİRGAZİ block), bringing the total of substantial pieces to thirty-two. Messerschmidt's copies were not particularly elegant or accurate, and his inability to provide photographs a considerable disadvantage. Yet much of his work has still not been replaced, and Meriggi took over many of his texts for his *Manuale* often without much substantial correction.

Period 1900–1914

Curiously the travellers of this period, Belck in 1901 and Grothe in 1906–1907, did not produce a single *editio princeps*, though they improved some texts. Others were more fortunate. Rott discovered *SUVASA in the late autumn 1906 and published in 1908. Gertrude Bell and Ramsay in the summer 1907 discovered the *KARADAĞ and *KIZILDAĞ inscriptions which they published in 1909. De Jerphanion travelling the same summer saw *KURUBEL and *TAŞÇI, which he published in 1908. The Cornell Expedition was also travelling later in 1907, and produced in 1911 *NİŞANTAŞ, *TEKİRDERBENT 1 and 2, *ARSLANTAŞ, *İSPEKÇÜR, *MALATYA 4 and *KELEKLİ, as well as giving new texts of inscriptions already known.⁷⁰ Their photographs were good though poorly reproduced, and their drawings were fair. Hogarth travelling in 1908 found and published the following year (1909) the stele *TELL AHMAR 1. Garstang, also travelling in 1908, published the same year *MALATYA 5, *MALATYA 6 and *GAZIANTEP. In 1909 Ronzevalle published *RESTAN which had been reported in 1902.

Garstang's book *The Land of the Hittites* (1910) formed, like the Cornell Expedition's *Hittite Inscriptions* the following year (1911), something of a corpus in itself. Garstang gave in Appendix B (pp. 395–401) an "Index of Hittite Monuments with bibliography", listing all inscriptions (also sculpture) known up to that date. He also gave photographs of a number of inscriptions.⁷¹

Meanwhile regular excavations produced an influx of material. Garstang's own work at Sakça Gözü uncovered sculpture and architecture of the period, but curiously no inscription, so that it remains unclear to which ancient state the city belonged.⁷² Winckler's initial excavations at Boğazköy 1906–1907 immediately located the two inscribed stele bases which were published forthwith,⁷³ *BOĞAZKÖY 1 and *BOĞAZKÖY 2. Beyond these two and the long-known rock inscription of NİŞANTAŞ and the epigraphs of YAZILIKAYA, the continuous series of Boğazköy excavations in the 1930's and since 1950 have recovered a number of small Hieroglyphic stelae, fragments and epigraphs,⁷⁴ but nothing of great significance until the BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG inscription of 1988.⁷⁵ It is the seals of Boğazköy that have been of great significance for Hieroglyphic (see below, p. 14), and of course the archives of Cuneiform tablets, the decipherment of which was a necessary preliminary for the decipherment of Hieroglyphic (see also below, p. 14).

63 *MVAG* 5 (1900/4), Berlin.

64 In addition to the twelve known in 1886, listed in n. 52 above, BABYLON 1, KIRÇOĞLU, İSKENDERUN, *KARKAMIŞ A1b, MALATYA 1, GÜRÜN, IZGIN, MARAŞ 2, MARAŞ 3, MARAŞ 8, EĞREK, ANDAVAL, BULGARMADEN, KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA.

65 In addition to the twenty-one listed in n. 53 above, MALATYA 2, SAMSAT 1, PALANGA, MARAŞ 6, MARAŞ 7, *KARABURCLU, *BEYKÖY.

66 In addition to those listed in n. 54, FRAKTİN, DOĞANLI DERESİ.

67 Included in the present corpus, in addition to the NINEVEH bullae, NINEVEH seal and DELAPORTE seal already noted, only PORADA seal (see SEALS, XIII.4).

68 *MVAG* 7 (1902/3), Berlin.

69 *MVAG* 11 (1906/5), Berlin.

70 KARADAĞ 1 and 2, KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA, KARABURUN, HİSARCIK 2, BOHÇA, İVRİZ, BULGARMADEN, FRAKTİN, KURUBEL, GÜRÜN, MALATYA 5 and 6, ALEPPO 1, SAMSAT 1, MARAŞ 8. They also reported but could not reach KÖTÜKALE.

71 HAMA 1 (squeeze), GAZIANTEP, MARAŞ 1, MALATYA 5 and 6, PALANGA, EĞREK, FRAKTİN, BOHÇA, SİPYLOS, KARABEL, BOR, İVRİZ (Berlin cast), YAZILIKAYA.

72 See Garstang's reports in *LAAS* 1 (1908), pp. 97–117; 5 (1913), pp. 63–72; 24 (1937), pp. 119–140. Also *Land of the Hittites* (1910), pp. 298–314; *The Hittite Empire* (1929), pp. 262–278.

73 *MDOG* 35 (1907), p. 57 f. figs. 6 and 7.

74 For a complete numbering to date of the Hier. stone inscriptions and fragments from BOĞAZKÖY see Hawkins *StBoT* Bh. 3, p. 121 Appendix 7; and here Appendix 1 (below, p. 35).

75 See below, p. 18 and nn. 189–190.

Karkamiš excavation and publication

The Karkamiš excavations under Hogarth, Campbell Thompson and Woolley, 1911–1914, produced all the *in situ* sculpture and inscriptions of the Temple of the Storm-God⁷⁶ with the Long Wall of Sculpture,⁷⁷ the Processional Entry⁷⁸ and the Royal Buttress,⁷⁹ as well as many pieces found out of context.⁸⁰ These were published in 1914 (*Carchemish* I, pls. A1–A11, essentially the complete inscriptions), and, with an interval occasioned by the First World War, in 1921 (*Carchemish* II, pls. A12–A18, essentially the incomplete inscriptions). The much delayed final publication in 1952 (*Carchemish* III, pls. A19–A33) contained principally a re-publication of the earlier-known inscriptions from the British Museum 1878–1881 excavations,⁸¹ with a few new pieces⁸² and the numerous fragments.⁸³ With the publication of *Carchemish* II in 1921, the site had produced some twenty-four major inscriptions, only three of which had been known to Messerschmidt, thus a considerable accession of new material over and above his total of thirty-two substantial pieces. Karkamiš as a site is the most prolific source of Hieroglyphic inscriptions, as befits the city which preserved a continuous tradition from the Empire Period.⁸⁴ Since the Karkamiš excavations, some more recently discovered major and minor pieces from other provenances may on internal reference be grouped with the KARKAMIŠ inscriptions: in the major category, CEKKE, KÖRKÜN, TUNP 1 and TILSEVET.

Period 1920–1940

The years between the wars were preeminently the time when, in the aftermath of the decipherment of Cuneiform Hittite (which involved also the recognition of the language Cuneiform Luwian), Hrozný, Forrer, Bossert, Meriggi and Gelb applied themselves seriously to the decipherment of Hieroglyphic (see further below). Besides the on-going German excavations at Boğazköy under Kurt Bittel, 1931–1939, which added a very important new access of Hieroglyphic seals (see further below, p. 14), several excavations took place at important Neo-Hittite sites during this period, which recovered Hieroglyphic inscriptions. The French excavations at Tell Ahmar 1929–1931⁸⁵ recovered and published in 1929 the recently discovered *TELL AHMAR 2 as well as restoring and republishing TELL AHMAR 1. The American Syrian Hittite Expedition of the Oriental Institute, Chicago, working in the Plain of Antioch 1932–1938,⁸⁶ excavated the fragmentary inscriptions *TELL TAYINAT 1, 2, and 3, published by Gelb in 1939. The Expedition also collected and published in Gelb's volume fragments of inscriptions *TULEIL 1 and 2 and *JISR EL-HADID frags. 1–3. The Danish Carlsberg Foundation Excavations at Hama, 1931–1938,⁸⁷ uncovered the Neo-Hittite citadel with substantial architectural and sculptural remains, but unfortun-

ately found only rather scanty and fragmentary inscribed material HAMA fragments 1–11 (as numbered in the present work). French excavations at Malatya-Arslantepe, 1932–1933,⁸⁸ uncovered the Lion Gate, source of most of the sculpture with epigraphs already found at the site, to which the excavators added *MALATYA 9–12, published in 1940 in the excavation report along with a re-publication of the previously found inscriptions.

At the same time excavations on Assyrian sites were finding odd pieces of Hieroglyphic. Campbell Thompson at Nineveh in 1932 found a unique clay tablet with an unfortunately largely illegible inscription, and a piece of stone plaque also Hieroglyphic and illegible.⁸⁹ The American excavations at Khorsabad found in 1929 and 1932 two clay bullae with impressions of the same seal as on one of the Nineveh bullae.⁹⁰ But quite the most peculiar find of this sort was made by Jacobsen and Lloyd in 1924 at Hines, where they found the fragment HINES,⁹¹ a copy of one of the inscriptions of Urhulina king of Hamath. Here too is the place to record one of the most significant of all Hieroglyphic finds, actually excavated in 1905 but not published until 1924, that of the ASSUR lead letters at Assur, found by Andrae and published twenty years later. Their provenance from Assur is almost as strange as that of the HINES inscription from Hines.

76 *KARKAMIŠ A2+3 (door jambs); *KARKAMIŠ A4b (archaic stele).

77 *KARKAMIŠ A1a and A1b (orthostats).

78 *KARKAMIŠ A8 (A11a) (door jamb) with *KARKAMIŠ A4d (statue inscription); *KARKAMIŠ A8+9 (A11b+c) (pair of door jambs, reused but restorable to the door remodelled by the Royal Buttress).

79 *KARKAMIŠ A6 and 7 (sculptured orthostats).

80 *KARKAMIŠ A4a (land deed), *A4c, *5a, *5b (tombstones); *A12 (orthostat), *A13a–c (statue base), *A13d (orthostat), *A14a and b (inscribed lions), *A15a (stele), *A15b (statue base), *A15c, d, e (fragments), *A16a (lion frags.), *A16b (orthostat frag.), *A16c (archaic stele), *A16d, e (frags.), *A16f (tombstone), *A17a, b, c, d (stelae), *A18a–g, i–j (frags.), *A18b (tombstone).

81 See above, nn. 52–53.

82 KARKAMIŠ A20a (orthostat frag.), KARKAMIŠ A24 (frags. of orthostat?), A25a (frags. of orthostat), A25b (stele frag.), A26a (orthostat frag.), *A30b (base).

83 *A19 (incised frags.), A20b1–13 (frags. of A21/22), *A26b–e (corner relief frags.), *A27 and *29 (relief frags.), A28 (British Museum frags.), *A30a–g (miscellaneous frags.), A33 (miscellaneous).

84 See II (KARKAMIŠ), The Historical Context, p. 73 f. and nn. 10–13.

85 See III (TELL AHMAR), The Historical Context, p. 225 and nn. 17–20.

86 See VII (AMUQ), The Historical Context, p. 364 and nn. 42–52.

87 See IX (HAMA), The Historical Context, p. 398 f. and nn. 5–11, p. 402 and nn. 59–65.

88 See V (MALATYA), The Historical Context, p. 282 and n. 3.

89 See XII (MISCELLANEOUS), 10 and 11.

90 See XIII (SEALS), 13.

91 See IX (HAMA), 5.

Among the travellers in Anatolia in the inter-war period an indefatigable example was H. H. von der Osten. He travelled far and regularly 1926–1931 and recorded his journeys in the series *Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor*.⁹² He was often the first to see newly discovered inscriptions and the first to publish photographs: thus “CARCHEMISH” (here ANKARA), 1927; MALATYA 8, 1928; MARAŞ 11, 1929; *ÇALAPVERDİ 1 and 2, 1929, 1930; KARAKUYU, BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2, and DARENDE, 1931.

Other important inscriptions were appearing at this period. *KAYSERİ was seen and published by Lewy in 1925, and *ANKARA (“CARCHEMISH”) seen by Cameron in 1926 (publ. 1927). Construction of the Kayseri-Sivas railway cutting through the mound of Sultanhan in 1928 found the large stele base, reported in 1929 and 1930/31, and published as *SULTANHAN by Delaporte in 1934. The same year, Bossert published *TOPADA, which had been reported as early as 1908. Also in the same year, the Turkish teacher of French in the Kayseri Boys High School, Kara Mehmet Ağa Zade Kemaleddin (alias Kemaleddin Karamete), in a handbook on the local history published preliminary photographs of ÇİFTLİK and ERKİLET 1 and 2, along with other previously known inscriptions.

All the five scholars concerned with the decipherment at this period, Hrozný, Forrer, Bossert, Meriggi and Gelb, travelled widely in Anatolia at one time or another, in search of new inscriptions or better copies and photographs of known ones. In particular the travels of Hrozný and Gelb in these years led to the publication of new corpuses. Hrozný in 1934, July–November, worked his way through museums from Istanbul to Aleppo,⁹³ while Gelb had two long stints in Anatolia, June–September, 1932 and 1935,⁹⁴ thus straddling Hrozný’s journey.

During the 1930’s Hrozný edited the then known Hieroglyphic inscriptions mostly in a series of articles in *Archiv Orientalní*, and these were mostly collected and reprinted in his *Les Inscriptions Hittites Hiéroglyphiques*. Vol. I (1933) took the inscription KARABURUN as subject for decipherment, appending a long commentary, a grammatical sketch and signary. Vol. II (1934) contained a selection of published texts,⁹⁵ and Vol. III (1937) the texts on which Hrozný had worked during his Anatolia peregrination including six *editiones principes*.⁹⁶ He thereby covered all the fairly well preserved and substantial inscriptions available to him, and he continued beyond the end of the reprinted volumes with studies on NİĞDE, ANDAVAL, EĞREK, HİSARCIK 1 and İSKENDERUN. His method was to acquire good photographs, usually acknowledged to the relevant museum authorities, and to copy the inscriptions which he had himself seen in a not very elegant but surprisingly accurate hand.⁹⁷ He then had each inscription type-set in a linear arrangement with facsimile representations of each sign, an astonishing feat of the

typographer’s art which has never been repeated. Unfortunately his decipherment was at a rather rudimentary stage and his transliterations and translations are somewhat over-ambitious.

Gelb’s book *Hittite Hieroglyphic Monuments* (1939) did set out to produce a new corpus of inscriptions, though he imposed certain limitations on this. Thus understandably he did not republish the KARKAMIŞ material from *Carchemish* I and II, nor did he include any of the Istanbul Museum material, which Bossert claimed to be preparing for re-publication.⁹⁸ He only included inscriptions from Turkey, on which he had worked himself, thus none of the material from the British Museum, the Louvre, the Berlin Museum or the Metropolitan Museum, New York, nor did he include TELL AHMAR 1 from Aleppo Museum though he did work on it.⁹⁹ Also he tended not to republish inscriptions already published in Messerschmidt or elsewhere, unless he could produce better photographs or a more reliable copy,¹⁰⁰ though, as he noted, his work overlapped with that of Hrozný. Gelb drew together a considerable accession of new material since Messerschmidt (1906) and *Carchemish* I and II (1914 and 1924), a total of some fifteen substantial inscriptions¹⁰¹ and some twenty-five fragments, epigraphs and seals.¹⁰² He gained comparatively few *editiones principes* (mainly the Plain of Antioch material), since he was generally anticipated by narrow margins by von der Osten, Hrozný, Delaporte and others. But his work was a fine collec-

92 *O.I.C.* 2, 6, 8, 14; Chicago, 1927, 1929, 1930, 1933.

93 *Ar. Or.* 7 (1935), p. 208–210.

94 *HFM*, pp. 1–6.

95 ASSUR letters, most of *Carchemish* I–II (KARKAMIŞ A1a–A18), KARABURUN (revised), BABYLON 1, BOHÇA, BULGARMADEN, MARAŞ 1, MARAŞ 4, SULTANHAN (base), HAMA 1–4, RESTAN.

96 *ERKİLET 1 and 2, *BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2, *KARKAMIŞ A24a2+3, ANKARA (“CARCHEMISH”), *KARKAMIŞ A20a, TOPADA, SUVASA, KAYSERİ, KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA, EMİRGAZI altars, KARAKUYU, FRAKTİN, KARADAĞ 1, KIZILDAĞ 1 and 3, IZGIN, İVRİZ, BOR, TELL AHMAR 1 and 2, DARENDE, MALATYA 1, 3, 5, 6, 7.

97 We may compare his Cuneiform copies, *KBo* V and VI.

98 *HFM*, p. ix. Bossert never produced any systematic re-edition.

99 *HFM*, p. 6. The “unknown Hittite inscription supposedly from Carchemish” was not apparently CEKKE, ALEPPO 2 or QAL’AT EL MUDIQ, none of which had entered the museum at this date (1935).

100 E.g. ANDAVAL, KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA.

101 BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2, ANKARA (“CARCHEMISH”), KARKAMIŞ A24a2+3, *ÇİFTLİK, DARENDE, ERKİLET 1 and 2, İSPEKÇÜR, KARAKUYU, “KARAPINAR” (TOPADA), KAYSERİ, *KÖTÜKALE, RESTAN, SULTANHAN.

102 *ALACA HÖYÜK 1, KARKAMIŞ A20a1, KARKAMIŞ A25a1, KARKAMIŞ B39a, ÇALAPVERDİ 1 and 2, EĞRIKÖY, HİNES, İMAMKULU, *JISR EL-HADID 1–3, KARGA, KURUBEL, *KHORSABAD seals, SİRKELİ, SUVASA, TAŞCI, *TELL TAYINAT 1–3 and other frags., *TULLEIL 1 and 2, *VELİİSA.

tion compiled with exemplary method, and has served as a model for the present corpus.¹⁰³

Effectively this phase of the investigation of Hieroglyphic, characterized as the expansion of the corpus (together with the initial phase of effective decipherment), was terminated by the outbreak of the Second World War, yet several important landmarks properly belonging with this phase occurred in 1940, and after. The publication of Delaporte's *Malatya-Arslantepe I* (1940) constituted a corpus of the MALATYA inscriptions by drawing together the previously found pieces and related material. A major inscription was added to the KARKAMIŠ material with the publication by Dunaan in 1940 of the large and well preserved stele *CEKKE. A significant rock relief with epigraphs, *HANYERİ was published by A. Rıza Yalçın in 1940.¹⁰⁴ But most important was the publication of the Boğazköy seal impressions by Güterbock as *SBo I* and *II* (1940 and 1942). This constituted a final publication of the seal finds from the excavations 1931–1938, which had become available in preliminary publications as they were found. The contribution of this material to the decipherment is noted in the following section.

Karatepe: discovery and publications

It is appropriate that the next stage should have been inaugurated in 1946 with the discovery by Bossert and Halet Çambel of the great bilingual inscription of KARATEPE. Its implications for the decipherment are also assessed in the following section, but even for the expansion of the corpus, the discovery of this, the longest known Hieroglyphic inscription,¹⁰⁵ marks a very significant advance. Yet Bossert's publication of the text was tardy and still incomplete even in its unsatisfactory preliminary form at the time of his death in 1960. The preliminary publication was completed by Akurgal (1961, photographs), and Steinherr (1974, text), while the final publication has been reserved for Halet Çambel as a companion volume to the present corpus.

In the post-war years, the main scholars active in Anatolia collecting and publishing Hieroglyphic inscriptions included Bossert, Güterbock, Meriggi, Laroche, Sedat Alp and Mustafa Kalaç, also R. D. Barnett. Some important new inscriptions became available at this time: SULTANHAN stele (discovered 1939, published 1949), KULULU 1, KULULU 2, ŞIRZI, KARAHÖYÜK, ALEPPO 2, MEHARDE; also some minor fragments and epigraphs: BOĞAZKÖY 6–11, ÇAĞDIN, HANYERİ, İVRİZ frag. 1, MALKAYA, SAMSAT 2, AZAZ.

Bossert continued active up to the time of his death. In addition to his gradual publication of KARATEPE, he edited a number of known inscriptions, often improving the texts. He also travelled round recent discoveries, (re)editing these, though he did not score many *editiones principes*.¹⁰⁶ Güterbock at the same time was a frequent visitor to Hieroglyphic inscriptions, also

producing new editions of texts.¹⁰⁷ Barnett too contributed to the field.¹⁰⁸ Meriggi made a major study tour in 1958,¹⁰⁹ working on the inscriptions in the museums of Istanbul, Ankara, Kayseri, Sivas and Adana. His subsequent travels 1962–1971¹¹⁰ were on the whole more concerned with archaeology though he worked on some further Hieroglyphic inscriptions.¹¹¹ Laroche, working at the time on general Luwian studies as well as the digraphic seals from Ugarit,¹¹² offered two illuminating text editions.¹¹³

Both Laroche and Meriggi gave their major contributions to the study of Hieroglyphic during these years: Laroche with his book *Les Hiéroglyphes Hittites* (1960); and Meriggi with his *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar* (1962), followed by his *Manuale di Eteo Geroglífico I, II/1* and *II/2–3* (1966, 1967, 1975). Laroche's book is actually a detailed signary, and is described as “première partie”, since it was intended to form the introduction to a volume giving the texts in transliteration, translation and commentary, together with a grammatical analysis of the language.¹¹⁴ This, unfortunately, has never appeared. The work as it stands is evaluated in the following section, Decipherment and Interpretation, as is also Meriggi's *Glossar*. The latter forms an index of words to the subsequently published *Manuale*, a work similar to that planned but not achieved by Laroche, a corpus of all inscriptions known, divided into texts of the Late Period and of the Hittite Empire, each given in copy, transliteration, translation and commentary. Unfortunately Meriggi's copies are largely based

103 In one procedure I have not found it necessary to follow him, namely his somewhat over-elaborate method of producing a copy (see *HHM*, p. vii f.), which involved drawing on a given photograph with indian ink and then bleaching out the photograph. It is just as satisfactory to trace photographs on the clear acetate now (but perhaps not then?) available.

104 *TTAED* 4 (1940), p. 265 f. (photograph, republished by Bossert, *Altanatolien* (1942), Abb. 564).

105 Its 75 clauses may be compared with ASSUR letter *f+g*, 53 clauses; SULTANHAN, 51 clauses; TOPADA, 39 clauses; KARKAMIŠ A1a (incomplete, but longest KARKAMIŠ), 38 clauses.

106 Long-known texts: KÖTÜKALE, DARENDE, KARABURUN, KIRÇOĞLU, MARAŞ 3, SAMSAT 1, KARKAMIŠ A20b2. Recent discoveries: KULULU 1, *KULULU 2, SULTANHAN, ŞIRZI, *MALKAYA, *SAMSAT 2, HANYERİ.

107 KIZILDAĞ 4, *ÇAĞDIN, *ŞIRZI (with Sedat Alp), *İVRİZ frag. 1, *KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN) (with T. and N. Özgüç), *KULULU 1, *SULTANHAN stele (with Kemalettin Karamete – for whom see above, p. 10 col. i).

108 Besides his study on KARATEPE (*An. St.* 3 (1953), pp. 53–95), an edition of CEKKE and *ALEPPO 2.

109 Reported in *QdBG* 3 (1958), pp. 3–35. His main work here was on PALANGA, MARAŞ 2, MARAŞ 7, KARKAMIŠ fragments, TEKİRDERBENT 1, HİSARCIK 2, TOPADA, İSPEKÇÜR, EMİRGAZI altars.

110 Reported in *QA* 1–10 (1962–1971).

111 GÜRÜN, *MALATYA 15 (sealing), ŞIRZI, KARADAĞ-KIZILDAĞ, ARSLANTAŞ, TAÇIN, ÇALAPVERDİ 3. From Syria he collected *AZAZ and *MEHARDE (upper).

112 See above, n. 16; below, n. 143.

113 KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN), KARKAMIŠ A1b.

114 *HH*, p. xvi.

on old publications of the texts and were not adequately collated and corrected. Furthermore, a considerable number of new texts has appeared since the completion of the *Manuale*.

Indeed Laroche's and Meriggi's publications provide useful points of reference against which the rate of new Hieroglyphic discoveries may be measured. Laroche included in his *HH* a brief bibliography of all the inscriptions then known (1960), and it is interesting to note that since Gelb's 1939 corpus, some nine major inscriptions had been added,¹¹⁵ and a number of minor pieces along with insignificant fragments and epigraphs.¹¹⁶ He subsequently published an updated list in 1969,¹¹⁷ by which time a further four major pieces had been added,¹¹⁸ along with other minor pieces.¹¹⁹ Meriggi's publication of *Manuale* II/2–3 (1975) added only eleven minor and insignificant pieces.¹²⁰

Recent work

The Turkish scholars most active in Hieroglyphic studies since the 1960's have been Mustafa Kalaç and Sedat Alp, and especially for seals Ali and Belkis Dinçol, and the archaeologists most concerned Tahsin and Nimet Özgüç. There has also been Halet Çambel's massive work of recovery and restoration at Karatepe. To Kalaç have gone most of the new Hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered since 1960, and to him we owe the *editiones principes* of KÖRKÜN, KULULU 3, KÜRTÜL, TİLSEVET, TÜNP 1 and 2, MARAŞ 12 (MARAŞ 14, 15, 16 forthcoming), MALPINAR, AKSARAY, KULULU 4, KULULU 5, NİĞDE 2 and ASMACIK, a handsome contribution. Sedat Alp has made a detailed study of the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ inscriptions along with the *editio princeps* of BURUNKAYA (1974). Subsequently in the years 1979 and after, he conducted investigations at the Commagenian site of Ancoz during the rescue operations for the Atatürk Barrage Project, and recovered a number of characteristic inscribed blocks similar to fragments found earlier.¹²¹ Tahsin Özgüç has collected and published a batch of new KULULU material, including the *editio princeps* of the important lead strips, and has made some useful observations on Sultanhan, Çalapverdi, and Eğriköy, sites in the Kayseri *vilayet*, sources of the eponymous inscriptions.¹²² Later, almost miraculously, Kutlu Emre located at Sultanhan the missing fragment of the famous stele. Tahsin Özgüç's most recent contribution has been the publication of the YALBURT inscription discovered in 1970, the longest known Empire Period text.¹²³ Nimet Özgüç has been instrumental in making public the new finds in her own area of investigation, particularly NİĞDE 2 and AKSARAY, and has also conducted the large-scale rescue operations at the site of Samsat, from which a number of Hieroglyphic fragments have been recovered.¹²⁴

These years have also been the period of my own involvement with the Hieroglyphic inscriptions. First

visiting Turkey in 1965 and 1966 as a member of the Kayalidere Urartian excavations, I began examining Hieroglyphic inscriptions in 1967, and then realizing that a revisions of all published texts would yield substantial results, I began serious work on them in 1968, which I have continued ever since. For the record, I have visited Turkey, normally during the long vacations, July–September, in the years 1968, 1969, 1971, 1974, 1976, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1996, and in 1971, 1974, 1976, 1978 I also visited Syria. In that time I have worked in the museums of Istanbul, Ankara, Kayseri, Sivas, Niğde, Adana, Maraş, Adıyaman, Gaziantep, Antakya, and Aleppo, and I have visited, sometimes more than once, all the known rock reliefs and inscriptions. I have been able to produce the *editiones principes* of PORSUK, ANCOZ 1, ADIYAMAN 1, ADIYAMAN 2, SHEIZAR, TELL AHMAR 3, MEHARDE (lower), MALPINAR (with Mustafa Kalaç) and BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG,¹²⁵ and to these may be added, in the present work, HAMA 6, 7, 8, the BEIRUT bowl, and (by courtesy of Professor Sedat Alp) the ANCOZ fragments. For the purpose of making texts and photographs I have also visited the principal European and American museums where Hieroglyphic inscriptions are to be found: the Louvre (principally in 1986), the Berlin Museum (1985), the Oriental Institute, Chicago, and Metropolitan Museum, New York (1983), the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Geneva (1982), and the Danish National Museum, Copenhagen (1979). [Also *TELL AHMAR 5].

Other scholars working in the field of Hieroglyphic inscriptions at this time have been Massimo Poetto, Emilia Masson and Itamar Singer. Poetto has produced a series of studies, including *editiones principes* of MARAŞ 11, MALATYA 13, ALEPPO 3 and BOROWSKI 1–2. Emilia Masson has concentrated on inscriptions of

115 CEKKE, KARATEPE, SULTANHAN stele, KULULU 1, KULULU 2, ŞIRZI, KARAHÖYÜK, ALEPPO 2; also MEHARDE (not listed).

116 MALATYA 9–12, BOĞAZKÖY 6–8 (numbering according to Laroche), ÇAĞDIN, HANYERİ, İVRİZ frag. 1, MALKAYA.

117 *RHA* XXVII/84–85 (1969), pp. 109–131.

118 TÜNP 1, TİLSEVET, KÖRKÜN, PORSUK; also the ALTINTEPE pithos inscriptions, KULULU lead strips (all then still unpublished).

119 ALACA HÖYÜK 4, ANCOZ 1 and 2, BOĞAZKÖY 9–11, HAMA 5, HEMİTE, KIZILDAĞ 5, KULULU 3, KÜRTÜL, YEKBAZ, NIMRUD shells, SAMSAT 2, AZAZ.

120 *Minor*: MALATYA 14, ADIYAMAN 1, ADIYAMAN 2, KULULU 3, KULULU 6; BOĞAZKÖY 12; *insignificant*: MARAŞ 12, KULULU 7, BOĞAZKÖY 13–14 (for numbering see above, n. 74).

121 See ANCOZ fragments, bibliography.

122 *Kültepe and its vicinity in the Iron Age* (Ankara, 1971).

123 *Inandiktepe* (Ankara, 1988), pp. xv–xvii/xxv–xxvii, 172–174, pls. 85–95.

124 See SAMSAT fragments (VI. 15).

125 For the discovery of this inscription, see below, p. 18 and nn. 189–190.

the Empire Period. Itamar Singer has joined the field with the *editio princeps* of BOROWSKI 3.

In reckoning up the continuing rate of appearance of new Hieroglyphic inscriptions since Meriggi's final total in 1975, we note the discovery of some fifteen major inscriptions,¹²⁶ and over twenty minor ones and substantial fragments¹²⁷ as well as over ten small fragments or illegible texts.¹²⁸ If we look back over the points in time at which we have conducted counts of Hieroglyphic inscriptions known, the following pattern emerges:

<i>Messerschmidt</i>						
<i>total:</i>	1900		1906			
major	26		6			
minor	28		1			
<i>additions:</i>						
	<i>Carchemish</i>	<i>Gelb</i>	<i>Laroche</i>	<i>now</i>		
	1914	1921	1939	1960	1969	1991
major	21	15	9	4	14	
minor	(many)	25	(many)	(some)	30	

We thus note a total of some 95 major inscriptions; the total for minor inscriptions and fragments is less easy to quantify (and less significant), but certainly there would be over fifty minor but perceptible pieces. Furthermore the rate of discovery appears to be accelerating. One point stands out: the present corpus will require addenda and that sooner rather than later. [1995, new major inscriptions: TELL AHMAR 5, and (probably) an unpublished inscription from EREGLI].

2. Decipherment and Interpretation

General Problems

It is not proposed to go into this subject in great detail since it has been covered before in a number of adequate studies.¹²⁹ Nevertheless a summary of the stages, methods and results is relevant to the present work and is given here.

The groups of allied problems which decipherers have had to confront may be identified as follows.

1. General recognition of the nature of the script as being mixed logographic-phonetic with reading aids such as determinatives and other markers. From the time of the earliest scholarly interest in Hieroglyphic, the deciphered Egyptian Hieroglyphic and Mesopotamian Cuneiform were available as possible models for comparison.

2. Identification of the logograms and their interpretation. Some of these with strongly pictographic content were comparatively easy to penetrate, as for example animals' heads and parts of the body. Others have been more problematic and some elude understanding even today. A crucial problem has been distinguishing between logograms and phonetic signs, especially since some signs have both functions.

3. Identification of phonetic signs and attribution of values. Crucial here has been the recognition that this part of the script is a syllabary essentially of the consonant+vowel type distinguishing 3-vowel series (*a i u*). Penetration of this aspect of Hieroglyphic was largely achieved by correct identification in the inscriptions of known names of persons and places and the establishment of phonetic values on the basis of these.

4. Interpretation of the language written by the syllabary and the recognition of its relationships. This has resulted of course in the perception, becoming ever clearer right up to the present, that the language behind the Hieroglyphs is a form of Luwian, which is known otherwise both from a small corpus of Cuneiform texts, c. 1500–1200 B.C., and a somewhat larger group of inscriptions in the closely related Lycian language, written in the alphabetic script in the period c. 500–300 B.C.

First attempts

The earliest would-be decipherers – Sayce, Ménant, Peiser, Jensen, Hommel, Campbell Thompson, Cowley, Frank – made little progress beyond the identification of a few logograms, achieved largely by means of the “Tarkondemos seal”, one of the earliest inscriptions recognized, which is digraphic, and thus a mini-bilingual, but one which is in fact so treacherous that only now has a definitive interpretation been achieved.¹³⁰ The identifications made did lead to the

126 KULULU lead strips 1 and 2, AKSARAY, SHEIZAR, BOROWSKI 1, KULULU 4, KULULU 5, YALBURT, MALPINAR, BOROWSKI 3, MARAŞ 14, İVRİZ 2, BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG, HAMA 6 and 7.

127 KULULU lead strips 3, frags. 1 and 3, ANCOZ 1, BURUNKAYA, ANCOZ 3 and 4, NİĞDE 2, MARAŞ 11, ALEPPO 3, BOROWSKI 2, MALATYA 13, TELL AHMAR 3, TELL AHMAR 4, BOĞAZKÖY 18, 19, 20 (for numbering see n. 74 above), ANCOZ 5–10, ARSLANTAŞ, MARAŞ 16, HAMA 8, BEIRUT bowl.

128 ANCOZ 2, ASMACIK, MARAŞ 13, MARAŞ 10, MARAŞ 15, SAMSAT frags., İVRİZ frags. 2–3, ANTAKYA, AIN DARA, BOĞAZKÖY 15, 16, 17 (for numbering see above, n. 74).

129 Notably by J. Friedrich, *Entzifferungsgeschichte der hethitischen Hieroglyphenschrift* (*Die Welt als Geschichte*, Beiheft 3; Stuttgart, 1939); id., *Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen* (1954), I.3 (updated to take account of KARATEPE); A. Kammenhuber, *Die Erforschung der hethitischen Hieroglyphenschrift und des Hieroglyphenluwischen* (in Friedrich *et al.*, *Hb. Or.* (1969), pp. 148–161); also R. D. Barnett, *Karatepe, the key to the Hittite Hieroglyphs* (*An. St.* 3 (1953), pp. 53–95); Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann, *HHL*, pp. [3]–[10]; cf. also the chapter by M. Pope, *The Story of Decipherment* (London, 1975, pp. 136–145). From the bibliography on each sign in Laroche's *HH*, it can be clearly seen when and by whom the correct values were first attributed, as well as the earlier sequence of failed attempts.

130 See above, n. 40. [The 1990/91 Boğazköy bullae have now provided evidence which permits a definitive solution of the problem of reading: Hawkins, and Morpurgo Davies, *Studies Watkins*, (Innsbruck, 1998), pp. 243–260.]

recognition that (unsurprisingly) groups of inscriptions began with the names of kings and their countries, but this observation, though in fact it later provided the point of entry into the phonetic system, did not provide these scholars with sufficient data for them to achieve substantially reliable results. They were of course working largely in the period before the decipherment of Cuneiform Hittite, and it may be judged that penetration of the Hieroglyphs would hardly have been possible without the great opening up of their whole background provided by the reading of the Boğazköy archives.

Successful entry

Thus the period of the first successful, though gradual, penetration of the script and language was essentially the 1930's, when the largely independent efforts of Meriggi,¹³¹ Bossert,¹³² Gelb,¹³³ Forrer¹³⁴ and Hrozný¹³⁵ began to bear fruit. Besides identifying many logograms, they achieved successful entry into the syllabary in spite of adopting a large number of still erroneous values due to lack of proper evidence. They reached a position where they could recognize the outline of the grammar, but their translations of connected texts, when attempted, can be seen from the present viewpoint to have been generally wide of the mark. Towards the end of this period the first substantial contribution to the decipherment by digraphic seals became available with the publication of the Boğazköy seals by Güterbock.¹³⁶ This was later matched by the seals of Ugarit published by Laroche,¹³⁷ and again very recently by the seals of Meskene-Emar still in the process of publication.¹³⁸

The bilingual and after

In the meantime of course, the discovery of the KARATEPE bilingual carried the understanding of the script to a new level. Now at last a complete and reliable translation of a Hieroglyphic text, the longest known, could be given from the parallel Phoenician text, a translation moreover which raised surprisingly few problems.¹³⁹ Much of the decipherment of the 1930's was confirmed, and many new lexical identifications were provided. In general a new and justified confidence could now be felt by those working in this field.

The principal scholars working with this new material were Bossert, Meriggi and Laroche.¹⁴⁰ Bossert in his last years produced a large number of articles,¹⁴¹ though he never completed even the preliminary publication of the KARATEPE bilingual. He was prolific of ideas but undisciplined in supporting argument. Thus when right at the end of his life he approached a very significant step forward, namely the re-evaluation of the signs \uparrow , \updownarrow , he did not succeed in winning general acceptance for this.¹⁴²

Laroche, from the background of his studies on Cuneiform Luwian and Lycian, brought a comparative approach to bear on Hieroglyphic. He also had at his

disposal, as noted above, the collection of digraphic seals from Ugarit,¹⁴³ which brought both corroboration of earlier readings and evidence for new. His book *HH* (1960) was essentially a detailed signary but included also transliterated and translated excerpts of the clearest passages in the inscriptions. Backed up by the Ugarit evidence, he produced a revised and rationalized system of transliteration of greatly enhanced accuracy, which with modifications has provided the basis for that used in the present corpus. The book, as noted above, was

131 After preliminary studies, 1930–1933, for which see the bibliography of Meriggi's work published in *Athenaeum* 47 (1969), p. xiii, principally Die hethitischen Hieroglyphenschriften: I. Die kürzeren Votiv- und Bauinschriften (*WZKM* 40 (1933), pp. 233–280); II. Die längeren Votiv- und Bauinschriften (*WZKM* 41 (1934), pp. 1–42); Die längsten Bauinschriften in "Hethitischen" Hieroglyphen, nebst Glossar zu sämtlichen Texten (*MVAeG* 39/1 (1934), pp. 1–177). The *Glossar* here was of course the forerunner of Meriggi's revised *Glossar* (1962).

132 Principally *Šantaš und Kupapa* (*MAOG* VI/3; Leipzig, 1932).

133 *Hittite Hieroglyphs* I, II, III (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization nos. [2], 14, 21, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago; Chicago 1931, 1935, 1942).

134 *Die hethitische Bilderschrift* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization no. 3, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago; Chicago, 1932). I had in my possession a copy of an unpublished manuscript by Forrer: *Tabalische Grammatik hethitischer Bilderschrift* (1932), sent to me in 1980 by Dr. Galina Kellerman, who apparently had it from one Natalie Frankley. I myself have since passed it on to Professor Massimo Poetto.

135 The series of text editions published in *Archiv Orientalni* 1933–1937, mostly reprinted in his *Les Inscriptions Hittites Hieroglyphiques* as noted above, p. 10 with nn. 95–96.

136 See above, n. 16, also p. 9.

137 Above, n. 16; below n. 143.

138 See below, p. 16 and n. 158.

139 One significant error however was the very understandable failure to identify the factual negative from the bilingual (actually Hier. NEG₂ = Phoen. *bl*, KARATEPE, 108, 134), and the compounded error of identification of FRONS-*li*- (*bantili*-) as *nala*-, "no": see Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), pp. 132 cit. 15–16, 149 f. cit. A and D. Note also the failures to identify the values *za* and *ia* from the equivalents Hier. \uparrow = Phoen. *z* (in the name *Azatiwatas*/*'zṭwā*) and Hier. \updownarrow = Phoen. *y* (in the name *Azatiwataya*/*'zṭwy*); in each case the digraphic writings of the names are obscured by other factors, and the bilingual did not offer any clear and unambiguous evidence elsewhere.

140 Gelb and Güterbock each gave detailed comments on the implications of the earliest published sections of the bilingual for the understanding of Hieroglyphic; Güterbock, *Eranos* 47 (1949), pp. 93–115; Gelb, *Bi. Or.* 7 (1950), pp. 129–141. Neither continued to do detailed work in Hieroglyphic thereafter. Sedat Alp also used the information from KARATEPE in his work on Hieroglyphic writings of personal names, *Zur Lesung von manchen Personennamen auf den hieroglyphenbithitischen Siegeln und Inschriften* (Ankara, 1950).

141 See the bibliography in his memorial volume, *Gs Bossert*.

142 Ist die B-L Schrift im wesentlichen entziffert? (*Or.* NS 29 (1960), pp. 423–442); Die Entzifferung der B-L wird fortgesetzt (*Or.* NS 30 (1961), pp. 110–118); zur Vokalisation des Luwischen (*Or.* NS 30 (1961), pp. 314–322). Although he recognized many of the cogent arguments for the re-evaluation, he never discarded the old readings, assuming instead the existence of improbable polyphonic values. These contributions are also overloaded with much irrelevant and incorrect speculation.

143 As published by him in *Ugaritica* III (Paris, 1956), pp. 97–160.

intended only as an introduction to a second part, which has never appeared. It is ironical too that the accession of evidence from Ugarit failed to provide compelling evidence on the values of the signs ↑ and ∩.

Meriggi's *Glossar* provided an essential tool for working with the texts, a complete index of all words, which permitted quick and easy location especially when it was joined by the complete corpus of texts in his *Manuale*. It is a measure of its value that still today after the alteration of crucial sign readings and substantial modification of others it has not yet been superseded and can, indeed must, be used.

The books of Laroche and Meriggi have remained basic to the study of Hieroglyphic since their publication. Yet using them together is not entirely straightforward, both because of the discrepant system of the numbering of the signs which they employ, and the discrepant systems of transliteration. These difficulties are diminished by the "conversion tables" which both books give at their ends, but still the use of both together demands a considerable degree of mental agility on the part of the reader.

Indeed these discrepancies highlight a severe problem facing any contributor to Hieroglyphic studies: namely how to impose a logical system of reference on what may seem to be a chaotic writing system. How too can one best incorporate the valid parts of the work of one's predecessors while at the same time introducing the necessary revisions established on the basis of new evidence? My own attempts to deal with this problem are detailed below in the section D, Principles of Transliteration (p. 23 ff.). Essentially I have attempted to maintain Laroche's system with only the unavoidable modifications.

That the study of this script does not remain stationary was shown, in the period immediately succeeding publication of Laroche's and Meriggi's books, by the work of H. Mittelberger, who in review articles¹⁴⁴ and a lengthy contribution of his own¹⁴⁵ made many valid points in correction and revision of sign readings and grammar. His observations clearly pointed the way towards the "new readings" of the signs ↑ ↓ and ∩ ∩, especially with the proposal of the reading *ia* for ∩, and the *i*-vocalization of the signs *ni/ní*, *si* and *wi*. The necessary evidence to introduce the complete change for the four signs was not yet available to him.

It was also in this period that the late Professor L. R. Palmer convened a group of scholars in Oxford to study the Hieroglyphic texts.¹⁴⁶ It was with these meetings that my own introduction to the subject began.

The "new readings" (↑ ↓, ∩ ∩)

The re-reading of ↑ ↓ from *i/i* to *zi/za* was, as noted above, envisaged by Bossert in the last year of his life,¹⁴⁷ and that of ∩ from *ā* to *ia* by Mittelberger in 1964,¹⁴⁸ by Kalaç in 1968,¹⁴⁹ and by Neumann 1973.¹⁵⁰

The actual decisive evidence in this shift was available from 1969 with the publication of the pithoi from Altintepe,¹⁵¹ but the significance of their inscriptions was not immediately appreciated.¹⁵² On these pithoi were incised measures, in place of the long-known Urartian Cuneiform *a-qar-qi* and *té/tè-ru-si* the Hittite Hieroglyphic equivalents *á-ba+ra/i-ku* and *tu-ru-↑* or *tu+ra/i-↓*. This provided a correspondence, of the type from which the decipherment of the Hieroglyphic syllabary had been built up, of Cun. *si* // Hier. ∩, thus indicating that the latter sign had a value *sibilant+vowel* rather than the simple vowel, as was currently assumed. Since the pairs ↑ ↓ and ∩ ∩ were recognized as descended from undifferentiated Empire Period forms ∩ and ∩, it was clear that the double-bar across the base of the second of each pair was a later introduced distinction. Detailed consideration of usage indicated that ↑ in fact corresponded to Cun. *zi* and ↓ to Cun. *za*, also ∩ to Cun. *ia*. From this point it was obvious that Hieroglyphic as currently read would lack an *i*-vowel sign, but also that if *za* is marked off from *zi* by the addition of the double-bars, then *ia* must be marked off from *i*, thus indicating this value for ∩. Our understanding of this distinction by means of the double-bars has been clarified by the observation, made originally by Gelb,¹⁵³ but only later seen to be of extreme relevance to the problem, that the double-bars represent a cursive form of the sign *a* (*HH*, no. 450), thus that the *a*-vocalization of *za* and *ia* is indicated by the writing of *a* in ligature with *zi* and *i*.¹⁵⁴ The last value to be established, that of ∩ = *i*, was very fully supported by observations of *plene*-writings of the type *Ci-i*, parallel to *Ca-a* and *Cu-u*.¹⁵⁵

144 Very useful and detailed review articles of both Laroche's *HH* and Meriggi's *Glossar* were published in *Sprache* 8 (1962), pp. 276–286; *ibid.*, 9 (1963), pp. 69–105, 219–224.

145 *ibid.*, 10 (1964), pp. 50–98.

146 The other participants were O. R. Gurney, Anna Morpurgo Davies, Jill Hart, and myself. Palmer's interest in Hieroglyphic produced his edition of BABYLON 1 (*TPS* 1958, pp. 57–67).

147 See above, n. 142.

148 *Sprache* 10 (1964), p. 83 § 29.

149 *Belleten* 32 (1968), pp. 326–330.

150 *F: Otten* (1) (1973), pp. 243–251.

151 Tahsin Özgüç, *Altintepe* II (Ankara, 1969), pls. LIII–LIV. See below, Appendix 4, p. 37.

152 E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes d'Altintepe* (*Anadolu* 15 (1971 [1973]), pp. 55–61); J. J. Klein, *Urartian Hieroglyphic inscriptions from Altintepe* (*An. St.* 24 (1974), pp. 77–94).

153 Gelb, *HH* III, p. 2.

154 Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *JRAS* 1975, p. 121 n. 2; *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, Serie III, 8/3 (1978), pp. 779–781. Remarkably, an Empire Period example of this graphic practice has recently appeared on the BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG inscription, where (§ 18) we find *zi/a+a* written for *za*: see Hawkins, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1990, p. 307 n. 13.

155 See Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann, *HHL* (see following footnote), pp. [21]–[25]. Note that these observations incorporate the proposal of Mittelberger to read the sign *wa* also as *wi*, and the values *ni*, *ní* and *si* for formerly *a*-vocalized forms.

These „new readings“ were fully argued by Anna Morpurgo Davies, Günter Neumann and myself in 1974,¹⁵⁶ the published form of papers read at a London symposium held by the Royal Asiatic Society at the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1973.¹⁵⁷ It may be claimed that new discoveries since 1974, principally that of the large number of digraphic seals from Meskene-Emar,¹⁵⁸ have abundantly confirmed our proposals. There in numerous Empire Period writings of personal names, Cun. *zi* and *za* are regularly represented by Hier. 𐎠 , thus to be transliterated as the undifferentiated *zi/a*, and Cun. *i* and *ia* by Hier. 𐎡 , thus *i(a)*, and it is also noteworthy that contradictory evidence is altogether lacking.¹⁵⁹

The only significant „casualty“ of the „new readings“ worth recording is the supposed reading of *a-i-a/ā-* for the verb $\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow / \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow$, „make“, identified with Cun. Luw. *a(ia)-*, „make“, and considered instrumental in the decipherment by Gelb.¹⁶⁰ It now becomes re-read as *i-zi-i/ia-*. However a Cun. writing *izzia-* has now been identified as the equivalent of the Hier. verb, and further, examples of a Hier. verb written *á(-ia)-* have been collected which provide the true equivalent of Cun. Luw. *a(ia)-*.¹⁶¹

The „new readings“, it may be claimed, have won general acceptance. Meriggi with characteristic generosity fully adopted the system.¹⁶² Acceptance came also from Gelb,¹⁶³ Güterbock,¹⁶⁴ Laroche,¹⁶⁵ Kalaç,¹⁶⁶ Mittelberger,¹⁶⁷ Oettinger,¹⁶⁸ Carruba,¹⁶⁹ and Neu.¹⁷⁰ These transliterations are used besides by Anna Morpurgo Davies, Neumann and myself, by Starke,¹⁷¹ Melchert,¹⁷² and an increasing number of other col-

leagues. Early doubts by Puhvel have I hope been resolved.¹⁷³ Poetto however, for no very obvious reason, maintains an occasional value *a* for *i*, transcribing *a/i*.¹⁷⁴

Recent progress

This then is the new platform from which Hieroglyphic studies have been conducted for the last twenty years, and progress has been substantial. As an appendix to the „new readings“, utilizing a new piece of evidence I was able in 1975 to establish the sign for the factual negative *na* (NEG₁₋₃) and with Anna Morpurgo Davies to sort out the rather confused situation on negation and disjunction.¹⁷⁵ Since then in a series of independent and joint studies, we have been able to identify a number of new lexical and grammatical elements.¹⁷⁶ Onofrio Carruba and Massimo Poetto have also been active in this field.¹⁷⁷ A prolonged cor-

156 Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: new evidence for the connection (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 6 (1973 [1974], pp. 143–197 – cited as *HHL*, with page-numbering [1]–[55]).

157 Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, Hieroglyphic Hittite: some new readings and their consequences (*JRAS* 1975, pp. 121–133, with additional note by G. Neumann).

158 Also published by Laroche, still (1991) in preliminary articles only: see *Akkadica* 22 (1981), pp. 5–14; Meskéné-Emar, dix ans de travaux (ed. D. Beyer; Paris, 1982), pp. 53–60; Les Hiéroglyphes Hittites de Meskéné-Emar: un emprunt d'écriture (*CRAIBL* 1983, pp. 12–23). For a collection of closely comparable material from the middle Euphrates, see now H. Gonnet, *apud* D. Arnaud, *Textes Syriens de l'Âge du Bronze Récent* (Aula Orientalis Supplementa; Barcelona, 1991).

159 Certainly nothing to contradict Hier. *zi/a* = Cun. *zi* or *za*. With Hier. *i(a)*, Cun. equivalents *i*, *e* and *ia* are all well established as would be expected. Cun. *a* has expected equivalences with Hier. *a* and *á*; we would not expect an equivalence with Hier. *i(a)*. Two such however do appear to exist, where Semitic names beginning with Cun. 𐎠 U (i. e. the Storm-God *Adad*) are written Hier. *i(a)-tá/tà-* (*Akkadica* 22 (1981), p. 10 nos. 5 and 6). Rather than assuming that *i(a)* is used here to write the equivalent of *a*, which is opposed by a very adequate collection of evidence supporting the absolute distinction Cun. *a* = Hier. *a/á*; Cun. *i/e/ia* = Hier. *i(a)*, we may suggest instead that Semitic (*H*)*adad* was perceived phonetically as [edad] and written *ita-*, much as later (*H*)*amat* is written *i-ma-tu* and (*H*)*alab i-la-pa-* (for which see KARKAMIŠ A24a2+3, § 6, and Commentary).

160 Gelb, *HH* II, p. 14 with n. 3.

161 Morpurgo Davies and Hawkins, *Hethitica* 8 (1987), pp. 276–279, 295 addenda 2 and 3.

162 *Schizzo* (1980), p. 248 ff.

163 Personal letter to Anna Morpurgo Davies and myself, dated 24 May 1976.

164 Personal communications.

165 Personal communication at the XXIII R.A.I., Birmingham 1976, in the context of his paper, a preliminary report on the evidence from the digraphic Meskene seals; cf. also *Akkadica* 22 (1981), p. 13 and *passim*.

166 First used by him in *Anadolu Araştırmaları* 4–5 (1976–1977), pp. 61–66.

167 Review article on *HHL*, *Das neue Bild der Hethitischen Hieroglyphen* (*Grazer Beiträge* 7 (1978), pp. 1–14).

168 *Stammbildung* (Nürnberg, 1979), p. 565 n. 10.

169 *Gs Kronasser* (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 1, 6; *SMEA* 24 (Rome, 1984), p. 60.

170 Review of *HHL*, *Kratylos* 28 (1983 [1984]), pp. 213–216.

171 See below, nn. 178–179.

172 See below, n. 180.

173 See e.g. *HED* 1 (1984), p. 344 f., where the old reading *aia-* for new *izí(ya)-* is maintained. Professor Puhvel has since informed me that he accepts the new readings.

174 See e.g. *Studia Meriggi* (1979), p. 501 n. 1. He also continues to read *na, ná, sa* for *ní, ní, sí*.

175 *An. St.* 25 (1975), pp. 119–156, 157–168.

176 E.g. A.M.D.: *Fs Szemerényi* (1979), pp. 577–610; *KZ* 94 (1980), pp. 86–108; *An. St.* 30 (1980), pp. 123–137; *KZ* 96 (1982/83), pp. 245–270; *Fs Risch* (1986), pp. 129–145; *Studia Cowgill* (1987), pp. 205–228.

J. D. H.: *KZ* 92 (1978), pp. 112–116; *KZ* 94 (1980), pp. 109–119; *Kadmos* 19 (1980), pp. 123–142; *Essays Mellink* (1986), pp. 93–102.

Joint: *Fs Neumann* (1982), pp. 91–105; *Kaniššumar* (1986), pp. 69–81; *Hethitica* 8 (1987), pp. 267–295; *Studia Pugliese Carratelli* (1988), pp. 169–182; *Kadmos* 32 (1993), pp. 50–60.

177 E.g. O.C.: *Fs Neumann* (1982), pp. 35–52; *Gs Kronasser* (1982), pp. 1–13; *SMEA* 24 (1984), pp. 57–69; *Kaniššumar* (1986), pp. 49–52.

M.P.: *O4* 17 (1978), pp. 279–285; *Or. NS* 47 (1978), pp. 252–262; *RJO* 52 (1978), pp. 1–5; *Studia Meriggi* (1979), pp. 501–507; *Fs Szemerényi* (1979), pp. 669–677; *Or. NS* 49 (1980), pp. 252–267 (with Meriggi); *SMEA* 22 (1980), pp. 127–132; *KZ* 95 (1981), pp. 274–278; *Fs Neumann* (1982), pp. 275–284; *Gs Kronasser* (1982), pp. 96–115 (with Meriggi); *Kadmos* 21 (1982), pp. 101–103; *Athenaemum* 61 (1983), pp. 528 f.; *Vicino Oriente* 6 (1986), pp. 157–162; *O4* 26 (1987), pp. 187–189; *Vicino Oriente* 7 (1988), pp. 171–176; *O4* 28 (1989), pp. 193–196.

response going back to 1979 between Frank Starke and myself has served to draw together our respective studies on Cun. and Hier. Luwian and has been productive in elucidating problems of both.¹⁷⁸ Starke's massive *Stammbildung des Luwischen Nomens* (*StBoT* 31; Wiesbaden, 1990) has utilized fully the Hieroglyphic evidence alongside the Cuneiform.¹⁷⁹ Recently too Craig Melchert has contributed some notable articles elucidating readings, lexicon and morphology.¹⁸⁰ Two

books reached me after the submission of the manuscript of this corpus in October 1990: that of M. Marazzi, *Il Geroglifico Anatolico: problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca* (Rome, 1990), which constitutes a valuable work of reference and bibliography for the Hieroglyphic corpus; and Rudolf Werner's *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* (*Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 106; Freiburg (Schweiz) and Göttingen, 1991), a more succinct work, which will be of value to students.

C. The Corpus

1. Definition of the Corpus

Empire and Late Periods

It is against this background of discovery, publication and decipherment that the present Corpus of Hier. Luwian inscriptions has been planned and written. It was my original intention not to include the inscriptions of the Hittite Empire Period, but to restrict the Corpus to the inscriptions of the Neo-Hittite states of the Iron Age. This was for several reasons, both practical and theoretical. The Iron Age inscriptions are much more numerous, much better preserved, longer and better understood than those of the Empire Period, which are few, mostly very short, and poorly preserved. The Iron Age inscriptions also form a fairly homogeneous group and were readily accessible, an important consideration. My primary interest has been the Luwian language rather than the Hieroglyphic script itself. The bulk of the Empire Period Hier. inscriptions are short epigraphs associated with sculpture giving names and titles (the latter always logographically written). As such, these inscriptions offer little evidence on language, and even if they reveal identifiable linguistic features, these may not be Luwian, as for example, the YAZILIKAYA group with their Hurrian character.

Among this class of Empire Period inscription we may class: ALACA HÖYÜK 1–3, BOĞAZKÖY 4, 8, ÇAĞDIN, HANYERİ, HEMİTE, İMAMKULU, KARABEL, KARGA, MALKAYA, SİPYLOS, SİR-KELİ, TAÇIN, TAŞCI, TELL AÇANA, YAZILIKAYA.

To these may be added the figures of Tudhaliyas and Suppiluliumas recently discovered at Boğazköy.¹⁸¹ Also the royal stelae from that site, BOĞAZKÖY 3 and 11 (both fragmentary), and a better preserved example recently discovered¹⁸² come into this category, for even when they preserve a genealogy there is no evidence as to the language in which it should be read, and the same applies too to the small stele BOĞAZKÖY 12.

The only Empire Period inscriptions which could properly find a place in a corpus of Hier. Luwian inscriptions were, up until 1988: ALEPPO 1, BOĞ-

AZKÖY 1 and 2 stele bases, NIŞANTAŞ, EMİRGAZİ altars A–D, EMİRGAZİ block, EMİRGAZİ fragment, FRAKTİN, KARAKUYU, KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA, and some BOĞAZKÖY fragments. Most of these even when tolerably preserved, are very short and almost entirely logographically written. Thus their Luwian content is very small, often amounting to no more than one or two phonetically written words to show that they should be read in Luwian. The EMİRGAZİ block and KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA are effectively fragments of once considerable texts, as is also NIŞANTAŞ on account of its erosion into illegibility (except for the first line). This left the EMİRGAZİ altars with their duplicate and mutually restoring inscriptions as the only substantial text of the period, though even this is badly worn and difficult to read. It does however exhibit marked differences from texts of the Late Period. Since 1970 it has been known that a long Hier. inscription of the Empire Period had been discovered at Yalburt near Iğın (formerly designated ILGIN but now YALBURT), but this remained unpublished. Thus because this small group was difficult, different, inaccessible and uninformative, I decided not to include it in the Corpus.

178 For Starke's work utilizing the new readings and combining the evidence of Hieroglyphic in philological studies, see e.g. *KZ* 93 (1979), pp. 247–261; *KZ* 94 (1980), pp. 74–86; *Kadmos* 19 (1980), pp. 142–148; *KZ* 95 (1981), pp. 141–157; *Fs Neumann* (1982), pp. 407–425; *Sprache* 31 (1985), pp. 249–255; *KZ* 100 (1987), pp. 243–269.

179 Though the printed book reached me only after the submission of this manuscript, Dr. Starke was kind enough to provide me with a copy of his manuscript in the course of 1988, so I have been able to co-ordinate much of his work and conclusions with my own.

180 *An. St.* 38 (1988), pp. 29–42; *KZ* 101 (1988), pp. 211–243; *KZ* 102 (1989), pp. 23–45; *KZ* 103 (1990), pp. 198–207.

181 Tudhaliyas IV (BOĞAZKÖY 19 – for numbering see above, n. 74): see *Arch. Anz.* 1986, pp. 394–396 with Abb. 29 a–b, 30; *Anatolica* 14 (1987), p. 87 Abb. 17. Suppiluliumas II (BOĞAZKÖY 20): see *Arch. Anz.* 1989, pp. 317, 327 Abb. 40 and 58.

182 BOĞAZKÖY 18 (also Tudhaliyas IV): see *Arch. Anz.* 1984, p. 336 f. Abb. (9), 10; *Anatolica* 14 (1987), p. 84 Abb. 13. [New fragment BOĞAZKÖY 24; also new stele from the village DELİHASANLI].

The Seals

The same considerations applied to the rather extensive corpus of Empire Period seals. The seal inscriptions are comparable to the epigraphs on sculpture: they are short inscriptions giving names and titles. The former may belong to any language group, not only Hittite or Luwian but also Hurrian or Semitic, while the latter are always logographically written, without indication of the language in which they should be read (though this would doubtless be that of the seal-holder). Furthermore, the signary which they employ differs markedly from that of the contemporary stone inscriptions, not to mention from those of the Late Period.¹⁸³ Thus it is entirely appropriate to restrict them to a corpus of their own, and useful work is being done towards this end,¹⁸⁴ though there are great practical difficulties in assembling the widely dispersed and elusive material. In any case these Empire Period seals never contain phonetically written Luwian words,¹⁸⁵ and are thus irrelevant to a corpus of the Luwian language.

The digraphic seals of Boğazköy, Ugarit and particularly Meskene-Emar are of course specially relevant to the Hieroglyphic script and its decipherment, since they establish many of the signs' values by giving Cuneiform correspondences. The two earlier groups have been thoroughly worked over and their information assimilated into the system by their editors Güterbock and Laroche.¹⁸⁶ A full publication of the third group, which is in fact by far the most numerous and informative, is still awaited.¹⁸⁷

[Note. At Boğazköy in 1990 and 1991 over 3000 bullae bearing seal impressions were excavated in the *Westbau* on Nişantepe. The royal seals are being published by H. Otten, and those of the officials by Suzanne Herbordt with the present author's collaboration].

The comparatively small group of seals of the Late Period does by contrast contain material relevant to the language, e.g. the word for "seal", and has thus been included in the corpus.

Separation of the Empire Period corpus

In the field of the Empire Period stone inscriptions, matters have changed rather drastically since I planned and almost completed this Corpus. The long YALBURT inscription was unexpectedly published in 1988,¹⁸⁸ at exactly the same time as another long and well preserved inscription of the period was excavated on the Südburg at Boğazköy.¹⁸⁹ This sudden access of new material has somewhat transformed our knowledge of Empire Period Hieroglyphic. My report on the BOĞ-AZKÖY-SÜDBURG inscription has recently appeared, in which I have included editions of the texts of YALBURT, the EMİRGAZİ altars, and the KARADAĞ-KIZILDAĞ group of inscriptions (Appendices 1–3).¹⁹⁰ Later it should prove practicable to supplement

this treatment with a further section of this Corpus containing the Empire Period inscriptions that properly belong with it. This should appear as: XIV. Inscriptions of the Hittite Empire.

1. YALBURT, the longest legible Hier. inscription of the period, a historical text of Tudhaliyas IV. Unfortunately its 17 blocks were discovered out of their proper order. A more or less complete reconstruction of the order to restore the original text may be possible. The text contains a fair proportion of syllabic writings of Luwian. [See now M. Poetto's edition *L'iscrizione luwio-geroglifica di YALBURT* (Stud. Med. 8; Pavia, 1993)].

2. BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG, a historical inscription of Suppiluliumas II, with an appended building inscription. In contrast with YALBURT, this text is largely logographic with few syllabic writings; also it does not write clause connectives and hardly any noun and verb endings, factors which severely hamper our comprehension.

3. NİŞANTAŞ, a long, apparently historical inscription of Suppiluliumas II, of which *KBo* XII 38, ii 22–28, iii 1–21, may well represent a fragmentary version in Cun. Hittite. The eroded state of the inscription appears desperate, yet most of the first line has now been read with a high degree of probability.¹⁹¹ I am currently (1993) working on this text and am hopeful of producing a substantial amount of new reading.¹⁹²

4. EMİRGAZİ altars, a dedicatory text of Tudhaliyas IV for the altars themselves. The preserved part of the text seems to contain almost entirely the injunctions concerning the altars and curses and blessings for future violators or respecters of these. The main problem of this text (composite, from the four partially preserved exemplars) is the reading, for the signs are worn and faint, and the recovery of an accurate and reliable text remains a desideratum.¹⁹³ Although there is much logographic writing, there are also many phonetically written words.

183 See XIII. SEALS, Introduction, where it is reckoned that some 70 signs in Laroche's *HH* occur solely on Empire Period seals.

184 See *ibid.*, with n. 2.

185 An exception is the magnificent seal of Kuzi-Tešub, known from LİDAR bullae (also MESKENE), which for this reason is included in the present Corpus (see XIII.1).

186 See above nn. 16, 143.

187 See above, n. 158.

188 See above p. 12 and n. 123.

189 See Neve and Otten, *Arch. Anz.* 1989, pp. 316–332 and 333–337.

190 As Beiheft 3 in the series *StBoT*. For my preliminary report see *Arch. Anz.* 1990, pp. 305–314.

191 See most recently E. Masson, *Studi Pugliese Carratelli* (1988), pp. 150–152.

192 Season of 1992, most of l. 2, and parts of ll. 3, 4, 5 read. Further readings in 1993.

193 See most recently E. Masson, *Journal des Savants* 1979, pp. 4–49. [A spell of work on EMİRGAZİ in Istanbul Museum in September 1993 has now furnished me with the material to produce a text; cf. edition in *StBoT* Bh. 3, pp. 86–102].

5. EMİRGAZİ block, a fragment of a historical text of Tudhaliyas IV, showing connections with the historical information on YALBURT. Again a reliable text is a desideratum.¹⁹⁴
6. EMİRGAZİ fragment, a small piece but important for its link with a clause on YALBURT, also on KIZILDAĞ 4.¹⁹⁵
7. FRAKTİN, epigraphs to sculptures of Hattusilis III and Puduhepa. This text earns its inclusion in a Luwian corpus by two apparently phonetically written words among the epithets.¹⁹⁶
8. KARAKUYU, dedicatory inscription for a reservoir constructed by Tudhaliyas IV.¹⁹⁷ It is uncertain whether this contains any phonetically written words other than mountain names, thus its characterization as Luwian is uncertain, but it contains writings relevant to the Empire Period corpus.
9. ALEPPO 1, dedicatory inscription for temple of Hebat-Šarruma by Talmi-Šarruma king of Aleppo (grandson of Suppiluliumas I).¹⁹⁸ This is perhaps the earliest datable (by generation) Hieroglyphic stone inscription. Though short, it may contain one or two phonetically written Luwian words.
10. KÖYLÜTOLU YAYLA block,¹⁹⁹ apparently a fragment truncated by loss of elements with parts of the inscription on both left and right sides. Content is obscure, and attribution not preserved, but it contains several phonetically written Luwian words.
- 11 and 12. BOGAZKÖY 1 and 2 stele bases, bearing short, dedicatory texts of a man and a woman.²⁰⁰ These are probably purely logographically written, thus not actually of assured Luwian character.

[Note. Recent discoveries add the inscriptions of the KINIK bronze bowl and the ANKARA silver bowl. The inclusion of the following can now also be justified: KARABEL with TARKONDEMOS seal; İMAMKULU; TAŞCI; HATİP].

Intermediate inscriptions

Enough has been said to explain the separation of the Empire Period inscriptions from those of the Iron Age. There remain some transitional pieces between the two groups, namely KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN) stele, and the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ group of rock inscriptions (with the recently discovered BURUNKAYA). Both appear archaic but are apparently post-Empire on historical grounds, since they both name “Great Kings”, thus should not be dated to the period in which the only Great Kings were the known lords of Hattusa. They thus probably both belong to the immediate post-Empire Period, a supposed dark age of some 200 years, 1200–1000 B. C. Yet the publication of YALBURT reveals how closely linked to it is the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ group.²⁰¹ Also the appearance of the seal of Kuzi-Tešub, son of Talmi-Tešub, who as King of Karkamiš appears to have survived the collapse of the Hittite Empire, led to his identification

in the genealogies of two kings of Malatya as “grandfather”, entitled “Great King”. This has the effect of raising the date of the Iron Age inscriptions and sculpture of Malatya to the late 12th-early 11th centuries B. C. which goes some way to filling the gap of the dark age. Because of their apparent post-Empire date, and their importance in a consideration of the dating and development of the Hieroglyphic script, these transitional pieces, KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN) and the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ group, are included with the Late rather than the Empire Period corpus.

2. Arrangement of the inscriptions

Groups

The Late Period inscriptions fall for the most part into fairly clear-cut groups, according to their provenance from one or other of the Neo-Hittite states. The principal epigraphic centres known are: *Karkamiš* on the west bank of the Euphrates, the main survivor from the period of the Hittite Empire, and the largest source of Hieroglyphic inscriptions; *Til Barsip* (Hier. *Masuwari*, mod. Tell Ahmar) on the east bank of the Euphrates below Karkamiš, source of an early group of Hieroglyphic inscriptions antedating the conquest of the city by the Arameans; *Gurgum* (*Marqas*, mod. Maraş) a centre particularly rich in funerary monuments, with an epigraphic tradition stretching back from c. 800 B. C. for at least two centuries; *Melid* (mod. Malatya) on the west bank of the upper Euphrates, also probably a survival of the Hittite Empire, where the sculptural and epigraphic remains seem to be the earliest, showing closest connections with their Empire Period prototypes; *Kummub* (classical Commagene), the west bank Euphrates state between Melid and Karkamiš, at present known only for a small group of inscriptions of the late 9th-early 8th centuries B. C.; *Unqi* (mod. Amuq) in the plain of Antioch, also known only from a small group of very badly destroyed sculpture and inscriptions; *Halab* (mod. Aleppo), apparently controlled by the Aramean state of Bit-Agusi/Arpad, where the ancient cult-centre of the Storm-God appears to be the original source of some Hieroglyphic monuments

194 See E. Masson, *ibid.* I now have the material to produce a text (see preceding note).

195 Sedat Alp, *Fs Otten* (1) (1973), pp. 11–13, Abb. 1 a–c; E. Masson, *Kadmos* 19 (1980), p. 121.

196 Güterbock, *Fs Matouš* (1978), pp. 127–136.

197 Most recent edition in Meriggi, *Manuale* II/3 (1975), nos. 95–96 p. 315 f.; cf. Forlanini, *Hethitica* VII (1987), pp. 73–87.

198 Most recent edition in Meriggi, *Manuale* II/3 (1975), no. 306 p. 330 f.

199 See most recently E. Masson, *Kadmos* 19 (1980), pp. 106–118.

200 Most recent edition in Meriggi, *Manuale* II/3 (1975), nos. 39, 40 pp. 287–289.

201 [See now Hawkins, *Fs Sedat Alp* (Ankara, 1992), pp. 259–275].

found in Babylonia; *Hamath* (mod. Hama) on the Orontes river in mid-Syria, where the Hurro-Hittite dynasty of the 9th century B. C., known from a group of Hieroglyphic inscriptions, was replaced in the 8th century by an Aramean dynasty; *Tabal*, the south-east corner of the Anatolian plateau, divided into several kingdoms and city-states, each with its own monumental traditions, largely of the later 8th century B. C.; and *Que* (classical Cilicia), at present represented only by one main inscription, the well-known KARATEPE bilingual, which seems to belong late in the Hieroglyphic tradition. Also there should be mentioned in this context the small city-state of *Sam'al* (mod. Zincirli) lying at the eastern exit of the pass from Cilicia across the Amanus range, the seat of a dynasty bearing mixed Hittite and Aramean names, which modelled its sculpture and alphabetic inscriptions on those of its Hittite neighbours. The Aramean state of Bit-Agusi/Arpad already mentioned, which like *Sam'al* was deeply embedded in a Neo-Hittite matrix, has also left three early Aramaic inscriptions.

Order

In the present work, the inscriptions have where possible been grouped according to their epigraphic centres in ten chapters numbered I–X, with additional chapters XI (for the self-contained group of the ASSUR lead letters), XII (a small group, MISCELLANEOUS, of unprovenanced, unattributable inscriptions) and XIII (a further group, SEALS). The ordering of these chapters designated by Roman numerals is as follows:

I. CILICIA, consisting almost entirely of the great KARATEPE bilingual, placed first, although probably the latest inscription in chronological terms, in recognition of its outstanding importance.

II. KARKAMIŠ, placed next as being otherwise the most important group, covering the longest chronological span, and certainly the most numerous collection of Hieroglyphic inscriptions.

III. TELL AHMAR, following KARKAMIŠ as a closely related but small appendix.

IV. MARAŞ, placed next because of its importance in fixing the earlier chronology of the inscriptions from established links with Assyrian chronology, also because of its fairly close links with KARKAMIŠ.

V. MALATYA, the most northerly and also the earliest group of inscriptions appropriately follows MARAŞ.

VI–IX. COMMAGENE, AMUQ, ALEPPO, HAMA, all fairly small groups from the central area, north to south, could appear in any order here.

X. TABAL, the second largest group, following KARKAMIŠ, lying on the north-west periphery of the Neo-Hittite world, placed last to emphasize its relative distinctness; it divides into an archaic western group (KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ), a cohesive southern group (Tyana), and a more miscellaneous northern group,

centring on Tabal proper. Apart from the archaic western group, all the Tabalian inscriptions seem to belong to the latest period, the later 8th century B. C.

The chronology of each group is determined by internal and external criteria. Within each group we can usually detect one or more dynasties, whose relative order may or may not be apparent. Many of the members of these dynasties can be identified as rulers named in the Assyrian historical records and thus anchored to the Assyrian-based chronology of the 9th and 8th centuries B. C. Where the dynasties cannot be thus tied to absolute chronology, they must at least be fitted into the available gaps.

Each chapter is introduced by a section designed to establish the historical context of the group of inscriptions. Each group is defined by examination of the identity of the ancient state, its historical background and extent, and the degree of its archaeological investigation. The Assyrian historical references are reviewed, and the indigenous Hieroglyphic monuments are grouped into dynasties where possible, and linked to the general chronology or fitted into gaps.

The individual inscriptions within each group are numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. They are arranged chronologically as far as possible, beginning with those which can be linked to ordered dynasties, continuing with those which can be arranged by stylistic criteria, and ending with indeterminate pieces and fragments.

Summary of results

I. CILICIA. The date of the KARATEPE bilingual and its associated sculpture is controversial because of the identification among the latter of both 9th and 8th century elements. Historically the inscription may be dated by the identification of the author's patron Awarikus with a late 8th century ruler, also possibly by the identification of the author Azatiwatas with an early 7th century ruler. If this is correct, a date to the reign of Sennacherib of Assyria (704–681 B. C.) offers the best fit. Epigraphically a very late date seems the most probable.

II. KARKAMIŠ. This site, the chief heir of the Hittite Empire, provides as noted the fullest sequence of sculpture and inscriptions extending over most of the Late Period. Historically it is attested in Assyrian sources under two kings only, c. 870–848 and 738–717 B. C. Of the three native dynasties reconstructable from the indigenous sources, two must belong before this period, an archaic group of "Great Kings" and the "House of Suhis". How far back before c. 1000 B. C. the recovered monuments extend is still uncertain. The third dynasty, the "House of Astiruwas", must fall within the gap of a century between the two periods of Assyrian attestation, and one of its later members, known from inscriptions and sculpture, may be identified with the Assyrian-attested last king of Karkamiš.

III. TELL AHMAR. Sculpture and inscriptions provide evidence of a 4-generation dynasty including six kings. These must have preceded the Aramean tenure of the city, first attested in 858 B. C., which was immediately followed by the period as an Assyrian province (854–*c.* 605 B. C.). Stylistically the monuments are closely linked to the early Karkamiš style of perhaps the 10th century B. C.

IV. MARAŞ. Datable inscriptions from here are all 9th century B. C. or earlier, and none can be attributed to Assyrian-attested rulers of the 8th century. Some of the non-royal sculpture in the form of uninscribed funerary monuments may well date to the later period. The chronology is basically established by the Maraş Lion inscription (MARAŞ 1), among whose recorded seven generations of rulers three kings, including the inscription's author himself, can be identified with Assyrian-named persons. The establishment of the Lion and its author at *c.* 800 B. C. takes the six ascending generations of ancestors back towards 1000 B. C.

V. MALATYA. Most of the sculpture from this site has always been recognized as showing close links with the Hittite Empire style, and thus being either early post-Empire in date or at least very conservative. The inscriptions permit the reconstruction of dynasties, each of several generations. None of the rulers named can be identified with those attested by Assyrian reference (*c.* 853–835, and 743–712 B. C.), nor could the generations be accommodated in the gap (except perhaps the dynasty named on ŞIRZI, where the father of the author may be identified with a king named in Urartian sources, *c.* 760). Thus the bulk of the inscriptions with the associated sculpture must be placed before *c.* 850 B. C. In fact the recent recognition that two Malatya kings claim in their inscriptions to be grandsons of Kuzi-Tešub, Great King of Karkamiš, seems to take all this linked material back to a late 12th–early 11th century B. C. date. One group of Malatya sculptures only and one poorly preserved statue inscription (PALANGA) may date to the 8th century B. C. Only the colossal ruler figure, found interred in the Lion Gate, belongs to the latest style of all, the later 8th century B. C.

VI. COMMAGENE. All of this small group of inscriptions, including some recent finds, seem to belong to a father-son dynasty, Suppiluliumas and Hattusilis. A recently published Assyrian stele attests the presence of a king Ušpilulume on the throne of Kummuh, minimally 805–773 B. C. The identification of this ruler as the Suppiluliumas of the indigenous inscriptions provides an entirely appropriate date for the group.

VII. AMUQ. This kingdom is known principally from the excavations of two Iron Age sites, Ain Dara and Tell Tayinat. From the former much archaic sculpture but virtually no inscriptions have been recovered. From the latter, the sculpture and inscriptions are so badly broken that they can hardly be linked to the Assyrian

historical sources to provide secure evidence for date, either 9th or 8th centuries B. C.

VIII. ALEPPO. Under this heading a stele and two stone bowls found in Babylonia are included because of internal suggestion that they originated as dedications in the temple of the Storm-God of Aleppo. The stele appears to be in the 9th century Karkamiš style. The bowls offer no definite criteria.

IX. HAMA. As in COMMAGENE, most of the inscriptions (probably also the architecture and sculpture) from this site are the work of a father-son dynasty, Urhilina and Uratamis. The identification of the father with the Irhuleni named by Shalmaneser III (858–821 B. C.) in the period 853–845 B. C. gives an entirely probable dating of the monuments to early and late in the reign of Shalmaneser. The pair of inscriptions MEHARDE and SHEIZAR are in an idiosyncratic style, probably archaic, and not easily connected with other monuments.

X. TABAL. Of the three groups into which this group of inscriptions subdivides, the western group KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ and BURUNKAYA can now be seen, since the discovery and publication of two major Empire Period inscriptions, to be extremely early, probably shortly post-Empire. The two other groups are both very late, later 8th century B. C. They comprise the cohesive southern group, attached to a three-generation dynasty of Tuwana, the most important middle member of which, Warpalawas by name, has long been identified with a ruler attested in Assyrian sources, *c.* 738–710 B. C.; and the more heterogeneous northern group attached to the dynasty of Tuwatis and his son Wasusar-mas, who is attested in Assyrian sources *c.* 738–729 B. C. The “private” inscriptions found in comparatively large numbers here do not seem to differ significantly in date from the dynastic inscriptions of the north and south groups, nor do the KULULU lead strips, which agree closely in style with some of the stone inscriptions.

XI. ASSUR letters. Though found in a mysterious context by the Assur excavations, these lead strips resemble closely those from KULULU, and thus seem to belong to a particular late style in Tabal. A single reference may suggest that one end of the correspondence was Karkamiš, but nothing from the latter site is written in a style as close to the letters as are many Tabalian documents.

XII. MISCELLANEOUS. This section consists of unprovenanced inscriptions and fragments which do not show clear evidence for association with the known groups. Equally the dates of these pieces within the 9th–8th centuries are very hard to determine.

XIII. SEALS. The numerous seals of the Empire Period form, as noted above, essentially a distinct corpus from their contemporary stone inscriptions with

which they have little in common. For the Late Period surprisingly few seals are known, yet those that there are deserve a place in the Corpus alongside the other inscriptions. Besides names, occasionally those of known rulers, they often contain interesting words or phrases of qualification, including the word for “seal” itself. A special group belonged in some way to the goddess Kubaba. Thus all seals of this period which I have been able to collect are included in a final chapter.

3. Presentation of the inscriptions

Photographs

The goal of this Corpus is to present each inscription in photograph(s) with a juxtaposed copy, and in transliteration with translation. Obtaining good photographs of all inscriptions has not been easy. Many factors affect the quality of a photograph: the shape of the inscription, its state of preservation, position, lighting, etc. In general I have tried to photograph every inscription myself, and the deficiencies of my skill as a photographer have been somewhat counterbalanced by the fact that I at least knew what effect I hoped to achieve. I have by no means always been able to take better photographs than those already published, but sometimes another photograph, even inferior in quality, may be useful in bringing out new points. In some cases I have used the photographs of others, in particular those of the late I. J. Gelb, who with great generosity gave me full access to his photographic files when I was visiting Chicago in 1983, and provided me with many prints both published and unpublished. Whenever I have used another’s photograph, due acknowledgement is given. If not specified otherwise, the photograph is my own.

Copies

Making a good copy also depends on the circumstances of the inscription. For preference my new texts were made by tracing either from a squeeze or directly on clear acetate affixed to the stone itself. Both techniques are obviously easiest when the inscription itself is on flat surface(s), which is by no means always the case: a common form is the apsidal stele, and there are a number of inscriptions actually on sculptured elements such as the Maraş lion. In making squeezes, I have used both latex and paper. They are very useful to take away for detailed study, and on occasion readings can be made more easily on squeezes, which can be studied at leisure with different lights, than on the stone itself. In general they give a better impression of incised inscriptions than relief. On the other hand, it is often not possible to make a squeeze. Tracing on acetate is less laborious and messy, but does not of course leave one with a record for later consultation.

If neither a squeeze nor acetate tracing is possible, tracing from photographs can be quite satisfactory, or

even copying directly on to a photograph in Indian ink. Ideally this is done in front of the inscription itself; otherwise a later collation of the text is desirable in varying degrees, depending on the quality of the photograph.

Karkamiš

A special case is constituted by the inscriptions of Karkamiš, the largest single group in the whole Corpus, and one which, unusually, was the product of regular excavation. Because of the peculiar circumstances of discovery, the interruption of the excavation by the outbreak of the First World War, and the passage of hostilities across the site twice, a number of the inscriptions were destroyed, lost or damaged. (A few other inscriptions are also lost, but the lost ones from Karkamiš are by far the most numerous in this category.) But fortunately the Karkamiš excavation records are comparatively well preserved in the form of photographs and paper squeezes in the British Museum. This material, which is only partially published in the *Carchemish* reports, has been freely available to me, and constitutes an important source, not only for lost and damaged inscriptions, but also for checking surviving pieces. In many cases my texts are based on Karkamiš squeezes, though wherever possible these have been checked against the original inscriptions.

Transliteration and translation

Transliteration of the texts follows the principles set out in detail in the following section D (below, p. 23 ff.). In translation, where doubt exists, I have tried to signal different degrees of uncertainty. Italicizing the English translation indicates that the word or phrase is approximately understood, but the exact meaning may be different. One question-mark indicates a guessed meaning and two an unsupported guess. Where a meaning cannot be guessed I put the Luwian word itself in capitals. If the reading is too uncertain, I place a blank but indicate in translation the verbal or nominal endings where these can be seen. On some occasions where the syntax of the clause is ambiguous, alternative possible translations are offered.

Commentary

This follows each transliteration-translation, and aims to discuss fully the problems of reading and interpretation and to justify those chosen. Interesting and problematic words are discussed in detail in the Commentary under the passage most appropriate to elucidating them, and full cross references to the other occurrences are given. These detailed discussions of individual items are listed in an *Index of words discussed*, intended to serve as an interim measure until the projected glossary to the texts is published.

Bibliography

Each inscription is preceded by a collection of information relating to it arranged under the following headings:

Location, whether in museum, *in situ*, in private collection, lost or unknown, together with any identifying museum or collection number, where known.

Description of the inscribed element (rock-face, stone stele/orthostat/sculpture/base, other object or unrecognizable fragment, or the few metal inscriptions, such as lead strips and bowls, or the few ostraca), and of the inscription itself (lines, orientation, order of reading, continuity, missing parts). Particulars of each inscription are briefly noted: condition, dimensions, script (relief or incised), sign-forms (monumental, cursive or mixed), peculiarities, and use or not of word dividers.

Publication, to show principally when and in what form(s) the inscription became available to the academic world. Importance is attached to priority, but it is also recorded when new and clearer photograph(s) and/or copy were published. In the case of well-known pieces it has also been noted when and where original photographs have been repeatedly reproduced.

Edition, showing where a full transliteration and translation usually with some commentary has been given. Pre-KARATEPE these are usually the work of Meriggi or Hrozný; post-KARATEPE usually Meriggi, sometimes Bossert, and more recently Kalaç, myself, Anna Morpurgo Davies or Poetto.

Excerpts, intended to show who has contributed to the elucidation of single clauses, when and up to what point. These are particularly important as reference to the contributions of scholars who have not edited complete texts, e.g. Laroche, Mittelberger, Carruba, Starke, Melchert. In selecting what to include I have loosely adopted the general criterion of a complete translation of the clause which has been at least approximately understood by today's standards.

Note: in my Commentary, an author's name followed by loc. cit. refers exclusively to the citation of the author under *Excerpts*.

Content, a brief summary of the text as understood and preserved.

Date, a brief statement, seldom a lengthy discussion, but often with reference to discussion in the Historical Context section.

Text, details as to how this was obtained – traced from stone, squeeze or photograph (see above, p. 22).

Photograph(s), source given. If my own, when and where taken; if another's, acknowledgement.

4. Present Corpus and further volumes

This then is the Corpus of *Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (for volume II, see below). It divides naturally into text and illustrations, and in the case of the text, practical considerations of size dictate the division into two parts: 1. Introduction, Cilicia, Karkamiš, Tell Ahmar, Maraş, Malatya, Commagene; 2. Amuq, Aleppo, Hama, Tabal, Assur letters, Miscellaneous, Seals, Altuntepe pithos inscriptions, Indices. The illustrations are given as a separate tome, part 3.

Professor Halet Çambel has prepared the publication of KARATEPE-ASLANTAŞ as a separate volume, and it has been agreed that it is appropriate to associate it with the present Corpus and number it volume II: see below, p. 46.

Clearly it is desirable in a Corpus of this type to accompany it with a comprehensive glossary, together with a signary and indices of names (divine, personal and geographical). This could hardly be accommodated in the format of the Corpus as divided, and requires a separate volume. It is my intention, following the completion of this Corpus, to proceed with the preparation of such a volume. As well as glossary, signary, and indices, it should include a sketch of the grammar of Hieroglyphic Luwian drawn from the texts of the Corpus. Here too I would hope to add the section XIV, Inscriptions of the Hittite Empire, as outlined above, p. 18 f.

D. Principles of transliteration

1. Order of the Signs

Laroche's system, as has been noted, is about as logical as may be devised for an essentially unsystematic script, and it is this system which I and others have

used, with the necessary modifications, over the last twenty-five years. In order to minimize discontinuity, I have opted in the present Corpus against an attempt to devise a new system, and have preferred to adopt and adapt that of Laroche.

Thus, first, I maintain Laroche's sign-order and numbering. This is however subject to the following modifications.

1. In *HH*, some 28 signs are incorrectly included because they were unrecognized variants of other signs. Thus they should be deleted along with their numbers, and the entries transferred to the well-established headings. The following numbers should thus disappear: 63, 64 (=69); 76 (=221); 113 (=26); 114 (=378+105); 119 (=246); 124 (=115); 136 (=43); 143 (=214); 167 (=107); 168 (=329); 169 (=382); 170 (=73); 183 (=423); 242 (=432); 266 (=93+228); 287, 302 (=399); 310 (=201); 339 (=319); 359(2) (=245); 401 (=477); 444 (=9); 453, 454 (=179); 465, 467 (=191); 487 (=1?). Further such doublets will no doubt become apparent. Note that 20, 36 and 114 should be abolished as separate entries and listed under 378.

2. At least 26 pairs of signs should probably be merged, i. e. the pair requires only one heading not two. These include (where the second sign should be listed under the first): 1 (+2); 14 (+13); 39 (+44); 39 (+40); 56 (+57); 59 (+60); 62 (+68); 86 (+87); 88 (+89); 91 (+92+94); 445 (+186); 212 (+213); 221 (+222); 231 (+232+233); 252 (+253); 255 (+256); 257 (+260); 275 (+276); 312 (+313); 349 (+348); 358 (+359(1)); 419 (+420); 468 (+469); 474 (+473); 477 (+479).

3. Some 70 signs are found only on seals and are often of dubious form and recognition. These have no place in the signary of the monumental inscriptions and may be relegated to glyptic works. These include: 5, 23, 38, 47, 48, 50, 54, 118, 127, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 154, 156, 157, 164, 184, 188, 189, 195, 203, 208, 211, 220, 271, 289, 323, 324, 333, 353, 354, 365, 373, 385, 403, 405, 409, 414, 418, 425, 426, 436, 437, 438, 440, 441, 442, 443, 449, 452, 458, 459, 482, 483, 489–497. Occasionally signs attested hitherto only on seals appear on new monumental inscriptions, e. g. nos. 177, 416, which can now be seen on YALBURT, no. 122 on BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG.

4. Some 37 signs are attested in the Empire Period only, of which 11 may be identified as Empire Period forms of later signs. The others should be kept separate from the Late Period signary. These signs include: 3, 4, 11, 13 (=14), 53, 55, 56 (=57), 88 (=89), 116 (=100), 137, 149, 151, 158, 173, 226, 227, 254, 270 (=70), 277 (=371?), 283, 285, 292, 296+297 (=294), 303, 306, 312 (=313), 318, 320 (=165), 352, 361, 367, 369, 372, 416 (=319?), 424, 461 (=462), 463.

5. On the other hand a number of signs unrecognized by or new since Laroche's signary are in need of numbers. These are virtually all on KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN) or on the BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG inscription, thus are essentially Empire Period or archaic signs. Since Laroche's last used number is 497, these new signs are numbered from 501 onwards. In this system 501, exceptionally, is a late sign found on KARATEPE

TABLE 1. New or previously unrecognized sign

501		KARATEPE, 68
502		SÜDBURG, §2 EMİGAZI, §33b KARAHÖYÜK, §18
503		SÜDBURG, §7
504		SÜDBURG, §7
505		SÜDBURG, §7
506		SÜDBURG, §7, 13
507		SÜDBURG, §13
508		YALBURT, 4 §2, 8, 10 §3 11 §1, 12 §4 EMİGAZI, §37
509		YALBURT, [6 §2], 15 §2
510		YALBURT, 6 §2, 15 §2
511		YALBURT, 7 §2b, 17 §2
512		KARAHÖYÜK, §5
513		KARAHÖYÜK, §7
514		KARAHÖYÜK, §8
515		KARAHÖYÜK, §11
516		KARAHÖYÜK, §14
517		KARAHÖYÜK, §15
518		KARAHÖYÜK, §15
519		KARAHÖYÜK, §15
520		KARAHÖYÜK, §15
521		KARAHÖYÜK, §18
522		KARKAMIŞ stone bowl, §1
523		AFRIN, §2

and elsewhere; 502–507 are from the SÜDBURG inscription, 508–511 from YALBURT, 512–521 from KARAHÖYÜK, and 522–523, new occurrences. See Table 1.

It will be noted that the removal of the signs (over 150 in number) listed in 1–4 as not belonging in the Late Period signary considerably simplifies it down to

a total of some 350 signs. Of these, over 200 may be reckoned as logograms, of which over 30 serve as determinatives (it is somewhat difficult to distinguish between a logogram with more than one reading and a determinative). The regular syllabary consists of almost 60 syllabograms, and there are in addition some 30 rare alternative syllabograms.

The removal of these signs and the abolition of their numbers from the Late Period signary leaves large gaps in the retained numeration of Laroche, but this does not appear to pose a problem. I have not made any alterations to the numbers and order of the signs, even when this might seem required by later recognitions that some signs have been classified under the wrong headings. Laroche's classification system groups the signs under ten headings: I. Corps humain, vêtements; II. Animaux; III. Végétaux, etc. This is in fact a very approximate procedure, since the greater part of the signs cannot be identified for what they represent with any certainty. Nevertheless it was and remains useful in breaking the signs up into groups, which facilitates the memorization and location of individual items. Examples of incorrect classification which have been left undisturbed include: *la* (*175), classified under *Végétaux* as a "sorte de fleur", can now be seen to represent "tongue"; *243, seen as a "bâtiment", is in fact a "forearm", thus CUBITUM – both of these should of course be reclassified under *Corps humain*. Sign *338 is probably not a pot but a knife, thus CULTER, so should be under *Armes* etc.; while *344 represents two profiles joined by a line, flanking a seal, symbolizing "agreement", thus CONTRACTUS, so should be classified with its opposite, *24, symbolizing "disagreement", thus LIS. But in spite of these new perceptions, it has seemed preferable not to disturb the existing order.

Note: * before numeral indicates Laroche, *HH* no.

2. The Logograms

Finding an agreed system of transliteration for logograms is a problem which recurs for scholars dealing with most ancient writing systems. The question is twofold: first, what is the value of the signs and why are they used as they are?; secondly, how can scholars of different nationalities agree on a conventional system of transcription?

If we begin with the first problem, we find a number of easy cases: the logogram may stand for what it depicts, i. e. is a pictogram, as *90 is a foot and may be read "foot"; it may also determine words for related concepts, i. e. serve as an ideogram, as "foot" determines the verb "come", and semantically related verbs. Yet sometimes we can identify the object depicted but do not know why it is used as it is: why does *341 representing a pot determine all the words which it does? And finally there are logograms which we quite

simply do not understand, i. e. we can neither identify what they represent, nor can we understand the way in which they are used: what is *273 and why does it determine both *warpi*, "skill, etc.", and *tupi*, "smite"?

Turning to the problem of transcription, we find that in the latter case, the logograms which are not understood, there is simply no option: these can only be represented by a conventional number. (Note that the asterisk preceding such numbers in the transliterations follows the practice of Linear B in thus distinguishing conventional sign-numbers from the transliteration of actual figures in the Hieroglyphic). We could of course apply this method consistently and indicate all logograms by their sign-number, but this has the disadvantage of giving the reader no help with the interpretation, not even that offered by the obvious pictographic values of some of the signs. Thus it appears to be more appropriate to use actual words where possible. In the case of e. g. the sign "foot", which both indicates a foot and determines verbs of coming, since one single transcription is required, a word meaning "foot" will be appropriate for this purpose. For the pot sign *341, a conventional transcription of a word for "pot" will also be suitable, even if we do not understand the function of the logogram.

The problem remains however of what words to choose. Ideally it might be desirable to use the words used by the language itself: the Luwian word for "foot" to represent the sign FOOT etc. But in most cases this is simply impossible, since we do not know the appropriate Luwian words for a large number of the objects and concepts, and even if we did, it would be extremely problematic to choose between (quasi-)synonymous words. Indeed no scholar has attempted this solution in its entirety, though Meriggi used it partially, combining it with transcriptions into Sumerian for the common logograms where a ready equivalence was available, and resorting to the number system where neither would serve. Other scholars have transcribed recognizable logograms with an appropriate word from their own language, thus FOOT/PIED/FUSS etc. Meriggi's mixed system can hardly be followed: the number of ready Hieroglyphic-Sumerian equivalences is too few, and in any case sets up a false presumption of connection between Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform, while the attempt to use Luwian words falls down, as noted, on the inadequacy of our knowledge. On the other hand, transcription into the scholar's own language lacks generality.

What is required is an international language, widely known, the use of which can be clearly seen to be conventional. In 1974 Anna Morpurgo Davies, Günter Neumann and I decided to adopt Latin for the purpose, a solution modelled on the practice imposed by Linear B scholars from the early 1960's. Of course this system is not ideal. Sometimes we may not know the relevant Latin words or these may be too obscure to be readily

(continued p. 28)

TABLE 2. Logograms Transcribed into Latin

ADORARE 6		BONUS 165		CUBITUM 243		FINES 216	
AEDIFICARE 246		BONUS ₂ 370		CULTER 338		FLAMMAE(?) 477	
AEDIFICIUM 244		BOS 105		CUM 58		FLUMEN 212	
ALA 78		BRACCHIUM 32		CURRUS 288		FONS 215	
AMPLECTI 9		CAELUM 182		DARE 66		FORTIS 28	
ANIMAL 404		CANIS 98		DECEM 397		FRATER see INFANS	
ANNUS 336		CAPERE 41		DELERE 248		FRONS 26	
[AQUA]	see FLUMEN	CAPERE ₂ 43		DEUS 360		FULGUR 200	
AQUILA 133		CAPERE + SCALPRUM 330		DIES 358		FUSUS 305	
ARGENTUM 257		CAPUT 10		DOMINA 15		GAZELLA 104	
ASCIA 281		CAPUT + SCALPRUM 10 + 268		DOMINUS 390		GRYLLUS 120	
ASINUS 100		CASTRUM 231		DOMUS 247		HEROS 21	
ASINUS ₂ 100		CENTUM 399		DOMUS + SCALA 252		HORDEUM 179	
AUDIRE (AURIS+TU+MI) 78		CERVUS 102		EDERE 7		INFANS 45	
AVIS 128		CERVUS ₂ 103		EGO 1-2		INFRA 57	
AVIS ₂ 132		CONTRACTUS 344		EQUUS 99		IUDEX, IUSTITIA 371	
AVIS ₃ 130		CORNU 108		EUNUCHUS 474		[IRA]	see LIS
AVUS 331		CRUS 82		EXERCITUS 269		LAPIS 267.8	
BESTIA 97		CRUS ₂ 84		FEMINA 79		LECTUS 301	
BIBERE 8		CRUX 309		FILIA		LEPUS 115	

Note the phonetic transcription of the following logograms:

ARHA 216		HALPA 85		SARMA 80-81	
-------------	--	-------------	--	----------------	--

(TABLE 2. Logograms Transcribed into Latin)

LIBARE 27		MONS 207		POST 34		STATUA 12	
LIGARE 31		MORI 386 + 381		PRAE 14		STELE 267	
LIGNUM 382		NEG ₂ 332		PUGNUS 39-40		SUB	see INFRA
LINGERE 112		NEG ₃ 332		PUGNUS + PUGNUS	see LIGARE	SUPER 70	
LINGUA 175		NEPOS 300 + 488		PURUS 322		TERRA 201	
LIS 24		OCCIDENS 379		[REGINA]	see MAGNUS DOMINA	THRONUS	see MENSA
LITUUS 378		OCULUS 25		REGIO 228		THRONUS ₂ 298	
LOCUS	see TERRA	OMNIS 366		REL 329		TONITRUS 199	
LONGUS 62		ORIENS 192		REX 17		UNUS 380	
LOQUI 22		OVIS 111		SACERDOS 355		URBS 225	
LUNA 193		PANIS 181		SCALPRUM 268		URCEUS 345	
MAGNUS 363		PES 90		SCRIBA 326		VACUUS 245	
MALLEUS 280		PES. SCALA ROTAE 91/92/94		SCUTELLA 402		VAS 341	
MALUS 368		PES ₂ 93		SCUTUM 272		VERSUS 447.26	
MALUS ₂ 368		PISCIS 138		SERVUS 387		VIA 221	
MANUS 59-60		PITHOS 337		SIGILLUM 327		VIR 313	
MATER 79	see FEMINA	POCULUM 346		SOL 191		VIR ₂ 386	IL
MENSA 294		PODIUM 264		SOL ₂ 190		VITELLUS 109	
MILLE 400		PONERE 65		SOLIUM 299		VITIS 160	
MINUS 381		PORTA 237-238		SPHINX 121			

intelligible. Also it is clear that a sign must always be transcribed with the same form of its chosen word, which involves ignoring rules of inflection and congruence, producing such grammatical monsters as BOS 9, “nine oxen” (singular followed by a number higher than 1), and MAGNUS.DOMINA, “(great) queen” (without the standard agreement pattern). It may however be suggested that these are minor disadvantages in comparison with the difficulties of having a multitude of transliterations into any of the major modern languages. We note that since our proposal and practice of the system a number of scholars have seen fit to adopt it. For a complete list of Latin transcriptions for logograms employed in this Corpus, see Table 2 (p. 26 f.).

3. The Syllabograms

Transliteration here too is based on Laroche’s 1960 system with the corrections and modifications which have been added during the intervening years. The opportunity is here taken to introduce a number of further minor modifications in the interest of greater consistency and simplicity.

The Regular Syllabary (see Table 3)

This is Laroche’s *Syllabaire Normale* (HH, p. 263 f.), with the following alterations.

Corrections

These consist of the “new readings” of $\uparrow \downarrow$, $\uparrow \uparrow$ from a/\bar{a} , i/\bar{i} to i/ia , $\bar{z}i/\bar{z}a$. As noted, substantial new corroboration has appeared since the original proposals, particularly from the digraphic seals of Meskene-Emar. The Empire Period forerunners of each pair, $\uparrow \downarrow$, $\uparrow \uparrow$, where the a -vocalized forms are not distinguished, are here transliterated $i(a)$ and $\bar{z}i/a$. Note that in digraphic writings, Empire Period Hier. $i(a)$ alternates with Cun. i , e , ia , but not, contrary to assertion, with a (see above, p. 16 and n. 159). The evidence does not suggest that Empire $i(a)$, Late i ever had a value a , nor indeed is this graphically likely.

Modifications

These include changes to Laroche’s 1960 system already proposed and a number of minor ones introduced here for the first time. They consist mainly of changes in the vocalization of syllabograms introduced in connection with the new readings (former Ca to Ci), and simplification of the system of diacritical marks following the elimination of certain supposed values.

$\uparrow a$, $\uparrow \acute{a}$ (changed from Laroche’s diacriticals \grave{a} , $\acute{á}$, which were retained even after the 1974 new readings). The value a was left vacant by the removal of $\uparrow \downarrow$ for i , and logic and consistency demand that it should be

filled. In Empire Period digraphic writings, Cun. a corresponds to both Hier. $\uparrow \downarrow$ and $\uparrow \uparrow$, the forerunners of the present Late Period pair, though the latter sign, as in the Late Period, is used only initially (or internally for the glottal stop \prime , as in the rendering of Ba’al as $pa-\acute{a}-li$). The most logical replacement for a is $\uparrow \downarrow$, especially since it is found in *plene* writings $Ca-a$ parallel to $Ci-i$, $Cu-u$.

$\uparrow \downarrow$ ba , $\uparrow \uparrow$ $b\acute{a}$. Laroche’s order reversed to that of Meriggi, because $\uparrow \downarrow$ seems to be the primary ba , being well attested in the Empire Period. The Empire forerunner of $\uparrow \uparrow$, which is $\uparrow \uparrow$, is not attested with a phonetic value $b\acute{a}$ at that date, being solely the logogram for *HATTI* and *HATTUSA* (also in *HATTUSILI*).

$\uparrow \downarrow$ $la/i/u$. The Empire Period forerunner of this sign always apparently has the value lu , thus fills the u -slot in the l -series. But in the Late Period it is definitely found alternating with la (in (“CRUX”) $wa/i-la/i/u$, KARKAMIŠ A4d, § 2 = (CRUX) $wa/i-la$, CEKKE, § 24; also KULULU 5, § 8), and with li (in $mu-wa/i-ta-la/i/u-i-si-// mu-wa/i-ta-li-si$, MARAŞ 4, §§ 1//10; also FRONS- $la/i/u-//$ FRONS- $li(-i)-$, KARATEPE, 136, 279, Hu.//Ho.). Definite evidence for a value lu has only appeared recently: the writing $ka-la/i/u-na-$ as a variant of $ka-ru-na-$, “granary” (see MARAŞ 8, § 7, and Commentary). To what extent it represents lu in other attestations is uncertain: perhaps we may assume that lu was always intended except in the few cases where there is evidence to the contrary.

$\uparrow \downarrow$ mi . An a -vocalized value $m\acute{a}$ may be categorically rejected for the Late Period (see already Mittelberger, *Sprache* 8 (1962), p. 277 f.), though the possibility of such in the Empire Period requires investigation. Yet curious usages do appear in the Late Period: thus OMNIS-*MI-ma-* (= *tanima-*, “all”, see KARATEPE, 281, and ASSUR letter $f+g$, § 19, and Commentaries); also AEDIFICARE \pm *MI-* (= *tama-*, “build”, see KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 23, and Commentary); AUDIRE \pm *MI* ($-ma-ti-$) (= *tumanti-*, “hear”, see KARKAMIŠ A6, § 1, and Commentary); also PURUS-*MI-ia* (= *kumya* or *kumaya* (?), “pure”, see MALPINAR, § 7, and Commentary). In such cases *MI* has to be regarded not as a syllabogram but as a “phonetic indicator” attached to the logogram, probably reflecting an Empire Period graphic practice. Note also (DEUS)SARMA + *RA/I* + *MI-ma-*, “Sarruma”, and (DEUS)LUNA + *MI-ma-*, “Arma”; also PURUS.FONS.*MI*, “Suppiluliuma”.

$\uparrow \downarrow$ ni , $\uparrow \uparrow$ $n\acute{i}$. Changed from a - to i -vocalization suggested by Mittelberger and confirmed by new readings. Both signs in this commonly alternating pair derive from well-established Empire Period forerunners.

$\uparrow \downarrow$ nu , $\uparrow \uparrow$ $n\acute{u}$. Order of Laroche’s diacriticals reversed (also Meriggi’s), on the grounds that $\uparrow \downarrow$ appears to be the more regularly used form in the normal syllabary. Both signs of the pair are attested with Empire Period forerunners.

TABLE 3. The regular syllabary

 (450)	<i>a</i>	 (209)	<i>i</i>	 (105)	<i>u</i>
 (19)	<i>á</i>				
 (215)	<i>ha</i>	 (413)	<i>hi</i>	 (307)	<i>hu</i>
 (196)	<i>há</i>				
 (434)	<i>ka</i>	 (446)	<i>ki</i>	 (423)	<i>ku</i>
 (176)	<i>la</i>	 (278)	<i>li</i>		
				 (445)	<i>la/i/u</i>
 (110)	<i>ma</i>	 (391)	<i>mi</i>	 (107)	<i>mu</i>
 (35)	<i>na</i>	 (411)	<i>ni</i>	 (153)	<i>nu</i>
		 (214)	<i>ní</i>	 (214)	<i>nú</i>
 (334)	<i>pa</i>	 (66)	<i>pi</i>	 (328)	<i>pu</i>
 (383)	<i>ra/i</i>			 (412)	<i>ru</i>
 (415)	<i>sa</i>	 (174)	<i>si</i>	 (370)	<i>su</i>
 (433)	<i>sá</i>				
 (104)	<i>sà</i>				
 (402)	<i>sa₄</i>				
 (327)	<i>sa₅</i>				
 (100)	<i>ta</i>	 (90)	<i>ti</i>	 (89)	<i>tu</i>
 (29)	<i>tá</i>			 (325)	
 (41)	<i>tà</i>				
 (319)	<i>ta₄</i>				
 (172)	<i>ta₅</i>				
 (439)	<i>wa/i</i>				
 (210)	<i>ia</i>				
 (377)	<i>za</i>	 (376)	<i>zi</i>	 (432)	<i>zu?</i>
 (329)	<i>kwi/a</i>				
	<i>hwi/a*</i>				

 (450 + 383)	<i>a + ra/i, ra + a</i>
 (209 + 383)	<i>i + ra/i, ri + i</i>
 (175 + 383 + 450)	<i>la + ra/i + a</i>
 (389)	<i>tara/i</i>
 (134)	<i>ara/i</i>
 (290)	<i>hara/i</i>
 (315)	<i>kar</i>
 (371 + 383)	<i>IUDEX + ra/i</i>
 (14)	<i>pari</i>

* Note. In Late Period texts this sign is transliterated *HWT* (see p. 30).

𐎗 *si*. Changed from *a*- to *i*-vocalization suggested by Mittelberger and confirmed by new readings.

𐎗 *sá*. Transliteration *sá* vacated by the change of 𐎗 to *si*, and thus available for 𐎗 in place of the quite unjustified *śa*, which appears to signal a different kind of sibilant.

Δ *su*. For alternations *sú* and *sü*, see below, Alternative Syllabograms (p. 32 f.), and Appendix 2 (p. 35 f.).

𐎗 *ti*. An *a*-vocalized value *ta* may be categorically rejected. It was based solely on the writings *ti-pa-sa* “sky”, compared with Cun. Luw. *tap/ta-ap-* in the same word, but this discrepancy between the two dialects hardly justifies the abandonment of the well established *ti*. Cf. already Mittelberger, *Sprache* 8 (1962), p. 278.

𐎗 *ta*. Transliteration *ta* vacated by the denial of its applicability to 𐎗, *ti*, thus available for and appropriate to 𐎗, also coinciding with Meriggi’s usage.

𐎗 *ta*₄, 𐎗 *ta*₅. This pair, which alternate freely with each other, remain notably distinct from *ta*, *tá*, *tà*. Doubts about the vocalization persist: an *a*-vocalization seems well established, but some evidence points as well – or instead – to *i*-vocalization. See Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *JRAS* 1975, pp. 130–132. The pair is probably separated off from *ta*, *tá*, *tà* by the quality of the dental, whether this is, as seems likely, *d*, or something else. For a new consideration based on Empire Period evidence, see Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3, Appendix 5.

𐎗 *zu*². No further evidence confirming this Late Period value has emerged, but more digraphic evidence on Empire Period *zu* is forthcoming from Meskene-Emar with the names *Zulanna* (*zu-la-na*) and *Zu-Astarte* (*zu-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ti*): see Laroche, *Akkadica* 22 (1981), p. 12.

𐎗 REL(*kwi/a*). Sign used normally to indicate simply the relative pronoun, but in a number of words also as a syllabogram. Its Empire Period forerunner 𐎗 doubtless corresponded to Cun. *ku-i* or *ku-wa-*, thus *kwi* or *kwa*. In the Late Period it was used either to write these sounds or the sounds into which these had developed. It is doubt on this latter point, coupled with confusion with the following sign which is now partially resolved, that gave rise to reservation in transliterating it syllabically. Certainly now *kwi/a* is the most likely reading, yet there is still a possibility that a sound shift from *kw* lurks behind the sign. Note that the Hier. combination *ku-i* is never found, and *ku-wa/i* seldom, which strengthens the supposition that such would be written REL. Words using REL as a syllabogram include: *ta-sà-REL+ra/i-*, “earth” (compound with cognate of Hitt. *kwerá*, “field?”); REL-*ia/sà-*, “fear”, Cun. Luw. *kuwaya-* (see SULTANHAN, § 17, and Commentary); *pa-sà-REL-*, “neglect”, Hitt. *paškuwai-* (see SULTANHAN, § 20, and Commentary); REL-*za-*, “incise” (see KARATEPE 4, § 2, and Commentary); REL+*ra/i-*, “cut”, Hitt. *kwer-* (see MARAŞ 4, § 13, and Commentary); REL-*tu-na*, “at the ploughing/reaping(?)” (see KARATEPE, 269, and Commentary); REL-*ti-sà-*

mi/ma-, “?” (see ASSUR letter *a*, § 9, and Commentary); also personal names REL-*si-si-ti-mi-* (ASSUR letter *c*, § 1), REL-*za-ia+ra/i-* (CEKKE, § 17 e), REL+*ra/i-mu-wa/i-* (KULULU lead strip 1, 32), REL+*ra/i-na-zi-* (KULULU lead strips 1, 34; frag. 1, i 3, ii 3), REL-*sà-i-* (KULULU lead strips 1, 4; 2, 13), REL-*za-FRATER-la-* (KULULU lead strip 1, 17). For a re-evaluation of the evidence on this and the following sign, see now Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Running and Relatives in Luwian* (*Kadmos* 32 (1993), pp. 50–60).

𐎗 *HWI*. Formerly confused with REL, but now the Empire Period forerunner (𐎗) is found often on YALBURT in the verb “run”, and the form can be seen to have nothing to do with REL (𐎗). At this date it clearly corresponds to Cun. Luw. *hu-i*, i. e. *hwi*, and presumably does also in the late Period as is supported by the identification of the personal name Hier. *sa-ṯ* with Cun. Urartian *śa-hu-* (see KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, § 8; ŞIRZI, § 1, and Commentaries). Besides being used to write the verb (*hwi*)*hwi(ya)(śa)*-, “run”, it is used as a Late Period syllabogram in writing *hwitara/hwisara*, “wild beasts” (and derivatives, see MARAŞ 1, § 11, and Commentary); *hwapasanu-*, “harm” (ASSUR letter *f+g*, § 13, and Commentary). But the sign does become used instead of REL in some late inscriptions: see SULTANHAN, § 4, Commentary. This may well suggest a late weakening of *kwi* towards *hwi*. While it would probably be correct to transliterate *hwi/a*, caution suggests a less committal *HWI*, which indicates reservation as to the sound expressed at this date.

*The sign ra/i(*383)*. The peculiarity of this sign is that it is graphically “enclitic”, i. e. cannot stand alone but is always attached to another sign, a curious phenomenon presumably arising from the fact that Luwian, like Hittite, does not have an initial *r*. Its well established alternative *a*- and *i*-vocalization prompted the transliteration *ra/i*. Laroche’s alternative transliteration *ta/ti* has already been rebutted by Mittelberger (*Sprache* 8 (1962), p. 277 f.; 10 (1964), p. 71 f.), who demonstrated, surely correctly, that the sign was not used to write *ta/ti* as such but only when this had changed to *ra/ri* by rhotacism.

The sign is commonly attached to *a* and *i*, thus 𐎗, 𐎗. These provide the normal way of rendering initial *ar*- and *ir*-. Thus for *ar*-, see *a+ra/i-*, “long” (KARATEPE, 291, and Commentary); *a+ra/i-ma-za*, “?” (SULTANHAN, § 46, and Commentary); *a+ra/i-ma-sa*-, “monthling(?)” (SULTANHAN, § 3, and Commentary); *a+ra/i-nu-wa/i-ti-*, “Arnuwanti-” (IZGIN 1, § 12, and Commentary); (MONS)*a+ra/i-pu-tá-*, “Mount Arputa” (KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, § 25); *a+ra/i-ta-lí-*, “?” (KULULU 1, §§ 5, 10). For *ir*-, see *i+ra/i-há//ha-*, “frontier” (KARATEPE, 101, 152); *i+ra/i-ia-za*, “?” (İVRİZ 1, § 3); *i+ra/i-nu-*, verb caus. (KARKAMIŞ A12, § 13).

When r is found internally and finally however, we have argued that it is to be read $ri+i$, i.e. the vowel sign, besides providing the attachment for the ra/i , functionally serves to indicate the vowel pronounced after the r : see *HHL*, p. [29] f. Melchert has argued similarly for r as $ra+a$ (see *An. St.* 38 (1988), pp. 29–32); and this transliteration has been adopted. We should however note an exception: the personal name written $i-a+ra/i-ri+i$ and its alternative $i-ara/i-ri+i$, “Yariri-” (KARKAMIŠ A6, § 1 // A15b, § 1).

The sign r has been understood as a variant of the simple r , $la+ra/i$; and since the double bars in r and r are recognized as a form of a written in ligature to indicate an a -vocalization, the interpretation of r as $la+ra/i+a$, representing $lara$ -, follows (see KARATEPE, 19, and MARAŞ 1, § 1 b, Commentaries).

The normal syllabary also commonly uses a number of signs of the form $Cara/i$, which show an attached ra/i though the original sign has no independent phonetic value. Transliterations ending in $-a/i$ are generally maintained for these too.

r $tara/i$: clearly the numeral $3+ra/i$, indicating tar , tra or tri , a rebus-writing taken from the word for “three”.

r ara/i : cursive form of “eagle-man” + ra/i , possibly rebus-writing using cognate of Hitt. $hara(n)$ -, “eagle”.

r $hara/i$: seems to be descended from Empire Period h $hara/i$ // $hala/i$, used particularly to write the element hli in $ehli$ (see Laroche, *Akkadica* 22 (1981), p. 13).

r kar : probably to be grouped with these other signs, used only in the names *Karkamis* and *Karhuha*-, whence transliteration kar rather than $kara/i$, though possibly KAR might be more appropriate.

r $IUDEX+RA/I$: alternates with $tà+ra/i$, KARATEPE, 277, Ho.//Hu., in the word $batara/i$ -, “life(?)”; recurs in the same word in KARKAMIŠ A5a, § 2; ÇİFTLİK, § 16. Origin not understood. [But see now Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3, pp. 111–113].

The sign r $pari$ should be grouped with the above signs though not accompanied by $+ra/i$; clearly a rebus-writing with $pari$, “before”, and new readings show that it represents only $pari$, not $para$ (note alternation $pa+ra/i$ // $-pari-i$, KARATEPE, 264, Hu.//Ho.). Its Empire Period origin, writing pri in the element $ibri$, is clear: see Laroche, *Akkadica* 22 (1981), p. 13. Its syllabographic use in Late Period names seems to be a continuation of the Empire Period practice: thus $pari-tà$ - (HAMA 4/RESTAN/QAL'AT EL MUDIQ/HAMA 8, § 1); (DEUS.VITIS) $ti-pari-ia$ - (KARKAMIŠ A2+3, § 7; A11a, § 9); $la-pari-VIR$?- (BABYLON 1, § 1); cf. PRAE- $ri+i$ - $SARMA$ - (KARKAMIŠ A4a, § 2).

Alternative Syllabograms (see Table 4)

(For the still problematic syllabogram $pa?$ (r) see below, Appendix 3, p. 36 f.)

These correspond to Laroche’s “valeurs phonétiques rares, incertaines, complexes” (*HH*, pp. 265–268), or rather to those which are retained. For those discarded, see the following section.

Besides the regular syllabary with its over 50 simple syllabograms and its additional complex ones for $Cara/i$ writings, there are a number of alternative syllabograms which are occasionally used. These are generally restricted to several inscriptions only: principally the Cilician KARATEPE, and in Tabal to TOPADA and KAYSERİ, spilling over into a few other inscriptions. Notably such syllabograms are hardly found in any of the other groups of inscriptions, i.e. not in KARKAMIŠ, TELL AHMAR, MARAŞ, MALATYA, COM-MAGENE, AMUQ, ALEPPO, HAMA or the ASSUR letters, and not even widely within TABAL itself. One or two of these odd values do however appear on occasion at KARKAMIŠ.

The syllabaries of both KARATEPE and TOPADA are the subjects of special examinations placed after the end of their respective Commentaries. In KARATEPE the values of the alternative syllabograms can generally be established by their alternation with signs of known value, but in TOPADA these odd values mostly have to be deduced from context. Signs reviewed here include those occurring in KARATEPE and TOPADA and/or elsewhere. The more *recherché* TOPADA values are considered under TOPADA, the Signary (below, p. 460 f.).

Values and modifications

r i : shifted from a -vowel to i -vowel with the new readings, KAYSERİ only, and with ra/i (r $ri+i$), KAYSERİ and KARATEPE.

r $hà$: TOPADA, § 10, and AKSARAY, § 8, only, see Commentaries.

r $hú$: found only in $hu-hú+ra/i-pa-li$ -, “?” (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 10); $hú+ra/i-na-li//la-za$ -, “?” (KULULU lead strips 1, 38; 2, 15); and (DEUS)TONITRUS- $hú-za$ - (AKSARAY, § 8, from which occurrence Kalaç established the value – see *KZ* 92 (1978), p. 123 f.).

r $lí$: diacritical changed from li because transliteration of r as $la/i/u$ leaves li vacant. Evidence for form and usage of the sign has clarified since 1960 with its identification on KARATEPE and TOPADA (Bossert, *Or.* NS 30 (1961), pp. 199–202; Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), p. 128).

r li : single KARATEPE alternation only.

r $má$: seems to be adequately established by one clear and another possible KARATEPE occurrence (Ho. 127, also Ho. 374?)

r $mà$: sole occurrence on SUVASA inscription B in the name *Wasusarma*- in place of the usual ma .

r $mí$: promoted from mi because it is relatively well attested on KARATEPE and TOPADA, also now KULULU 3.

TABLE 4. Alternative syllabograms

		 (299)	<i>i</i>		
 (314)	<i>ha_x</i>			 (347)	<i>hú</i>
		 (125)	<i>lí</i> (K,T)		
		 (291)	<i>lí</i> (K)		
 (362)	<i>má</i> (K)	 (419)	<i>mí</i>		
 (304)	<i>mà</i> (S)	 (387)	<i>mì</i> (K?)		
 (332)	<i>ná</i>	 (447)	<i>ní_x</i>		
				 (102-3)	<i>rú</i> (K?)
 (223)	<i>sa₆</i> (T,S)	 (447)	<i>sí</i> (T)	 (108)	<i>sú</i>
 (316)	<i>sa₇</i> (T,S)			 (448)	<i>sù</i>
 (380)	<i>sa₈</i>				
 (82)	<i>ta₆</i>	 (488)	<i>tí</i>	 (326)	<i>tù</i>
 (41.6)	<i>ta_x</i> (T)			 (228)	<i>tu₄</i> (K)
 (166)	<i>wá/i</i>				
 (165)	<i>wà/i</i> (K)				
 (299)	<i>íá</i>				
 (379)	<i>íà</i> (K)				
 (335)	<i>zá</i>	 (313)	<i>zí</i>		
 (336)	<i>zà</i>	 (336)	<i>zì</i>		
 (336)	<i>zax</i>				
 (112)	<i>zax</i>	 (128)	<i>zì₄</i>		

Note: K KARATEPE
T TOPADA
S SUVASA

𐎎 *mi*: demoted from *mi* because of its poor attestation, a single KARATEPE alternation with *mi* (§ LI, 293, where see Commentary). Its common appearance in the writing of the word “servant” cannot certainly be identified as syllabographic and is now taken as a logogram SERVUS (-*ta*₄/*ta*₅-): see KARATEPE, 6, Commentary, and note new evidence confirming its logographic character.

𐎎 *ná*: syllabographic value taken from factual negative (NEG₂ = *na*); used occasionally on KARKAMIŠ (A11*b*+*c*, A6), also SHEIZAR, TOPADA, ALEPPO 2 – see Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), pp. 126–128 cit. 1–8.

𐎎 *ni*_x: appears established by single TOPADA alternation in the word *Parzutawani*- (§§ 13/26), and may be used in KARKAMIŠ (*Ninuwī*(??)-, KARKAMIŠ A11*b*+*c*, § 2, and Commentary).

𐎎 *ru*: KARATEPE only, apparently acrophonic from CERVUS (= *Runtiya*-/*Runza*-); value *kar* to be discarded (see below).

𐎎 *sa*₆, 𐎎 *sa*₇: TOPADA (+SUVASA) only.

𐎎 *sa*₈: identified originally only on TOPADA, but now much better established by occurrences on KULULU 4 (where see Commentary, beginning), also PORSUK.

𐎎 *si*[?]: TOPADA only, inferred from context.

𐎎 *ta*₆: this logogram (CRUS) is normally used to write the verb *ta*-, “stand”, but use as an alternative syllabogram *ta*₆ is found on TELL AHMAR 1 – see there, Peculiarities.

𐎎 *su*, 𐎎 *sü*: these signs alternate with and are closely bound up with *su*. See below, Appendix 2 (p. 35 f.).

𐎎 *ta*_x: TOPADA only, variant for *tá*, which does not occur in the inscription?

𐎎 *ti*: promoted by vacation of space by *ta*₄, *ta*₅ (*tí* and *tí* for Laroche); found frequently on KARATEPE, also SHEIZAR.

𐎎 *tü*: promoted by abolition of former *tü* (= PONERE, see below, Discarded Values); syllabic value established by KARATEPE alternations and explained as acrophonic from *tupala*-, “scribe”; occurs also on TOPADA and in KARKAMIŠ in the name *Sastura*(?)-(CEKKE, A21).

𐎎 *tu*₄: established by two KARATEPE alternations only.

𐎎 *wá/i*: promoted from *wà/i* because comparatively well attested, besides KARATEPE, TOPADA, and KAYSERİ, also now CEKKE, AKSARAY and NIĞDE 2.

𐎎 *wà/i*: demoted from *wá/i* because of the rareness of its syllabographic use, only in KARATEPE alternations; otherwise to be regarded always as logogram BONUS, see KARKAMIŠ A1*a*, § 22, and Commentary. [But note that the 1990/91 Boğazköy bullae now provide ample evidence for an Empire usage with the value *wà/i*].

𐎎 *ía*: value switched from *à* along with the new readings; KARATEPE and KAYSERİ only.

𐎎 *ia*: value based on single KARATEPE alternation, switched from *ā*₄ along with the new readings.

𐎎 *za*: well attested value switched from *i* with new readings, alternating with *za* in a number of common writings; besides KARATEPE, respectable appearances in KARKAMIŠ A11*b*, 18*e*, CEKKE, also SULTANHAN and the fragmentary TELL TAYINAT 1, JISR EL HADID, ÇALAPVERDİ.

𐎎 *zi*, 𐎎 *zà*: values switched with new readings, occur only on KAYSERİ; origin unknown. LITUUS clearly marks *a*-vocalization: cf. *336+double bars (𐎎) for *za*_x, AKSARAY, § 4, and Commentary. Possible syllabic use in postposition *336-*na-na* (see KARKAMIŠ A2+3, § 24, and Commentary); also possibly in *336/AN-NUS(-)*na-ba-sa/sa*₅- (TOPADA, §§ 10, 12, and Commentary).

𐎎 *zi*: switched from *i* with new readings; syllabic use established by KARATEPE alternations, now found also on KULULU 4 (see Peculiarities); clearly acrophonic from *ziti*-, “man”.

𐎎 *za*₄: switched from *i*₄ along with new readings; syllabic use established only by KARATEPE alternations, with one possible KARKAMIŠ occurrence (see KARKAMIŠ A21, § 4, Commentary), but otherwise to be treated as logographic (see KARKAMIŠ A11*a*, § 11, Commentary).

𐎎 *zi*₄: switched from *i*₆ along with new readings; syllabic value established only by two KARATEPE alternations; possibly found also in MARAŞ 4, § 5 (see Commentary).

Empire Period syllabic values only

𐎎 *ur* 𐎎: confined to the writing of *Urbi-Tešub* on seals SBo I, 43, 44.

𐎎 *us* 𐎎: confined to writing *sà+US-ka* for the goddess Sauska (attested once in the early Late Period, MAL-ATYA 6); odd usage (i.e. apparent VC value) not clearly understood, thus transliterated *US*.

𐎎 *bi* 𐎎: used in the writing of several names, now corroborated by digraphic Meskene writings (unpublished). [But cf. now Gonnet, *apud* Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l'Age du Bronze Récent* (Barcelona, 1991), no. 72c, p. 206].

𐎎 *bur* 𐎎: confined to writing of name *Saburunuwa*-, odd usage (apparently CVC) not understood; recurrence on TOPADA apparently as an incorrect (meaningless) archaism – see TOPADA, The Signary, I, note.

𐎎 *ka*, 𐎎 *gà* 𐎎: as logogram the hand with downward-pointing thumb expresses ideographically “down, under” (*kata*, *annan*), and derives from the former a syllabic value used in writing of names. Only the logographic use survives in the Late Period.

𐎎 *tal* 𐎎: found mainly in the writing of the onomastic element *talmi*, but also now on YALBURT in writing of the place-name *Talawa* (see Poetto, edition of YAL-

BURT (above, p. 18), p. 70). The usage does not survive into the Late Period, but the logogram OMNIS looks similar.

Discarded values

Thus many of Laroche's "valeurs phonétiques rares, incertaines, complexes" have been classified, sometimes with modified transliteration, as alternative syllabic values, and others set aside as being restricted to the Empire Period. The remainder should be discarded altogether.

𐎧 (*299): in its alleged value *as*, it is better taken as a logogram, transcribed SOLIUM(+MI) (see KARATEPE, 128, 194, and Commentary).

𐎡 (*439): value *ú* originated with Bossert, based on alternations Hier. *wa/i+ra/i-pa-la-wa/i* = Cun. *Urballa*; Hier. *á-wa/i+ra/i-ku* = Cun. *Urikki*; Hier. *wa/i-wa/i* (i.e. *wawi*, "ox") = Lyc. *uwa*; also syllabic value *u* derived from logogram BOS. See Laroche, *HH* no. 439, bibliography. But these are correspondences rather than equivalences and do not justify adding the value *u* to the established *wa/i*.

𐎧 (*24): value *har* was based on a misidentification of the sign *ki* and the attribution of a hypothetical value on the basis of the comparison of the supposed logogram with a supposed Hittite parallel (see HAMA 2, § 4, Commentary). Each stage of the reasoning is to be discarded.

𐎧 (*342): value *hú* attributed in distinction from *hu* (*307), but in fact probably just a variant form of the latter (KARATEPE, 284; see KARATEPE, The Syllabary, p. 68, s.v. *hu*) or its Empire Period form (YAZILIKAYA, no. 48). The third example quoted KARKAMIŠ A24a6, l. 1 is in fact *341 (read (*341) *á-ta-na-sa-*).

𐎧 (REL, *329): value *hú?* attributed following confusion with sign *h*. In fact the former is likely to have the value *kwi/a*, the latter *hwi*: see above, the Regular Syllabary.

𐎧 (*331): sign occurs solely in writing *huba*, "grandfather", and should be regarded as a logogram (AVUS). There is no justification for attributing a syllabic value.

𐎧 (*314): value *ká/gá* incorrectly extrapolated from 𐎧, *kar*, but this is without support. In fact recent evidence points to a value *hà*: see above, Alternative Syllabograms.

𐎧 (*103): sign should always be regarded as logogram, CERVUS₂, except in a rare syllabographic use derived from it, *rú* (see above, Alternative Syllabograms). The writing (DEUS)CERVUS₂+RA/I-hu-ha, and (DEUS.CERVUS₂)*kar-hu-ha* for *Karhuba* pro-

vided evidence for syncretism between the Stag-God and Karhuhas, but the writings provide no support for a syllabic value *kar*: see KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 18, and Commentary.

𐎧 (*278): no evidence is offered, or exists, in favour of adding a value *là* to the well established *li*.

𐎧 (*85): value *l(a)* attributed because of the sign's occurrence in the writing of the place-name *Halpa*, "Aleppo", written TONITRUS.*85-*pa*. TONITRUS must be logographic and cannot be given a syllabographic value *ha* (see below), which rules out the attribution of the value *l(a)*. The sign appears to be a "kneeling leg", and could conceivably be a rebus-writing of a syllable *hal* (from Hitt. *haliya*, "kneel"): see KÖRKÜN, § 5, and Commentary.

𐎧 (*419): evidence for phonetic value comes solely from alternation with *mi*, thus *mi* (see Alternative Syllabograms). A value *mà* is without support and may be discarded.

𐎧 (*225): a value *mú?* was attributed on the basis of an incorrect interpretation of KIZILDAĞ 3, l. 3 (see Commentary there), and should be discarded.

𐎧 (*26): the value *na₄* was attributed on the basis of the incorrect interpretation of FRONS-*li* (*hantili*, "front, first") as a negative (see KARATEPE, §§ XXVI–XXVII, Commentary). In fact the sign is always the logogram, FRONS, which it depicts.

𐎧 (*248): the value *pâr* was based on the incorrect interpretation and identification of the verb written by this sign as *paranu-* (= Hitt. *parbnu-*, "pursue"). In fact it has been shown that the sign is logographic, DOMUS+MINUS = DELERE: see KARKAMIŠ A4a, § 14, Commentary.

𐎧 (*378), 𐎧 (*25): the values *si??* and *s(i)* were incorrectly attributed to these two alternating signs on the basis of their occurrence in writing the name *Azatiwata*. It has now been shown that the second syllable is written with 𐎧 (*za*), giving *á-za-ti-wa/i-ta* and that the two signs, LITUUS and OCULUS are logograms determining verbs of perception: see Hawkins, *Kadmos* 19 (1980), pp. 123–142.

𐎧 (*383): values *+ta/ti* for the sign *ra/i* are to be discarded: see above, the Regular Syllabary, on the sign *ra/i*.

𐎧 (*65): a syllabographic value *tù* is incorrectly attributed to the "putting hand", which in fact is used only logographically (= PONERE) to write *tuwa*, "put", never syllabographically.

𐎧 (*199): a syllabographic value *ha* was given on the basis of a confusion with the sign *há* (*196), but this should certainly be discarded: see Hawkins, in Meijer, *Natural Phenomena*, pp. 53–82.

E. Appendices

Appendix 1. BOĞAZKÖY hieroglyphic inscriptions on stone

(Following the numbering of Laroche, 1969 (BOĞAZKÖY 1–11) and Meriggi, 1975 (BOĞAZKÖY 1–13)).		(new numbers)
BOĞAZKÖY 1, 2	stele bases Winckler, <i>MDOG</i> 35 (1907), p. 57 f. Abb. 6, 7.	BOĞAZKÖY 14 graffiti (pavement, Great Temple) Güterbock, <i>Boğazköy</i> IV (1969), p. 53, Taf. 28
BOĞAZKÖY 3	stele (Tudhaliyas IV) Bittel-Güterbock, <i>Boğazköy</i> 1 (1935), Taf. 27.	BOĞAZKÖY 15 graffiti (2 blocks, Great Temple) Bittel, <i>MDOG</i> 102 (1970), p. 9 Abb. 4.
BOĞAZKÖY 4	graffito (sphinx) Bittel, <i>WVDOG</i> 60 (1937), p. 8 Abb. 1.	BOĞAZKÖY 16 graffito (Lion Gate) Neve, <i>Ist. Mitt.</i> 26 (1976), pp. 9–11, Taf. 1–2.
BOĞAZKÖY 5	NIŞANTAŞ (Suppiluliumas II) Perrot, <i>Exploration</i> (1872), pl. XXXV.	BOĞAZKÖY 17 block Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1980, pp. 299 Abb. 17, 304 f., Abb. 23
BOĞAZKÖY 6	fragment Otten, <i>MDOG</i> 87 (1955), p. 13 Abb. 1.	BOĞAZKÖY 18 stele (Tudhaliyas IV) Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1984, pp. 336–337, Abb. 9, 10.
BOĞAZKÖY 7	blocks Neve, <i>Boğazköy-Hattuša</i> XII (1982), p. 81 f. Abb. 32 a, b.	BOĞAZKÖY 19 epigraph (Tudhaliyas IV) Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1986, pp. 394–396, Abb. 29, 30.
BOĞAZKÖY 8	boulder Bittel, <i>MDOG</i> 89 (1957), pp. 18 f., 23 Abb. 18.	BOĞAZKÖY 20 epigraph (Suppiluliumas II) Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1989, pp. 316 f. Abb. 40, 327 Abb. 58.
BOĞAZKÖY 9–11	fragments Beran, <i>MDOG</i> 93 (1962), pp. 48–51 Abb. 41–44.	BOĞAZKÖY 21 SÜDBURG (Suppiluliumas II) Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1989, pp. 316 ff., Abb. 41, 42, 59.
BOĞAZKÖY 12	stele Güterbock, <i>Boğazköy</i> IV (1969), pp. 49–52, Taf. 19 b	BOĞAZKÖY 22 block (Boğazkale Museum) unpublished
BOĞAZKÖY 13	fragment Güterbock, <i>Boğazköy</i> IV (1969), p. 52 Abb. 14.	BOĞAZKÖY 23 3 fragments of inscription Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1992, pp. 317, 319 Abb. 12.
		BOĞAZKÖY 24 stele fragment (Tudhaliyas IV) Neve, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1993, p. 629 and Abb. 8.
		BOĞAZKÖY 25 fragment Seeher, <i>Arch. Anz.</i> 1997, p. 326 f., Abb. 10.

Appendix 2. *HH* no. 448: *sù*

The correct evaluation of the sign *HH* no. 448 is of some considerable significance, as has long been recognized, since it is used to write the crucial syllables in the Hier. words for “horse”, “dog”, and “horn”. The Hier. evidence has been considered to point to a value *su* (distinguished with diacritical as *sù* (Laroche) or *śu* (Meriggi)). Recently Melchert has argued on largely etymological grounds for a value *zu* (distinguished as *zú*): see *Studies Cowgill* (Berlin, New York, 1987), p. 201 f. He supports his theory that PIE **k̑w* > Luw. *zu* with the evidence offered by the appearance of the Hier.

(DEUS) *á-la-sù-wa/i-*, to be identified with Hitt. ^D*allanzu* (ÇİFTLİK, § 10; KULULU 5, § 1). He also compares a Hitt. stem *hapanzu-* with a Hier. form from KÖRKÜN, § 3, but this involves him in an excision of a normally written +*ra/i*; the form actually reads *ba-pa-sù+ra/i-wa/i-ti* (abl. sing.), which is less straightforward to link to the Hitt. stem (see *KZ* 101 (1988), p. 236 f.; and cf. my remarks, KÖRKÜN, § 3, Commentary).

Arguments against the value *zú* in favour of *sù* are as follows:

1. The word “horn(s)” is written (“CORNU”) $sù + ra/i-ni$. In the KARATEPE bilingual, a word translated by Phoen. šb^{\prime} , “plenty”, is written (“CORNU + RA/I”)(-) $su + ra/i-$ (KARATEPE, 35, 191 (Hu. only)). The original logogram CORNU has an occasional phonetic value su (distinguished as $sú$): on ÇALAPVERDİ 1, l. 3, the word wa/i -CORNU may be seen to render the usual $wasu$, “well”; and more important, CORNU + RA/I is regularly used to write the syllables $sura/i$ in the toponym *Assur*, thus $a-sú + ra/i$ (REGIO)- $wa/i-ni-$, “Assyrian”, and $a-sú + ra/i$ (REGIO)- $ia-$, “Assyria”. The implication of these writings is that CORNU = su , thus may be transliterated $sú$, and that it collected its value acrophonically from the word “horn”, thus $surni$. It is very hard to introduce the value $zú$ into one of these interlocking writings. Laroche’s excessive caution on the value $sù$ was rebutted already by Mittelberger (*Sprache* 8 (1962), p. 278).

2. With this establishment of the homophony of no. 448 and su , we may dismiss Melchert’s attempt to evade the identification of the toponym $su + ra/i-za$ (URBS) (KARKAMIŠ A6, § 6) with the ethnicon $sù + ra/i-wa/i-ni$ (URBS) (KARKAMIŠ A15b, § 19), which was noted by Mittelberger. Both inscriptions are of the same ruler, Yariris of Karkamiš. While the contexts of the two occurrences are, as Melchert urges, somewhat different (first, a group of peoples who had heard Yariris’s name; second, a number of scripts [which Yariris could write?]), the probability is that the reference is to the same people, the *Sura*, a term in which I have suggested that the Urartians, people and script, should be recognized. (This is further supported by Gernot Wilhelm’s detailed examination of the Urartian term KUR $\text{Šura}/i/u$, used of themselves: see KARKAMIŠ A6, § 6, Commentary).

Other occurrences of the sign are less definite than nos. 1 and 2, but some add to the presumption in favour of $sù$.

3. $sù-pu-na$ (ŞIRZI, § 4, see Commentary there): this is interpreted on the basis of the context as “to suck”; it may be connected with an IE root $*seu-$ or $*seuH-$, and if so, would support the reading $sù$.

4. The Commagenian toponym $sù-ki-ti/ta$ (URBS) (BOYBEYPINARI 1, § 2; 2, § 5; MALPINAR, § 1) has been compared with Hitt. $\text{Šug}(az)zi(ya)$ (Bossert, *Or. NS* 28 (1959), p. 273).

Other occurrences of the sign are neutral: personal names $sù-wa/i-ri + i-mi-$ (MALATYA 3), $sù-zì$ (CEKKE, § 17 g); unidentified lexical items $*466(-)sù-ni-$ (verb, KARKAMIŠ A1a, §§ 19, 20); $[x](-)sù-na-la$ (verb, KARKAMIŠ A15c, § 1); $sù + ra/i-wa/i-za$ (noun/adj., ASSUR letter e , § 27); $*187(-)sù-mi-la-$ (noun, ASSUR letters a , § 11; ϵ , § 8).

In conclusion, while the comparison of Hier. (DEUS) \acute{a} - $la-sù-wa/i-$ and Hittite Dallanzu speaks for a zu -value of $sù$, the interchange of this sign with su and $sú$ speaks for retaining a su -transliteration. A few other comparisons may support this view, so that it would seem premature to shift to a zu -reading at this stage. On the other hand, if we want to accept Melchert’s conclusion that an IE palatal velar was assibilated (or affricated) in Common Luwian, a reading $sù$ need not prevent us from doing so. It is perfectly possible that $[tʃ]$ was the normal treatment before other vowels but that before u/w a different sibilant appeared, conceivably (but not necessarily) as the result of a secondary innovation in Hier. Luwian itself.

Appendix 3. HH no. 462

The sign HH no. 462 is one of the most recalcitrant outstanding problems of the Hieroglyphic script. It is found with and without the addition of the enclitic sign ra/i (HH no. 383), and while $*462 + ra/i$ appears always to be syllabographic, $*462$ alone seems normally to be a logogram. Though the original grounds for the attribution of a value $pá^2$ (nos. (i) and (ii) below) have been discarded, the transliteration $pá^2$ has been maintained *faute de mieux* for conventional purposes. The main occurrences of the sign are listed below with reference to the place in the Commentary where each is most fully discussed.

- (i) (*349) $sà-pá^2 + ra/i-ka-wa/i-ni$ (URBS), ethnicon, epithet of the Storm-God: KARKAMIŠ Ala, § 3.
- (ii) [...] $pá^2 + ra/i-s[\acute{a}...]$ $x-sa-pa-wa/i-na$ (URBS) [(DEUS)] TONIT[RUS]- $za-sa$: TELL AHMAR frag. 2 – see discussion there.

- (iii) (“LOQUI”) $pá^2 + ra/i-ta$, “words (?)”: KARKAMIŠ A31, § 4; cf. KAYSERİ, § 20; also EMİRGAZİ altars, § 10 (Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3, p. 94).
- (iv) $pá^2 + ra/i-ta-mi-$, “pronounced (?)”: KULULU 1, § 12.
- (v) (LOQUI) $pá^2 + ra/i-li-i-li-i-sà-$, “?”: JISR EL HADID, frag. 2, l. 3.
- (vi) (DELERE) $p[\acute{a}^2] + ra/i-nu-wa/i-$, “destroy”: KARKAMIŠ A28g; cf. KARKAMIŠ A4a, § 14.
- (vii) (DEUS.BONUS) $ku-pá^2 + ra/i-ma-$, the god Kumarbi: TELL AHMAR 1, § 2.
- (viii) (DEUS) $pá^2 + ra/i-wa/i-i-zì-i$, the *marwainzi*-gods: KULULU 2, § 6.
- (ix) (DEUS) $pá^2 + ra/i-ta_5$, one name of the Stag God: MALATYA 5.
- (x) (“ANNUS”) $pá^2 + ra/i(-i)$, “?”: KARATEPE, 57.
- (xi) (*255) $pá^2 + ra/i-ia-ni-$, “proud (?)”: KARATEPE, 57.

- (xii) $pá^2 + ra/i-wa/i-li$, vegetation: SULTANHAN, § 6.
- (xiii) (“CASTRUM”) $tara/i-pa-pá^2-za-ba$, “?”: ÇALAPVERDİ 1, § 32.
- (xiv) (*462) $mu-wa/i-i-ta$, “seed (?)”: KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, § 28; also FEMINA. *462, *ibid.*, § 29.
- (xv) (*462) $mu-wa/i-si$, “?”: KARKAMIŞ A27c, l.1
- (xvi) REX. *462, “potent (?) king”: MALATYA 5.
- (xvii) *462 $-ti-i$, “?”: KULULU 2, § 3.
- (xviii) $i-pá^2-//“PÁ^2”-i$, epithet (?) of Stag-God: BULGARMADEN, § 7.
- (i) city name with Cun. *Išmerikka*
- (iii) and (iv) with a Lyc. stem *mar-*, “command”, and (iii) specifically with Hier. (“LOQUI”) $ma-ra+a-ti-$ (ASSUR letter b, § 4).
- (vi) verb with Hitt. *mernu-/marnu-*, “cause to disappear”.
- (vii) and (viii), following my suggestions, with Kumarbi and the *marwainzi*-gods.
- (x) with Hitt. *me(a)ni-*.
- (xiii) as a stem *tarpama-*, in preference to *tarpaša-*.

I have myself suggested the possibility of comparing (xi) with the term *marianu* (see Commentary).

While naturally agreeing that a value *ma* looks a good deal more plausible than *pa*, I still do not feel that *462 actually = *ma*. Specifically I cannot accept the identification of (“LOQUI”) $pá^2 + ra/i-ta$ as simply a plural form of (“LOQUI”) $ma-ra+a-ti-$, since the singular of the former seems adequately represented by “LOQUI” $-tā-za$ (KAYSERİ, § 20). Thus I would emphasize that *462 quite clearly does not alternate with *ma* in the manner of many alternative syllabograms, and I would take this as an indication that it thus represents something *different*, but, on the basis of the comparison made, *akin* to *ma*. Could we perhaps envisage that a value *ba* as against *pa* might be independently represented by the present sign?

The identifications of the city names in (i) and (ii) as *Barga* and (*Til-*)*Barsip* led to the attribution of the value $pá^2$, but the identifications have been rejected. The identification of (iii) with Cun. Luw. *paratta* seemed to maintain a $pá^2$ value, but the identification is very questionable. Note that (xiii) is the only apparent example of $pá^2$ alone as a syllabogram. In xiv–xvii, the sign appears to be logographic. In (xviii) there is now some reason to doubt that the sign is correctly identified as *462 – it may be a separate sign.

Melchert has reviewed the evidence (*An. St.* 38 (1988), pp. 36–38), pressing further the links, which had already begun to emerge, between *462 and a value *ma*. Specifically he makes the following connections:

Appendix 4. The ALTINTEPE pithos inscriptions (see p. 588 f.).

I. CILICIA

The Historical Context

- Background: the Hittite Empire
- The state, name and people in the Iron Age
- Archaeological investigation
- Cilicia in the Assyrian sources
- Neo-Babylonian and Classical sources
- The Hieroglyphic monuments

The Inscriptions

Karatepe-Aslantaş

The Bilingual

1. KARATEPE 1 (duplicate gate inscriptions)

Separate inscriptions

- 2–4. KARATEPE 2–4 (orthostat, bases)

Fragments

5. KARATEPE fragments

Other

6. DOMUZTEPE 1
7. DOMUZTEPE 2
- [8. ADANA]

The Historical Context

Background: the Hittite Empire

The Cilician Plain forms a well defined geographical entity, marked off by the Amanus Mountains in the east, the Taurus to the north-west, the difficult country of Rough Cilicia in the west, and the sea to the south. Access is limited to comparatively few routes dictated by the terrain: the mountain passes of the Cilician and Amanus Gates, and the river valleys of the Seyhan and Ceyhan and of the Göksu in the west. Yet the plain at the same time forms the most important link between the Anatolian plateau and north Syria and the rest of the Fertile Crescent. It has urban centres of great antiquity, notably the sites of Adana and Tarsus.¹

For a period in the mid-IInd millennium B.C. the Cilician Plain formed the south end of an independent kingdom of Kizzuwatna,² which was able to shut off the Hittites in central Anatolia from access to Syria. Hittite records provide much information about this country, principally in the form of a series of treaties between the kings of Hatti and Kizzuwatna,³ extending from Ispatshus, contemporary of Telipinus, c. 1500 B.C., to Sunassuras, contemporary of Tudhaliyas I/II, c. 1400 B.C., as recently demonstrated. The latter treaty indeed preserves a part of the description of the Hatti-Kizzuwatna frontier north-west of the Plain.⁴

The continued independence of this barrier on the routes to Syria was clearly intolerable to the resurgent Hittite power under Suppiluliumas, who was able to terminate the dynasty and incorporate its territory into the Hittite kingdom where it remained until the disintegration of Hatti. Though shorn of its political independence, Kizzuwatna retained great cultural and cultic importance to the Hittites, particularly its two main centres, Kummanni, probably identical with Comana Cappadociae located at or near modern Şar,⁵ and La(hu)wazantiya, of uncertain location but probably

north of the Cilician Plain.⁶ Ataniya (Adana) and Tarsa (Tarsus) are also attested.⁷ The population seems to have been a mixture of Hurrian and Luwian,⁸ which would have produced a blend of western and eastern influences. The strongest Hurrian influence on Hatti was introduced through the person of Puduhepa, daughter of the Priest of Lawazantiya, who became the prominent queen of Hattusilis III, and brought with her extensive Kizzuwatnian cult and ritual.⁹ The heavily Hurrianized pantheon of Yazılıkaya belonging to the reign of Tudhaliyas IV was the result.

1 For a general survey of the sources, see: A. Erzen, *Kilikien bis zum Ende der Perserherrschaft* (Leipzig, 1940); P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *LPG* (1961), pp. 17–44; J. D. Bing, *Cilicia: a history of Cilicia during the Assyrian period* (Indiana University PhD 1969; University Microfilms, Ann Arbor 1973). [P. Desideri, A. M. Jasink, *Cilicia* (Turin, 1990)].

2 Basic study establishing location and reviewing Hittite sources: A. Goetze, *Kizzuwatna and the problem of Hittite Geography* (New Haven, 1940). Much new material has since become available: for attestations, see del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, s.v. Kizzuwatna; and for a recent review of the sources, Kümmel, *RLA* V/7–8 (1980), s.v. Kizzuwatna. At London University, Dr. D. Symington has completed a doctoral dissertation reevaluating the textual sources and history (1990).

3 Reviewed by Kümmel, op. cit., § 3; also by Symington, op. cit.

4 See Garstang and Gurney, *Geography*, pp. 59–62. [G. Wilhelm, in E. Neu, C. Rüster (ed.), *Fs Otten* (2) (Wiesbaden, 1988), pp. 359–370].

5 See del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, s.v. Kumani; Kümmel, *RLA* VI/5–6 (1983), s.v. Kummanni; also Symington, op. cit.

6 See del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, s.v. La(hu)wazantiya; Hirsch and Wegner, *RLA* VI/5–6 (1983), s.v. La(hu)wazantiya, A–B.

7 See del Monte and Tischler, *RGTC* 6, s.v. Ataniya, Tarša.

8 A. Goetze, *Cilicians* (*JCS* 16 (1962), pp. 48–58); cf. V. Haas and G. Wilhelm, *Hurritische und Luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna (Hurritologische Studien 1, AOATS 3; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974)*, esp. p. 5 f.

9 See H. Otten, *Puduhepa, eine hethitische Königin in ihren Textzeugnissen* (Mainz, 1975).

This is also the period when the Hittite Hieroglyphic script begins to appear on rock inscriptions, though only in the form of short identifying epigraphs to sculpture. Muwatallis left a figure of himself identified by name, titles and genealogy on a cliff jutting into the River Ceyhan at Sirkeli near Misis,¹⁰ and the discovery of a stele with his name and that of Kurunta, king of Tarhuntassa, at Meydancık near Gülnar is claimed.¹¹ A series of inscribed rock reliefs along the line of the upper Zamanti Su passing over the Gezbel Pass seems to mark an ancient route entering Kizzuwatna from Hatti. Appropriately the most westerly is FRAKTİN, showing Hattusilis III and Puduhepa, entitled “daughter of Kazuwana (Kizzuwatna), beloved by the god(s)”,¹² libating to Tešub and Hebat. TAŞÇI shows a procession of three figures, of the time of Hattusilis III,¹³ and a little further on İMAMKULU shows a religious-mythological scene with the Storm-God in his chariot, and the figure of a Hittite prince with bow and spear.¹⁴ Similarly the Gezbel pass inscription at HANYERİ has a religious dedication to Sarruma and the figure with bow and spear, with two princes’ names written one on either side.¹⁵ A further figure with bow and spear, with prince’s name, appears on a cliff on the lower Ceyhan where it emerges into the Cilician Plain at Hemite between Kadirli and Osmaniye.¹⁶

The state, name and people in the Iron Age

The account by Rameses III of the attack of the Sea-Peoples in his 8th year, c. 1190 B.C., records the collapse of Hatti, “Qode”, Karkamiš, Arzawa, and Alašiya.¹⁷ The second named place, *qdy*, is usually identified with Cilicia,¹⁸ and indeed the Cilician plain would be expected to be vulnerable to such sea-borne raids. The question of the Iron Age population of Cilicia is very much bound up with this period, and particularly with the problem of Danuna, a country named in an Amarna

letter, and identified with one of the Sea-Peoples of Egyptian sources.¹⁹ The KARATEPE bilingual equates Hier. *Adanawa*-(URBS) with the Phoen. (people) *dnym* and (toponym) *’dn*. Since the city-name is attested as early as the Telipinus Edict, c. 1550 B.C., if the *dnym*,

10 Börker-Klähn, *Bagh. Forsch.* 4 (Mainz, 1982), no. 317; see *Text*, p. 260 for catalogue entry with bibliography; Kohlmeyer, *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 15 (1983), no. 14, pp. 95–101, pls. 38–39; Rossner, *Heth. Felsreliefs*, pp. 223–227. Garstang’s sondage at the *höyük* of Sirkeli above the cliff with the relief suggested that it was an important Hittite site (see below, n. 35).

11 See Laroche *apud* Mellink, *Archaeology in Asia Minor* (*AJA* 76 (1972), p. 171; 78 (1974), p. 111 and pl. 27 fig. 71; 81 (1977), p. 296); cf. also Orthmann, *AJO* 25 (1974/77), p. 278; Laroche, *CRAIBL* 1981, p. 359 with Fig. 4. For the site, see now Davesne, Lemaire and Lozachmeur, *CRAIBL* 1987, pp. 359–383.

12 Börker-Klähn, *op. cit.*, no. 318; see *Text*, pp. 260–262; Kohlmeyer, *loc. cit.*, no. 8, pp. 67–74, pls. 23–24; Rossner, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–167. For the reading of the epigraph attached to Puduhepa, see Hawkins, *KZ* 92 (1978), p. 112 f.; Güterbock, *Fs Matouš* (1980), pp. 127–136. Güterbock’s reading DEUS *á-xi/a-mi*, “loved by the god(s)”, receives confirmatory support from the parallel DEUS-*niti unimis*, “recognized by the god(s)”, from the seal of Kuzi-Tešub king of Karkamiš; see Karkamiš, p. 73 and n. 5.

13 Börker-Klähn, *op. cit.*, nos. 319–320; see *Text*, p. 262 f.; Kohlmeyer, *loc. cit.*, nos. 9–10, pp. 74–80, pls. 25–28; Rossner, *op. cit.*, pp. 168–172. It is not entirely clear how the epigraphs are to be distributed among the figures, since they are not placed in obvious juxtaposition to them. The names appear to be placed as follows: 1st figure, name lost?; 2nd figure, *x-x-li(-)xi/a* (Kohlmeyer’s identification of initial signs unlikely); 3rd figure, *ma-na-a(-)xi/a* FILIA *lu-pa-ki* EXERCITUS.SCRIBA FILIUS²/*tá*?, “Mana(zi/a) daughter of Lupaki (son of?) the Army-Scribe”; without figure, VIR(-)*á* HASTA MAGNUS.REX *HATTI+li* MAGNUS.REX SERVUS, “Zidas, the spearman, servant of Hattusilis Great King”; separate figure, uncertain reading.

14 Börker-Klähn, *op. cit.*, no. 315; see *Text*, p. 259; Kohlmeyer, *loc. cit.*, no. 11, pp. 80–86, pls. 29–30; Rossner, *op. cit.*, pp. 173–179. The reading of the epigraph of the figure with the bow and spear as “Kuwalana-muwa the prince” is established: see Hawkins, *RLA* VI/5–6 (1983), s.v. Kuwatna-muwa.

15 Börker-Klähn, *op. cit.*, no. 314; see *Text*, p. 258; Kohlmeyer, *loc. cit.* no. 12, pp. 86–90, pls. 32–33; Rossner, *op. cit.*, pp. 180–185. The reading of the epigraphs identifying the religious scene of bull and mountains and its interpretation is due to Laroche, *Syria* 40 (1963), p. 282, reading REX.MONS (DEUS) *SARRUMA*, “Mountain-King Sarruma” (referring to the bull); and ... (DEUS)MONS, “... the divine mountain” (naming the mountain-man; the name appears to be written “hand + sword”, i.e. the Sword God, for which see now Hawkins, *StBot* Bh. 3, p. 34). For the establishment of the name Kuwalana-muwa for the figure with bow and spear, see Hawkins, preceding note. A further epigraph is placed behind the figure: it reads TONITRUS.MANUS-*mi* REX.INFANS (written twice antithetically), “Tarhunta/Tarhunta-piyami(?) the prince” (value of MANUS uncertain, *tá*(?)/DARE(?)).

16 Börker-Klähn, *op. cit.*, no. 316; see *Text*, p. 259 f.; Kohlmeyer, *loc. cit.*, no. 13, pp. 90–95, pls. 35–36; Rossner, *op. cit.*, pp. 219–222. The epigraph identifies the figure as *x.TONITRUS* REX.INFANS TONITRUS.DARE? REX.INFANS INFANS, “...-Tarhunta the prince, son of Tarhunta-piyami(?) the prince”. It is conceivable that the latter name may connect with the third epigraph of HANYERİ (see preceding note).

17 *Medinet Habu* I, pl. 36, ll. 16 ff. = Egerton and Wilson, *Historical Records of Rameses III* (Chicago, 1936), p. 53 – inscription of the year 8; see also e.g. Wilson, in *ANET*, p. 262. The passage is constantly quoted and has been much discussed in attempts to evaluate the historical information contained.

18 Since S. Smith, Kizzuwadna and Kode (*JEA* 8 (1922), pp. 45–47). Cf. Helck, *Beziehungen*, p. 289; M. Weippert, Ein ugaritischer Beleg für das Land “Qadi” der ägyptischen Texte? (*ZDPV* 85 (1969), pp. 35–50); Helck, *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III (1980), s.v. Kizzuwadna.

19 The isolated Amarna reference in a letter from Abimilki of Tyre to Akhenaten (*EA* 151, ll. 49–55) has caused confusion by appearing to place the land of Danuna (KUR *da-nu-na*) in Canaan: see Astour, *Hellenosemitica*, p. 4 f. I cannot agree that a report from Canaan that the king of Danuna is dead necessarily establishes that Danuna was in Canaan. The toponym has been identified with the *dnym* (“Denyen”) attested in the inscriptions of Rameses III (*Medinet Habu*, see above n. 17; also *Medinet Habu* I, pl. 44 caption to middle row on right, = Egerton and Wilson, *loc. cit.*, p. 48; and W. Erichsen, *Papyrus Harris I* (Brussels, 1933), 76, 7 = p. 92 l. 17 f., = Wilson, *ANET*, p. 262); they are listed along with the four other Sea Peoples, Philistines, Tjeker, Šekeleš and Wešeš, all characterized as “islanders”.

identified with the Danuna, only arrived in Cilicia after 1200 B.C., the connection between their name and Adana would be “accidental and secondary”, as has in fact been maintained.²⁰ It seems more reasonable to conclude however that Danuna/*Dnyn*, if correctly identified with the *dnyym*, are the Phoenician and Egyptian terms for the inhabitants of Adana and the Cilician Plain, and an examination of the attested forms establishes that this could be so.²¹ This designation for the city, land and people would thus be continued in the Iron Age as the indigenous term, also that used by the country’s nearest neighbour Sam’al (see below). It is not found in Assyrian sources, which refer to the country as Qaue, later Que, a term of unknown, possibly Hurrian, origin.²² The occasional references to a “city Que” do not specifically establish that there was a city of that name, until the period of the Sargonid Empire, when the determinative ^{uru} is found somewhat more frequently.²³ Very likely the provincial capital was at Adana. Alongside the land of Que, the land of Hilakku and its people appear in the records.²⁴ The characterization of them as mountain-dwellers and their land as adjacent to Tabal²⁵ permits their location in the area of the Toros and Bolkar Dağları, and the rough terrain stretching south-west. Hilakku clearly gave the Greeks their name for the whole of Cilicia, the distinction between Hilakku and Que being continued in Cilicia Tracheia (“Rough”) and Pedias (“Plain”). In the Neo-Babylonian period however the name Que is still found in the form Hume (i.e. *Khuwe), while a kingdom Pirindu was located in Rough Cilicia and extended as far as the Lydian border.²⁶

A number of Cilician towns are named in the sources: Lusanda (= Lawazantiya), Abarnani, Kisuatni (= Kizzuwatna-Kummanni), Timur, Tanakun, the land of Lamena, Tarzi (= Tarsus), and Pahari by Shalmaneser III;²⁷ the fortresses Harrua and Ušnanis by Sargon;²⁸ Illubru (= Hitt. Ellipra), Ingira and Tarzi by Sennacherib.²⁹ Adana, not mentioned as such, was perhaps referred to as the “city Que”.

Archaeological investigation

Archaeologically the Cilician Plain is not particularly well known, and Rough Cilicia even less so. Even the location of the ancient site of Adana is not certainly known.³⁰ The main investigated sites are Tarsus, excavated from 1934–1938 and again 1947–1949,³¹ and Mersin-Yümük Tepe, excavated 1936–1939 and again 1946–1947.³² Off the plain to the north-east, on the middle reaches of the Ceyhan river, the small one-period site of Karatepe, most famous for its Hieroglyphic-Phoenician bilingual inscription, has yielded its small Iron Age hill-top fort with fortification walls, and two city gates lined with sculptured orthostats, as well as a significant pottery assemblage.³³ The Karatepe team has also investigated Domuztepe, another impor-

tant hill-top site lying on the east bank of the river Ceyhan immediately opposite Karatepe.³⁴ These excavations have established Domuztepe as a site of long occupation and considerable importance. Apart from these excavations, British surveys of the Cilician plain were conducted in 1936–37 and 1951.³⁵ These located

- 20 See Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962), pp. 50–54, esp. 52; cf. Astour, *Hellenosemitica*, pp. 9–14. The question is further complicated by the identification of the *Danuna/Dnyn* with the Greek *Danaoi* and the Hebrew tribe Dan: Astour, loc. cit., pp. 45–53.
- 21 Laroche has shown that the Phoen. *dnyym*, reflecting the Cun. *Danuna*, may be explained as a Luvian ethnicon *Adanawani-* > *Danuni-*, semitized by the further ethnicon *-i*, *D^on^oni*, plur. *D^on^onim*: see *Syria* 35 (1958), pp. 263–275.
- 22 Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962), p. 52.
- 23 See Parpola, *NAT*, s.v. QUWE. Of the pre-Sargonid references listed, only one (from Shalmaneser III, see below p. 41 and n. 40) may refer specifically to a city Que. In inscriptions of Sargon an ^{uru}Que occurs once in alternation with a more common KUR Que (see below, n. 54 – Nimrud cylinder).
- 24 Parpola, *NAT*, s.v. HILAKKU. For a survey of the sources, see Hawkins *RLA* IV/6–7 (1975), s.v. Hilakku. The reference to a “city Hilakku” (determined by ^{uru}) occurs in Sargon’s inscriptions only as an alternative for a “land Hilakku” (see below, p. 42 and n. 52). Sennacherib’s narrative of his Cilician campaign thrice refers to the “people (*babulâte*/UN^{mes}) of the city (^{uru}) Hilakki” (see below p. 43 and n. 64); it is unclear whether this determinative is significant.
- 25 *ša tebi* KUR *Tabala*: see below, p. 43 and n. 68.
- 26 Attested mainly in the Neriglissar Chronicle, Grayson, *ABC*, Chronicle 6, p. 103 f; see also Zadok, *RGTC* 8, s.v. Hūmē, Pirindu, with other references. See also below, p. 43 and n. 76 for the claimed conquest of Hume and Piriddu (with Lydia) by Nebuchadrezzar.
- 27 See below, p. 41 and nn. 40, 43–45.
- 28 See below, p. 42 and n. 54.
- 29 See below, p. 43 and n. 64.
- 30 A mound in the centre of Adana, Tepebağ district, has been sounded and produced Hellenistic, Roman and Islamic material: see Seton-Williams, loc. cit. below, n. 35, p. 148. For a possible location of the ancient site upstream of modern Adana, see Garstang and Gurney, *Geography*, p. 61, who however record the doubts of Seton-Williams, based on the fact that the site proposed appears too small.
- 31 H. Goldmann, *Excavations at Gözlu Kule, Tarsus* vol. II, *From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age* (Princeton, 1956); vol. III, *The Iron Age* (Princeton, 1963).
- 32 J. Garstang, *Prehistoric Mersin, Yümük Tepe in Southern Turkey* (Oxford, 1953).
- 33 See Hawkins, *RLA* V/5–6 (1980), s.v. Karatepe A. Inschriften, Geschichte; Orthmann, *ibid.*, s.v. Karatepe B, Archäologisch, with bibliographies. Pottery now published by M. Darga, *Karatepe-Azatiwattaya kalesinin çanak çömlek buluntuları (Anadolu Araştırmaları* 10 (1986), pp. 371–400 with pls. I–XI).
- 34 See most recently H. Çambel and M. Özdoğan, 1983 Yılı Domuztepe Çalışmaları (*Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 6 (1984), pp. 259–272); H. Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş ve Domuztepe*, 1984 Yılı Çalışmaları (*ibid.* 7 (1985), pp. 271–285); H. Çambel, M. A. Işın, S. Sadler, *Karatepe-Aslantaş ve Domuztepe*, 1985 Yılı Çalışmaları (*ibid.* 8 (1986), pp. 329–343).
- 35 1936–37: J. Garstang, *Explorations in Cilicia (LAA* 24 (1937), pp. 52–68; 25 (1938), pp. 12–23). These paved the way for the excavation of Mersin: note the sondages at Kazanlı Höyük and especially Sirkeli, 1951; M. V. Seton-Williams, *Cilician Survey (An. St.* 4 (1954), pp. 121–174). Cf. also Orthmann, *İçel (RLA* V/1–2 (1976), s.v.), for overview of archaeological material from western Cilicia.

a large number of sites, and were able to identify their periods of settlement from the pottery, and thus to plot settlement patterns on maps. This pioneering work has not so far been followed up by further excavation, [though recently (1992) German excavations at Sirkeli have begun].

In the west, in Rough Cilicia, the site of Meydancık Kalesi has been the subject of little-reported excavations, and British excavations began at Kilise Tepe in 1994.³⁶

Cilicia in the Assyrian sources

Cilicia was sufficiently remote from Mesopotamia to lie beyond the reach of all but the most energetic Assyrian kings, and these when they came concentrated on the easily accessible Que rather than the recalcitrant Hilakku. Once Que was conquered however, it seems to have been successfully incorporated into the Assyrian imperial system, and to have been held until the end.

For more than two centuries after the disintegration of the Hittite Empire, Cilicia remains without historical reference. The sole exception is a notice in the Old Testament that Solomon (c. 965–931 B.C.) traded for horses with Que (*qwb*).³⁷ Shalmaneser III was the first Assyrian king to record contacts with Cilicia. Both Que and Hilakku, under their kings Kate and Pihirim, took part in a general north Syrian alliance which opposed him in 858 B.C.³⁸ Later in his reign, having subdued the north Syrian states and battled for years against the south Syrian alliance, Shalmaneser turned his attention to Cilicia and Anatolia. After reconnaissance expeditions up Mount Amanus in 842 and 840 B.C.,³⁹ he descended in 839 B.C. on Que, still ruled by Kate, captured the cities Lusanda, Abarnani and Kisuatni, and set up statues of himself at the nearest and furthest points of his conquest, the latter being on the sea-coast.⁴⁰ The identification of the cities Lawazantiya and Kizzuwatna-Kummanni points to this campaign being conducted principally in the mountains north-east of the Cilician Plain. The possibility remains of identifying the uninscribed Assyrian royal relief of Ferhatli-Uzun-öğlantepe as one of the monuments.⁴¹ Shalmaneser may have passed through Que on his return from Tabal

in 836 B.C.,⁴² and it could have been on this occasion that he attacked Kate's royal city Pahri,⁴³ probably to be located at Misis (classical Mopsuestia).⁴⁴ Subsequently Shalmaneser led expeditions against Que for three consecutive years, 833, 832, and 831,⁴⁵ capturing first Timur, another royal city; then Tanakun, the city of an otherwise unknown ruler Tulli, the land of Lamena in a mountainous area, and finally Tarzi (Tarsus), where the local population submitted and accepted the replacement of Kate by his brother Kirri. Kate thus reigned minimally from 858 to 832–31 B.C. These Cilician campaigns of the 830's are associated with an event narrated on the stele of Kulamuwa of Sam'al,⁴⁶ son of Hayanu who had opposed Shalmaneser in 858 B.C. Kulamuwa tells how when the king of the "Danuna" (*mlk dnnym*) oppressed him, he "hired" against him the Assyrian king. The title "king of the Danuna" is shown by KARATEPE to refer to the king of Que ruling in Adana, and doubtless Kulamuwa's oppressor was Kate, whose power thus extended east of the Amanus into north Syria.

For nearly a century after Shalmaneser, Cilicia was left in peace by a weakened Assyria. A king of Que (*qwb*) is recorded by Zakur of Hamath as being a member of the Arpad-led alliance against him.⁴⁷ No Cilician participation in the fighting against Urartu, Arpad and Unqi is reported by Tiglath-pileser III for the years 743–738 B.C.,⁴⁸ but the lists of tributary kings for

36 Meydancık: see above, p. 39 and n. 11. [Kilise Tepe: see *An. St.* 45 (1995), p. 139 ff.].

37 I *Kings* 10:28/II *Chron.* 1:16; identified by Winckler (following Lenormant), *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 173 f.; cf. Schrader, *KAT*³ (Berlin, 1903), p. 238.

38 Kurkh Monolith, III *R* 7 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.2), i 53 f. This passage is now fully preserved on the new, nearly duplicate inscription from the Nabu temple covering campaigns 1 and 2: see Mahmud and Black, *Sumer* 44 (1985–86), pp. 135–155, text 1, rev. 26–29.

39 *Safar Annals*, Michel, *WdO* II/1 (1954), pp. 38 f., 40 f. (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.10), iii 37–41, iv 15–19; Black Obelisk, Michel, *WdO* II/2 (1955), pp. 152 f., 154 f. (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.14). Latter campaign also on Eponym Chronicle, 840 B.C. (19th *palû*), C^b4, *RLA* II, s.v. Eponymen, p. 433 obv. 1; also *STT* no. 46, obv. 1' ("[to the mountain] of cedar").

40 Most detailed account *Safar Annals* only: Michel *WdO* II/1 (1954), p. 40 f. (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.10), iv 22–39. Summary account, Black Obelisk, Michel, loc. cit., p. 154 f. (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.14), ll. 100–102. Eponym Chronicle, loc. cit., 839 B.C. (20th *palû*), obv. 2. ("[to] the city Que").

41 Taşyürek, *An. St.* 25 (1975), pp. 169–172; Börker-Klähn, *Bagh. Forsch.* 4, no. 235: see *Text*, p. 220.

42 See Tabal, p. 427 and n. 31.

43 Assur statue, Michel, *WdO* I/2 (1947), p. 58 f. (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.40), iii 5–8. Though the linking of Que with Tabal in this summary inscription is no certain evidence that the two places were visited in the same year, the siege of Pahri is not recorded in the narratives of the other Que campaigns, so may perhaps belong to the year of the Tabal campaign. But cf. Schramm, *EAK* II, p. 83, where it is dated to 833 B.C.

44 So identified by Bossert, *JKF* I/3 (1951), pp. 290–294.

45 Eponym Chronicle, C^b4, *RLA* II, s.v. Eponymen, p. 433 obv. 8–10 (cf. *STT* no. 46, obv. 8'–10'), years 833, 832 and 831 B.C.; Black Obelisk, Michel, *WdO* II/3 (1956), pp. 221, 223 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.14) ll. 126–141 (25th and 26th *palûs*). For the discrepancy in the chronology, see Reade, *ZA* 68 (1978), pp. 251–255: the Black Obelisk seems to have compressed the campaigns of the latter two years into *palû* 26 only.

46 Donner and Röllig, *KAI*², no. 24; Gibson, *TSSI* III, no. 13.

47 Zakur stele, see Hama, p. 401 and n. 47.

48 See Maraş, p. 250 and nn. 19–20; Amuq, p. 363 and n. 34.

738⁴⁹ and 732 B.C.⁵⁰ include a king Urikki of Que, but significantly no king of Hilakku. The extent of Tiglath-pileser's control in Cilicia is not clear, but in 729 B.C. he was able to act decisively in replacing the king of Tabal,⁵¹ which implies command of the routes through Cilicia.

In the reign of Sargon II, both Que and Hilakku are found to be in Assyrian hands, though when and under what circumstances they came there is unknown. On establishing Ambaris as king of Bit-Burutaš, Sargon gave him his daughter and the land of Hilakku as a dowry, but when in 713 Ambaris was removed, he appointed a provincial governor over Bit-Burutaš and Hilakku.⁵² This poses a problem of historical geography, for it is hard to see that Hilakku and Bit-Burutaš would have been contiguous: the known states of Tuwana, Šinuhtu, Atuna and Hubišna would be expected to lie between them.⁵³ In 715 B.C. Sargon captured two fortresses of Que, Harrua and Ušnanis, from Midas of Phrygia who had seized them long before.⁵⁴ The status of Que is not specified, though the event implies that it was in Assyrian hands.⁵⁵ Later, in 710–709 B.C., while Sargon was in Babylonia engaged in the expulsion of Merodach-baladan, and fighting on the Elamite frontier, he received a messenger from his governor of Que, attested here for the first time, reporting three successful incursions which he had made into the territory of Midas of Phrygia.⁵⁶ Shortly thereafter Midas himself sent a messenger allegedly offering submission and bringing gifts.⁵⁷

These events are clearly reflected in a long letter from Sargon to Aššur-šarru-ušur, now identified as the governor of Que in question, which sheds much light on Cilician and Anatolian affairs.⁵⁸ From this we learn that Midas, in a sudden peace gesture, had apprehended an embassy of fourteen men of Que sent by Urik to Urartu and handed them over to the Assyrians. Sargon was delighted with this *démarche*, and instructed his governor under all circumstances to maintain the new cordiality with Phrygia, since it would enable Assyria to control “all those kings of Tabal”, among whom only Urballa (Warpalawas) is named. Clearly the Assyrian governor was in full control of Que. The Urik mentioned has been identified, with every plausibility, with Urikki, known as the tributary king of Que in 738 and 732 B.C.; but since his country was now an Assyrian province, it would seem that he may have been in exile.⁵⁹ Also mentioned is an otherwise unknown Kilar, who had demanded the cession to him of four districts (*nagû*). He was presumably another local ruler, perhaps of Hilakku.⁶⁰

The reason for Midas's *volte face* has been plausibly supposed to be the threat of the Cimmerians, who since their severe defeat of the Urartian king c. 714 B.C. would have already been threatening central Anatolia. Sargon's jubilation, clearly perceptible in the letter, was premature. When he went to Tabal in 705 B.C.,⁶¹ per-

haps in response to an appeal from Midas, he was slain in battle. Midas shared his fate ten years later, if the date of the classical tradition is correct.⁶² Such an unprecedented Assyrian disaster must have had critical repercussions in the north-western Assyrian provinces. Certainly the Assyrian hold on Tabal was lost forever, and that on Que and Melid shaken to an uncertain degree.

49 This list of tributaries appears in the Annals at the end of the comprehensive reorganization following the annexation of Unqi-Kullani and north Hamath, immediately before the 9th *palû*, i.e. in the year 738 B.C. Its date is guaranteed by its occurrence with two significant discrepancies (different ruler of Tyre, omission of Hamath) on the Iran stele, set up in 737 B.C. See Rost, *Tiglath-pileser*, p. 14 ll. 82–89 and pl. XIII = *ARAB I*, § 769; *ibid.*, p. 26 ll. 150–154 and pls. XV–XVI, cf. pls. IV + V = *ARAB I*, § 772; cf. Tadmor, *Azriyan*, p. 255 f.; Weippert, *ZDPV* 89 (1973), pp. 33–35. Iran Stele, Levine, *TNASI*, p. 18, col. ii ll. 1–19.

50 This list of tributaries, very similar to the previous but damaged, is found on the summary inscription, the Nimrud Tablet. It clearly omits Damascus and Samaria, and perhaps Tyre; has lost Karkamiš, Kaska, Hupišna; and adds kings of Trans-Jordan, Judah and Philistia. The list is placed after an Arabian campaign of 733–32 B.C., for which see I. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 29, 83 f., i.e. purportedly in 732 B.C. Because of the summary nature of the inscription however, it cannot be taken as conclusive evidence that all the kings named actually paid tribute at this date: e.g. Panammu of Sam'al, who is listed, died during the siege of Damascus. See Nimrud Tablet, Rost, *Tiglath-pileser*, p. 70 and pl. XXXVII, rev. 7'–13'; cf. Weippert, *loc. cit.*, p. 52 f.

51 See Tabal, p. 427 and n. 37.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 427 f. and nn. 38, 45.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 425 f. and nn. 7, 12–14.

54 Annals, Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 20, 22, ll. 119 f., 125 f. = *ARAB II*, § 16; Nimrud cylinders, Gadd, *Iraq* 16 (1954), p. 182 and pl. XLVII, v 37–40, and *ibid.*, p. 199 and pl. LI, l. 21 (cf. Khorsabad cylinder, Lyon, *Sargon*, p. 4, l. 24 = *ARAB II*, § 118; Bull inscription, Lyon, *Sargon*, p. 14, l. 24 = *ARAB II*, § 92). The Annals text ostensibly adds a third city of doubtful reading (read ^uqu-u[m]-a-s[?]) – the suspicion must remain, comparing this with the other passages, that it should read some variation of ^uhal-šimēs, “fortresses”).

55 Cf. the suggestion of Lemaire that it was actually at this point that Que passed into Assyrian control: *NABU* 1 (1987), p. 5.

56 Annals, Lie, *Sargon*, pp. 66–68, ll. 445–452 = *ARAB II*, § 42; Display inscription, Winckler, *Sargon*, p. 126 and pl. 35 no. 75, ll. 150–151, = *ARAB II*, § 71.

57 Annals, *ibid.*, ll. 452–454 (broken); Display inscription, *ibid.*, ll. 152–153.

58 Nimrud letter XXXIX, collated and re-edited by Postgate, Sargon's letter referring to Midas (*Iraq* 35 (1973), pp. 21–34). Postgate's identification of Aššur-šarru-ušur as governor of Que is based on K 1008, now published as *CT* LIII, 15, which names him as such (rev. 2'). For his dating to the reign of Sargon, see Postgate, *loc. cit.*, pp. 32–34; and cf. p. 27 n. 12, where are mentioned two further documents, now published by Postgate, *TCAE*, pp. 309, 376 (*ADD* 928 and *ND* 2451). Cf. also Lemaire, *Aššur-šarra-ušur* gouverneur de Qué (*NABU* 1 (1987), p. 5 f.).

59 Postgate, *loc. cit.*, p. 28, suggests that as king he could have co-existed with an Assyrian governor, but this is perhaps less likely.

60 Postgate, *loc. cit.*, p. 29.

61 See Tabal, p. 428 and n. 50.

62 Midas's dates as given by Eusebius, 738–696/5 B.C., fit well with his minimum dates established by Assyrian attestations, 718–709 B.C.: see Hawkins, *RLA* VIII/3–4 (1994), s.v. Mita.

Although Sennacherib in the building inscription annexed to the earliest account of his first campaign, written before his second campaign in 702 B.C., claimed to have deportees from Que and Hilakku working at Nineveh,⁶³ there is no reason to suppose that his army went to Cilicia before 696 B.C. At that date he sent an expedition against Kirua the ruler (EN URU) of Illubru, who led a revolt of the people of Hilakku, secured the adherence of the cities Ingira and Tarzi and closed the “Que route” (*girri KUR que*), i.e. the Amanus passes.⁶⁴ The rebellion thus arose in western Cilicia but engulfed the entire country. It is not certain when the revolt broke out, but it is possible that this was on the death of Sargon, and that the rebels were able to maintain themselves for nine years before attracting Assyrian intervention. Sennacherib claims to have captured Ingira, Tarzi and finally Illubru, which he reorganized and settled with deportees. Kirua he removed to Nineveh and flayed. Greek sources remembered that Greeks were involved on the anti-Assyrian side, and that Sennacherib’s victory was costly to his own army.⁶⁵ Curiously this campaign was edited out of the final edition of Sennacherib’s Annals, perhaps because it was not led by the king in person. It is likely that the Assyrian province of Que was reestablished by the action, and a governor is probably attested as eponym of 685 B.C.,⁶⁶ which would support this view.

Esarhaddon was sufficiently in control of Que to fight a battle against the Cimmerians under their leader Teušpa in 679 B.C. at Hubušna (= Kybistra) on the Anatolian plateau.⁶⁷ At the same time he claimed to have subdued the unruly folk of Hilakku.⁶⁸ As to Que itself, Sanduarri, king of Kundi and Sissu, who was captured and beheaded in 675 B.C.,⁶⁹ is supposed, by the identifications proposed for Kundi and Sissu,⁷⁰ to have ruled in the north-east of the plain in the district of modern Kozan. Up to his death Sanduarri may thus have coexisted with an Assyrian governor based in Adana or Tarsus, and afterwards his kingdom may have been incorporated into the province. Some very fragmentary questions of Esarhaddon to the oracular Šamaš concerning Que and Hilakku survive.⁷¹ They seem to show that an attack by Tabal, [also Hilakku?], on Que was feared.

In the reign of Aššurbanipal, three governors of Que are attested, one in 655 B.C.,⁷² and two postcanonical, Marduk-šarru-ušur,⁷³ and Nabu-danninanni.⁷⁴ Thus control of this province seems to have lasted until the later days of the Empire. Hilakku, on the other hand, was no more under control than it had ever been, and an independent king Sandasarme is attested early in the reign.⁷⁵ Like the Anatolian princes, Gyges of Lydia and Mugallu of Tabal, he is said to have sought Assyrian help, no doubt also against the Cimmerians.

Neo-Babylonian and Classical sources

A pattern emerges for the Sargonid period of a general Assyrian control of Que contrasted with repeated

and unsuccessful attempts on Hilakku, always characterized as “insubmissive”. After the fall of the Assyrian Empire, some degree of Babylonian control over Hume (Que) was exercised by Nebuchadrezzar, who claimed its conquest, along with less probable claims on Piriddu and Lydia,⁷⁶ and certainly was entertaining captives from Hume and Pirindu.⁷⁷ Yet a king of Cilicia, Syennesis I, is attested in classical sources in 585 B.C.⁷⁸ Neriglissar’s Cilician campaign of 557 B.C. reveals that a king of Pirindu, Appuašu, was able to attack Hume and Syria (*eber nāri*).⁷⁹ This Pirindu, lying between Hume and Lydia, must certainly have corresponded largely to

63 Smith cylinder, Luckenbill, *Sennacherib*, p. 95, l. 71 = *ARAB* II, § 364; repeated in the King cylinder of 694 B.C., *CT* XXVI, pl. 19, col. v 53 = *ARAB* II, § 383 (also its duplicate the Heidel cylinder, *Sumer* 9 (1953), p. 154, col. v 82).

64 King cylinder, *CT* XXVI, pls. 15 f., iv 61–91 = *ARAB* II, §§ 286–289; also duplicate Heidel cylinder, *Sumer* 9 (1953), pp. 146–151, iv 92–v 28.

65 See King, *CT* XXVI, pp. 11–13. The account seems to have been derived ultimately from Berossos, by Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenos, who are quoted by Eusebius. See S. M. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (*JANE* 1/5; Malibu 1978), p. 24.

66 Aššur-danninanni, Eponym Canon C^d: Schroeder, *KAV*, no. 20, iii + iv l. 35.

67 See Tabal, p. 428 and n. 52.

68 Thompson cylinder, Borger, *Asarhaddon*, p. 51 (“Nin. A”), iii 47–55 = *ARAB* II, § 516.

69 Babylonian Chronicle, Grayson, *ABC*, p. 83, iv 7 f.; Thompson cylinder, Borger, *Asarhaddon*, p. 49 f. (“Nin. A”), iii 20–38 = *ARAB* II, § 513; also Nin. B, *ibid.*, p. 50, i 36–54 = *ARAB* II, § 528.

70 Identification with classical Kyinda and Sisium (modern Sis, = Kozan) by Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung*, p. 81. Kyinda is variously located, either identified with Anavarza or placed near Anchiäle: see Gough, *An. St.* 2 (1952), p. 91 f.; Simpson, *Historia* 6 (1957), p. 503 f.; Bing, *Historia* 22 (1973), pp. 346–350. A western location near Anchiäle, while favoured for Kyinda, hardly seems suitable for Kundi.

71 Knudtzon, *AGS*, no. 60, obv. 7, 11, rev. 13; no. 61, rev. 5; no. 62/63, obv. 9; Klauber, *PRT*, no. 43, rev. 3. See now Starr, *AA* 4 (Helsinki, 1990), nos. 14–17.

72 For attestations of this *limmu*, and the forms of his name, see Weidner, *AJO* 13 (1939–41), p. 206 f. and pl. XII.

73 *ARU* 47, l. 26 f.

74 *ARU* 359, l. 28 f.; 522, l. 5; probably also 69, l. 8 f. (restore <Nabu>).

75 Prism B, Piepkorn, *Ashurbanipal*, p. 44 (ii 73–79); the appearance of Sandasarme in this edition of the Annals for the first time gives the date of the incident a *terminus ante quem* of 649 B.C., the date of the edition. The incident is repeated in the later editions, C, F, and especially A (Streck, *Ashurbanipal*, p. 18 (ii 75–80) = *ARAB* II, § 782).

76 Text in *CT* 46, no. 45, see Lambert, *Iraq* 27 (1965), esp. pp. 2, 7 l. 21. The attribution to Nebuchadrezzar is not absolutely certain.

77 Weidner, *Mélanges Dussaud* II (Paris, 1939), pl. II, A rev. 7, 8; (B rev. ii, 2); cf. p. 935.

78 As arbiter, along with “Labynetos” of Babylon, between the Lydians and Medes after their battle of 28 May 585 B.C. (Herodotos, I. 74). The name *Syennesis* would appear to reflect accurately a Luw. form *suwanasis*, “(son) of a dog”! See KARKAMIŠ A4a, § 10, Commentary.

79 Neriglissar Chronicle for year 557 B.C., see Wiseman, *CCK*, pp. 74–77 and pls. VI, XVII–XVIII (edition), 38–42 and 86–88, (context and commentary); Grayson, *ABC*, p. 103 f.

Assyrian Hilakku and the Greek kingdom of Cilicia.⁸⁰ Probably this kingdom contested the control of Hume with the Babylonians. Nabonidus campaigned in Hume in 555 B.C.⁸¹

The Hieroglyphic monuments: Karatepe

Thus it may be seen in the case of Cilicia, Plain and Rough, there is no such clear-cut *terminus ante quem* for indigenous Hieroglyphic inscriptions as for most of the other Neo-Hittite states. The Assyrians record no destruction and annexation accompanied by large scale deportations as they do for Unqi, Hamath, Karkamiš, Gurgum and Kummuh. The only indigenous monuments yet found are KARATEPE and the little known DOMUZTEPE, and the problem of fitting this into the historical framework has been much discussed: where can we place the ruler Azatiwatas, promoted by Awarikus king of Adana, who then established his lord's family on the throne of Adana, and reestablished control of the Cilician plain by the house of Mopsos?⁸² Attempts at dating have been based on various criteria. The most obvious one is historical: the identification of Awarikus with Urikki of Que, who was ruling in 738–732 B.C., and at least still active, if in exile, in 710–09 B.C. This would unequivocally establish the beginning of Azatiwatas's tenure in the reign of Urikki and its extension into the period after Urikki's lifetime, thus the end of 8th–beginning of 7th centuries B.C. While the identity of the names Awarikus/Urikki is not in doubt, if other criteria pointed to an earlier date, it may legitimately be argued that Awarikus was a homonymous predecessor of Urikki ruling in the city Adana/the country Que.⁸³

Another criterion of date which supports this late dating is the palaeography of the Phoenician script, which is generally agreed to point to the end of the 8th century B.C.⁸⁴

Stylistic analysis of the sculpture however is much more controversial. Both 9th and 8th century elements have been identified,⁸⁵ which have led scholars to opt firmly for one date or the other. Recent research has suggested a solution in identifying a number of reused 9th century elements in a monument with inscription created at the end of the 8th century B.C.,⁸⁶ but the excavator does not consider that the archaeological evidence can support this hypothesis.⁸⁷ The problem remains for further exploration.

A further argument for the late dating of the inscription which may now be advanced is the Hieroglyphic graphic usage. KARATEPE shows a series of syllabic values paralleled elsewhere only in the Tabal inscriptions associated with the names of Tuwatis and Wasu-sarmas, i.e. later 8th century B.C.⁸⁸ This consideration should be added to that of the Phoenician palaeography.

Since graphic criteria, both Phoenician and Hieroglyphic, as well as a series of late features in the sculptural iconography, point to a late dating, it is appropriate to review the historical data to see how the external evidence from Assyrian and other sources may best be combined with the inscription's internal evidence. Starting again with the Awarikus-Urikki identification, we may reaffirm that the bulk of Azatiwatas's actions as described in the inscription, his establishment of his lord's family on the throne of Adana (§§ XIV–XVI) and his pacification of the Plain of Adana (*passim*), belong after the death of Awarikus, i.e. after 710–09 when Urikki was still alive. It is also hard to see that these actions could have been performed during Sargon's reign and specifically while his governor of Que, Aššur-šarru-ušur, was sitting in Cilicia, perhaps in Tarsus or in Adana itself. If this is so, the best period to accommodate Azatiwatas's deeds would seem to be after the death of Sargon in a period of reduced Assyrian interference in Cilicia. It has been pointed out that Azatiwatas must then have been involved in Sennacherib's Cilician expedition of 696 B.C.⁸⁹ According to Sennacherib's account, the main anti-Assyrian move came from Hilakku in the west Cilician mountains and involved places only as far east as Tarsus. Azatiwatas would actually have been an Assyrian client, and his narrative could combine with that of Sennacherib: thus his "bad men in the west" (§§ XX–XXXI) could perhaps have been the anti-Assyrian revolt. His failure to mention Assyrian presence may be paralleled by the comparable omission by Zakur of Hamath. Could his reign, and the presence of the house of Mopsos in Adana, have extended beyond 696 B.C., when Sennacherib probably restored an Assyrian governor, as may be

80 For this very involved historical problem, see especially Houwink ten Cate, *LPG*, pp. 27–30. For the localization of the capitals Ura and Kirši at Silifke and Meydanlık Kalesi, see Lemaire, loc. cit. (n. 11 above), pp. 372–377.

81 Babylonian Chronicle, Grayson, *ABC*, p. 105, col. i 7; prisoners from this campaign are recorded on his Istanbul stele: Langdon, *NBK*, no. 8, ix 32 = Oppenheim, *ANET*³, p. 311.

82 See the bibliography in Hawkins, *RLA* V/5–6 (1980), s.v. Karatepe A., § 2; and add Bron, *Recherches* (1979), ch. IX; Garelli, *RA* 75 (1981), pp. 54–60. For Mopsos, see Hawkins, *RLA* VIII/5–6 (1995), s.v. Muksas.

83 For two Phoenician inscriptions on which the name of a king Urikki ('wrk) has been identified, see Lemaire, *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 9 (1983), pp. 9–19 (HASANBEYLİ); Mosca, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9 (1987), pp. 1–28 (CEBELİREİS DAĞI).

84 J. D. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician scripts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), ch. IV esp. pp. 116–119; cf. Bron, *Recherches*, ch. VIII (pp. 154–158). [Now W. Röllig, *apud* Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Palaeography, pp. 73–81].

85 See Deshayes, *RA* 75 (1981), pp. 32–46, with previous bibliography.

86 Winter, *An. St.* 29 (1979), pp. 115–151.

87 See Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, pp. 9–11.

88 See Tabal, p. 430 and nn. 64–68.

89 Bing, *Cilicia*, ch. 4.

corroborated by the attestation of a governor of Que as eponym in 685 B.C.⁹⁰

A further proposal to identify Azatiwatas with Sanduarri, king of Kundi and Sissu,⁹¹ executed by Esarhaddon in 676 B.C. may also be considered. There is little phonetic obstacle to identifying Hier. *Azatiwatas*, specially in its rhotacizing form *Azatiwaras*, with Cun. *Sanduarri*, and the location of Kundi and Sissu at Anavarza and Kozan respectively,⁹² would tie in well with the area of Karatepe.

Such a placing of Azatiwatas and his inscription remains somewhat hypothetical, especially in the question of the coexistence of native dynasts with Assyrian governors in this frontier area. It may how-

ever be thought not implausible. It would certainly make KARATEPE as much as a generation later than any other Hier. inscription at present known, with the possible exception of NIĞDE 2, written by the son of Warpalawas. By this date all the other centres of Hier. inscriptions had disappeared permanently into the Assyrian imperial system except Melid and Tabal which share with Cilicia a somewhat peripheral status. It would not perhaps be surprising if Cilicia, sheltered perhaps from the worst ravages of both the Assyrians and Cimmerians, should have transmitted to us this latest of the Hier. monuments, the idiosyncratic character of which may well reflect its comparative lateness.

The Inscriptions

I.1. KARATEPE 1 (the Bilingual)

Location. Portal orthostats, *in situ* at Karatepe-Aslantaş, nr. Kadirli, province of Adana, Turkey.

Description. Two city gates in the fortifications surrounding the hill-top of Karatepe-Aslantaş, (1) Lower (North) Gate, (2) Upper (South) Gate, their walls faced with basalt orthostats bearing sculptures and inscriptions. Each gate has one Hieroglyphic and one Phoenician inscription, designated by excavator *Hu.*, *Phu.* (i.e. *Hieroglyphisch*, *Phoenikisch*, *unten*: Lower Gate) and *Ho.*, *Pbo.* (i.e. *Hier.*, *Phoen.*, *oben*: Upper Gate). *Hu.* and *Phu.* are complete, except for a passage of *Hu.*; *Ho.* and *Pbo.* are both damaged, but are duplicates of *Hu.* and *Phu.* (There is a third, slightly divergent Phoen. text on the skirt of a colossal divine statue which stood just inside the Upper Gate to left of way: the Phoen. texts are designated A (*Phu.*), B (*Pbo.*), C (statue)). The texts *Hu./Ho.* and *Phu./Pbo.* constitute a Hier.-Phoen. bilingual with word-for-word equivalences and few, minor divergences.

Phu. was discovered complete and *in situ*, written in 3 cols. on 4 adjoining orthostats, continuing on the base below and terminating on the portal lion (see Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, pp. 16–18). The text sequence depends on this version. It is cited by cols., i–iv, and line nos.

Hu. is written on 6 orthostats (overlapping from 2 on to adjoining sculptured slabs), on long stretches of the bases, and on two portal beasts, lion and sphinx (see Çambel, *op. cit.*, pp. 24–30). The Hier. text occupies much more space than the Phoen., and the order of reading *Hu.* is established by *Phu.*, for its placing by no means corresponds to this order. The text can be divided into 75 clauses, numbered §§ I–LXXXV,

and subdivided into 412 words, numbered 1–412 (§§ XLI–XLIII and XLIV–XLVII on two largely destroyed elements, orthostat and base, are hardly preserved). It is hard to see how the order of *Hu.* could have been so disturbed without a reconstruction, at least of the inner gate chamber with §§ I–XLIX, subsequent to the execution of the inscription. But although with a slight rearrangement of the inscribed elements a somewhat more logical order could be suggested, the excavator strongly advocates the view that each stone was specially dressed to fit its own position, and thus that we are not at liberty to propose hypothetical rearrangements.

Ho. and *Pbo.*, both fragmentary and found almost entirely out of position, depend like *Hu.* for the reading order on *Phu.* The scattered orthostats, bases and portal figures bearing the inscriptions have been restored by the excavators to approximate or inferred positions with the exception of the 2 bases found *in situ*. Of these one is a separate inscription without apparent Phoen. correspondence, ending with a “scribal signature” – see KARATEPE 4 (below, p. 68–70).

With it are to be associated two further inscribed elements, partially reconstituted from scattered fragments, which also lack Phoen. correspondences; these are designated KARATEPE 2 and 3 (below, p. 68–70).

For an earlier discussion of the inscribed elements, their locations and restorations, see Hawkins, *RLA* V, s.v. Karatepe, A, 1, with bibliography. Full evidence is provided by Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*.

90 See above, p. 43 and n. 66.

91 Winter, *loc. cit.* (n. 86), pp. 146–149; cf. Hawkins, *ibid.*, p. 156.

92 See above, p. 43 and n. 70.

Discovery. Visited four times between 1927–1944 by Ekrem Kuşçu, primary school teacher in Kadirli. On 28/2/1946, Ekrem escorted Bossert and Halet Çambel to site. Statue with Phoenician inscription viewed and squeezes taken, fragments of Hier. and Phoen. inscriptions examined. From 15/3–15/4/1947 a preliminary survey season was undertaken by Bossert and Bahadır Alkım. Work on surface monuments undertaken, text of Phoen. statue inscription prepared, one portal lion frag. with Phoen. inscription, one with Hier. inscription located. For these two preliminary visits see (1) Bossert and Çambel, *Karatepe* (Istanbul, 1946; Turkish and English); (2) Bossert and Alkım, *Karatepe* (Istanbul, 1947; Turkish and English), esp. pp. 1f./16 f., 11–14/25–28.

Systematic excavation of the two gates was completed in three campaigns (especially the first), 1/9–7/12/1947, 8/6–11/7/1948, 17/9–15/11/1948, under the direction of Bossert, Bahadır Alkım and Halet Çambel. These are reported in *Karatepe Kazıları/Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe* (1st preliminary report, Turkish and German; Ankara, 1950). The continuous series of campaigns since have been occupied by planning and restoration and have been reported only in short notices.

Publication. The bilingual was published in a preliminary form only. The final publication, Phoenician and Hieroglyphic, is provided by Halet Çambel, in *Karatepe-Aslantaş*.

Bossert's preliminary publication presented *Hu.* and *Ho.* as parallel texts divided into clauses, numbered I ff., and words, accompanied by *Phu.* and *Pho.* to demonstrate the word-for-word correspondence. The Hier. signs, accurately copied, were arranged in linear, word-by-word order running right-left: above, (1) *Hu.*, (2) *Phu.*, actual script and order reproduced, (3) *Phu.* transcribed into square script and rearranged in Hier. word order to show correspondences; below, (1) *Ho.* (fragmentary), (2) *Pho.* (fragmentary). Useful as a preliminary presentation demonstrating exactness of the bilingual rendering, this was inadequate because: (1) order of Hier. readings was not established beyond doubt – new reference to original text (where available) showed many cases of transcription in wrong order; (2) even clause division can be shown to be incorrect; (3) word-for-word identifications, when originally incorrect, served to perpetuate error (e.g. the negatives, words 108, 134; the word FRONS-la/i/u-//li-, = *bantili-*, “former, first”, words 136, 279).

Bossert's preliminary publication in this form, completed by Steinherr, appeared in eight sections, as follows:

- (1) *Hu.* §§ I,1–X,55: *Oriens* 1 (1948), pp. 171–173 (repeated *Belleten* 12 (1948), pls. CXI–CXII); *Ho.* §§ I–X, pp. 188–192.

- (2) §§ XI,56–XXIV,128: *Oriens* 2 (1949), pp. 91–97 (§§ I,1–XXIV,128 repeated *Karatepe Kazıları* (1950), pls. XXI–XXVI).
 (3) §§ I,1–XXXI,158: *Ar. Or.* 18/3 (1950), pp. 18–28.
 (4) §§ XXXII,159–XL,216: *JKF* 1 (1950/51), pp. 270–272.
 (5) §§ XLI,217–XLVII,260: *JKF* 2 (1952/53), pp. 178–179.
 (6) §§ XLVIII,261–LII,302: *JKF* 2 (1952/53), pp. 306–308.
 (7) §§ LIII,303–LVIII,330: *Gs Kretschmer* (1956), pp. 42–44.
 (8) §§ LIX,331–LXXIV,407: Steinherr, *MSS* 32 (1974), following p. 125.

In fact, Steinherr's word and clause divisions are in places demonstrably incorrect, which necessitates re-numbering: see below.

The Table opposite lists the individual elements of *Hu.* and *Ho.*, the clauses which each contain, and the published photographs.

This inadequate preliminary publication, on which scholars have been dependent for some 40 years, is superseded by Halet Çambel's final publication.

From some of these photographs, Meriggi made provisional drawings (*Manuale* II/1):

- Hu.* 1 (p. 70); *Hu.* 3 (p. 71); *Hu.* 10 (p. 86); *Hu.* 11 (p. 88); *Hu.* 12 (p. 88); *Hu.* 4, part (p. 92).

Editions. Phoenician: for a new edition, see now W. Röllig *apud* Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş* Appendix I, pp. 50–81 (hereafter Röllig, *Edition*).

Hieroglyphic: Bossert (followed by Steinherr) accompanied his eight section publication with translation and commentary (no transliteration):

- (1) translation, p. 170 (= *Belleten* 12, pp. 521 (Turkish), 529 f. (German)); commentary, pp. 174–187
 (2) translation, p. 90 f.; commentary, pp. 91–93, 96–117; Nachtrag, pp. 117–119
 (3) translation, p. 14 f.; commentary, pp. 29–42
 (4) translation, p. 269; commentary, pp. 273–290; Nachträge, pp. 290–295
 (5) translation, p. 169; commentary, pp. 181–182; Nachtrag, pp. 183–188
 (6) translation, p. 309; commentary, pp. 309–339
 (7) translation, p. 41; commentary, pp. 41, 45–51
 (8) commentary and translations, pp. 105–123

Meriggi's preliminary editions appeared as the text became available:

- (1) *Athenaeum* 29 (1951), pp. 52–59 (text, §§ I–XXXI, transliteration, translation bilingual), 59–91 (commentary).
 (2) *Acme* 4 (1951), pp. 185–187 (text, §§ XXXII–XL, transliteration, translation; Hier. text redrawn, reoriented left-right), 188–199 (commentary).

(continued, p. 48)

TABLE

Abbreviations

Akurgal, E., *The Art of the Hittites* (London, 1962).*Bell.* – *Bellefen*.Ceram, C. W., *Narrow Pass, Black Mountain* (London, 1956; German ed., *Enge Schlucht und schwarzer Berg* (Hamburg, 1955)).*KK* – H. T. Bossert *et al.*, *Karatepe Kazıları* (Ankara, 1950).Metzger, *Anatolia II* (London, 1969).Woolley, C. L., *History Unearthed* (London, 1956).

Hu., element	clauses	Ho., element	clauses	published photographs
(1) <i>orthostat</i>	I–III	(1) <i>lion</i> (fragmentary)	[II–III, V, VI, VII, VIII, X]	complete: <i>Bell.</i> 18, Abb. 1–3 complete: <i>Or.NS</i> 28, Tab. LV, Abb. 24
(2) <i>base</i>	IV–XI	(2) <i>orthostat</i>	XII–XXIX (missing: XIV 71– XV 76; XIX 96–100; XXIII 124–XXIV 125; XXX 147– 148)	only V 22–VII 40: <i>KK</i> , pl. XVIII 91; cf. <i>ibid.</i> , pl. XVII 84 complete: Ceram, pl. XLIV, cf. XXXIX (= Woolley, p. 148)
(3) <i>orthostat</i>	XII–XIX			complete: <i>Bell.</i> 18, Abb. 4–5
(4) <i>base</i>	XX–XXIV 125			only XX 106–XXI 111 and XXIV 125: <i>Bell.</i> 18, Abb. 6; cf. <i>Bell.</i> 12, lev. CXXXII res. 26; <i>KK</i> , pl. XVII 86
(5) 2 <i>orthostats</i>	XXIV 126–XL			only XXV 131, XXIX 146, XXXII 160–161, XXXIV 180–182, XXXVII 196–198: <i>Oriens</i> 1, pl. X; cf. <i>KK</i> , pl. XVII 84
		(3) <i>orthostat</i>	XXX 149–XXXII 161	complete: $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{Oriens} 1, pl. VI; cf.Ceram, pl. XLIV (= Woolley, p. 148);Bell. 12, lev. CXXXIIIres. 11 – RHA IX/50, p. 13, fig. 11$
(6) [<i>orthostat</i>	XLI–XLIII]			none
(7a) [<i>base</i>	XLIV–XLVII]			none
(7b) <i>base</i>	XLVIII–XLIX			none
		(4) [<i>orthostat</i>	XXXII 162–XLVII 260a?]	–
		(5) <i>base</i> (in situ)	XLVII 260b–XLVIII 272	none
		(6) 2 <i>orthostats</i>	XLIX 274b–LVIII 328 (missing: XLIX 273–274a; LIII 305–307)	complete: Ceram, pl. XLIV [†] , (cf. XXXIX), = Woolley, p. 148
(8) <i>lion</i>	L–LI 290			complete: <i>Bell.</i> 18, Abb. 7
(9) <i>orthostat(s)</i>	LI 291–LIV 309			complete: Akurgal, pl. 147; cf. Ceram, pl. XXXVIII
(10) <i>base</i>	LIV 310–LXXII 378			only LIX 331–LXXII 378: Akurgal, pls. 146–147; cf. Ceram, pl. XXXVIII (for LIV 310–LVIII 330, cf. <i>Bell.</i> 18, Abb. 7)
(11) <i>orthostat(s)</i>	LXXII 379– LXXIII*			complete: Akurgal, pls. 148–149; cf. Ceram, pl. XXXII
(12) <i>sphinx</i>	LXXIV–LXXV*			complete: Akurgal, pl. 144; cf. Ceram, pls. XLII–XLIII (also Metzger, ill. 20)
		(7) <i>lion</i> (fragmentary)	[LIX 331 ...] LXX 369– LXXV 410	complete: <i>Or.NS</i> 28, Tab. LV Abb. 25

† complete photograph only in German edition.

* renumbered from Steinherr: see below, p. 48.

- (3) *Studi ... Levi della Vida* II (1956), pp. 136–138 (text, §§ XLVIII–LII, transliteration, translation bilingually with Phoen., Hier. text redrawn, re-oriented left-right), also figs. 1, 2, 4 (drawings of elements *Hu.* 1, 3, 4 (partial), 11; *Ho.* scribal signature (see KARATEPE 4), after published photographs of Bossert and Ceram).
- (4) *Manuale* II/1 (1967), no. 24, pp. 72–89 (text, §§ I–LXXI bilingual transliteration, translation; Hier. text, §§ I–LVIII redrawn, reoriented left-right, §§ LIX–LXXI, drawn from Akurgal's photographs), 90–100 (commentary).

Güterbock, *Eranos* 47 (1949), pp. 93–115 (§§ I–X, transcription, transliterations, translation, commentary).

Gelb, *Bi. Or.* 7 (1950), pp. 129–141 (§§ I–X, transliteration, translation, commentary).

Laroche's treatment of the bilingual appears broken up into clauses throughout his *HH*:

§ II (7–9):	nos. 329.I.1; 363.I(e).
§ IV:	no. 178.2.
§ V (24–29):	no. 379.I.1; 447.1(b).
§ VII:	no. 255.1.
§ VIII:	nos. 70.1; 99.
§ IX:	no. 269(b).
§ X:	no. 272.
§ XI:	nos. 255.2; 329.I.6.
§ XII:	nos. 201.I; 329.I.1; 368.5.
§§ XIV–XV:	no. 390.1.
§ XVI:	no. 294.
§ XVIII (85–88):	nos. 17(a); 366.1.
§ XIX (95–97):	nos. 39.I.1; 231.
§ XX (102–106):	nos. 329.I.4; 368.1.
§ XXI:	no. 329.I.2.
§ XXII:	nos. 57.2; 65.1; 90.I.
§ XXIII:	no. 329.I.6.
§ XXIV:	nos. 165.I.2; 329.I.5.
§ XXV (129–131):	nos. 39.I.1; 274(a).
§ XXVI:	nos. 26.2; 274(a); 329.I.2.
§ XXVII:	nos. 14.I(a); 17(a); 329.I.1.
§ XXVIII:	no. 329.I.6.
§ XXIX:	nos. 57.1; 90.III.
§ XXX:	nos. 57.1 + 216.I.1.

§ XXXI:	no. 329.I.6.
§ XXXIII (172–176):	no. 329.I.1.
§ XXXIV:	nos. 93; 221.I; 329.I.4.
§ XXXV:	nos. 305; 329.I.6.
§ XXXVII:	no. 165.I.2.
§ XXXIX:	nos. 65.1; 172.4.
§ XL (209–213):	nos. 34.I(a); 329.I.6.
§ XLVIII (261–263):	no. 82.1.
(266–268):	no. 336.I(a).
§ L:	nos. 17(a); 70.2.
§ LII:	no. 200.1.
§ LVIII (324–328):	no. 309.2.

Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies have treated the bilingual in two places: *JRAS* 1975/2, pp. 124–133 (text §§ LIX–LXXV, transliteration, translation, commentary: note new clause division with modified numbering); *An. St.* 28 (1978), pp. 103–119 (commentary on main problems, translation of entire bilingual). These two are referred to jointly below as *Edition*. The renumbering of the final section corresponds to the editions of Steinherr and Meriggi as follows:

H & MD		S		M	
§ LIX	331–333	LIX	331–332	LIX	
§ LX	334–335	LX	333–335		
§ LXI	336–337	LXI	336–339		
§ LXII	338–339				
§ LXIII	340–345	LXII	340–344	LX	
§ LXIV	346–350	LXIII	345–349	LXI	
§ LXV	351–354	LXIV	350–352	LXII	
§ LXVI	355–359	LXV	353–356	LXIII	
§ LXVII	360–362	LXVI	357–359	LXIV	
§ LXVIII	363–365	LXVII	360–365	LXV	
§ LXIX	366–368				
§ LXX	369–372	LXVIII	366–369	LXVI	
§ LXXI	373–376	LXIX	370–373	LXVII	
§ LXXII	377–384	LXX	374–375	LXVIII	
		LXXI	376–381		
§ LXXIII	385–400	LXXII	382–395	LXIX	
§ LXXIV	401–407	LXXIII	396–402	LXX	
§ LXXV	408–412	LXXIV	403–407	LXXI	

Note: No account is taken here of J. Faucounau, *La Lecture du texte hiéroglyphique de Karatepe* (*Bulleten* 49 (1985), pp. 233–260), which employs an unacceptable method of transliteration.

Transliteration

Translation

(1)
§ I,
1–6

Hu. |EGO-*mi* ¹(LITUUS)*á-za-ti-i-wa/i-tà-sá* (DEUS)SOL-
mi-sá CAPUT-*tí-i-sá* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ta-sa*
SERVUS-*ta₄-sá*

I (am) Azatiwatas, the
Sun-blessed(?) man,
Tarhunzas's servant,

(1)

Ho. EGO [...
Phoen. 'nk 'ztwd b-brk b'l 'bd b'l

I (am) 'ZTWD the blessed of
Baal, the servant of Baal,

- § II,
7–11
- Hu. á-wa/i+ra/i-ku-sa-wa/i || REL-i-na MAGNUS+ra/i-
nu-wa/i-ta á-TANA-wa/i-ní-i-sá(URBS) REX-tí-sá
- Ho. [á-w]á/i+ra/i-[ku]-sa-wa/i [REL]-i-na [...-w]a/i-ta
á-TANA-[wa/i]-ní-[...](URBS) [REX]-tí-sa
- Phoen. ʾš ʾdr ʾwrk mlk dnnym
- whom Awarikus the Adan-
awean king promoted.
- whom ʾWRK the king of the
DNNYM promoted.
- § III,
12–17
- Hu. wa/i-mu-u (DEUS)TONITRUS-bu-za-sa á-TANA-
wa/i-||ia(URBS) MATER-na-tí-na tá-tí-ha i-zi-i-tá
- Ho. wá/i-mu [...]-za-sa [...
- Phoen. pʿln bʿl l-dnnym l-ʿb w-l-ʿm
- Tarhunzas made me
mother and father to
Adanawa,
- Baal made me as father and as
mother to the DNNYM.
- (2)
- § IV,
18–20
- Hu. |ARHA-ba-wa/i |la+ra/i+ a-nú-ha |á-TANA-wa/i-
na(URBS)
- Ho. [... ...](URBS)
- Phoen. yhw ʾnk ʾyt dnnym
- and I caused Adanawa
to prosper,
- I caused the DNNYM to live,
- § V,
21–29
- Hu. |“MANUS”(-)la-tara/i-ba-ba-wá/i |á-TANA-wá/i-za
(URBS) |“TERRA+X”(-)wá/i+ra/i-za |zi-na | (“OCCI-
DENS”)i-pa-mi |VERSUS-ia-na |zi-pa-wá/i (ORIENS)
ki-sà-ta-mi-i |VERSUS-na
- Ho. “MANUS”(-)la-tara/i-ba-ba-wà/i |á-TANA-wa/i-za
(URBS) TERRA+LA+LA(-)wá/i+ra/i-za zi-na
(“OCCIDENS”)i-pa-mi |VERSUS-|...
- Phoen. yrhb ʾnk ʾrš ʾmq ʾdn l-mmsʾ šms w-ʿd mb ʾy
- and I extended the Adanawa
plain on the one hand
towards the west and on
the other hand towards
the east,
- I extended the land of the plain
of ʾDN from the rising of
the sun even unto its setting,
- § VI,
30–37
- Hu. |á-mi-ia-za-há-wa/i (“DIES<>”)ba-lí-za |á-TANA-
wá/i-ia(URBS) |OMNIS+MI-ma | (“BONUS”)sa-na-
wa/i-ia | (“CORNU+RA/P”)su+ra/i-sa |LINGERE(-)
ba-sa-sa-ba |á-sá-ta
- Ho. [...]OMNIS-[MI]-ma BONUS-na-wá/i[...]
|LINGERE(-)ba-s[a-... -t]a
- Phoen. w-ken b-ynty kl nʿm l-dnnym w-šbʿ w-mnʿm
- and in my days there were
to Adanawa all good
things, plenty and luxury,
- and there were in my days
every good to the DNNYM
and plenty and luxury,
- § VII,
38–40
- Hu. | (“MANUS<>”)su-wá/i-ba-ba-wá/i |pa-há+ra/i-wa/i-ní-zi
(URBS) | (“<>*255”)ka-ru-na-zi
- Ho. [...]-ba+ra/i-wa/i-n[í-zi]i(URBS) (*255)ka-ru-na-zi
- Phoen. w-mlʾ ʾnk ʾqrt pʿr
- and I filled the Paharean
granaries,
- and I filled the granaries of
PʿR,
- § VIII,
41–44
- Hu. |EQUUS.ANIMAL-sù-ha-wa/i-ta (EQUUS.ANI-
MAL)á-sù-wa/i |SUPER+ra/i-ta |i-zi-i-ba
- Ho. (EQUUS.ANIMAL)á-[sù]-pa-wá/i-ta (EQUUS.
ANIMAL)á-sù-wá/i SUPER+ra/i-ta i-zi-i-ha
- Phoen. w-pʿl ʾnk ss ʿl ss
- and I made horse upon
horse,
- and I made horse upon horse,
- § IX,
45–48
- Hu. EXERCITUS-la/i/u-za-pa-wa/i-ta |EXERCITUS-
la/i/u-ní|SUPER+ra/i-ta |i-zi-i-há
- Ho. [...]-[lʿ][...]
- Phoen. w-mgn ʿl mgn
- and I made army upon
army,
- and shield upon shield,

§ X, 49 – 55	<p>Hu. (<<“SCUTUM”>>)hara/i-li-<i>pa-wa/i-ta</i> (<<“SCUTUM”>> hara/i-li SUPER + ra/i-ta i-zi-i-há < ...></p> <p>Ho. [...]-<i>pa-wá/i-t[a]</i> EXERCITUS-<i>la/i/u-ní-i</i> SUPER + ra/i-ta i-zi-i-ha OMNIS-<i>MI-ma-ζ[a]</i> (DEUS) TONITRUS-<i>bu-ta-tí</i> DEUS-<i>na-ri+i-ha</i></p>	and I made shield upon shield, ... all by Tarhunzas and the gods.
	Phoen. <i>w-mhnt 'l mhnt b- 'br b' l w- 'lm</i>	<i>and army upon army by the grace(?) of Baal and the gods.</i>
§ XI, 56 – 59	<p>Hu. REL-<i>pa-wá/i</i> (*255)<i>pá² + ra/i-ia-ní-zi</i> ARHA <i>ma-ki-sa-há</i> </p> <p>Ho. [...] (*“255”)<i>pá² + ra/i-[ia]-ní</i> [...]</p>	So I broke up the proud,
	Phoen. <i>w-šbrt mlsm</i>	<i>And I broke the proud,</i>
(3) § XII, 60 – 64 (2)	<p>Hu. (<<“MALUS₂”>>)hā-ní-<i>ia-ta-pa-wa/i-ta-</i>' REL-<i>ia</i> (TERRA)<i>ta-sà-REL + ra/i</i> <i>a-ta</i> <i>á-sá-ta</i></p> <p>Ho. (<<“MALUS₂”>>)hā-ní-<i>ia-ta-ia-pa-wa/i-ta</i> REL-<i>ia</i> (<<“TERRA + LA + LA”>>)<i>wa/i + ra/i-ri+i a-ta</i> <i>á-sa-ta-</i>'</p>	and the evils which were in the land,
§ XIII, 65 – 68	<p>Hu. <i>wá/i-ta</i> (TERRA)<i>ta-sà-REL + ra/i</i> <ri+i?> ARHA [*501][...]-<i>há</i></p> <p>Ho. <i>wa/i-ta</i> (“TERRA”) <i>ta-sà-REL + ra/i-ri+i</i> ARHA *501-<i>ha-há</i></p>	I [remov]ed out of the land.
	Phoen. <i>w-trq 'nk kl b-r' 'š kn b- 'rš</i>	<i>And I removed(?) all the evil which was in the land.</i>
§ XIV, 69 – 73	<p>Hu. <i>á-ma- ζa₄-há-wá/i-ta</i> DOMINUS-<i>ní-ζa</i> DOMUS- <i>na-ζa</i> (BONUS)<i>sa-na-wá/i</i> <i>u-sa-nú-há</i></p> <p>Ho. <i>á-ma-ζa-pa-wá/i-ta-</i>' DOMINUS-<i>ní-ζa</i> [...]</p>	And I blessed(?) my lord's house well,
	Phoen. <i>w-ytn 'nk bt 'dny b-n'm</i>	<i>and I established the house of my lord in good(ness),</i>
§ XV, 74 – 80	<p>Hu. <i>á-mi-há-wa/i</i> DOMINUS-<i>ní-i</i> (NEPOS)<i>ha-su-</i>' OMNIS-<i>MI-ma</i> (BONUS)<i>sa-na-wa/i-ia</i> CUM-<i>na</i> <i>i-zi-i-há</i></p> <p>Ho. [...] OMNIS-<i>MI-ma-ia</i> (<<“BONUS”>>)<i>sa-na-wá/i-ia</i> CUM-<i>ni i-zi-i-há</i></p>	and I did all good things for my lord's family,
	Phoen. <i>w-p' l 'nk l-šrš 'dny n'm</i>	<i>and I did good to the root of my lord,</i>
§ XVI, 81 – 84	<p>Hu. <i>á-pa-sá-há-wá/i-ta</i> <i>tá-ti-i</i> (<<“THRONUS”>>)<i>i-sà-</i> <i>tara/i-ti</i> (“SOLIUM”)<i>i-ζ-s[á-nu-wa/i-ha]</i></p> <p>Ho. <i>á-pa-sa-há-wa/i-ta-</i>' <i>tá-ti-i</i> (<<“THRONUS”>>)<i>i-sà-</i> <i>tara/i-ti-i</i> (<<“SOLIUM”>>)<i>i-sà-nu-wà/i-há-</i>' </p>	and I caused it/them to sit upon its/their father's throne.
	Phoen. <i>w-yšb 'nk 'l ks' 'by</i>	<i>and I caused it to sit on the throne of its father,</i>
§ XVII	[Hu.] (Ho. lacks this clause).	[...]
	Phoen. <i>w-št 'nk šlm 't kl mlk</i>	<i>and I established peace with every king,</i>

§ XVIII,
85–94

Hu. [... || ...] |*[i-zj]-i-[ta]* |*á-[mi]-ia-ti* |IUSTITIA-*na-ti*
|*á-mi-ia+ra/i-ha* | (“VAS”) *á-ta-na-sa-ma-ti* |*á-mi-ia+ra/i-há*
|| | (“BONUS”) *sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ti*

And every king made me
father to himself be-
cause of my *justice* and
my *wisdom* and my
goodness.

Ho. |OMNIS-*MI-sa-ha-wa/i-mu-ti-i* REX-*ti-sa* |*tá-ti-na*
|*i-zj-tà* |*á-mi-ti* |IUSTITIA-*na-ri+i* |*á-mi-ia+ra/i-há*
| (“VAS”) *-ta-na-sa-ma-ri+i* |*á-mi+ra/i-ha* | (“BONUS”)
sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ti

Phoen. *w-ᵑ b-ᵑbt ᵑln kl mlk b-ᵑdqy w-b-ᵑkmtj w-b-nᵑm lby*

and also every king made me
as father because of my
justice and my *wisdom* and
my goodness of heart.

§ XIX,
95–101

Hu. (“CASTRUM”) *ha+ra/i-ni-sà-pa-wá/i* |PUGNUS(-)
la/i/u-mi-tà-ia [AEDIFICARE]-*MI-ha* [...

Ho. *ha+ra/i-ni-[|| ...]* | (“FINES”) *i+ra/i-há-zᵑa*

Phoen. *w-bn ᵑnk ᵑmyt ᵑzt b-kl qᵑyt ᵑl ᵑblm*

And I built strong
fortresses [...

...]on the frontiers,

And I built strong walls in all
the limits on the frontiers,

(4)

§ XX,
102–107

Hu. (MALUS) *á-tu-wa/i-ri+i-zj-wa/i-ta* |CAPUT-*tí-zj*
|REL-*ta-na* |*a-ta* |*á-sa-tá* | (“*217?”) *u-sa-lí-[zj]*

Ho. |MALUS-*ta₄-zj-wá/i-ta-* |CAPUT-*tí-i-zj* |REL-*i-*
ta-na a-ta |*á-sa₄-ta* | (“*217”) *u-sà-lì-zj*

Phoen. *b-mqmm b-ᵑš kn ᵑšm rᵑm bᵑl ᵑgddm*

wherein were bad men,
robbers,

in places in which there were
bad men, masters of gangs,

§ XXI,
108–113

Hu. NEG₂-*wá/i* REL-*zj* |SUB-*na-na* PUGNUS. PUG-
NUS-*ta₄-ta* |*mu-ka-sa-sa-na* |DOMUS-*ní-i*

Ho. NEG₂-*wa/i* REL-*zj* |SUB-*na-na* |*tà-tà-ta mu-ka-sá-sá-na*
|| DOMUS-*ní-i*

Phoen. *ᵑš bl ᵑš ᵑbd kn l-bt mpᵑš*

who had not served(?)
under Muksas’s house,

none of whom had been servant
to the house of MPŠ,

§ XXII,
114–118

Hu. *á-mu-pa-wá/i-ma-tà* | (LITUUS) *á-zᵑa-ti-wa/i+ra/i-sá*
| (“PES”) *pa-tà-zᵑa* |SUB-*na-na* |PONERE-*há*

Ho. |*á-mu-pa-wa/i-ma-ara/i* (LITUUS) *á-zᵑa-ti-wa/i-tà-sá*
| (“PES”) *pa-tà-zᵑa* |SUB-*na-na* | (“PONERE”) -*há*

Phoen. *w-ᵑnk ᵑztwd ᵑšnm tᵑt ᵑᵑmy*

and I, Azatiwatas, put
them under my feet.

and I ’ZTWD put them
under my feet,

§ XXIII,
119–124

Hu. |REL-*pa-wá/i-ta* |LOCUS-*ta₄-ta-zᵑa-* |*á-pa-ta-zᵑa*
| (“CASTRUM”) *ha+ra/i-ni-sà* |*a-ta* |AEDIFICARE+
MI-ha

Ho. |REL-*i-pa-wa/i-ta* | (“LOCUS”) *-ta₄-ta-zᵑa* || <*á-pa-*
ta-zᵑa> (CASTRUM) *ha+ra/i-ni-i-sà a-ta* || [...]

Phoen. *w-bn ᵑnk ᵑmyt b-mqmm hmt*

So I built fortresses in
those places,

and I built walls in those
places,

§ XXIV,
125–128

Hu. |*á-TANA-wa/i-sa-wa/i* (URBS) || (5) |REL-*ti* | (BONUS)
wa/i+ra/i-ia-ma-la |SOLIUM-*MI-i*

Ho. [...] REL-*ti* | (BONUS) *wa/i+ra/i-ia-má-la*
|SOLIUM+*MI-i*

Phoen. *l-ᵑštnm dnnym b-nᵑt lbnm*

so that Adanawa might
dwell peacefully.

for the DNNYM to dwell in
peace of their heart.

- § XXV,
129 – 133
- Hu. |*274-ta-li-ha-há-wa/i “CASTRUM”-sà PUGNUS(-)
la/i/u-mi-tà-ia-’ || (“OCCIDENS”)i-pa-mi “VERSUS”-na
- Ho. |(*274)há-ta-li-há-há-wá/i (“CASTRUM”)ha+ra/i-ní-sà
|PUGNUS(-)la/i/u-mi-tà-ia (“SOL”)i-pa-mi-i |VERSUS-na
- Phoen. w-’n ’nk ’rst ’zt b-mb’ šmš
- And I smote strong
fortresses towards the
west,
- And I subdued strong lands in
the setting of the sun,
- § XXVI,
134 – 137
- Hu. |NEG₂-wa/i REL-ia (*274)ha-ta-la-i-ta |FRONS-li-zi
REX-ti-zi
- Ho. |NEG₂-wa/i |REL-ia |(*274)há-ta-||la-i-ta |FRONS-
la/i/u-zi REX-zi
- Phoen. ’š bl ’n kl b-mlkm
- which former kings had
not smitten,
- which none of the kings had
subdued,
- § XXVII,
138 – 141
- Hu. |á-mu || REL-zi |PRAE-na |á-sá-ta
- Ho. |á-mu-wa/i |REL-zi₄ |PRAE-na |á-sá-ta
- Phoen. ’š kn l-pny
- who were before me.
- who were before me.
- § XXVIII,
142 – 144
- Hu. |á-mu-pa-wa/i+ra/i (LITUUS)á-za-ti-wa/i+ra/i-sá
(*274)ha-ta-li-i-ha
- Ho. |REL-i-pa-wa/i-ara/i |á-mu (OCULUS)á-za-ti-wa/i-
tà-sá-’ (*274)ha-ta-li-há
- Phoen. w-’nk ’ztwd ’ntnm
- (So) I, Azatiwatas, smote
them,
- And I, ’ZTWD, smote them,
- § XXIX,
145 – 146
- Hu. INFRA-ta-ha-wa/i-ta || | (“PES”)u-sá-ha
- Ho. INFRA-ta-ha-wa/i-ta | (“PES”)u-sa-há-’ ||
- Phoen. yrđm ’nk
- and I brought them down,
- and I brought them down,
- § XXX,
147 – 152
- Hu. INFRA-ta-ha-wa/i-tà |(SOLIUM)i-sà-nú-há (DEUS)
ORIENS-mi VERSUS-na á-mi-ia-za-ta (FINES)
i+ra/i-há-za ||
- (3)
- Ho. [...] (DEUS)ORIENS-mi VERSUS-na
|á-mi-za-ta | (“FINES”)i+ra/i-ha-za
- Phoen. yšbm ’nk b-qšt gbly b-mš’ šmš
- and I settled them down
towards the east on my
frontiers,
- I settled them in the limits of
my frontiers in the rising of
the sun,
- § XXXI,
153 – 158
- Hu. REL-pa-wa/i |á-TANA-wa/i-ní-zi(URBS) |zi-tà
|á-pa-ti-i INFRA-ta |(SOLIUM)i-sà-nú-wa/i-ha
- Ho. REL-pa-wa/i |á-TANA-wa/i-ní-zi(URBS)«-pa-wa/i»
|zi-tà |a-pa-ri+i <INFRA-ta> (SOLIUM)i-sà-nu-há
- Phoen. w-dnny m yšbt šm
- and so I settled Adana-
weans down ... there.
- and I settled DNNYM there.
- § XXXII,
159 – 170
- Hu. |a-wa/i á-mi-za | (“DIES”)ha-li-ia-za || |á-TANA-
wa/i-ní-zi(URBS) FINES+hi-zi “MANUS”(-)
la-tara/i-ha |zi-na | “OCCIDENS”-pa-mi |VERSUS-
ia-na |zi-pa-wa/i “ORIENS”-ta-mi VERSUS-na
- Ho. |a-wá/i |á-mi-ia-za | (“DIES”)ha-li-ia-za || [...]
- Phoen. w-ken b-ynty b-kl gbl ’mq ’dn lmmš’ šmš w-’d mb’y
- In my days I extended the
Adanawean frontiers on
the one hand towards
the west and on the other
hand towards the east,
- And they were in my days on
all frontiers of the plain of
’DN from the rising of the
sun even unto its setting,

- § XXXIII, 171–176
Hu. |á-pa-ta-za-pa-||wa/i-ta |?“LOCUS”-ta₄-ta-za «-ha-pa-wa/i» |REL-ta HWT-sà-ta rú-wa/i-na |á-sa-ta
and even in those places which were formerly feared,
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-b-mqmm š ken l-pnm nšt^cm
and in the places which were formerly feared,
- § XXXIV, 177–181
Hu. CAPUT-ti-sa-wa/i+ra/i REL-i-ta-na HWT-sà-i-ia ||
“VIA”-wa/i-na (“PES₂”)i-u-na
where a man fears them (for) the road to go (it),
Ho. [-]
Phoen. š yšt^c dm l-let drk
where a man fears to walk the road,
- § XXXV, 182–187
Hu. REL-pa-wa/i- mi-ia-za (“DIES”)há-li-ia-za |FEM-INA-ti-zi-há “FUSUS”(-)si-tara/i<-?> PES₂. PES₂(-)-tā-ti
so in my days even women walk with spindles.
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-bynty nk št tk(?) lhdy dl plkm b-br b’l w-’lm
in my own days a woman walks(?) alone(?) with spindles, by the grace of Baal and the gods.
- § XXXVI, 188–195
Hu. a-wa/i á-mi-ia-za || (DIES)há-li-ia-za (CORNU+RA/I) su+ra/i-sá |LINGERE(-)há-sá-sá-ha sa-na-wa/i-za-sa-ha |SOLIUM-MI-ia-sa |sá-ta
In my days there was plenty and luxury and good living,
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-ken b-kl ynty šb^c w-mn^cm w-šbt n^cmt
And there was in all my days plenty and luxury and good living,
- § XXXVII, 196–200
Hu. |BONUS+RA/I-ia-ma-la-ha-wa/i SOLIUM-MI-ta |á-TANA-wa/i-sá(URBS) || |á-ta-na-wa/i-za-ha(URBS) |TERRA+LA+LA-za
and peacefully dwelt Adanawa and the Adanawa plain.
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-nht lb l-dnnyw w-l-kl ‘mq dn
and peace of heart to the DNNYM and to all the plain of DN.
- § XXXVIII, 201–204
Hu. |a-wa/i za “CASTRUM”-zá AEDIFICARE+MI-ha
I built this fortress,
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-bn nk b-qrt z
And I built this city,
- § XXXIX, 205–208
Hu. wa/i-tu-ta (LITUUS)á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-ia-na(URBS) |á-ta₄||ma-za PONERE-ha
and to it I put the name Azatiwataya.
Ho. [-]
Phoen. w-št nk šm ztwdy
and I established its name ZTWDY,
- § XL, 209–216
Hu. REL-pa-wa/i-mu POST-na |(DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-za-sá (DEUS)CERVUS₂-za-sá-há |sá-ta za-ti “CASTRUM”-si AEDIFICARE-MI-na
So Tarhunzas and Runzas were after me for this fortress to build (it).
Ho. [-]
Phoen. k-b’l w-ršp sprm šlhñ l-bnt
since Baal and Rešep-of-the-goats sent me to build it.

§§ XLI–XLVII: missing in Ho., fragmentary in Hu. (word numbering estimated from Phoen.).

(6)

§ XLI	Hu.	[...]-tā [AEDIFI]CARE- <i>MI-ha</i> [...]-ta[...]	[and] I built it [by Tarhun]za[s ...
	Ho.	[–]	
	Phoen.	<i>w-bny 'nk b-'br b'l w-b-'br ršp špr m b-šb' w-b-mn'm w- b-šbt n'mt w-b-nht lb</i>	<i>and I built it by the grace of Baal and by the grace of Rešeph-of-the-goats, in plenty and in luxury and in good living and in peace of heart,</i>

§§ XLII–XLIII: no fragments of Hu. or Ho. identified

	Phoen.	<i>l-kny mšmr l-'mq 'dn w-l-bt mpš</i>	<i>for it to be a protection for the plain of 'DN and for the house of MPŠ,</i>
		<i>k b-ynty kn l-'rš 'mq 'dn šb' w-mn'm</i>	<i>since in my days there was plenty and luxury to the land of the plain of 'DN.</i>

(7 a)

§ XLIV	Hu.	[...]x[...]i-zi-i[...] á-mi-[ia-za] ("DIES") <i>ha-li-[ia]-z[a]</i>	[...] ... [in] my day[s].
	Ho.	[–]	
	Phoen.	<i>w-bl kn mtm l-dnny m ll b-ynty</i>	<i>And there was not ever in my days night(?) for the DNNYM.</i>

§ XLV

	Hu.	z[a-pa/ha-wa/i]-' <>"CASTRUM"-sā-z[á] AEDIFICARE- <i>M[l]-ha</i>	And I built this(?) fortress,
	Ho.	[–]	
	Phoen.	<i>w-bn 'nk b-qrt z</i>	<i>And I built this city,</i>

§ XLVI: not in Hu.; Ho missing

	Phoen.	<i>št 'nk šm 'ztwdy</i>	<i>I established its name 'ZTWDY,</i>
--	--------	-------------------------	---

§ XLVII

	Hu.	<i>wa/i-t[a...] z[a...]</i> (DEUS)TONI[TRUS ...] <i>a-ta (SOLIUM) i-s[ā]-nú-ha</i>	and therein I caused to dwell ... Tarhunzas,
--	-----	---	---

(5)

	Ho.	[...]-sā-nú-há	
	Phoen.	<i>yšb 'nk bn b'l krntryš</i>	<i>I caused to dwell in it Baal KRNTRYŠ,</i>

(7 b)

§ XLVIII,
261 – 272

	Hu.	<i>wa/i-na i-zi-sa-tu-na ta-ia</i> ("FLUMEN") <i>há-pa+</i> <i>ra/i-sá OMNIS-<i>MI-i-sá</i> (ANNUS)u-si pá² + ra/i</i> <i>BOS.ANIMAL-sá (*486)REL-tu-na-ha (OVIS.</i> <i>ANIMAL)há-wa/i-sá "VITIS"(-)há+ ra/i-ha OVIS.</i> <i>ANIMAL-wa/i-sa</i>	and every river-land will begin to honour him: by(?) the year an ox, and at the cutting(?) a sheep and at the vintage a sheep.
	Ho.	<i>wá/i-na i-zi-i-sa-tú-na CRUS-ia FLUMEN-<i>pari-i-sá</i></i> <i> OMNIS-<i>MI-i-sá</i> ("ANNUS")u-si ("ANNUS")</i> <i>pá² + ra/i-i (BOS.ANIMAL)wa/i-wa/i-sa ("*486")</i> <i>REL-tú-na-ha ("OVIS.ANIMAL")há-wa/i-sá "VITIS"(-)</i> <i>há< + ra/i>-wá/i (OVIS.ANIMAL)há-wá/i-i-sá</i>	
	Phoen.	<i>w-ylk zbh l kl b-mskt zbh ymm 'lp 1</i> <i>w-b[-'t h]rš š 1 w-b-'t qsr š 1</i>	<i>and all the MSKT shall make come a sacrifice to (him): an annual sacrifice one ox, and at the time of the ploughing one sheep, and at the time of the reaping one sheep.</i>

§ XLIX,
273–277
(6)

Hu. *wa/i-ta u-sa-nú-wa/i-tu-u* (LITUUS) *á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-na*
sa-pi-sá-ta₃-ri+i |ba-tà+ra/i-ti-i-há

Let him bless Azatiwatas
with health and life,

Ho. [*wa/i-ta u-sa-nu*]-*wá/i-ti-u* (OCULUS) *á-za₄-ti-wá/i-*
tà-na |sá-pi-sa-ara/i-ri+i ha-IUDEX+RA/I-ri+i-há

Phoen. *w-brk b'l kr[n]tryš 'yt 'zřwd h ym w-šlm*

And may Baal KRNTRYŠ
bless 'ZTWD with life and
health,

(8)
§ L,
278–282

Hu. SUPER+*ra/i-li-há-wa/i-sá |FRONS-la/i/u-sá*
i-zi-ia+ra/i-ru |OMNIS-MI-ma-za REX-ta-za

and let him be made
highly preeminent over
all kings.

Ho. |SUPER+*ra/i-li-ha-wa/i-sá |FRONS-li-i-sá i-zi-ia-rú*
|OMNIS-MI-ni-i-ma-za₄ |REX-tá-za

Phoen. *w- 'z 'dr 'l kl mlk*

and strength exceeding over
every king,

§ LI,
283–296

Hu. *pi-ia-tu-há-wa/i-tu-u* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sá*
ARHA u-sa-nú-wa/i-mi-sá za-si-há-wa/i |(“CASTRUM”)
há<+ra/i>-na-sá-si DEUS-ni-zi (LITUUS) *á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-ia*
|| (9) “LONGUS”-*ta₃-ia* (DIES) *há-li-ia mi-ia-ti-zi-ha* ||
(ANNUS) *u-si-zi sa-na-wa/i-sá-ha-wa/i | tá-mi-bi-sá*

And may Tarhunzas the
highly blessed and this
fortress's gods give to
him, to Azatiwatas,
long days and many
years and good
abundance,

Ho. |*pi-ia-tù-há-wa/i-tu₄-u* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu_x-za₄-sa*
|*ARHA |(BONUS)u-sa-nú-wá/i-mi-sá za-i¹-si-i-há-wá/i ||*
(“CASTRUM”) *há+ra/i-ni-sà-si |DEUS-šA₄-zi*
¹(OCULUS) *á-za-ti-wá/i-tà-ia* (“LONGUS”) *a+ra/i-ia*
| (“DIES”) *há-li-ia |mi-ia-ti-zi₄-há | ANNUS-si-zi*
|(BONUS) *sa-na-wà/i-sa-há-wá/i | tá-mi-bi-sá*

Phoen. *l-tty b'l krntryš w-kl 'ln qrt l- 'zřwd 'rk ymm w-rb*
šnt w-rš 't n 'mt

so that Baal KRNTRYŠ
and all the gods of the city
give to 'ZTWD length of
days and multitude of years
and good abundance,

§ LII,
297–302

Hu. |*pi-ia-tu-há-wa/i-tu* OMNIS-MI-ma-za || <*pihas-sa*
tanimanza> REX-za SUPER+*ra/i-ta*

and let them give him all
victory over all kings.

Ho. *pi-ia-tù-há-wá/i-tú* OMNIS-MI-ma-za-’ “FULGUR”-
há-sá OMNIS-MI-za |REX-ta-za SUPER+*ra/i-ta*

Phoen. *w- 'z 'dr 'l kl mlk*

and strength exceeding over
every king.

§ LIII,
303–308

Hu. REL-*pa-wa/i za* (“CASTRUM”) *há+ra/i-ni-sà-||za*
i-zi-ia-ru (DEUS)BONUS-*sa* (DEUS)VITIS-*sá-há*

And so let this fortress
become (one) of the
Grain-God and the
Wine-God,

Ho. |REL-*i-pa-wà/i |za-'* [...] [...] (DEUS)VITIS-*ti-ti-há*

Phoen. *w-ken b-qrt z b'lt šb' w-trš*

And may this city be mistress
of grain and wine,

§ LIV,
309–313

Hu. REL-*pa-wa/i-ta* || (10)|REGIO-*ni-ia* REL-*ia a-ta*
|SOLIUM+MI-*sá-i*

and so the nations that
dwell in (it),

Ho. |REL-*pa-wá/i-ta* REGIO-*ia* <REL-*ia*> *a-ta*
|(SOLIUM)*i-sà-nú-wa/i-ti*

and so the nations <that>
he/they shall cause to
dwell in (it),

Phoen. *w- 'm z 'š yšb bn*

and this people that dwells in
it,

§ LV, 314 – 319	Hu. <i>wa/i-tà i-zi-ia-rú</i> OVIS.ANIMAL- <i>wa/i-si</i> BOS. ANIMAL- <i>wa/i-si</i> (DEUS)BONUS- <i>si</i> (DEUS)VITIS- <i>ia-si-há</i>	let them become (those) of sheep, oxen, the Grain-God and the Wine-God !
	Ho. <i> wá/i-tà i-zi-ia-rú </i> OVIS.ANIMAL- <i>wa/i-si</i> BOS. ANIMAL- <i>si</i> (DEUS)BONUS- <i>sa</i> (DEUS)“VITIS”- <i>ia-si-há</i>	
	Phoen. <i>ykn b`l `lpm w-b`l š`n w-b`l šb` w-trš</i>	<i>shall be masters of oxen and masters of sheep and masters of grain and wine.</i>
§ LVI, 320 – 321	Hu. <i> ma-wa/i-za ha-sá-tu`</i>	Much let them beget for us,
	Ho. <i> ma-wá/i-za ha-sa-tù</i>	
	Phoen. <i>w-brbm yld</i>	<i>And by many they shall beget,</i>
§ LVII, 322 – 323	Hu. <i>ma-pa-wa/i</i> MAGNUS + <i>ra/i-nú-wa/i-tu`</i>	and much let them make great,
	Ho. <i> ma-pa-wá/i</i> MAGNUS + <i>ra/i-nú-wa/i-tu</i>	
	Phoen. <i>w-brbm y`dr</i>	<i>and by many they shall be mighty,</i>
§ LVIII, 324 – 330	Hu. <i>ma-pa-wa/i</i> (CRUX) <i>pa+ra/i-na-wa/i-tu-u</i> (LITUUS) <i>á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-ia mu-ka-sa-sá-há`</i> DOMUS- <i>ní-i</i> (DEUS) TONITRUS- <i>hu-ta-[ti]</i> DEUS- <i>na-ti-há</i>	and much let them be in service to Azatiwatas and to Muksas’s house by Tarhunzas and the gods !
	Ho. <i> ma-pa-wá/i</i> (“DOMUS.CRUX”) <i>pa+ra/i-na-wa/i-tu₄</i> (OCULUS) <i>á-za-ti-wá/i+ra/i-ia mu-ka-sá-sa-há</i> <i> </i> (DOMUS) <i>pa+ra/i-ní </i> [...]	
	Phoen. <i>w-brbm y`bd l`zřwd w-lbt mpš b.`br b`l w`lm</i>	<i>and by many they shall be servant to `ZTWD and to the house of MPŠ by the grace of Baal and the gods !</i>
§ LIX, 331 – 333	Hu. REX- <i>ta-ti-i-pa-wa/i</i> REL + <i>ra/i</i> REL- <i>sa-há </i>	If anyone from (among) kings,
	Ho. [-]	
	Phoen. <i>w`m mlk b-mlkm</i>	<i>If (there is) a king among kings,</i>
§ LX, 334 – 335	Hu. <i>ní-pa-wa/i-sa</i> ¹ CAPUT- <i>tí-sá</i>	or (if) he (is) a man (prince),
	Ho. [-]	
	Phoen. <i>w-rřn b-rřnm</i>	<i>or a prince among princes,</i>
§ LXI, 336 – 337	Hu. ¹ CAPUT- <i>tí-ia-za-ha-wa/i-tu-ta á-ta₄-ma-za</i>	and to him (there is) a manly (princely) name,
	Ho. [-]	
	Phoen. <i>`m `dm `š `dm šm</i>	<i>if (there is) a man, who (is) a man of name,</i>
§ LXII, 338 – 339	Hu. <i> za á-sa₅-za-ia</i>	proclaims this:
	Ho. [-]	
	(Phoen. : nothing corresponding)	(-)

- § LXIII, 340–345
(7)
- Hu. *ARHA-wa/i-ta* “*69”(-)*i-ti-wa/i* || (LITUUS)
á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sá á-ta₅-ma-za PORTA-*la-na-ri+i* *zi-na*
- Ho. [...] |*á-ta₄-ma-za₄* “PORTA”-*na* *zi-na*
Phoen. *š ymh šm ʔtwd b-š^c r z*
- § LXIV, 346–350
- Hu. *wa/i-mu-ta* || *á-ma-za á-ta₄-ma-za a-ta tu-pi-wa/i*
- Ho. [-]
Phoen. *w-št šm*
- § LXV, 351–354
- Hu. *ni-pa-wa/i-sá* (VAS)*á-la/i/u-na-za-ia* “CASTRUM”^{<’>}-
ní-si za-ti ||
- Ho. [...]-*za-ia* | “CASTRUM”-*si* [...]
Phoen. *ʔm ʔp yhmd ʔt b-qrt z*
- § LXVI, 355–359
- Hu. *wa/i-ta a-ta* AEDIFICARE+*MI-i* “PORTA”-*la-na*
za-ia
- Ho. [-]
Phoen. *w-ys^c b-š^c r z*
- § LXVII, 360–362
- Hu. (LITUUS)*á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sa* REL-*ia* *i-zi-ta₅*
- Ho. [-]
Phoen. *š p^c l ʔtwd*
- § LXVIII, 363–365
- Hu. |*a-wa/i za-ri+i* |*á-sa₅-za-ia*
- Ho. [...]-*ti-ʔ* [...]
(Phoen. : nothing corresponding)
- § LXIX, 366–368
- Hu. *wa/i+ra/i-la-ia-wa/i* “PORTA”-*la-na* *i-zi-i-wa/i*
- Ho. [...]-*ia*-[...]-*na* [...]-*wa/i*
Phoen. *w-yp^c l l-š^c r z*
- § LXX, 369–372
- Hu. |*á-ma-za* <*a*>-*há-wa/i-mu-ta á-ta₄-ma-za-ʔ* *a-ta tu-*
pi-wa/i
- Ho. [... *a-t*] *a* [*tu*]-*pi-wa/i*
Phoen. *w-št šm ʔly*
- § LXXI, 373–376
- Hu. *ní-wa/i-ta* (“VAS”)*á-la/i/u-na-ma-ti a-ta* AEDI-
FICARE-*MI-ri+i-i* ||
- Ho. [*ní-w*]*a/i-ta á-[la/i/u-na]-[má-ti]* [...]-*MI-ti-i*
Phoen. *ʔm b-hmdt ys^c*
- § LXXII, 377–378
(11)
- a. Hu. *ní-pa-wa/i* MALUS-*ta₄-sa-tara/i-ri+i* ||
- Ho. *ní-pa-wa/i* || |MALUS-*ta₄-sá-tara/i-ri+i*
Phoen. *ʔm b-šⁿ t*
- b. Hu. *ní-i-pa-wa/i* (MALUS₂)*ba-ní-ia-ta-sa-tara/i-ti a-ta*
|AEDIFICARE+*MI¹-ri+i* |*za-ia* “PORTA”-*la-na*
- Ho. [... *b*]*a*-[...]-*s*[*á*-...] *a²-[ta]* |AEDIFICARE+*MI-*
[*ri+i*] |*za-ia* | “PORTA”-*la-na*
- Phoen. *w-b-r^c ys^c b-š^c r z*
- “I shall delete Azatiwa-
tas’s name from the
gate(s) here,

who shall delete the name of
ʔZTWD on this gate,

and I shall incise my
name”;

and put his name,

or (if) he is *covetous* to-
wards this fortress,

if also he shall covet this city,

and blocks up(?) these
gates,

and tear out this gate,

which Azatiwatas made,

which ʔZTWD made,

and proclaims thus:

(-)

“I shall make the gates my
own,

and shall make (it) into a
gate of a stranger,

and I shall incise my
name for myself”;

and put his name upon it,

or (if) from covetousness
he shall block them
up(?),

if from covetousness he shall
tear (it) out,

or from badness

if from hatred

or from evil he shall
block up(?) these gates,

and from evil he shall tear out
this gate,

- § LXXIII,
385 – 400
- Hu. *wa/i-ta* || *ARHA* |MANUS(-)*i-ti-tu* CAELUM
(DEUS)TONITRUS-*bu-za-sá* CAELUM(DEUS)SOL-
za-sá (DEUS)*i-ia-sá* OMNIS-*MI-zi-ba* DEUS-*ní-zi*
á-pa |REX-*hi-sá* |*á-pa-há* “REX”-*na* |*á-pa-há-wa/i*
|CAPUT-*ti-na*
- Ho. |*wa/i-ta* |*ARHA* |“*69”(-)*i-ti-tu* (DEUS)*i-ia-sá*
|“CAELUM” (DEUS)TONITRUS-*bu-za-sá-* |“CAE-
LUM” (DEUS)SOL-|*za*-*sá* |OMNIS-*MI-zi-bá-wa/i*
DEUS-*ní-zi* |*á-pa-sá* REX-*ta-hi-sa* |*á-pa-há-* |REX-*ti-na*
|*á-pa-há-wa/i* CAPUT-*ti-na*
- Phoen. *w-mḥ b’l šmm w-’l qn ’rṣ w-šmš ’lm w-kl dr bn*
’lm ’yt b-mmlkt b’ w-’yt b-mlk b’ w-’yt ’dm b’ ’š ’dm šm
- may celestial Tarhunzas,
the celestial Sun, Ea
and all the gods delete
that kingdom and that
king and that man !
- then may Baal ŠMM and
El QN ’RṢ and the
eternal Sun and and all the
assembly of the sons of gods
delete that kingdom and that
king and that man who (is)
a man of name !
- (12)
§ LXXIV,
401 – 407
- Hu. POST-*na-wa/i* *ARHA*²¹ (“CRUS^{<’>})*ta-za-tu* |*ara/i-zi*
OMNIS-*MI-zi* (OCULUS)*á-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sa* |*á-ta₅-ma-za*
- Ho. POST-*na-ba-wa/i* *ara/i-zi*-*i* |OMNIS-*MI-zi*
|CRUS[...?]-*tu* [...
- Phoen. *’ps šm ’zṯwd ykn l-’lm*
- Hereafter may Azatiwa-
tas’s name continue to
stand for all ages,
- But the name of ’ZṲWD
shall be for eternity,
- § LXXV,
408 – 412
- Hu. (DEUS)LUNA + *MI-sa-wa/i* (DEUS)SOL-*ba*
REL-*ri+i á-ta₄-ma-za* “CRUS”-*i*
- Ho. [-]
- Phoen. *km šm šmš w-yrh*
- as the Moon’s and the
Sun’s name stands.
- like the name of the Sun and
Moon.

Commentary

§ I, 2. *Azatiwatas*: Hier. spelling certain since establishment of *za* for *ī* and demonstration of logographic use of LITUUS (Hawkins, *Kadmos* 19 (1980), p. 124 f.). Thus Hier. establishes vocalization of Phoen. consonantal outline as *Azatiwada*, and the rhotacizing Hier. variant *Azatiwaras* confirms the voiced character of the final dental (see A. Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 96 (1982/83), p. 250).

3–4. (DEUS)SOL-*mi-sá* CAPUT-*ti-i-sá*: epithet now well attested – KARKAMIŠ A5a, § 1; A18b, § 1; A21, § 2; BOYBEYPINARI 2, § 5; HİSARCIK 1, § 1; KULULU 2, § 1; KULULU 4, §§ 1,2; KULULU 5, § 3 (*ti-wa/i+ra/i-mi*, only full phonetic writing). SOL-*wa/i+ra/i-mi-sá* also occurs as personal name (CEKKE, § 17 i). The inexact Phoen. equivalent *b-brk b’l* should now be accepted as “blessed of Baal”, in spite of early syntactical doubts: see Lemaire, *Semitica* 27 (1977), p. 38 f. On question of original form (*tiwatami-/tiwatimi-(?)*) see KULULU 2, § 1, Commentary.

6. SERVUS-*ta₄-sá*: clearly identified by Phoen. equivalent *’bd*, “servant”, but the reading remains problem-

atic, since it is uncertain whether the first sign is a logogram or syllabogram. Sole evidence for a syllabographic value for SERVUS (*HH* no. 387) comes from KARATEPE, 293, Hu. *mi-* = Ho. *387- (thus *mi*), a very flimsy basis for reading. Another but obscure example of possibly syllabographic usage appears to be ŞIRZI, § 4 (*356(-)*sa*(-)*387-*wa/i-sá*); otherwise the only attested use is in the writing of the present word “servant”. Bossert adopted the dubious syllabic value *mi* and identified the word (which is also used as a personal name – BABYLON 2, § 1) with the Phrygian name *Midas*: see *JKF* 2 (1953), p. 328. The connections are tenuous, and it seems more prudent to treat the sign as logogram (SERVUS) until clearer evidence is forthcoming. [Note. The new Boğazköy bulla Bo. 90/316 confirms that the sign SERVUS is a logogram in the Empire Period: see Neve, *Antike Welt*, 1992 Sondernummer, p. 60 Abb. 162, top row, second from left. See also SUVASA, C, and KULULU 8, and Commentaries for Late examples. We may well accept Güterbock’s proposed explanation of the logogram as “man’s man” (*Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977), p. 15 n. 41)].

The stem of the word also shows peculiarities: it is always written with *-ta₄/ta₅-*, sometimes without further complement(s) (CEKKE, § 1, and Commentary, with other examples); sometimes with *-i-* (see ALEPPO 2, § 1, with other examples); but more usually with direct addition of case-endings, as here.

§ III, 15. MATER-*na-ti-na*: meaning of logogram established by Phoen. *m*, “mother”, as well as context “mother and father” (cf. KARKAMIŠ A5a, § 5?). Same logogram is used for “woman”, thus FEMINA, so Hier. fails to distinguish in the manner of Cun. AMA/SAL. The ambiguity is compounded by the phon. complements, in both cases *-(na)ti-*, both words being *-n-* stems with *-(a)ti-* suffix, representing respectively *anati-*, “mother”, and *wanati-*, “woman”: see Hawkins, *An. St.* 20 (1970), p. 80 f.; Starke, *KZ* 94 (1980), p. 74 ff. For a possible full phonetic writing of “mother”, *á-na-ia* (dat. sing.), see KULULU lead strip 1, § 9 entry 60, element 4, and Commentary.

§ IV, 19. *la+ra/i+a-nú-*: for interpretation of first sign as transliterated, and association of verb with simple *la+ra/i-//la-tà-*, see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *An. St.* 28 (1978), pp. 104–106, where the stem was tentatively associated with Hitt. *lazziya(hh)-*, “be (make) good, prosper” (for which see *CHD*, s.v.).

§§ III–IV, 14–20. Ho. between words 13 ([*Tarhun*]*zas*, lion rump, l. 1) and 21 (“MANUS”*(-)**la-tara/i-ha-ha-wà/i*, lion rump, l. 2) shows only [...]URBS, with no apparent space for intervening words. In fact the scribe/mason’s eye seems to have jumped from 14 (*Atanawaya*(URBS)) to 20 (*Atanawan*(URBS)), omitting words 15–19; cf. a similar haplography on Hu. 298–300.

§ V, 21. “MANUS”*(-)**la-tara/i-*: cf. TERRA*(-)**la-tara/i-*, probably the same verb, IZGIN 2, § 3.

23. Hu. “TERRA+X” (Ho. TERRA+*LA+LA*)*(-)**wá/i+ra/i-za*: associate with Hier. forms (TERRA+*LA+LA*)*wa/i-li-li-tà-* (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 8) // (TERRA+*LA+LA*)*wa/i-li-ri+i-tà-* (ANDAVAL, § 3) (see *Edition*, p. 106); and with Hitt.-Luw. *ulili-*, “field” (see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Kaniššumar*, p. 73 f.). Cf. further KARATEPE, 62 (Ho.), 200. The present form is shorter than the parallels: a restoration *wá/i+ra/i<-ri+i>-* (both Hu. and Ho.) would bring it into line, but alternatively it could be considered a haplographic writing. The form of the logogram “TERRA+X” is to be regarded as an archaism, an attempt to reproduce the Empire Period form of TERRA/LOCUS as seen on e.g. EMİRGAZI, YALBURT, BOĞAZKÖY-SÜDBURG, and KARAHÖYÜK (all relief). For probably genuinely archaic incised forms, see KARADAĞ 1, § 1 (and Commentary), with BURUNKAYA, § 1. For another possible example of the archaizing use of this form, see KARKAMIŠ A21, § 8, and Commentary.

22. *á-TANA-wa/i-za*: ethnic adj., either *atanawi+ya* (adj. suffix) + *an* (nom./acc.sing. N) + *sa* (particle), or *atanawi+za* (adj. suffix, cf. *Karkamisiza-* etc. – but what would have become of nom./acc. sing. N ending?); see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 106.

24 ..., 27. *zi-na ... zi-pa-wá/i-*: clearly paired deictic elements *zin ... zin ...*, “here ..., here ...”; “on the one hand ..., on the other ...” (no Phoen. correspondence); recurs in same context, below, 165 ..., 168; also KARKAMIŠ A6, §§ 4–6, and 30; KARKAMIŠ A15b, §§ 8–9, and similar context KARKAMIŠ A24, frags.19+19a; it also occurs singly, below, § LXIII, 345; and İSKENDERUN, § 4; SULTANHAN, § 12; and perhaps paired with *pi[n]*, IZGIN 2, §§ 4–5. For the parallel deictic element *pin*, see KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 11, and Commentary.

Hier. “west-east” = Phoen. “east-west”, so also § XXXII below; correct equivalences are given in § XXV, “west”, § XXX, “east”. The Hier. words seem to be participles of verb stems *ipa-* (“west”) and *kista-* (“east”), not otherwise identified.

§ VI, 31, 33. (“DIES”) *ba-li-za*, OMNIS+*MI-ma*: for identification of *li* and *ma* in these words, see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, pp. 103, 106.

36. LINGERE*(-)**ba-sa-sa*, also below, 192, = Phoen. *mn'm*, “luxury”: cf. LINGERE*(-)**ba-sa-ti*, abl. sing., KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 11; A23, § 6.

§ VII, 40. (*255) *ka-ru-na-zi*, = Phoen. *grt*: word to be interpreted less from the problematic Phoen. *hapax legomenon* than from contexts of the several Hier. attestations – here, also İSKENDERUN, § 3; HAMA 8, § 2; KARKAMIŠ A30b, § 1, MARAŞ 8, § 7; see Commentaries there. In the last two attestations the word is object of the verb *suwa-*, “fill”. HAMA 8 and MARAŞ 8 have variant spellings, *-lu-* for *-ru-*, while KARKAMIŠ A30b is uncertain. [See also now TELL AHMAR 5, § 2].

§ IX, 45–46. EXERCITUS-*la/i/u-za* EXERCITUS-*la/i/u-ni(-i)*: identification Hier. EXERCITUS = Cun. *ku-la-na-* established by Poetto, *Kadmos* 21 (1982), pp. 101–103, thereby re-establishing Cun. Hitt.-Luw. KARAŞ = *kuwalana-/kulana-*. Poetto notes Hier. paradigm as *-la/i/u-za* (nom./acc. sing. N, here), *-la/i/u-na-sa₈* (gen. sing., PORSUK, § 5), *-la/i/u-ni* (dat. sing., here), *-la/i/u-ti* (abl. sing., TOPADA, § 8; KÖRKÜN, § 6); since gen. and dat. sing. forms point to *-n-*stem, the abl. forms are problematic (see TOPADA, § 8, Commentary, with reference to Starke, *Stamm Bildung*, § 148). Noteworthy also is the consistent Hier. writing with *la/i/u*.

§§ IX–X. Equations Hier. EXERCITUS = Phoen. *mhn̄t*, “army”, Hier. SCUTUM = Phoen. *mgn*, “shield” (whence Latin transcriptions of logograms) are consistent with the Hitt. Empire period equations Hier. EXERCITUS = Cun. *kulana-* = KARAŞ = *ku(wa)lana-*

and should be accepted, but it is notable that Hu. reversed the order against the Phoen., where Ho. followed it. The resulting confusion, leading to reversal of equations, persisted throughout Meriggi's treatment of the passages.

53. OMNIS-*MI-ma-ṣ[a]*: identified by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 103, as representing *tanimanzā*, "all" (nom./acc. sing. N); collation shows *-a*-vocalization of *ṣ[a]* probably to be present.

§ XI, 56. REL-*pa-wá/i*: the bilingual has a number of examples of REL(-*i*)(-*pa*)-, a non-subordinating introductory particle, unrepresented by a Phoen. correspondence; see below, 119; 142 (Ho. only); 153; 182; 209; 303; and 309; and discussion under the last. A possible resumptive force seems likely in 119, 142 (Ho.), 153, 182 and 209: see Commentary there. Here no such sense is apparent.

57. (*255)*pá² + ra/i-ia-ni-ṣi*: neither logogram nor stem serve to elucidate this word, and the Phoen. *mlšm* is hardly clearer (see Bron, *Recherches*, pp. 51–53). Interpret largely from context. Neumann's proposal (*Fs Otten* (1), p. 248 f.) to associate with *pari(ya)*, "before", is contextually suitable, but the correspondence *pá² // pa* now looks less likely: see KULULU 2, § 6, Commentary, where a possible value *ma_x* is suggested. Could a possible *ma_x + ra/i-ia-ni-* here represent a survival from the IInd millennium of the term *mariannu*, denoting an equestrian class (for which see *CAD*, M/1, s.v.; also now Wilhelm, *RLA* VII/5–6, s.v.)? For the reading *pá²*, see Introduction, Appendix 3 (p. 36 f.).

§ XII, 60. ("MALUS₂")*ba//há-ni-ia-ta(-ia)*, also (MALUS₂)*ba-ni-ia-ta-sa-tara/i-*, "badness" (below, 380): cf. (MALUS₂) *ba-ba-ni-wa/i-*, TELL AHMAR 1, § 20, and Commentary. For a suggested association of the stem, see now Starke, *Stammbildung*, § 243 (following Oettinger).

62. Hu. (TERRA)*ta-sà-REL + ra/i // Ho.* ("TERRA + LA + LA^(c?)")*wa/i + ra/i-ri + i*: for readings of Hu. and Ho., and identifications as dat. sing., see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, pp. 103, 106. Also for identification of (TERRA + LA + LA)*wariri-* with (TERRA + LA + LA)*walili(-ta)- // waliri(-ta)-*, see above, 23.

§ XIII, 66. Hu. (TERRA)*ta-sà-REL + ra/i <-ri + i? > // Ho.* ("TERRA") *ta-sà-REL + ra/i-ri + i*: clear abl. sing. in Ho., together with demands of context, suggest that an abl. ending be supplied or restored in Hu.; cf. Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 103.

68. Hu. [*501] [...] *-há // Ho.* *501-*ba-há*: context seems similar to JISR EL HADID frag. 3, ll. 2–3; TELL TAYINAT 2, frag. 6, l. 1; verb perhaps the same in all cases, (PES₂)*501(+*RA/I*)(-*ba*)-, where *501 represents a previously unidentified logogram (= Meriggi, no. 405 c). Phoen. equivalent *trq*, obscure *hapax legomenon*, see Bron, *Recherches*, p. 53 f. for various interpretations.

§ XIV, 69: *á-ma-ṣa/ṣa₄*: for correct identification of case of this word (and the two following) as acc. sing. N., see Mittelberger, *Sprache* 8 (1962), p. 286; 9 (1963), p. 99.

70. DOMINUS-*ni-ṣa*, = Phoen. *'dn(y)*, confirming long proposed identification of logogram. Usual word "lord" (except in titularies, see KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 1, Commentary) has phonetic complements *-(na)-ni(-i)-*, nom. sing. MF (KARKAMIŠ A15b, § 21; TELL AHMAR 1, § 8; KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 9; KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 7; KARKAMIŠ A23, § 3; KARKAMIŠ A18e, § 6; ALEPPO 2, § 3; BOYBEYPINARI 2, §§ 2, 7); acc. sing. MF (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 16; TELL AHMAR 1, § 15; BULGARMADEN, § 8; ŠIRZI, § 2); dat. sing. (KARKAMIŠ A25a, § 6; IZGIN 2, §§ 8, 9; KARKAMIŠ A4a, § 11; ASSUR letters *d*, § 9; *e*, §§ 12(?), 21; BULGARMADEN, § 2); acc. plur. MF (KULULU 4, § 10). For gen. sing., *-nas*, see KÖRKÜN, § 3, and *-nis*, ALEPPO 3, § 1(?); and dat. plur., *-nanza*, KULULU 4, §§ 5, 6, and Commentaries there. An adj. form DOMINUS-*(na)ni(ya)*- is attested here: acc. sing. N (for which see also KARKAMIŠ A15b, § 4; BOYBEYPINARI 2, § 17a); also dat. sing. (following clause; KARKAMIŠ A6, § 8; KULULU 4, § 8); and dat. plur. (KARKAMIŠ A15b, § 17).

73. *u-sa-ni-há*: one verb *usanu(wa)-*, KARATEPE, 274 below, = Phoen. *brk*, "bless"; and cf. participle (BONUS) *usanuwamis*, KARATEPE, 286 below, which fits with this sense; as do other attestations, KULULU 4, § 10; BULGARMADEN, § 8; ŠIRZI, § 2 (both last forms have *-sa-* suffix). The verb *usanuwa-*, "bless", seems to be caus. of simple *wasá-*, "be good, dear", for which see BULGARMADEN, § 2, Commentary. Is the present verb to be identified? The equivalent Phoen. *yṯn* (< *ṯn*?, "erect"; see Bron, *Recherches*, p. 54 f.) suggests another stem, and association with Hitt. *wete-*, "build", has been proposed (van Brock, *Glotta* 46 (1968), p. 119 f.; cf. Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann, *HHL*, p. [41], n. 143). However the phrase here, *sanawa usanu-* is so close to the *wasu usanu(wa)-* of KULULU 4 and BULGARMADEN, that it seems best to include this attestation with *usanu(wa)(sa)-*, "bless" (or the like), and accept a slight divergence from the Phoen. This *usanu(wa)-* as caus. of *wasá-* would be an exact morphological parallel to Hitt. *aššanu-*, denominative formation from *aššu-*, "good" (see Weitenberg, *HUS*, § 188); the usage of the two is also very parallel. For etymology, see now Starke, *Stammbildung*, § 235; and for present passage Anm. 1036.

§ XV, 76. (NEPOS)*ba-su-*: clearly dat. sing., but odd form; for derivation, see Weitenberg, *HUS*, §§ 366–67, 374–75.

§ XVI. Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 107 f., point out that Friedrich's interpretation is undoubtedly correct and establishes the sense of Phoen.; cf. Bron, *Recherches*, p. 58 f. – but contrary to the assertion that

the Hier. verb lacks expressed direct object, this may be recognized in the particle chain's *-ata*, "it/them".

§ XVIII, 92. Hu. ("VAS")*á-ta-na-sa-ma-* (= Phoen. *ḥkmt*, "wisdom"): this word seems likely to be a derived form from ("VAS")*atri-/*atni-*, "form, figure, image; soul" (see KULULU 4, § 9, Commentary).

94. ("BONUS")*sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ti//ti-*: ending identified as *-astr-* < *-asr-*, the equivalent of the Hitt. *-ešsar* ending; see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 107, following Neumann, *Sprache* 11 (1965), p. 82 ff. Cf. also MALUS-*ta₄-sa//sá-tara/i-*, "badness" (below, 378), (MALUS₂)*ba-ni-ia-ta-sa-tara/i-*, "wickedness" (below, 380); also ("*314") *ba-CRUS-sá-tara/i-*, Cun. Luw. *hattaštarri-*, "frightfulness" (TELL AHMAR 1, § 12); and for a further Cun. Luw. (-Hitt.) parallel, *maršaštarri-*, "falsehood" (CHD, s.v.); for classification of these forms, see Starke, *Stammbildung*, §§ 241–248.

§ XIX, 96: PUGNUS(-)*la/i/u-mi-tà-ia* (also below, 131): for the adj. and verb PUGNUS(-)*la/i/u-mi-* from this stem, see KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 4; A15b, §§ 2, 3, and Commentaries. The present form in *-tà-* is identified as a participle in *-(a)nt-* by Mittelberger (*Sprache* 9 (1963), p. 103), as is also *HWT-sà-ta*, "feared", and further *ha//há-ni-ia-ta(-ia)*, "evils" (Neumann, *Fs Otten* (1), p. 248). The absence of any corresponding stem *lami-*, *lumi-* etc. in Hitt. and Cun. Luw. suggests that no attestations of this word give a full phonetic writing.

§ XX, 102. Hu. (MALUS)*á-tu-wa/i-ri+i-zi//Ho. MA-LUS-ta₄-zi-*: problem of reconciling endings noted by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *JRAS* 1975/2, p. 131; and for phonetic rendering of MALUS, see Hawkins, *An. St.* 30 (1980), pp. 150, 156 add. 3. It is clear that different forms of the basic stem **adu-*, "bad", are found in Cun. and Hier. Luw.; see now Starke, *Stammbildung*, § 109.

104. REL-*i-ta-na* (also below, 178); = Phoen. *(b)-ʔ*, "where(ver)": see KARKAMIŠ A1b, § 2, Commentary.

107. Hu. ([*"217?"])*u-sa-lí-zi//Ho. ("*217")u-sà-lí-zi-*: identification of *lí*, therefore also *li*, and derivation of form from *usa-*, "bring, carry", + *-(a)li-* suffix, noted by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, pp. 104, 108.

§ XXI. See Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), p. 132 cit. 15, elucidating the negative (NEG₂, Phoen. *bl*); also discussing the readings Hu. PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*ta₄-ta//Ho. ià-tà-ta*, Phoen. *ʔbd kn*, "be servant (to)". Other attestations of verb PUGNUS.PUGNUS suggest that the correspondence with the Phoen. may not be exact, and a sense "live" is considered: see ASSUR letters, General Commentary (B1). The question is now further examined by Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh.3, Appendix 6, in the light of new Empire Period evidence.

müksasan parni, "Mopsus's house" (dat. sing.): for a study of datives in *-(a)san* of *-(a)si-* gen. adjectives, see Morpurgo Davies, *An. St.* 30 (1980), pp. 123 ff., present example p. 126 cit. 12.

§ XXII, 114. Hu. *-ma-tà//Ho. -ma-ara/i,* = *-mu+ata*, "them for me": clear example of rhotacism of pronoun *-ata*, see Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 96 (1982/83), p. 249 and n. 15.

§ XXIII, 119. REL(-*i*)-*pa-*: for this introductory particle see 56 above and 309 below. In the present context § XXIII repeats § XIX, and the particle could have a resumptive force, as in most of the other cases.

120. Hu. LOCUS-*ta₄-ta-za:* Ho. has the appearance of reversing *ta₄* and *ta*, but LOCUS-*ta₄/ta₅-* (= **pita-*) elsewhere always indicates its stem with those signs, and the signs should therefore be read in the same order as Hu., which is epigraphically acceptable. The Phoen. equivalent *mqmm*, "places", suggests the identification with Hitt. *peda-*, "place", though a Hier. phonetic writing is not definitely identified (but cf. (LOCUS)*pi-ta-ha-li-ia-*, KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 4, and Commentary). For the Hier. paradigm of this word, which suggests the consistent use of an extended form **pita(n)t-* (= Lyc. *pddāt-*), as here dat. plur., = **pita(n)tanza*, see KARKAMIŠ A11a, §§ 23–24, and A31, § 7, Commentaries.

122. (CASTRUM)*ha+ra/i-ni-i-sà:* correct order, as against Bossert-Meriggi *-sà-i*.

§ XXIV, 126. REL-*ti* + pres. tense, = Phoen. *t-* + verbal noun: clear example of relative as conjunction expressing purpose; but cf. HİSARCIK 1, § 3, and Commentary.

128. SOLIUM+*MI-i:* for examination of this verb, see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, pp. 108–111, where *MI* is argued not to be phonetic, and it is proposed that the logogram represents **isa-*, "sit, dwell" (or perhaps *asa-*, see KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 10, and Commentary). SOLIUM±*MI-* is further used to write the simple verb "sit" in Hu. 197, 313; ÇİFTLİK, §§ 8–10; KARKAMIŠ A2+3, § 17 e. For evidence that *-MI* cannot form part of the phonetic writing of the stem, see particularly KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 16; KÖRKÜN, § 5, with Commentary.

127. (BONUS)*wa/i+ra/i-ia-ma-la:* for suggested analysis see Neumann, *Fs Otten* (1), p. 247; Starke, *Stammbildung*, § 192.

§§ XXVI–XXVII. See Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), p. 132, cit. 16, elucidating negative (NEG₂, Phoen. *bl*); also FRONS-*li//la/i/u-*, = **hantili-*, "former, first", for which see also 279 below, and TOPADA, § 3; CEKKE, § 6; KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 17; HAMA 4, § 2; PALANGA, § 2; MALPINAR, § 4. Noteworthy is the usual writing with *la/i/u*.

135. *ha//há-ta-la-i-ta:* for alternation *ha-ta-li(-i)-ha*, 1 sing. pret., with the present form 3 plur. pret., see KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 4, with Commentary, giving other examples.

137. REX-*ti-* (= Phoen. *mlk*, "king"): the Phoen. equivalent confirmed Sayce's original interpretation made in 1881. For the reading of the word, new evi-

dence is available from Lycian, where the Letoon trilingual has established Lyc. $\chi\eta\tau\omega\tau\iota$ = Greek βασιλεύς, “king”: see Laroche, *FdX* VI, pp. 64, 104 ff. Laroche had already noted the equivalence of Lyc. $\chi\eta\tau\omega\tau\iota$ with Cun. Luw. *handawata-* (*BSL* 53 (1958), p. 182 and n. 3 – more correctly now Lyc. $\chi\eta\tau\omega\tau\iota$ = Luw. *bandawate-*). This Luw. word is poorly attested: *bandawateš* (nom. sing. MF), *bandawaten* (acc. sing. MF), and *bandawatahiša* (abstract in *-abi(sa)*, nom./acc. sing. N) – *KUB* XXXV, 123 iv 1, 7, 12, see Starke, *StBoT* 30, p. 251. Laroche, *FdX* VI, p. 106, plausibly lined up Hier. REX-*ti-* with the Luw. and Lyc. stem to suggest that the same word lies behind the Hier. writing, as indeed seems most likely. Starke, however, starting from the writing LUGAL-*uš* (*KUB* IX, 31 ii 22; Zarpia Ritual, see *StBoT* 30, p. 53), and noting the presence in Hier. of *hasusari-*, “queen”, considers that a cognate of Hitt. *haššu-*, “king”, lies behind the Luwian writings, and reconstructs a form **hasuwati-* (with abstract **hasuwat-abi(sa)*) for the Hier. reading: see *KZ* 94 (1980), p. 77 and n. 15; *Stammbildung*, p. 172. Cf. further below, § LXXIII, 396, REX(-*ta*)-*bi-sa*, “kingdom”, and Commentary; also BOR, § 8, and Commentary.

§ XXVIII, 142. (Ho.). REL-*i-pa-* (not in Hu.): for this introductory particle see 56 above and 309 below. In the present context, § XXVIII repeats § XXV indicating a possible resumptive force for the particle.

144. Hu. *ba-ta-li-i-ha*: correct order as against Borsert-Meriggi *-ba-i*.

§ XXX, 151. Hu. *á-mi-ia-za-ta*//Ho. *á-mi-za-ta*: *-ta* doubtless *Ortspartikel* attached, unusually, to word not first in clause (so Meriggi, *Manuale* II/1, p. 93).

§ XXXI, 153. REL-*pa-*: see 56 above and 309 below. Can we detect here a resumptive force for the particle as has been noted elsewhere, perhaps arising from the parallelism of §§ XXX–XXXI?

155. *zi-tà*: considered by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 111, without definite conclusion.

§ XXXIII, 172. «*-ha-pa-wa/i*»: particles clearly redundant as in 154, Ho. only, «*-pa-wa/i*». For other examples of such, see MARAŞ 4, § 7; MARAŞ 1, § 11? Possibly *-ha* should remain: “even those places”.

“LOCUS”-*ta₄-ta-za(-ha)* REL-*ia*, “(even) in the places which ...”, guaranteed by Phoen. *b-mqmm* ʔ. That “place”, **pita(n)t-*, must be neuter in spite of *-(n)t-* suffix is clear from acc. sing. and plur. (KARKAMIŞ A31, §§ 6, 7, see Commentary), as well as from the present example.

174. *HWT-sà-ta*: the Phoen. equation of this participle in *-a(n)t-* and its associated verb *HWT-sà-* (following clause) with the root *št'*, “fear”, established the meaning clearly. The first sign, identified as a form of the relative, permitted the identification of the word with Hitt.-Luw. *kuwaya-*, “fear”, and derivatives (Laroche, *DLL*, s.v.; cf. *BSL* 55 (1960), p. 175 n. 2). The verb

is further recognized written REL-*sà-* (SULTANHAN, § 17), and REL-*i(a)-* (KARAHÖYÜK, § 12). Now however it is clear that the first sign in the present writing is in origin nothing to do with the relative (REL): see KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, § 8, Commentary (I transliterate now *HWT* instead of earlier REL₂). It can however be seen that some late Tabalian inscriptions do occasionally use *HWT* mistakenly for REL: see SULTANHAN, KULULU 2, BULGARMADEN, Peculiarities. It seems certain that KARATEPE does the same in the case of this verb, so the identification with Hitt.-Luw. *kuwaya-*, Hier. REL-*i(a)-* (*kuwaya-*), REL-*sà-* (*kuwaya*)*sa-?*) still stands.

§ XXXIV, 177. *-wa/i+ra/i*: can only be *wa+ara<ata*, “(it), them”, antecedent presumably “places”, dir. object.

179. *HWT-sà-i-ia* (for identification of stem, see preceding clause): form certainly now to be identified as 3 sing. *pres.*, in spite of rather odd sense; see Morpurgo Davies, *Fs Szemerényi*, pp. 597–600.

180. “VIA”-*wa/i-na*: unclear whether *harwa+an*, acc. sing. MF, or *harwan+a*, dat. sing. Other forms of the word show *-(n)t-* suffix, see TELL TAYINAT 2, frag. 7 l. 2; frag. 6 l. 2, and Commentary. Verb *harwani-*, “send”, clearly denominative, but of what stem? Either case could be translated without difficulty: either acc. sing. MF, “to go the road”, or dat. sing. “for the road to go”, cf. 214–216 below, “for this fortress (dat. sing.) to build”.

181. (“PES₂”) *i-u-na*: the new reading *i* resulted in the identification of the verb (“PES₂”) *i-*, “go”; see *HHL*, p. [47] and n. 163. The following paradigm can now be assembled:

1 sing. *pres.*, *i-wa/i* (KULULU 1, § 15).

1 sing. *pret.*, (PES₂) *i-ha* (BOYBEYPINARI 2, § 9).

3 sing. *pret.*, (“PES₂”) *i-tà* (KAYSERİ, § 19).

(“PES₂”) *i+ra/i* (CEKKE, § 20; TOPADA, § 13).

3 sing./plur. *imp.*, (PES₂) *i-tu-u* (TELL AHMAR frag. 5 l. 4).

inf., (“PES₂”) *i-u-na* (present attestation).

§ XXXV, 182. REL-*pa-*: for particle, see 56 above, 309 below. A resumptive force has been noted in some of the attestations above. Could this be detected here from the repetition of “in my days” from § XXXII above?

186. “FUSUS”(-)*si-tara/i*: now stands alone, since final *-ti* is to be transferred to next word, following the natural order of reading. The word is identified as “spindle” partly by recognition of Phoen. *plkm*, partly by the pictographic nature of the logogram, and partly by the recognition of this clause as a common literary topos of peace and security. The word is likely to be abl., and the case ending could be expressed by the final *-tara/i* (i.e. *-ati* > *-ari*) which would leave the stem of the word written (-)*si(a)-*, not certainly a full phonetic writing. Starke (*Stammbildung*, § 253) wishes to iden-

tify the Hier. word with Hitt.-Luw. *šittar-*, “spear-point” etc. To identify this stem in the present Hier. writing, it is then necessary either to identify the word as acc. sing. N or dat. sing., both of which entail difficulties for the syntax, or to restore an abl. ending, thus *si-tara/i<-ti>*.

187. PES₂.PES₂(-)*tâ-ti*: so read (*-ti* to be read here, as is more natural, not at end of preceding word) and reinterpreted as 3 plur. *pres.*, because the now frequent attestations of the verb (PES₂)PES₂(-)*tâ* show that *-tâ* is (part of) the stem not tense ending (3 plur. pret.):

1 sing. pres.	PES ₂ (-) <i>tâ-wa/i-i</i>	(KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 5).
3 sing. pres.	“PES ₂ .PES ₂ ”(-) <i>tâ-ia</i> “PES ₂ ”(-) <i>tâ-i</i>	(BOR, § 4). (SULTANHAN, § 15).
3 plur. pres.	PES ₂ .PES ₂ (-) <i>tâ-ti</i>	(present ex- ample).
	PES ₂ .PES ₂ (-) <i>tâ-ti-i</i>	(ALEPPO 2, § 4).
3 plur. pret.	“PES ₂ .PES ₂ ”(-) <i>tâ-ta</i> PES ₂ (-) <i>tâ-ta</i>	(BOHÇA, § 10). (HAMA 4, § 3).

PES₂.PES₂-*ti* (KARKAMIŠ A31, § 8) presumably also belongs here, though a less full writing. A further fragmentary attestation is probable on TELL AHMAR 1, l. 8, end. Melchert now proposes to identify PES₂(PES₂)(-)*tâ* with the verb CRUS/*ta-*, “stand”, on the basis of ALEPPO 2, § 4; SULTANHAN, § 15; and especially BOHÇA, § 10 (see Commentary).

Phoen. version problematic: see Bron, *Recherches*, pp. 78–85, for various interpretations, also Greenfield, *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978), p. 76 (Hebrew, English summary), and cf. Swiggers, *Bi. Or.* 37 (1980), p. 339 n. 14. The interpretation of Heltzer is unconvincing (*Anuario de Filología* 8 (1982) [1984], pp. 171–175). With the certain correspondence FEMINA-*ti-zi(-ha)* = *ʾšt*, and the fairly established FUSUS(-)*si-tara/i<-?>* = *dl plkm*, “with spindles”, there remains only the Hier. verb of motion PES₂.PES₂(-)*tâ-ti* to correspond to *tklhdy*. The identification of *lhdy*, “on her own, alone”, seems plausible and could perhaps in some measure correspond to *-ha*, “even”, thus Hier. “even women”//Phoen. “a woman on her own”. This would leave *tk* by itself or with restoration to provide the demanded verb of motion. All the more recherché explanations reported by Bron are rendered less plausible by the comparatively straightforward Hier. clause.

§ XXXVI, 194. SOLIUM-*MI-ia-sa*: regarded by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 108 f., as noun derived from verbal root *asa-/isa-*, “sit, dwell”. For evidence that *-MI* cannot represent a part of the phonetic writing of the word, cf. above, 128.

§ XXXVII, 197. SOLIUM-*MI-ta*: cf. note to preceding clause.

199–200. |*â-ta-na-wa/i-za-ha*(URBS) |TERRA +
LA+LA-*za*: cf. above, § V, Commentary.

§ XXXIX, 207. *â-ta₄-ma-za*: note Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 104, for absence of final *-NI* given by Bossert.

§ XL, 209. REL-*pa-*: for particle, see 56 above, 309 below; this is the only occurrence where Phoen. has a possible correspondence, namely *ḵ*, “as, since”. The possible resumptive force noted for the Hier. particle could depend here on the clause resuming the sense of § XXXVIII.

212. (DEUS)CERVUS₂-*za-sá*//Phoen. *ršp sprm*: the Hier. Stag-God *Runzas* is known as the late form of Hitt. Empire ^DKAL (= *Kurunta*), who was already at this date identified with Rešeph, especially in the latter’s Hurrianized form, Iršappa, in the Ugarit god-lists (see Nougayrol and Laroche, *Ugaritica* V, pp. 57, 521). One would suppose that the epithet *spr̄m* attached here to Rešeph was intended to define the god more closely to bring him into line with the established character of the Stag-God as the god of wild beasts. In this context “(he-)goats” seems more suitable than “birds”: Weipert, *ZDMG* Suppl. I (1969), p. 210 f.; contra, Bron, *Recherches*, pp. 88, 185.

214–216. *zati barnisi *tamuna*, “for this fortress to build (it)”: see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 112 for construction; cf. also above, § XXXIV, Commentary; and KARKAMIŠ A1a, § 23, and Commentary.

§§ XLI–XLVII, 217–260. Passage represented in Hu. by fragment of an orthostat (element 6) and a partially reconstituted base (element 7 a); in Ho. conceivably by frag. 23 S and by part of the last word at the beginning of element 5. The numbering of the clauses (Roman) and the words (Arabic) is taken from the Phoenician text (word count not accurate). In the discussion below, §§ XLIV–XLVII are taken in the reverse order, proceeding from the secure to the less secure.

§ XLI, 217. [...] *tâ*: may represent the end of the particle chain. If so, *-tâ* should represent *-ata*, “it” (the fortress, = Phoen. *-y*), rather than *-ta* *Ortspartikel* – “build” does not usually take *Ortspartikel* (§§ XIX, XXXVIII, XL, but cf. § XXIII, also § LXVI, as against §§ LXXI, LXXII). The height of the line estimated from the two other restored words may suggest a restoration such as [*amu-hawa*] *ta*.

219. [...] *ta*[...]: if the fragment really corresponds to the Phoen. passage, this should represent [(DEUS) TONITRUS-*bu*]-*ta*-[*ti*], “by Tarhunzas [and Runzas]”. For the height of the line demanded by such a restoration, cf. Hu., § I, especially 5.

§ XLVII. Remains of this clause in Hu., also Ho., provide a reasonable correspondence to Phoen.

z[*a₄*...]: Phoen. *b’l krnryš* elsewhere corresponds to *Tarhunzas arba usanuwamis*, but it does not seem possible to accommodate this epithet, which normally follows the god’s name, here. It thus seems necessary to identify

the sign as ζa_4 (cf. Hu. 69; Ho. 275, 284), and to suppose that it is used to write the demonstrative ζa -, thus $\zeta[a_4-na]$ |(DEUS)TONI[TRUS-*bu- ζa -na*], “this Tarhunzas (acc. sing.)”.

§ XLVI. This repeated clause (cf. § XXXIX) was clearly not present in Hu.

§ XLV. This repeated clause (cf. § XXXVIII) finds an obvious correspondence between the traces in Hu. and the Phoen., though it is not clear that an exact word-for-word match can be reconstructed from the Hier.

| $\zeta[a-pa/ba-wa/i]$ -: this would provide the exact equivalence Hier. ζa - (acc. sing. N) = Phoen. ζ , “this”, but it is not certain that the ζa does not belong as the final sign of the last word of the preceding clause. If so, restore simply | $a-[wa/i]$, and accept that Phoen. ζ has no corresponding Hier. word.

§ XLIV. It is vexing that the reconstructed inscription just fails to reach back far enough to indicate the correct reading of the crux in the Phoen.

| $\acute{a}-m\acute{i}-[ia-\zeta a]$ | (“DIES”) $ba-li-[ia-\zeta a]$ (or $ba-li-[ia]-\zeta[a]$): occurs repeatedly as equivalent of Phoen. $b-y\acute{m}t\acute{y}$, as again here (cf. 30–31, 160–161, 183–184, 189–190).

$i-\zeta i-i[...]$: apparently, but not certainly, verb $i\zeta i(ya)$ -, “make”, which usually corresponds to Phoen. p^l , where Phoen. kn usually corresponds to asa -, “be”. However kn twice corresponds to $i\zeta i\acute{y}ar\acute{u}$, “let it become” (306, 315), and a similar correspondence may be sought here. Required sense is “... was not made for Adanawa”, 3 sing./plur. pret. med.-pass. Such forms are very rare but pres. $i\zeta i\acute{y}ar\acute{i}$, “is made”, seems to occur twice (see MARAŞ 14, § 5, and Commentary). No pret. med.-pass. examples have however been identified, nor is it clear what forms these would have taken.

Phu.(A): $mtm\ l-dnny\acute{m}\ ll\ b-y\acute{m}t\acute{y}$: the Statue inscription (C) varies the order to $mtm\ ll\ b-y\acute{m}t\acute{y}\ l-dnny\acute{m}$. The latter text was published first, which resulted in scholars persisting in attempts to interpret $mtmll$ as one word, and after the appearance of Phu., to treat its text as corrupt: see Bron, *Karatepe*, pp. 14 f., 20, 91–93. This hardly seems justified, and it is surely better, with Donner and Röllig (*KAI*² II, p. 42), and Gibson (*TSSI* 3, p. 60), to follow Levi della Vida in identifying ll as a separate word, “night”, thus “there was never for the DNNYM night in my days”. The form of the Hier. clause suggested by what remains is: “[For Adanawa never did night] occur (“be made”) in my days”. The initial traces of a sign could belong to the word “night”, and if so it is most regrettable that the full word was not recovered, both to establish the reading of the Phoen. and to provide the Luwian word for “night”.

§ XLVIII. The means by which the obscure Phoen. may be brought into line with the straightforward Hier. are argued in detail by Morpurgo Davies and Hawkins, *Hethitica* 8 (1986), pp. 270–272. The results are the

identification of the following correspondences, Hier./Phoen.:

conjunction: wa - // w -

subject: (“FLUMEN”) $haparis$ OMNIS- mis , “every river-land” // $kl\ b-mskt$.

verb: (CRUS) $taia$ (intrans., + infinitive) // $y\acute{l}k$ (yiphil, trans.)

infinitive//direct object: $i\zeta i\acute{s}tuna$ // $\zeta b\acute{h}$

object of inf./indirect object: $-an$ // l

261–263. $wa+an\ i\zeta i\acute{s}tuna\ taia$, lit. “and there shall stand to honour him”: for construction and idiom, see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 112 (ta -, “stand” + infinitive = “begin to do something”); also Morpurgo Davies, *Fs Szemerényi*, pp. 592, 598–600.

265. Hu. (“FLUMEN”) $h\acute{a}-pa+ra/i-s\acute{a}$ // Ho. FLUMEN- $pari-i-sa$: doubtless to be associated with (FLUMEN.REGIO) $hapat(a)i$ - (HAMA 1–3, § 2, see Commentary); and FLUMEN- $pa-ti$ - (KARKAMIŞ A12, § 6), Hitt. $hapati$ - (= KUR İD, “river-land”). There is no reason why the KARATEPE form should not be simply a rhotacized form of the last. This recognition should provide a secure basis for the interpretation of Phoen. $b-mskt$.

Phoen. version thus to be interpreted by reference to the Hier. (see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Hethitica* 8, pp. 272, 289 ff. nn. 14–15):

“All the river-lands ($kl\ b-mskt$) will make come ($y\acute{l}k$) to him (l) a sacrifice ($\zeta b\acute{h}$) ...”

266–267. (“ANNUS”) $u-si$ (“ANNUS”) $p\acute{a}^2+ra/i(-i)$: = Phoen. $\zeta b\acute{h}\ ymm$, lit. “sacrifice of days”, i.e. “annual sacrifice”, as the corresponding Heb. phrase appears to mean (Bron, *Recherches*, p. 99). Hier. usi , “year” (dat. sing.) confirms the “annual” sense of the Heb./Phoen. phrase. $p\acute{a}^2+ra/i(-i)$ is generally unclear, both as to reading and interpretation. Melchert now, in the context of re-reading $p\acute{a}^2$ as ma_x , compares the present phrase with the difficult Hitt. expression MU $meani(a\acute{s})$: see *An. St.* 38 (1988), p. 38 n. 14. Hitt. $meani(a\acute{s})$ is now exhaustively examined in *CHD* 3/3 (1986), p. 229 ff. Certainly the present phrase would fit very well with some of the Hitt. usages. For the reading $p\acute{a}^2$, see Introduction, Appendix 3 (p. 36 f.).

269–272. *Seasonal Festivals*. Phoen. has “time of ploughing” ($h\acute{r}\acute{s}$) and “reaping” ($q\acute{s}r$), i.e. autumn (Oct.–Nov.) and summer (Jul.) (Hoffner, *Al. Heth.*, pp. 41 ff., 24 ff.). Corresponding Hier. has (*486) REL- $tu-na$ and “VITIS”(-) $h\acute{a}+ra/i$.

271. “VITIS”(-) $h\acute{a}+ra/i$: the logogram elsewhere determines only words connected with the vine, $wiyani$ -, “vine”; $matu$ -, “wine”; $tuwarsa$ -, “vineyard”; $tipariya$ -, “wine-god”; also $sarlata$ -, “libation”; (-) $h\acute{a}+ra/i$, otherwise unattested, perhaps not fully written, presumably dat. sing. like REL- $tu-na$. A combination of the context and the logogram suggests “vintage”, i.e. Sept.–Oct. (Hoffner, *Al. Heth.*, p. 39); Melchert now proposes an etymology, associating the stem with Hitt. $halki$ -, “grain”, and further with Hier. (*69) $ha+ra/i-\zeta a$ (AS-

SUR letter b, § 6, and Commentary): see KZ 101 (1988), pp. 220–224 cit. 5.

269. (“*486”) REL-*tu-na*: Phoen. “ploughing” and “reaping”, against Hier. “vintage” already suggests a sufficiently inexact correspondence to cast doubt on this word. The ending may be satisfactorily regarded as dat. sing, verbal noun, parallel to infinitive, i.e. “at the ...ing”. The stem itself has two possible points of entry: (1) pictographic content of logogram *486, representing presumably an agricultural implement, but this could be e.g. “plough” or “sickle”; (2) etymology of REL-*t*, i.e. **kwit*- or **kwat*-, might possibly give some indication. If both should point to “cutting”, this would align REL-*tu-na* with Phoen. *qsr*, thus offerings at the harvest; leaving Hier. “vintage” to align with Phoen. *hrš*, “ploughing”, which, although discrepant, at least have the advantage of being at approximately the same time of year.

§ XLIX, 276–277. If Phoen. and Hier. adhered to same word order, the correspondences would be *sa-pi-sa-ta₅*- (and var.) = *hym*, “life”; *ba-tà+ra/i-* (and var.) = *šlm*, “health, peace”. But this is not a reliable basis for equation: for differing orders, see “mother and father” (§ III); “west and east” (§ V, also § XXXII); “cutting (?) and vintage” (§ XLVIII); “sheep and oxen” (§ LV); “moon and sun” (§ LXXV).

Hu. *ba-tà+ra/i-ti-i* // Ho. *ba-IUDEX+RA/I-ri+i*: word recurs in ÇİFTLİK, § 16; KARKAMIŞ A5a, § 2. In general the meaning “life” is appropriate. Could the root perhaps be associated with Hitt. **haddul*-, “health”, and derivatives?

Hu. *sa-pi-sá-ta₅-ri+i* // Ho. *sá-pi-sa-ara/i-ri+i*: doubtless to be associated with *sa-pi-su+ra/i-* (ASSUR letters, *d* § 3, *e* § 2, *f+g* § 2) in the context of greeting formula “*sapisura/i* (be) unto you”, thus perhaps corresponding better to *šlm*, “peace”. The basic stem *sapis-* would thus show different suffixes: (1) *-ata-* (>*-ara-*); (2) *-ur* (<*-u(wa)r?*).

§ L. See Hawkins, *An. St.* 25 (1975), p. 149, app. 1A, elucidating SUPER+*ra/i-li/lí* FRONS-*la/i/u//li-i-*, *sarlı hantili-*, “highly pre-eminent”. Note also the informative writing OMNIS-*MI-ni-i-ma-za₄* = *tanimanza*, *ibid.*, p. 151, n. 18.

§ LI, 284. Ho. (DEUS) TONITRUS-*bu_x-za₄*:- the sign *bu_x* (HH no. 342) is probably just a variant of *bu* (HH no. 307); cf. Introduction, p. 34, Discarded Values (*bu*).

287. Hu. *za-si*//Ho. *za-i-si-i*: latter one of only two occasions where stem of demonstrative is written *za-i*; cf. KARKAMIŞ A1a, § 25, and Commentary. Here the *-i* could conceivably be attached to the previous word to give ending *-mi-i-sá*; order would be odd and difficult but not quite unparallelled. Alternatively it could be an isolated example of *i* written instead of *a* as a space-filler or word-ender as in the ASSUR letters, also MARAŞ 1, İSKENDERUN, KARKAMIŞ A5a etc.

289. Ho. DEUS-*SA₄-zi*: Mittelberger (*Sprache* 8 (1982), p. 280) plausibly reads DEUS-*ŠANI-*, i.e. *SA₄* is a rebus from (*SA₄*)*sani-*, “overturn”.

291–292. Hu. “LONGUS”-*ta₅-ia* (DIES)*bá-li-ia* //Ho. (“LONGUS”) *a+ra/i-ia* | (“DIES”) *bá-li-ia*: cf. |*a+ra/i-ia* |*ba-li-i* (pure phonetic writing, ÇİFTLİK, § 17, and Commentary; also BOR, § 11). For the curious form “LONGUS”-*ta₅-ia*, cf. perhaps LONGUS(-)*tá-ia(-)sa-ba-na* (İVRİZ 1, § 2, and Commentary), both possibly representing an extended form **ara-(n)ta-*. Alternatively, the explanation considered by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 112 f., namely a pseudo-archaic reversal of rhotacism, replacement of *r* by *d*, is possibly correct.

293. Hu. *mi-*/Ho. *mì-* provides the sole evidence for a syllabic value for the latter sign, HH no. 387. The sign occurs commonly in the writing of “servant”, *387-*ta₄/ta₅-*, where in fact it may be logographic, and otherwise only rarely: see above, § I, 6, Commentary.

295–296. *sa-na-wa/i-sá-ba-wa/i tá-mi-bi-sá*: Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies have argued (*Hethitica* 8 (1986), pp. 272–275) that both words in this phrase are to be identified as acc. sing. N, and that *tamibisa* is an abstract formation in *-bi(t)-*, and the exact correspondence to Hitt. *tam(m)etar*, “abundance”. If this is established, Bron’s interpretation of the Phoen. equivalent *rš’t* as “old age” must be discarded. For *sa-na-wa/i-sá* as (nom.) acc. sing. N, see TELL TAYINAT 2, frag. 2, l. 1, § iv, and Commentary; also ASSUR letter *e*, § 21, Commentary.

Starke now rejects the comparison of *tamibisa* with Hitt. *tam(m)etar*, stressing the presence of the *-wa* connective in this phrase and the difficulty of comparing *tamibisa* with the normal abstract forms in *-abi(sa)* (pers. comm., 26/2/88, and see now *Stamm-bildung*, Anm. 1397 a). He prefers to interpret: “und gut (wird sein) *tamibis*”. But actually *-wa* is used elsewhere to mark the final element in a coordinated series: see KARATEPE, § LXXIII; KARKAMIŞ A6, § 20. Also parallelism with the Phoen. *w-rš’t n’mt*, “... and good *rš’t*”, leads one to expect simply a further pair adj. + noun. As for the termination *-ibi(sa)* instead of the regular *-abi(sa)*, this does indeed call for an explanation. We have pointed out that Hitt. *tam(m)etar*, which is no doubt an abstract noun paired with the straightforward *iyatar* (itself paralleled by Cun. Luw. *iumabiša*), has an *-e* vowel instead of the expected *-a* found in *-atar* abstracts. Since Hitt. *-ē* is regularly reflected in Luw. *-i-*, the coincidence between the two similar forms with equivalent phonetic irregularities, Hitt. *tam(m)etar* and Hier. *tamibisa*, is so striking that it would seem perverse to deny the connection.

§ LII, 299. “FULGUR”-*bá-sá*: logogram determines *pi-ba-mi-* (KARKAMIŞ A11b+c, § 14, and Commentary), stem identified with Hitt. *piba-*, = logogram HI.HI, “lightning”, an interpretation which agrees well with the

Hier. pictogram. Present form best identified as *pibas* (+ *sa*), i.e. -*s*-stem noun, paralleled in Hitt. *pibašš(ašši)*-, also PNN *Pibaššamuwa*-, *Pibašdu*- (see Starke, *Stamm bildung*, § 58; cf. Cun. Luw. *tap-pa-aš-ša*, “sky”, = *tappas*+*sa*, nom./acc. sing. N, Hier. (CAELUM) *ti-pa-sá* (KÖRKÜN, § 9). The postulated Hier. *pibas*, lit. “lightning”, = Phoen. *ʕ*, “power, strength”, indicates transferred sense “brilliance, effulgence” as royal attribute; “victory” perhaps suitable equivalent in translation. Cf. also Hawkins, in Meijer, *Natural Phenomena*, pp. 71–73.

§ LIII. For correct analysis of the structure of this clause see Mittelberger, *Sprache* 9 (1963), p. 107.

303. REL(-*i*)-*pa*: for recurring introductory particle, see above, 56. The present example was cited by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 113, as the clear example of this particle being non-subordinating since followed by verb in imperative. A possible resumptive force has been noted for most of the attestations above. Here, where the present and the following clause are both introduced by it, its use may point to the parallelism between §§ LIII and LV.

307. (DEUS)BONUS-*sa*, = Phoen. *šb*^c: latter argued by Ginsberg to mean “grain”, not “plenty” (*JANES* 5 (1973), p. 138), which fits well with Hier. evidence, since the “good God”, named *Kuparmas*, is to be identified with Kumarbi, the earlier Hurr. grain god; see KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 9, Commentary.

308. Hu. (DEUS)VITIS-*sá* // Ho. (DEUS)VITIS-*tí-ti* // Phoen. *trš*: Hier. logograms indicating “god-vine” confirm Phoen. identification “wine”. Wine-god’s name appears as *Tipariyas* (see KARKAMIŠ A11a, § 9, Commentary); phonetic (-)*tí-ti*(-) in Ho. quite unexplained.

§ LIV, 313. Hu. SOLIUM+*MI-sá-i* // Ho. (SOLIUM) *i-sà-nú-wa/i-ti*: see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 108 f., for proposal to identify form in Hu. as 3 sing. pres. of the simple verb from caus. *isanu*-, i.e. **isa*- (or *asa*-, Hawkins, *An. St.* 31 (1981), p. 151), “sit”, = Phoen. *yšb* (piel); for ending in -*i*, cf. Morpurgo Davies, *Fs Szemerényi*, pp. 584 f., 604. The caus. (trans.) form of the verb in Ho. could have as understood subject an indefinite 3 sing., “(the nations <that>) one makes dwell (in it)”.

§§ LVI–LVIII, 320, 322, 324. *ma-wa/i-za* ... *ma-pa-wa/i* ... *ma-pa-wa/i*: Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 113 f., pointed out that no initial *ma*- could possibly represent the well-known *man* ... *man*, “whether ... or”, since the clauses have verbs in the imperative; and since the thrice repeated Phoen. *b-rbm*, “much”, or the like, had no other possible Hier. correspondence than the thrice-repeated *ma*-, the latter should be explained by reference to the former. It was then shown that *man* was indeed the expected form nom./acc. sing. N of *mayi*- (*ma’i*-), the established Luw. cognate of Hitt. *mekki*-, “much”; cf. also *ma(n)* ... *ma(n)*, AKSARAY,

§§ 2–3, and Commentary. For an alternative explanation, see now Melchert, *Studies Cowgill* (1987), p. 184 n. 5.

320. *ma-wa/i-za*: -*za* most easily explained as representing enclitic pronoun, 1 plur., -*a(n)za*, form largely confined to ASSUR letters, but also see MARAŞ 4, §§ 7(?), 14.

§§ LIX–LXXV. Treated in detail by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition* (first part), pp. 125–130; this involved some redividing of words and clauses and consequent renumbering against the editions of Steinherr and Meriggi – see above, under Editions (p. 48), for comparative table of numbering. In view of the often considerable differences of division and interpretation offered by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, the main equivalences argued in our *Edition* are repeated here.

§ LIX, 331. REX-*ta-ti-i* = *b-mlkm*, “from (among) kings”.

332. REL+*ra/i* = *’m*, “if”.

333. REL-*sa-ha* // *mlk*, “anyone//king”.

§ LX, 335. ¹CAPUT-*tí-sá* = *rzn*, “(person), prince”.

§ LXI. Correspondence not exact:

¹CAPUT-*tí-ia-za á-ta₄-ma-za* // *’dm šm*, “manly (princely) name // man of name”.

§ LXII. Hier. switches to direct speech, as also in § LXVIII below; for identification of *á-sa₅-za*-, “say, pronounce”, see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, pp. 127, 132 f.; ASSUR letters, General Commentary (A). Phoen. does NOT switch to direct speech, and thus lacks any equivalent to these clauses; also verbs and pronouns of §§ LXIII–LXIV and §§ LXIX–LXX are 1 sing. (Hier.) // 3 sing. (Phoen.).

§ LXIII, 340–341. *ARHA* “*69”(-)*i-ti-wa/i* = *yhb*, “I/he will delete”.

342–343. (LITUUS) *a-za-ti-wa/i-tà-sá á-ta₅-ma-za* = *šm ’ztwd*, “Azatiwatas’s name”.

344. PORTA-*la-na-ri+i* = *b-š’r*, “from the gate(s)”. Note that Ho. lacks -*ri+i*, which must be restored.

345. *zi-na* // *z*, “(on the one hand), here // this”.

§ LXIV, 347–348. *á-ma-za á-ta₄-ma-za* = *šm*, “my // (his) name”.

349–350. *a-ta tu-pi-wa/i* // *št*, “I shall incise // he puts”.

§ LXV, 352. (VAS) *á-la/i/u-na-za-ia* = *yhmd*, “he covets”.

353–354. “CASTRUM(⟨⟩)-*ní-si za-ti* = *b-qrt z*, “this fortress/city”.

§ LXVI, 356–357. *a-ta AEDIFICARE+MI-i* // *ys’*, “blocks up (?) // tears out”.

358–359. “PORTA”-*la-na za-ia* = *b-š’r z*, “these gates//this gate”.

For form AEDIFICARE+*MI-i*, see Morpurgo Davies, *Fs Szemerényi*, p. 590.

§ LXVII, 361. REL-*ia* = 's, "which".

362. *i-zi-ta₅* = p'l, "made".

§ LXVIII. See above § LXII.

§ LXIX, 368. *i-zi-i-wa/i* = yp'l, "I/he will make".

366. *wa/i+ra/i-la-ia* // ʔ, "own, proper // other, alien".

Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 129, proposed to combine *wa/i+ra/i-la-ia* here with Cun. Luw. (-Hitt.) *waralli-* // *nīwaralli-* to support the interpretation as "own, proper // not-own, alien, hostile" (for semantic range of the latter, cf. Akk. *nakru*, "foreign, alien, strange, hostile"). This still seems a very satisfactory interpretation, *pace* the remarks of Meriggi and Poetto, *Gs Kronasser*, p. 103 f.; see especially Hawkins, *An. St.* 31 (1981), p. 174 f.; Starke, *Stammbildung*, p. 452, and Anm. 1632; and the recurrence of the word *waralli-* in TOPADA, § 32, and the comparable TELL TAYINAT 2, l. 1, frag. 2, § iv; also BOYBEYPINARI 2, § 13. Here the Hier. phrase *waralli- izi-*, "make own, i.e. appropriate (to oneself)", is reversed in the differently phrased Phoen. to p'l ʔ, "make other, i.e. alienate (from someone)".

367. "PORTA"-*la-na* = (l)ʔr. The Phoen. l- has caused difficulty (see Bron, *Recherches*, p. 117), but the Phoen. may now be interpreted in the light of the clear Hier. For p'l l, "make into", cf. above, § III, "made me as father ..."; p'l ʔ, "gate of a stranger" corresponds fairly to Hier. "(make) the gate (my) own".

§ LXX. See above, § LXIV.

§ LXXI, 374. ("VAS")*á-la/i/u-na-ma-ti* = b-ḥmdt, "from envy".

375–376. *a-ta* AEDIFICARE-*MI-ri+i-i* // ys': see above, § LXVI.

§ LXXII, 378. MALUS-*ta₄-sa-tara/i-ri+i* = b-ḥn't, "from bad/hatred". Cf. above, 102, for note on rendering(s) of MALUS.

380. (MALUS₂)*ha-ni-ia-ta-sa-tara/i-ti* = b-r', "from evil". For ending *-sa-tara/i-*, cf. ("BONUS")*sa-na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-*, above, § XVIII, 94.

§ LXXIII, 386–387. ARHA MANUS/*"69"(-)*i-ti-tu* // mh, "delete", as in § LXIII above. Steinherr's edition of Ho. (lion, see photograph, *Or. NS* 28 (1959), Tab. LV Abb. 25) gives "PES"(-)*i-ti-tu-*; but also an unexpected MAGNUS over the following (DEUS)*i-ia-sá*. Examination of the photograph suggested, and collation confirms, that Steinherr mistakenly divided the sign *69 into PES and MAGNUS. Elsewhere the verb (-)*i-ti-*, "delete" is determined by *69 (KARATEPE, 341; TELL AHMAR 1, § 27; TELL AHMAR 2, § 23; also KARKAMIŠ A5a, § 14?; cf. also TELL AHMAR,

frag. 8), except the present Hu. attestation, where MANUS may be identified as a more pictographic version of *69.

For the correspondences of the Hier. and Phoen. gods, see Weippert, *ZDMG* Suppl. I (1969), esp. pp. 197 ff.; and criticism by Bron, *Recherches*, pp. 182–189.

395–396. Hu. *á-pa* REX-*bi-sá*//Ho. *á-pa-sá* REX-*ta-bi-sa* = b-*mmlkt h'*: Phoen. noun and congruent demonstrative pronoun clearly sing. (fem.), so also Hier. form, abstract in -(a)bi(+sa), thus acc. sing. N, and its congruent *á-pa*. Ho.'s REX-*ta-bi-sa* reveals more of the stem and doubtless corresponds to Cun. Luw. *hantawatabiša* (so Laroche, *FdX* VI, pp. 104–106; *pace* Starke, *KZ* 94 (1980), p. 77 n. 15; cf. also REX-*ti* = *hantawati-*, above, 137); Ho.'s *á-pa-sá* more problematic beside the easily identifiable *á-pa*, former identified by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, *Edition*, p. 129, as gen. sing., "his", but perhaps simply an error. For a different grammatical analysis of the phrase, which is central to a different view of the neuter particle *-sa*, see Starke, *Stammbildung*, § 19 with Anm. 85.

Phoen. ʔ' dm šm: no Hier. correspondence, and indeed inappropriate to context.

§ LXXIV, 401–402(?). Hu. POST-*na-wa/i* ARHA²¹ // Ho. POST-*na-ha-wa/i*: the Ho. reading without ARHA should be taken as the correct text (since ARHA has no apparent function), and Hu. as an error to be emended accordingly (or perhaps read POST-*na-'ha-wa/i?*). POST-*na*, "after(wards), in future" should probably be the Hier. correspondence of the problematic Phoen. ʔs, for which see Bron, *Recherches*, p. 123.

403. ("CRUS<")*ta-za-tu/ye_n*, "let it stand//be".

404–405. *ara/i-zi(-i)* OMNIS-*MI-zi* // l-'lm, "for all ages // to eternity". The word *ara/i-*, "age, time" is now recognized elsewhere: HAMA 4, §§ 10, 12, 13; KAR-KAMIŠ A18b, § 2, and parallel passages, see Commentaries; also identified with Cun. Luw. *ar-*, see *ibid*.

§ LXXV, 410. REL-*ri+i* = km, "as like".

412. "CRUS"-*i*: no Phoen. correspondence expressed, but understand verb "(is)".

KARATEPE. The Syllabary.

For tables showing the Regular Syllabary and Alternative Syllabograms, see Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Appendix III, p. 90 f.

The *script* is incised, and as *sign forms* both monumental and cursive forms are used, the common signs with two forms appearing frequently in either form: e.g. *ta*, *tà*, *sà*, *na*, *ma*; though *mu* and *u* are found only in the monumental form (except perhaps in 142 b). Most notable *peculiarity* is a monumental form of *ma* which is easily confused with *sà*: see words 33, 53, 69 (Hu.) 92, 114, 281 (Ho.). *Word-dividers* are frequent.

Syllabary is notable for number of rare syllabograms used, both those found in other inscriptions and those confined to KARATEPE. Since these normally corre-

spond to a sign of established value in the other version, their reading does not present much problem. The following may be noted:

☒ *TANA* (10, 14, 20, 22, 32, 125, 154, 162, 198) = *-ta-na* (199).

☞ BONUS for *wà/i* (21, 84, 196, 295, 303).*

☞ *li* (31, 107, 278); also TOPADA, §§ 6, 32.

☞ LINGERE for *za₄* (69, 275, 281, 284); also KARKAMIŠ A21, § 4 (?).

☞ VIR for *zi* (102, 107, 136); also KULULU 4, § 3.

☉ *sa₄* = *sa* (106); also KULULU 3, § 1; KULULU 4, §§ 1, 8, 10, 11; KULULU 5, §§ 3, 7 d, 13; KAYSERİ, §§ 1, 5, 7; TOPADA, §§ 4, 17, 19, 28; BOHÇA, § 1.

☉ *li* = *li* (107).

☞ *má* = *ma* (127, also 374?).

☞ SOLIUM + *a* for *ia* (131, 283, 292, 310); also KAYSERİ, §§ 5, 18.

☞ SOLIUM + *RA/I* for *ri+i* = *ti-i* (156, 277); also KAYSERİ, § 7.

☞ OCCIDENS for *ià* (297).

◊ *mi* (132, 151, 286); also KULULU 3, § 2; TOPADA, §§ 6, 10, 17, 31, 33.

☞ AVIS for *zi₄* (139, 293).

☞ *ri* (175, 280, 315).

☞ PRAE for *pari* = *pa+ra/i* (264); also HAMA 4, § 1; RESTAN/QAL'AT EL MUDIQ, § 1; HAMA 8, § 1; BABYLON 1, § 1.

☞ IUDEX + *RA/I* for *tara/i_x* = *tà+ra/i* (277); also KARKAMIŠ A5a, § 2; ÇİFTLİK, § 16.

☞ REGIO for *tu₄* (283, 325).

☞ *bu_x* = *bu* (284) probably variant sign form..

☞ *mi* = *mi* (293)

☞ *tù* = *tu* (283, 297, 321); also TOPADA, §§ 18, 20.

☞ *ti* = *ti* (15, 54, 83, 89, 103, 293); also AKSARAY, § 8; SHEIZAR, § 1.

* The new seal impression inscriptions from Boğazköy 1990–91 confirm Nowicki's proposal to recognize the sign *HH* no. 320 as the Empire Period form of *HH* no. 165 (see *Fs Neumann* (1982), p. 231): an Empire Period seal usage of BONUS with phonetic value *wà/i* is thereby confirmed.

I.2–4. KARATEPE 2–4

Location. Orthostat fragment and two bases, the last *in situ* in the south wall of the western gate-chamber of the South Gate at Karatepe-Aslantaş; the first two of uncertain provenance but apparently associated with the *in situ* piece.

Description. The *in situ* base inscription of the South Gate, KARATEPE 4, bears two clauses of sinistroverse inscription, beginning with one word placed on the left end of an otherwise uninscribed base block and ending before the left end of the adjoining block, leaving a blank space after it. The reason for this curious placing demands consideration. The other two pieces have been partially reassembled from scattered fragments. KARATEPE 2 consists of part of the two first lines of an inscription running sinistroverse-dextroverse, and the bottom left-hand corner with sinistroverse writing which is thus the end of the piece and part of an odd-numbered line, l. 3, or more likely, l. 5. The piece is most easily reconstructed as part of a five-line orthostat, narrower than most orthostats, though wider than the usual binders. KARATEPE 3 is reconstructed as a base-block of the regular size in the western gate-chamber of the South Gate, completely occupied with a sinistroverse inscription. Reasons for associating the two unprovenanced reconstructed pieces with the *in situ* base block are given below.

Dimensions: see Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*.

Condition: KARATEPE 2–3 as preserved, clear, KARATEPE 4, complete, undamaged.

Script, sign forms, peculiarities, word-dividers: as for KARATEPE 1 (p. 67).

Discovery. As noted, KARATEPE 4 excavated *in situ*; KARATEPE 2 and 3 reconstructed from scattered fragments. For details see Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, pp. 35–37.

Publication. KARATEPE 2 and 3 for first time by Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, p. 35 f. and pls. 108–111 (photographs, copies).

KARATEPE 4, Bossert, *Belleten* 18 (1954), p. 32 and Abb. 8 (photograph), 9 (text in linear arrangement); now Çambel, *op. cit.*, p. 36, pl. 112 (photographs, copy).

Editions (KARATEPE 4 only). Laroche, *Syria* 35 (1958), pp. 275–283, with fig. 5 (recopy); Meriggi, *Studi ... Levi della Vida* II (1956), p. 129 f. fig. 2 (recopy); id., *Manuale* II/1 (1967), p. 99 f., no. 24.5.

Content. The three pieces are the only Hier. inscriptions found at Karatepe-Aslantaş which are not part of the great bilingual, hence their designation as KARATEPE separate inscriptions. This fact on its own suggests that they may be associated. KARATEPE 2 with its one preserved clause effectively summarizes the whole long bilingual, but, notably, is the only passage from Karatepe to present Azatiwatas in the 3rd person instead of the 1st. KARATEPE 3 surprisingly introduces another authority besides Azatiwatas, whose name is largely lost, but whose titles (River-Lord, He[ro]), ethnic affiliation ([the city?] Zi[...]), and patronym ((M)ukatalas's son) are fairly preserved, and who is apparently the subject of a verb in the second short clause. The long known KARATEPE 4 was, be-

fore the appearance of KARATEPE 3, difficult to understand. With wide blank spaces on either side, it appeared to be complete and self-contained, yet the first clause did not appear to have any connection with the second, a scribal signature of the usual kind, nor was it easy to understand on its own – the connectives do not look like initial ones and no subject is apparent. These difficulties could be remedied by taking it as a

continuation of KARATEPE 3 (see below, Commentary).

Date. As for KARATEPE 1: apparently beginning of 7th century B.C.

Text, Photographs. See Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş* (above, Publication).

Transliteration	Translation
KARATEPE 2	
§ 1 <i>za-wa/i</i> “CASTRUM”- <i>z[a][x] wa/i-su[...]na</i> AEDIFICARE + <i>MI-ma-ià</i> ¹ (OCULUS) <i>á-z[a]-[t]i-w[a/i]-tà- [...]</i>	This fortress ... Azatiwatas built. [...]
§ 2 ...	-(<i>m</i>) <i>u</i> ² <i>á-za-ti</i> ...] he/they will love/eat!
KARATEPE 3	
§ 1 FLUMEN.DOMINUS- <i>ia-s[á]-¹sa- [...]</i> x HE[ROS] <i>zi- [...]</i> x- <i>[w]a/i-ni-sa[(URBS)?]</i> ¹ (<i>m</i>) <i>u-ka- FRATER-la-sa</i> (INFANS) <i>ni-mu-wa/i-za-sá</i>	The River-Lord Sa[...], the He[ro] of [the city?] Zi[...], (M)ukatalas’s(?) son.
§ 2 <i>w[a/i]-ta ARHA</i> <i>[u]-sá-[ta?]-</i>	[He] brought[t] away,
KARATEPE 4	
§ 1 REL- <i>pa-wa/i</i> (“PORTA”) <i>ku-rú-pi-ia + ra/i(URBS)</i> PRAE- <i>i</i> <i>pi-ia-tà-na(URBS)</i> PUGNUS.PUGNUS- <i>ta</i>	and (from) before (the gate of) the city Kurupiya(ra/i) he ...-ed the city Piyata.
§ 2 <i>za-ia-pa-wa/i</i> SCRIBA- <i>la-li-ia</i> ¹ DEUS- <i>ni-i-sá</i> ¹ DEUS- <i>na-(OCULUS)á-za-mi-sá-há</i> (“CAPERE + SCALPRUM”)REL- <i>za-ta</i>	These writings Masanis and Masanzamis incised.

Commentary

KARATEPE 2

§ 1. [x] *wa/i-su[...]na*: [x] conceivably the tip of the forward-pointing horn of a large ox-head following *su*, which would permit a reading *wa/i-su-[u]-na*. Resulting word would look like infinitive of verb *wasu-*, for which see BOHÇA, § 2, and Commentary; sense, “to adorn”?

§ 2. ...(*m*)*u*² *á-za-ti*: amount of space lost at top of line will depend on whether the fragment represents l. 3 almost joining the upper fragment, or l. 5, which would permit more space. In latter case, there could have been space for [LITUUS] or [OCULUS], identifying verb as “love” rather than “eat”.

KARATEPE 3

§ 1. Identification as title + personal name + epithet + ethnicon + patronym seems assured, thereby introducing another personality besides Azatiwatas into the KARATEPE inscriptions.

|FLUMEN.DOMINUS-*ia-s[á]-*: for this title, see BOYBEYPINARI 1, § 2, and Commentary, with other attestations, where it is suggested that these “river-lords” held authority in “river-lands”. This would seem also appropriate in well-watered Cilicia, whose “river-lands” are referred to in KARATEPE 1, § XLVIII.

¹*sa- [...]*x: inspection confirms personal determinative, thus the presence of a personal name here.

|HE[ROS]: for postulated placing of the two elements of HEROS (“profile” and “vase”), cf. e.g. SULTANHAN, § 1.

|*zi- [...]*x-*[w]a/i-ni-sa[(URBS)?]*: identification as ethnicon depends on the recognition of a *-wani-* ending together with the possibility of recognizing the pointed tip of URBS.

¹(*m*)*u-ka-|FRATER-la-sa*: recognition as a personal name, the patronym in gen. sing. before *nimuwizas*, depends on the observation of the personal determinative; also for the recognition of *-|FRATER-la-* as a common onomastic element (see EGRİKOY, § 3, Commentary), with the possible reading *-atala-* (see KARAKAMIS A15b, § 16, Commentary). For the first element, a decision between *uka-* and *muka-* is not possible epigraphically, and will have to depend on a lexical identification.

§ 2. Seems likely to require restoration as short clause with finite verb following § 1, in which an individual is introduced with titles, ethnicon and patronym. Verb must be 3 sing., probably preterite, yet even this leaves the clause curiously isolated and without obvious object. This suggests continuation on an adjoining element.

KARATEPE 4

Since its publication, this inscription, with its blank space before and after it, seemed to be an isolated and complete unit which should be intelligible on its own. The second clause has long been recognized as the type of “scribal signature” found elsewhere appended to inscriptions. Yet the first clause has always been difficult to link to the second, and in particular its introductory particles do not look appropriate to an initial self-contained passage, but rather suggest that it was a continuation of a text from elsewhere.

The reconstitution of the base inscription KARATEPE 3 has produced an element 0.32 m. high, thus agreeing with the base KARATEPE 4. As noted above, this piece seems likely to be incomplete and to have required continuation. Hypothetically the two inscriptions on the bases of similar height should be juxtaposed. The sense produced is not such as to confirm this unambiguously, but looks possible, as examined in detail below.

If the text did indeed run directly on from KARATEPE 3 to KARATEPE 4, the question naturally arises as to where the former was originally placed in the Gate Chamber. Exact juxtaposition with unbroken text sequence could be obtained by placing the base block with KARATEPE 3 at right-angles to the *in situ* base blocks with KARATEPE 4. The element could then have served as a podium for a stele or perhaps statue of the named river-lord, placed in the western gate chamber of the South Gate against the south wall, and visible to one entering the gate on looking left. Such an installation would have resembled the colossal statue and base found in the second east gate chamber of the South Gate of Karkamiš (for which see Woolley, *Carchemish* II, p. 92 and pl. 12). Halet Çambel pertinently points out that the absence of any rubble foundations for such a monument argues against this emplacement. Yet in the case of the Karkamiš parallel noted, Woolley specifically states: “The recesses were not paved, but had plain floors of beaten earth” (loc. cit., p. 91), nor does he mention or draw any such rubble foundation to the base. Alternatively the base with KARATEPE 3 could have formed part of the line of bases to the right of that with KARATEPE 4. The discontinuity of the supposed continuous text could be explained by the presence against the south wall of the Gate Chamber of an object which masked a stretch of the base, though the argument about the lack of rubble foundation could be applied in the same way against this supposition.

§ 1. |REL-*pa-wa/i*: as noted, does not seem likely as an introductory particle for a self-contained inscription; resembles rather the non-subordinating conjunction remarked above, words 56 and 303, where a resumptive

sense was suggested. Appropriateness to the reconstitution of the sense proposed here is not immediately apparent.

(“PORTA”) *ku-rú-pi-ia+ra/i*(URBS): unclear whether dat. sing. of place-name *Kurupiyara* or abl. sing. of *Kurupiya*. Former might be easier to translate with postposition PRAE-*i*, simply “before Kurupiyara”; but Laroche in his Edition notes the attestation in Cun. Hitt. of a toponym ^{URU}*Kuruppiya* (KUB XXIII, 11 ii 17'), one of the cities of Assuwa defeated by Tudhaliyas I/II and thus located in western Anatolia. PORTA is marked as a logogram, and it is unclear whether it should be read as an independent word or regarded as a determinative.

pi-ia-tà-na(URBS): apparently acc. sing. MF of place-name *Piyata*, thus dir. object.

PUGNUS.PUGNUS-*ta*: still unclear verb, seen above, § XXI, 111, where it is apparently intrans., as also in the ASSUR letters (see General Commentary (B1)); here, as also in SULTANHAN, § 43, it is apparently transitive. See further now Hawkins, *StBoT* Bh. 3, Appendix 6.

Sense: KARATEPE 3, § 2, +4, § 1: the combination of these two clauses to form a connected text, with the river-lord Sa[...] as subject, does not produce immediately obvious sense, but is at least preferable to attempting to understand KARATEPE 4, § 1, on its own.

§ 2. SCRIBA-*la-li-ia*: identified by Laroche (*Syria* 35 (1958), p. 281) as *laliya*, associated with Hitt.-Luw. *lala/i-*, “tongue”. But Hier. “tongue” is recognized in “LINGUA”-*la-ti-*, = *lalati-* (KARKAMIŠ A15b, §§ 20, 21, see Commentary), where in the same inscription SCRIBA-*li(-ia)-ti(-i)* (abl.), thrice attested (§ 19), is clearly the same word as the present attestation. Alongside “LINGUA”-*lati-*, “tongue”, it is not likely that SCRIBA-*lali-* would stand for the same word, indeed it is contrasted with it, and in view of the logogram is interpreted as “script, writing” as against “tongue, language”. It is difficult to dissociate SCRIBA-*laliya*, “writings”, i.e. perhaps “Hier. signs”, from SCRIBA-*la-*, “scribe”, probably read *tupal-* as in Hitt. (Laroche, *RHA* XIV/58 (1956), p. 26), and it would seem obvious that we have a further derived form from this noun; cf. such derivatives as *tatali-*, *hubatali-*, “fatherly, grandfatherly”.

¹DEUS-*ní-i-sá* ¹DEUS-*na*-(OCULUS)-*á-za-mi-sá-bá*: undoubtedly the names of the two scribes (as taken by Laroche, *Noms*, nos. 772, 773), in spite of Meriggi’s reservations; cf. PN ¹DEUS-*ní-*, KULULU lead strips 1, § 9, entry 55(4); frag. 1 i 1, ii 1).

(“CAPERE+SCALPRUM”)REL-*za-*, i.e. *kwaza-*, “incise”; now identified in “scribal signatures” BOYBEYPI-NARI 1, § 11; GAZIANTEP 1, l. 3; MEHARDE, § 9; SHEIZAR, § 8; TOPADA, § 39; İVRİZ 1, § 4; İVRİZ frag. 2; also different context, without logogram, ERKİLET 1, § 2; KARABURUN, § 11; ŞIRZI, § 8.

I.5. KARATEPE fragments

See Halet Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Hieroglyphic fragments, pp. 40–48, pls. 114–121.

I.6. DOMUZTEPE 1

Location. Statue base, still on site of Domuztepe, on the east bank of the Ceyhan river opposite Karatepe-Aslantaş, Cilicia.

Description. Double bull podium of black basalt, bearing on flank of either bull a 2-line inscription, both very poorly preserved. See preliminary report by Alkim, *Belleten* 14 (1950), pp. 650, 655 f.

Dimensions: ht., 0.80 m.; w., 1.0 m.; th., 1.30 m.

Condition (inscription): desperate.

Script, line-dividers: relief (worn).

Sign forms, peculiarities, word-dividers: unclear.

Discovery. Found by the Karatepe Expedition of Bossert and Alkim at Domuztepe in 1947 lying out of its original position. See Bossert and Alkim, *Karatepe II* (1947), pp. 15 (Turkish), 28 (English), pl. XXXII 156–160 (photographs, left side only); (Bossert and) Alkim, *Karatepe Kazıları* (1950), pp. 25 f. (Turkish), 67, 74 (German), pl. XXX 139–144 (photographs and drawing of podium only, inscription not visible); Alkim, *Belleten* 16 (1952), pp. 234 (Turkish), 247 (English), lev. XLV res. 27 (photograph, left side).

Publication. Only preliminary notices as given above. Further treatment promised by Bossert was not undertaken, presumably because of the illegibility of the

inscription. Now see Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Appendix 4, p. 94; pls. 122–123.

Sculpture. Orthmann, *USK (Domuztepe 1)*, pp. 112, 243, 482, Taf. 6 b.

Content. Royal inscription introduced by *amu*-sign (“I (am) ...”). It is particularly unfortunate that not even the names of the king and his kingdom can be identified, since they would have given important historical information as to whether the power of Cilicia extended across the river Ceyhan, or whether the river was a frontier. In fact there is evidence that Cilician kings did reach through the Amanus mountains into north Syria in the 9th century B.C. (see above, the Historical Context, p. 41), so it remains most likely that Domuztepe was held by them.

Date. Stylistic criteria only; see Orthmann, loc. cit., who places the piece in *Spätheth.* II, i.e. early 9th century B.C., by comparison with bases from Karkamiş in the Suhis-Katuwas style.

Text. After examining the inscription *in situ* for a considerable time in favourable light, I was unable positively to identify any sign on the left side besides *amu*, and on the right sides besides a *sa*.

I.7. DOMUZTEPE 2

Location, Description. Stele, Karatepe Excavations Depot. Small stele, showing Storm-God figure broken off at the knees. He wears a horned helmet and short, belted tunic with sword at waist, and carries in his right hand raised behind him a double-axe and in his left, held out in front, the Hieroglyph EGO (*HH* no. 1)

Dimensions: max. preserved ht., 0.80 m.; w., 0.56 m.; th., 0.30 m.

Discovery, Publication. Found in winter 1982–83 on south slope of Domuztepe: see H. Çambel, *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, p. 94 f., pls. 124–125.

Date. 9th–8th centuries B.C. The Domuztepe settlement and sculpture seem in general earlier rather than later.

Comment. Traditionally, in Hittite Empire divine representations (e.g. at Yazılıkaya, and on seals), deities including the Storm-God hold their Hieroglyphic names in this fashion, though the style does not persist into the Late Period, where the Storm-God always carries the thunderbolt. Is the present god really signalling that his name is *amu*, “I (am)”, and how could this be understood? If we seek a god whose name is “I am”, we note that the Hebrew Yahweh gave his name to Moses as just that (*Exodus* 3: 13–14). Cilicia was clearly open to Phoenician influence, and indeed the O.T. records that Solomon traded with Que (above, p. 41 and n. 37). Is it unthinkable that in this little Domuztepe Storm-God we might have a contemporary representation of the great Hebrew deity?

I.8. ADANA

Colossal limestone figure of the Storm-God, with basalt base representing a chariot drawn by two bulls. These monuments were ploughed up in a field near Adana in the spring 1998, and taken to Adana Museum. The base

bears a Phoenician and a Hieroglyphic inscription, very probably giving a new bilingual text. Date: probably late 8th century B.C.

II. KARKAMIŠ

The Historical Context

Background: the Hittite Empire and after

Archaeological investigations

The state and its extent in the Iron Age

Karkamiš in the Assyrian sources

The Hieroglyphic monuments

Archaic group

House of Suhis

House of Astiruwas

Non-royal inscriptions

Fragments

The Inscriptions

Archaic group

1. A4*b* (stele)
2. A16*c* (stele)
3. A18*d* (lion fragment)

*House of Suhis**Astuwatamanzas*

4. A14*b* (lion fragment)

Suhis II

5. A14*a* (lion fragments)
- 6–7. A1*a* and A1*b* (orthostats)
8. KELEKLI (stele)

Katuwas

- 9–10. A11*a* and A4*d* (door jamb and statue inscription)
- 11+12. A11*b*+*c* (door jambs)
- 13+14. A2+3 (door jambs)
15. A12 (stele)
16. A13*d* (orthostat)
- 17–19. A23 (+A26*a*²) and A20*a*1–2 (door jamb and fragments)
- (20. A25*a* (fragment))
- (21. A16*b* (fragment))

*House of Astiruwas**Yariris*

- 22–23. A6 and A7 (orthostat and epigraphs)
24. A15*b* (base)
25. A24 (stele(?) fragments)
- 25a. KARKAMIŠ stone bowl

Kamanis

26. A31 (stele)
27. CEKKE (stele)
28. A4*a* (drum)
- (29. TÜNPI (stele))
- (30. A25*b* (fragment))

Pisiri(?)

- 31–32. A21 and A20*b* (orthostats and fragments)
33. A22*c*+A20*b*6 (orthostat fragments)

Genealogical fragments (attribution uncertain)

34. A27*u*
35. A27*e* frags. 1–2
36. A13*a*–*c* (statue base fragments)
37. A26*f* (orthostat fragment)
38. A15*e*
39. A27*c*

Non-royal inscriptions

40. KÖRKÜN (stele)
41. A17*b* (stele)
42. A30*b* (base)
43. TİLSEVET (tombstone)
44. A18*b* (tombstone)
45. A5*a* (tombstone)
46. A5*b* (tombstone fragment)
47. A18*f* (tombstone fragment)
48. A4*c* (tombstone)
49. A16*f* (tombstone fragment)

Miscellaneous

50. A15*a* (stele fragment)
51. A15*c* (stele fragment)
52. A16*a* (lion fragments)
53. A17*a* (stele)
54. A17*c* (stele)
55. A17*d* (stele)
56. A18*a* (stele)
57. A18*e* (orthostat fragment)
58. A18*j* (stele)
59. B33 (epigraphs)

Fragments

60. A15*d*
61. A16*d*
62. A16*e*
63. A18*b*
64. A18*c*
65. A18*i*
66. B39*a*
67. A19
68. A26*b*–*e*
69. A27
70. A28
71. A29
72. A30
73. KARKAMIŠ sherd

Unpublished Fragments

74. KARKAMIŠ frag. a/b
(see Addendum, p. 590 f.)

The Historical Context

Background: the Hittite Empire and after

The city-state of Karkamiš may be regarded as the principal representative of the Neo-Hittite states, both by reason of its historical association and continuity, and of its artistic and epigraphic monuments.¹ This status was recognized in antiquity, in that “Karkamiš” and “Hatti” are often used interchangeably in Assyrian sources.² This may reflect a claim by the kings of Karkamiš in the dark age *c.* 1200–1000 B.C. to the position and titles of the Great King of Hatti.³

From the time that Suppiluliumas installed his son Piyassilis on the throne of Karkamiš under the name of Šarri-Kušuh, *c.* 1340 B.C., the states of Syria under their own vassal kings were ruled primarily from Karkamiš.⁴ The line of Šarri-Kušuh continued in unbroken succession from father to son for at least five generations, in contrast to the less regular succession of the Hittite royal line in Hattusa. The latest generation has recently been established by the discovery of impressions of a Karkamiš royal seal of Kuzi-Tešub, entitled “king of the land of Karkamiš, son of Talmi-Tešub, king of the land of Karkamiš ...”.⁵ Further evidence now suggests that this king and his line may have survived the collapse of the Hittite Empire.

Ample evidence for the position of the king of Karkamiš acting as Hittite viceroy is provided by the political archives of the vassal kingdom of Ugarit,⁶ and more recently those of Emar.⁷ It does not seem that Karkamiš’s control of Syria was seriously shaken after Mursilis had reestablished the Hittite dynasty in the critical period following the death of Šarri-Kušuh. The conquest of Hanigalbat by Adad-nirari I of Assyria (1307–1275 B.C.) and more permanently by Shalmaneser I (1274–1245 B.C.)⁸ put an end to Hittite control of this buffer kingdom established by Suppiluliumas, and stripped Karkamiš of its territory east of the Euphrates, leaving the city directly exposed to the rising Assyrian power. This position was however successfully held even in periods of forceful Assyrian thrusts.⁹

At the collapse of the Hittite Empire during the movements of the sea-peoples, as recorded by Rameses III in his 8th year, *c.* 1190 B.C.,¹⁰ Hatti, Qode (Cilicia¹¹), Karkamiš, Arzawa, and Alašiya were simultaneously swept away. In this context “Karkamiš” probably refers to the Hittite empire in Syria. There is no evidence, epigraphic or archaeological, that the city itself, remote from coastal depredations, was destroyed: indeed the recent appearance of a successor of Talmi-Tešub, the Kuzi-Tešub noted above, provides the contrary evidence of continuity. This is further supported by the recognition of Kuzi-Tešub’s name in the genealogies of two kings of Melid, who claimed to be his

grandsons, and entitled him “Great King, Hero of Karkamiš”.¹² None of the Hittite Empire kings of Karkamiš had expressly laid claim to the first title, not even Kuzi-Tešub himself on his seal inscription. This belonged only to the paramount king ruling from Hattusa.¹³ But it looks as if Kuzi-Tešub, after the disappearance of the line of Suppiluliumas I in Hattusa, laid claim to the vacant titles both on his own behalf as the senior surviving member of the line (he was Suppiluliumas’s great-great-grandson), and perhaps also on behalf of Karkamiš. At least three subsequent kings of Karkamiš maintained these imperial pretensions (see below).

Nearly a century later, Tiglath-pileser I, crossing the Euphrates *en route* for Mount Lebanon, *c.* 1100 B.C.,

1 See for a general treatment Hawkins, *RLA* V/5–6 (1980), s.v. Karkamiš, with bibliography. For Assyrian representations of the people, see Wäfler, *AOAT* 6 (1975), pp. 216–231.

2 See Hawkins, *RLA* IV/2–3 (1973), s.v. Hatti: the 1st millennium B.C., especially §§ 3–4.1.

3 See below, with nn. 12–13.

4 For this period, see especially Klengel, *GS* I (1965), 6 Kap.; also id., *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Nordsyriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z.* (*AOF* 2 (1975), pp. 47–64).

5 D. Sürenhagen, Ein Königssiegel aus Kargamis (*MDOG* 118 (1986), pp. 183–190). Talmi-Tešub was previously the last attested king of the Empire dynasty. See now Hawkins, Kuzi-Tešub and the “Great Kings” of Karkamiš (*An. St.* 38 (1988), pp. 99–108); note the correct reading of Kuzi-Tešub’s seal: for Sürenhagen’s *ku-ni-ti-muwa-sa* REGIS.FILIUS! we should read DEUS-*ni-ti u-ni-mi-sa* X FILIUS, “... son, recognized by the god(s)”, (*ibid.*, p. 100 and nn. 4–5).

6 Klengel, *GS* I, loc. cit.; also Hawkins *RLA* V, s.v. Karkamiš, § 6.

7 D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata* (Emar VI/1–3; Paris, 1985); cf. the preliminary report, id., *AAAS* 25 (1975), pp. 87–93. Note in particular the tablets and seals of Sahurunuwa: Arnaud, op. cit., VI.3, no. 31, p. 44 f.; D. Beyer, Le sceau-cylindre de Sahurunuwa, roi de Karkemish, in *La Syrie au Bronze Récent* (Extraits de la XXVIIe R.A.I., Paris, juillet 1980; Paris, 1982), pp. 67–78; and of Ini-Tešub and Hismi-Tešub (Msk. 73.57–58): Arnaud, op. cit., VI.3, nos. 18–19, pp. 29–31; Laroche, in *Meskene-Emar: dix ans de travaux* (ed. D. Beyer; Paris, 1982), p. 55 f.

8 See von Weiher, *RLA* IV/2–3 (1973), s.v. Hanigalbat; id., *Fr Otten* (1), pp. 321–326; Nashef, *RGTC* 5, s.v. Hanigalbat; Grayson, *RIMA* 1, A.0.76.3, ll. 4–51; *RIMA* 1, A.0. 77.1, ll. 56–87; A. Harrak, *Assyria and Hanigalbat* (Hildesheim etc., 1987), ch. 2–3.

9 Adad-nirari I and Shalmaneser I only claimed to have conquered “as far as Karkamiš”, not to have attacked it. Tukulti-Ninurta I does not mention the city and his struggle with the Hittites lay further north: cf. I. Singer, The battle of Nihriya and the End of the Hittite Empire, *ZA* 75 (1985), pp. 100–123.

10 Cilicia, p. 39 n. 17.

11 See Cilicia, p. 39 and n. 18.

12 See Malatya, p. 286 f. and nn. 62, 65.

13 Gonnet, *Hethitica* III, p. 18 f., 25. But note that a decree of Tudhaliyas IV does appear to rank Ini-Tešub along with himself as a “Great King”: Nougayrol, *PRU* IV, 18.06 + 17.635, p. 137 f., l. 20 f.; Klengel, *GS* I, pp. 83, 86 and nn. 138, 139, 154. Ini-Tešub

encountered Ini-Tešub “king of the land of Hatti”.¹⁴ It is hard to see where the centre of this country would have been if not in Karkamiš, and the king’s name, recalling the famous Ini-Tešub of the Hittite Empire dynasty, reinforces the impression of dynastic continuity.

Archaeological investigations

The site of Karkamiš, even before its identification as the ancient city by George Smith in 1876,¹⁵ was known as a source of sculpture and inscriptions. This prompted operations by agents of the British Museum in the years 1878–81, which recovered some important monuments.¹⁶ Otherwise Karkamiš is known archaeologically from the British excavations of 1911–14, cut short by the outbreak of war, resumed in 1920, and again terminated by the outbreak of further hostilities.¹⁷ The establishment at that date of the Turkish-Syrian frontier running through the site of Karkamiš itself has precluded the resumption of these incomplete excavations ever since, by reason of the politically sensitive location of the site.

The achievements of the excavations were limited to a survey of the fortifications, and to the excavation of the upper levels of the citadel mound, and of an area of the lower town at its foot, running from a Water Gate on the river, past a “Hilani” building to the Temple of the Storm-God and including two monumental entrances, the “Great Staircase” ascending to the citadel, and the “King’s Gate”.¹⁸

The citadel excavations were not productive, having recovered principally a poorly preserved Iron Age building, suggested with little supporting evidence to have been the temple of Kubaba. The fortifications of the Lower Town, which lay south-west of the Citadel, consisted of a river wall with Water Gate running south from the Citadel and the north wall running west from it; the ends of these two were connected by a long loop of earth rampart pierced by two gates, the West and the South. An outer fortification enclosing an Outer Town further to the south-west was traced, and some private houses lying within were examined. The date of these frequently rebuilt fortifications could not be established in detail but doubtless went back at least to the IInd millennium B.C.

Otherwise the only substantial remains uncovered were those of the Iron-Age Lower Town, from which the bulk of the Karkamiš sculpture and inscriptions found *in situ* were recovered.¹⁹ The Temple of the Storm-God, the Long Wall of Sculpture, the Gatehouse of the Great Staircase, the Herald’s Wall, the Royal Buttress and the Processional Entry all produced their sculptures, mainly relief orthostats, and their dedicatory inscriptions. The circumstances of discovery were such that in most cases it was the sculptured facades and

entrances that were excavated rather than the buildings themselves. Only the Water Gate produced sculptures without inscriptions, and only the Hilani building produced neither sculpture nor inscriptions *in situ*. This area of excavations, as well as other locations on the site and chance finds of uncertain provenance, added a mass of sculpture and inscriptions, much of it fragmentary.

The State and its extent in the Iron Age

Karkamiš was essentially a city-state in the Iron Age, though a rich and powerful one, presumably by reason of its important position on ancient trade-routes at a key Euphrates crossing.²⁰ Assyrian references are normally to the city Karkamiš, until after the Assyrian conquest and annexation, when references to a land (KUR) also appear.²¹ The indigenous Hieroglyphic sources normally determine the name *Karkamis*²² with “city” (URBS).²³ The city seems to have held no territory east of the Euphrates in the Iron Age, where attested neighbours were the Hittite principality of Til-Barsip and the Aramean tribal state of Bit-Adini, until the conquest of these by the Assyrians in 856 B.C.²⁴ Bit-Adini on the contrary is attested in 858–857 B.C. as holding cities on the west bank of the Euphrates, in

did use the title “Hero” of himself, not on his seals but in edicts: e.g. *PRU* IV, p. 121, 17.352 I.3; p. 164 f., 17.68 I.4, 17.108 I.3.

14 Texts 3 and 4: Weidner *AJO* 18 (1957–58), pp. 344 (= *RIMA* 2, A.0.87.3), ll. 26–28, 350 (= *RIMA* 2, A.0.87.4), ll. 28–30.

Note the correction of the erroneously restored parallel text *KAH* II, 71, by Hawkins, *Iraq* 36 (1974), p. 70 f. n. 24.

15 D. G. Hogarth, *Carchemish* I (London, 1914), p. 6 and n. 1.

16 *Ibid.*, pp. 8–12.

17 Reported by C. L. Woolley, *Carchemish* II (London, 1921); and Woolley, with R. D. Barnett, *Carchemish* III (London, 1952).

18 Cf. the summary of the results by Hawkins, *RLA* V, s.v. Karkamiš, §§ 8–12.

19 Note in particular the review articles of *Carchemish* III: P. Meriggi, *La Ricostruzione di Kargamis* (*RSO* 29 (1954), pp. 1–16); H. G. Güterbock, *Carchemish* (*JNES* 13 (1954), pp. 102–114).

20 Cf. I. J. Winter, *Carchemish ša kišad Puratti* (*An. St.* 33 (1983), pp. 177–197).

21 Parpola, *N-AT*, s.v. GARGAMIŠ. The sole use of KUR before the Sargonid period determines the ethnicon *Gargamišaya* on the Kurkh Monolith of Shalmaneser III (III R 7, i 43); but all other attestations of the toponym on that monument use the determinative URU, as does also a new duplicate (see below, n. 32).

22 Written *KAR-ka-mi-sà/si* (ethnicon)-(URBS). The use of the initial sign *KAR* is regular in the Empire period; note also writings with *ka+ra/i-*, Late period archaic (KARKAMIŠ A4b, § 1; A18d1). The writing *KAR-mi-si-* (KARKAMIŠ A2+3, § 5, see Commentary) confirms that the writings *ka+ra/i-mi-sà//si-* (AS-SUR letter a, § 6; SULTANHAN, § 32) also refer to Karkamiš.

23 The use of REGIO on KARKAMIŠ 4b, § 1, also KARKAMIŠ A14b, § 1, seems to be archaic: cf. the same use on the seal of Kuzi-Tešub (see Sürenhagen, above, n. 5); and by the other Empire period kings of Karkamiš in their titularies, especially on their seals.

24 See Tell Ahmar, p. 224 and nn. 8–11.

the land of Paqarruhbuni,²⁵ and the cities [...]ga, Tagi[...], Surunu, Paripa, Til-Başere (modern Til-Beşar), and Dabigu.²⁶ From 856 B.C. Assyria held Pitru at the mouth of the River Sajur and Nappigi (modern Membij).²⁷ All this must have considerably circumscribed the territory of Karkamiš, yet it is not clear whether this situation existed before the reign of Ahuni, and again after his defeat. Shalmaneser III referred to many cities of Karkamiš, but only one, Sazabe, by name,²⁸ and in 847 B.C. campaigned against Paqarruhbuni,²⁹ which could then have belonged to Karkamiš. One would suppose that Karkamiš's territory adjoined that of Kummuh in the north, and of Bit-Agusi/Arpad in the west, perhaps also that of Sam'al and/or Gurgum in the north-west. The discovery of outlying stelae gives some idea of the extent of Karkamiš's holdings at various dates: KELEKLĪ to the north of the city in c. 900 B.C.; KÖRKÜN to the north-west c. 800 B.C., also TÜN P 1 and TİLSEVET from the same area; and most distant and surprisingly far west, CEKKE, c. 775 B.C.

Karkamiš in Assyrian sources

A bare chronological outline for the history of Karkamiš in the Iron Age is provided by the surprisingly few Assyrian references, which name two kings only, Sangara, a contemporary of Aššurnāširpal II and Shalmaneser III, and Pisiri, a contemporary of Tiglath-pileser III, (Shalmaneser V) and Sargon II. After the encounter of Ini-Tešub by Tiglath-pileser I in c. 1100 B.C., there are no references to any western states until Aššurnāširpal II undertook a similar campaign c. 870 B.C. Crossing the Euphrates from Bit-Adini, he approached Karkamiš, where he encountered Sangara "king of Hatti", and received from him a massive tribute, especially silver, bronze and iron, as well as luxury items.³⁰ The "Hittites" settled at Aššurnāširpal's newly founded palace at Kalhu were probably from Karkamiš, as were also the "Hittite" ambassadors who attended the inauguration.³¹ The same king Sangara, in alliance with Sam'al, Unqi, and Bit-Adini, later also Cilicians and others, faced Shalmaneser III in 858 B.C., who won two battles against the alliance.³² In 857 and again in 853 B.C. Sangara was among the north Syrian kings who submitted.³³ Meanwhile in 856 B.C. Shalmaneser had captured Til-Barsip, only 20 km. downstream from Karkamiš, and established it under the name Kar-Shalmaneser as a permanent Assyrian base to control the Euphrates crossing.³⁴ In spite of the cowing of north Syria and the weakening of Karkamiš's position, Shalmaneser thought it necessary to attack the cities of Karkamiš and Bit-Agusi again in 849 and 848 B.C.³⁵ One campaign against Sangara is illustrated on Shalmaneser's bronze gates from Balawat, including a representation of the fortified city on the banks of the Euphrates.³⁶ The 848 B.C. campaign, in which Sangara is mentioned for the last time and 97 cities of Karkamiš were

claimed, is the last Assyrian reference to Karkamiš for over a century. Sangara thus reigned minimally c. 870–848 B.C.

Šamši-Adad V, who did not venture across the Euphrates, maintained the Assyrian hold on Kar-Shalmaneser "opposite Karkamiš",³⁷ and this city became the seat of the *turtān* Šamši-ilu (minimum tenure of office 796–752 B.C.).³⁸ Adad-nirari III confronted Ataršumki of Arpad supported by an alliance of eight kings at Paqirahubuna in 805 B.C.,³⁹ and in 796 B.C., Bar-Hadad of Aram incited Bar-Guš (= Ataršumki) to lead against Zakur of Hamath in Hatarikka an alliance of ten kings including, besides Damascus and Arpad, Que, Unqi, Gurgum, Sam'al and Melid, and two or three missing names.⁴⁰ The composition of the earlier alliance may be inferred from the later. Kummuh and Hamath are clearly Assyrian clients at this date, but it is possible that Karkamiš might be one of the missing names from the alliance.

25 Ibid., n. 8.

26 Ibid., n. 10. Dabigu seems to have been the principal objective; it is clearly identical with Dabiq of medieval Arabic sources. See Honigmann, *RLA* II (1938), s.v. Dabigu; Sourdel, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (new ed., Leiden, 1965) s.v. Dābik.

27 Ibid., n. 11.

28 On the 857 campaign, see below, n. 33.

29 Black Obelisk, 12th *palū*, *WdO* II/2 (1955), p. 152 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.14) ll. 89–90; also Cameron Annals, *WdO* I/6 (1952), p. 468 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.6) iii 16–20; Safar Annals, *WdO* II/1 (1954), p. 36 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.10) iii 6–10).

30 Annals, iii 57, 65, 69 f. (*AKA*, p. 363 ff.) = *RIMA* 2, A.0.101.1; also *ICC* 44 (= *RIMA* 2, A.0.101.2) ll. 25–29; Standard Inscription (*AKA*, pp. 180 l. 22, 216 l. 8) = *RIMA* 2, A.0.101.26.

31 Banquet stele, i 35 (Wiseman, *Iraq* 14 (1952), pp. 33, 41) = *RIMA* 2, A.0.101.30. These captives are probably those shown on a Balawat bronze gate fragment of Aššurnāširpal described as being "[...] of San]gara the Hittite": see Barnett, *Symbolae Böhl*, p. 21 and pl. facing p. 20. The ambassadors are listed (ibid., iv 143–147, pp. 35, 44): 5 LIM LÚ.MAH^{MEŠ} ¹⁰šap-ra-a-te ša KUR su-bi KUR bi-in-da-na-a-a KUR pa-ti-na-a-a KUR hat-ta-a-a KUR šur-ra-a-a KUR ši-du-na-a-a KUR gūr-gu-ma-a-a KUR ma-li-da-a-a KUR hub-uš-ka-a-a KUR gil-za-na-a-a KUR ku-ma-a-a KUR mu-ša-ši-ra-a-a, "5000 chieftains, ambassadors of the land of Suhu, Hindaneans, Patineans, "Hittites", Tyrians, Sidonians, Gurgum-eans, Malideans, Hubušians, Gilzaneans, Kumeans, Mušāšir-eans."

32 Kurkh Monolith, III R 7 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.2), i 43, 53; new text duplicates, see Mahmud and Black, *Sumér* 44 (1985–86), pp. 135–155, text 1, rev. 12, 26.

33 Kurkh Monolith, III R 7–8, ii 19, 27, 83. A submission of north Syrian kings not named individually is reported for 856 B.C.; ibid., ii 39 f.

34 See Tell Ahmar, p. 224 and n. 11.

35 Black Obelisk, 10th *palū*, *WdO* II/2 (1955), p. 150 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.14), ii 85; Cameron Annals, 10th and 11th *palūs*, *WdO* I/6 (1952), p. 466 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.6), ii 55–57, 69; Safar Annals, 10th and 11th *palūs*, *WdO* II/1 (1954), p. 34 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.102.10) ii 46 f., 52.

36 King, *Bronze Reliefs*, pls. XXXI–XXXVI (Band VI); the epigraph notes "tribute of Sangara the Gargamišean".

37 Monolith Inscription, I R 30 (= *RIMA* 3, A.0.103.1), ii 9–10.

38 See Tell Ahmar, p. 224 n. 4.

39 Pazarcık stele, see Commagene, p. 331 f. nn. 26–27.

40 See Hama, p. 400 f. and nn. 45–47.

There is no specific evidence that Karkamiš fell under Urartian influence in the following years, as did Melid and Kummuh, but it is not impossible. The city is not named as involved in the Urartu-Arpad led alliance defeated in 743 B.C. by Tiglath-pileser III,⁴¹ nor in the siege of Arpad 742–740 B.C.,⁴² nor in the revolt of Unqi, 739–738 B.C.⁴³ However in the list of tributary kings for 738 B.C., Pisiri of Karkamiš appears, and his name is also to be restored in the similar but damaged list for 732 B.C.⁴⁴ He was still on the throne in 717 B.C., when Sargon accused him of anti-Assyrian intrigue with Mita of Muski, and removed him to Assyria.⁴⁵ Karkamiš was annexed and constituted as a province, and for the following century of the Assyrian empire, governors are attested in 691 and 649 B.C.⁴⁶ At the collapse of the Assyrian empire, Karkamiš was the scene of the last stand of the remnant of Assyria supported by Egypt,⁴⁷ and the expulsion and rout of this force by Nebuchadrezzar in 605 B.C. extinguished the last spark.

The Hieroglyphic monuments

The *terminus ante quem* for the indigenous sculpture and inscriptions is likely to be the Assyrian conquest of 717 B.C., and the absolute chronological fixed points are the reigns of the two Assyrian-attested kings, Sangara (c. 870–848 B.C.) and Pisiri (c. 738–717 B.C.). Neither of their names appears on any Hieroglyphic inscription, although a group of inscribed sculptures with the author's name missing seems certain to be dated to the time of Pisiri.⁴⁸ No significant group can be so attributed to Sangara.⁴⁹

The main Karkamiš sculptures form groups which offer scope for stylistic analysis and comparative dating,⁵⁰ and they are also associated with inscriptions which permit the reconstruction of multi-generation dynasties to give a more exact chronological focus.⁵¹

The Archaic Group. The earliest approximately placeable Karkamiš monument is the archaic stele KARKAMIŠ A4*b*, the work of Ura-Tarhunzas (MAGNUS.TONITRUS), entitled “Great King, Hero, king of the land of Karkamiš”, the son of *x-pa-ziitiš*, also entitled “Great King, Hero”. These titles are unparalleled in the later Karkamiš inscriptions or indeed in the dynasty of Šarri-Kušuh under the Hittite Empire.⁵² They appear to derive from those claimed by Kuzi-Tešub as recorded on GÜRÜN.⁵³ It is impossible on present information to know whether Ura-Tarhunzas was of the line of Kuzi-Tešub. The Luwian names borne by himself and his father may indicate the contrary, but in any case they both adopted Kuzi-Tešub's grandiose titles.

The stele itself concerns a quarrel with another country, which was resolved by the gods. Appended is a

statement that the stele was set up by ..., son of Suhis the Ruler (*tarwanis*), the priest of Kubaba. The curiosity is the co-existence of a Great King and a Ruler, whether or not they exercised authority in Karkamiš contemporaneously.^{53a}

A monument closely similar to KARKAMIŠ A4*b* is the fragmentary stele KARKAMIŠ A16*c*, which is unfortunately largely illegible, also now mostly lost. It can be seen to be the work of MONS + *t[u]?*, “Great King, Hero, king of the land of Kar[kamiš]”. The author's name appears to be *Tudhalijas*, written in the style of the Hittite Empire, and this finds support from the recognition of the name also on the KELEKLİ stele (see below), where the same individual may be indi-

41 See Maraş, p. 250 and n. 19.

42 See Aleppo, p. 390 and n. 29.

43 See Amuq, p. 363 and n. 34.

44 For sources, see Cilicia, p. 42 and nn. 49–50.

45 Annals, ll. 72–76 (Lie, *Sargon II*, pp. 10–12), = *ARAB* II, § 8; Iran stele, ll. 20–22 (Levine, *TNASI*, p. 36); Oriental Institute Tablet, ll. 2–14 (Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958), pp. 22 f., 100); Nimrud cylinder, iv 13–24 (Gadd, *Iraq* 16 (1954), p. 179, pl. XLV); Nimrud slab, ll. 10, 21 f. (Winckler, *Sargon*, p. 170 f., pl. 48) = *ARAB* II, § 137 f. The incident is also referred to in conquest summaries: *ARAB* II, §§ 79, 92, 99, 118.

46 Bel-emuranni, *RLA* II, s.v. Eponymen, p. 426 f. (C^d); Luckenbill, *Sennacherib*, p. 131 n. 1; Ahi-ilaya, *RLA* II, s.v. Eponymen, p. 441 b; Piepkorn, *Ashurbanipal*, pp. 88 l. 98 f., 90 l. 2.

47 Babylonian Chronicle, Grayson, *ABC*, pp. 98–102, Chronicles 4 (l. 24) and 5 (ll. 2 f., 14).

48 See below, p. 79.

49 *Pace* the arguments of Ussishkin, who attributes to Sangara the Soldiers', Kubaba's and Hunters' processions (KARKAMIŠ B2*a*–B3*b*; B18*b*–B24; B26*c*, B60*a*–B60*b*), and the Victors' procession of the Long Wall of Sculpture (KARKAMIŠ B41*a*–B46); see *An. St.* 17 (1967), pp. 181–192; 26 (1976), pp. 105–112. In my opinion the epigraphic evidence should be decisive; KARKAMIŠ A1*a*, an inscription of Suhis II, describes the construction of the Long Wall of Sculptures in which it was placed; and KARKAMIŠ A11*b*+*c*, an inscription of Katuwas, describes the other groups, “Karhuhas's and Kubaba's procession” (§§ 16–17).

50 See principally Orthmann, *USK*, Kap. II.1–2, pp. 29–45; S. Mazzone, *Sui rilievi di Karkemish dall'eta di Sargon II al 605 av. Cr.* (*RSO* 47 (1974), pp. 177–210); ead., *Ricerche sul complesso dei rilievi neolitici di Karkemish* (*RSO* 51 (1977), pp. 7–38); Genge, *NSR*, Kap. IV pp. 56–90, VII pp. 153–167.

51 Earlier work by H. T. Bossert, *Zur Geschichte von Karkamiš* (*SCO* 1 (1951), pp. 35–67); Woolley and Barnett, *Carchemish III*, ch. XIV, XVI, pp. 238–249, 259–266; P. Meriggi, *I nuovi frammenti e la storia di Kargamis* (*Athenaeum* 30 (1952), pp. 174–181); id., *Le iscrizioni storiche in eteo geroglifico* (*SCO* 2 (1953), I. Gruppo sud-orientale, pp. 8–52). More recently with new readings, see Hawkins, *Building Inscriptions of Carchemish* (*An. St.* 22 (1972), pp. 87–114); id., *Who was Yarisir?*; Kamanis and Sasturas (*An. St.* 29 (1979), pp. 153–162); id., *Kubaba at Karkamiš and elsewhere* (*An. St.* 31 (1981), pp. 147–176); id., *Rulers of Karkamiš; the house of Astiruwas* (*LX Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara 1981: Kongreye sunulan bildiriler*, I. Cilt (Ankara, 1986), pp. 259–271). See also R. Stefanini, *Hieroglyphica* (*Studia Meriggi* (1979), pp. 595–611).

52 See above, p. 73 and nn. 12–13.

53 See Malatya, p. 286 and n. 62; above, p. 73 and n. 12–13.

[53a See now Hawkins, *Fs Houwink ten Cate* (1995), pp. 73–85.]

cated. This king is likely to be a successor, and indeed descendant, of Ura-Tarhunzas. The links of these two Great Kings with the Karkamiš dynasty of Suhis are considered below.

Since four claimants to the title “Great King” are all seen to be kings of Karkamiš (Kuzi-Tešub, x-pa-zitis, Ura-Tarhunzas and Tudhaliyas(?)), a fifth, the Great King of the KARAHÖYÜK (Elbistan) stele⁵⁴ must also be considered as a possible king of the city. The stele was dedicated to the Storm-God of POCULUM.PES.*67 country (reading unknown but presumably indicates Elbistan) when the Great King visited the country, apparently peacefully. Such an expedition by a king of Karkamiš at this date seems possible. Other considerations, however, suggest that it may be preferable to associate this monument with a western, Anatolian tradition.⁵⁵

The House of Suhis. The “house of Suhis” is associated with a large group of early Karkamiš sculpture and inscriptions. It is known from the following genealogies: KARKAMIŠ A14*b*, § 1 (Astuwatamanzas [...]), “Karkamisean Country-Lord, son of Suhis (I) the Ruler”); KELEKLİ, § 1 (Suhis (II) “the Ruler, [Karkamisean] Country-Lord, [son of] Astuwatamanzas [...])”); KARKAMIŠ A11*b+c*, § 1 (Katuwas “the Ruler, ... Karkamisean Country-Lord, son of Suhis (II) the Country-Lord, grandson of Astuwatamanzas the Country-Lord”); i.e. a four-generation dynasty –

Suhis I, the Ruler.

Astuwatamanzas, [the Ruler?], the Country-Lord.

Suhis (II), the Ruler, the Country-Lord.

Katuwas, the Ruler, the Country-Lord.

Of the surviving Karkamiš monuments, none can with certainty, by means of the inscription, be attributed to Suhis I (but for his connection with KARKAMIŠ A4*b*, see below); and to Astuwatamanzas only the short lion inscription A14*b*, showing archaic characteristics, which records his building of a gatehouse, perhaps that at the head of the Great Staircase, if that is indeed the provenance of the lion. On the other hand, groups of uninscribed sculpture recognizably more archaic than the group attributed to Suhis II and Katuwas doubtless belong to the period of one or both of the earlier rulers. This includes in particular the Water Gate sculpture.⁵⁶

To Suhis II may be attributed the inscribed lion KARKAMIŠ A14*a*, which is both stylistically and epigraphically later than that of Astuwatamanzas with which it was paired.⁵⁷ The preserved part of the inscription contains largely clauses which later became stereotypes of succession, divine favour, and curse formula. On the other hand the KELEKLİ stele, which is certainly Suhis’s work, begins after the name and genealogy with the extraordinary statement, “When King Tudhaliyas marries my dear daughter ...”, but then breaks off. The truncated inscription KARKAMIŠ A1*a*, which has lost the name of its author, is certainly to be attributed to Suhis II by the combination of its “my

dear wife BONUS-tis”⁵⁸ (§ 22) with the adjoining KARKAMIŠ A1*b*, § 1, “I (am) BONUS-tis, dear wife of Suhis the Country-Lord.” The former inscription, incorporated in the Long Wall of Sculpture, seems to have contained the *res gestae* of Suhis, including military victories, his worship of the gods, his execution of the divine-led victory procession which constitutes the Long Wall, and the erection of his own statue to receive offerings (probably to be identified as the fragmentary statue represented by the head KARKAMIŠ B54*a* with the double lion base KARKAMIŠ B53).

The bulk of the dynasty’s surviving inscriptions belong to Katuwas, including:

KARKAMIŠ A2+3, a pair of portal orthostats from the door of the cella of the Temple of the Storm-God, which describe its construction and endowment;

KARKAMIŠ A11*a* with KARKAMIŠ A4*d*, a portal orthostat and statue inscription from the Processional Entry, combining dynastic narrative with a description of the building of the orthostated gates with their wooden superstructure as women’s quarters, and the erection of the divine figure Atrisuhas, (perhaps to be interpreted as the “soul of Suhis”);

KARKAMIŠ A11*b+c*, a pair of portal orthostats, displaced and reused, also combining dynastic and military narrative with notice of building activities, particularly the wooden upper storeys and the orthostat processions of Karhuhas (KARKAMIŠ B2–3) and Kubaba (KARKAMIŠ B19–24);

KARKAMIŠ A12, a large stele fragment, probably of an original form like KELEKLİ, with an inscription giving military narrative and religious dedication;

KARKAMIŠ A13*d*, an orthostat fragment with a full-length introductory figure as a portrait, and religious dedication;

KARKAMIŠ A23 (+ fragment A26*a*?), and fragment KARKAMIŠ A20*a*, a pair of portal orthostats with dedication to Kubaba;

KARKAMIŠ A25*a*?, a fragment provisionally attributed to Katuwas from its comparable wording;

KARKAMIŠ 16*b*?, a fragment with comparable wording.

Katuwas’s dynastic narrative, particularly on KARKAMIŠ A11*b+c*, mentions civil strife with “Ura-

54 See Malatya, p. 283 and nn. 13–14.

55 See Tabal, p. 429 and n. 60.

56 Grouped by Orthmann as *Karkemis* I, and assigned along with Ain Dara to his earliest category *Sph.* I (*USK*, pp. 30 f., 37, and Kap. III, passim). Genge however proposes a later date (*NSR*, Kap. IV.7).

57 Ussishkin denies the pairing of the lions A14*a* and A14*b*, and their restoration on either side of the Gatehouse of the Great Staircase, on grounds of their dissimilarities. He also maintains a later stylistic dating of lion A14*a* and thus a postulation of a Suhis III: see *JNES* 26 (1967), pp. 87–92; reaffirmed *An. St.* 26 (1976), p. 111 f.

58 BONUS-tis revised reading of *Watis*: see KARKAMIŠ A1*a*, § 22, Commentary.