

TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1: a new Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Great King Hartapu, son of Mursili, conqueror of Phrygia

Petra Goedegebuure,¹ Theo van den Hout,¹ James Osborne,¹ Michele Massa² and Fatma Şahin³

¹University of Chicago, USA, ²British Institute at Ankara, UK, and ³Çukurova University, Turkey
pgoedegebuure@uchicago.edu

Abstract

In this article, the authors present a first edition of the recently found inscription TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1, propose an eighth-century dating and explore some of the consequences of this date for the group of inscriptions mentioning Hartapu, son of Mursili.

Özet

[Gina to add Turkish translation of abstract - unless you'd like to add your own]

We present here a first edition of the inscription TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1 (henceforth TKH 1) found by the Türkmen-Karahöyük Intensive Survey Project (TISP), a sub-project of the Konya Regional Archaeological Survey Project (KRASP), in June 2019 (fig. 1; for photographs, see Osborne et al. 2020, this volume). Our main objective here is the reading and translation of TKH 1 with special focus on the palaeography and its use for dating the text. The palaeography places the text in the eighth century BC. Since the inscription was written in the name of K/Hartapu, son of Mursili, this dating has consequences for the other Hartapu inscriptions, as edited most recently in Hawkins 2000: 433–42. As we argue below, against current opinion, KIZILDAĞ 4 might in fact be eighth century as well.

The inscription is currently located in the Konya Archaeological Museum. For the archaeological context of the discovery and its implications for the history and urban character of Türkmen-Karahöyük, see Osborne et al. 2020, this volume. The siltstone or mudstone block on which TKH 1 was inscribed measures roughly 95cm by 45cm. The top and the right side are flat, while the left side and bottom are broken. Unlike the bottom, where damaged

signs are present along a fresh break, the left side was apparently broken in antiquity, since the broken area is worn and slightly rounded. The inscription starts top right.

The inscription preserves three lines in decreasing height (line 1: ca 21cm; line 2: ca 16cm; line 3: ca 12cm), although the original height of line 3 is difficult to determine. In lines 1 and 2 the bottom signs are either resting on or close to the row dividers. After restoration of the final visible sign of the inscription in line 3, SOL, it is obvious that not a single other sign of line 3 would originally have rested on a bottom row divider. This is unexpected given the placement of the signs in lines 1 and 2. Moreover, part of a sign is visible below and to the left of *wa/i* at the beginning of line 3, right side. We should therefore take into account at least enough space to accommodate a single row of signs below the break.

Similarly, it is difficult to say whether lines 1 and 2 continued on the far left, although the blank spaces, the lack of any sign traces to the left of *mu(wa)-tá* (line 1) and *ara/i-ni* (line 2) and the fact that the second row divider ends *before* the left edge suggest that nothing may have been lost, and the inscription could be complete as is. In the remainder of this article we operate under this assumption.

Still, the inscription gives the impression of being unfinished. Starting on the right, the signs in line 1 have been carved in high relief up to the country name *mu-sà-ka*(REGIO), with the remainder of the text being incised. Looking at KIZILDAĞ 1, with the king seated on his throne incised and the caption identifying him in relief, one could theoretically envision the official titulature and genealogy in relief and the further narrative left incised. The signs in this first part of line 1 are also taller than in the rest of the inscription: the MAGNUS.REX combination fills the entire height of (the already higher) line 1 as compared to the same combination in line 2 under the wings of the sun disk. Yet this contrast of relief versus incision within a single inscription is unique among both Late Bronze Age and Iron Age hieroglyphic inscriptions. One might also have expected the even more official-looking name and titles in line 2 with the *aedicula* to have been executed in high relief as well. But this scenario cannot apply anyhow since the process of carving out the background of signs clearly continued beyond the titles and genealogy to include the ox head (*mu*) of *mu-sà-ka*(REGIO) as well, but was then discontinued for unknown reasons. Another sign of the unfinished state of the inscription is the differing depth of the relief (compare, for example, the signs *ka+ra/i-tá-* versus the surrounding signs) among the signs in the first part. Moreover, the carving-out is rough and unpolished.

A final observation concerns the varying density of the signs in a line. The signs in the initial high-relief part are more crowded than the rest of the inscription. It is conceivable that this is due to the technique of executing the inscription. If the signs were incised in a first stage with the carving-out around the incised signs following in stage two, then this would automatically result in a higher density and a more crowded arrangement of the signs.

Transliteration, translation and commentary

§1 (relief) MAGNUS.REX *ka+ra/i-tá-pu-sa* HEROS
URBS-*li-si-sa* FILIUS
(incised) *mu-sà-ka* (REGIO) REL *mu(wa)-tá*

§2 *ara/i-ni* TERRA INFRA-*tá-a* | PES.*a*

§3 13 REX SOL₂ MAGNUS.REX *há+ra/i-tá-pú*
MAGNUS.REX
(DEUS)TONITRUS CAELUM DEUS-*ni* OMNIS₂
DARE-*ta*₆

§4 13 REX *273 LEO^{??}-*há* 1 ANNUS MAGNUS.
SCALPRUM+*ra/i* 10
CASTRUM.FORTIS | SUB PONERE

§5 *a-wa/i-t[á[?]]* SELLA *520 *a-pa[?]+ra/i[-i[?]]* (DEUS)
SO[L-o[?]]

§1 When Great King Kartapu, Hero, son of Mursili, conquered the country of Muška,

Alternatively: Great King Kartapu, Hero, son of Mursili, who conquered the country of Muška.

§2 the enemy descended upon (his) territory (lit. came down into the land),

§3 (but) the Storm God of Heaven (and) all the gods delivered (its) 13 kings (to) His Majesty, Great King Hartapu.

§4 In a single year he placed the 13 kings, the(ir) weapons (= troops?), and wild beasts^{??} under (the authority of) ten strong-walled fortresses.

§5 And th[ey (?)] are there (as) His Maje[sty's] Chiefs (?)-of-the ...

General remarks

The writing is highly logographic, a feature that is shared with the other Hartapu inscriptions that mention more than Hartapu's name (KIZILDAĞ 2, 3, 4; KARADAĞ 1; BURUNKAYA). With the exception of §1, nouns are not marked for case. As a result, all syntactic relations have been inferred based on our understanding of the most likely candidates for subject- and objecthood, and any other roles nouns may assume in the clause, such as the recipient or beneficiary of an action, or modifier or head noun. Even the SÜDBURG inscription (*editio princeps* Hawkins 1995), well known for its overall logographic writing and the ensuing syntactic ambiguities, contains more case endings.

An additional problem is the lack of sentence connectives, which are otherwise so ubiquitous in the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus. Only in §5, at the end of the inscription, do we find *a-wa/i-*. The only remaining means to establish clause boundaries is to identify the verb, assuming that the verb is in the usual clause-final position or, more rarely, in clause-initial position. Clearly identifiable verbs are *mu(wa)-tá* in §1 and DARE-*ta*₆ in §3, with the expected past-tense ending *-ta*. The other words we identify as verbs do not have endings but are accompanied by INFRA/SUB 'down/under'. Because the sentence initial cluster *a-wa/i-* (§5) immediately follows SUB PONERE (§4), SUB PONERE certainly is a verb, 'put under'. The adverb INFRA-*tá-a*, 'down', (§2) combines well with a verb of motion, hence we take PES as the verb 'come'.

INFRA-*tá-a* | PES.*a* and | SUB PONERE are the only expressions that are marked by the crampon (*386, in transliteration represented as |). This usage does not comply with any of its known uses in either the second or

the first millennium. In the first millennium, the crampon is a word divider, in many inscriptions occurring before almost every word. In the second millennium, on the other hand, it still has the value VIR₂, ‘man, person’, and is used as a determinative for words denoting persons if it is not a logogram itself (for a full overview of the development of the use of the crampon, see Hawkins 2010).

Specific remarks

§1 *ka+ra/i-tá-pu-sa*: the spelling of the Great King’s name with a clear *ka-* sign (*ka+ra/i-tá-pu-sa*) is puzzling vis-à-vis the writing with *há* in §3. We know that the Late Bronze Age laryngeal /h/ in the Anatolian Iron Age languages in some positions developed into dorsal stops (see Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1993: 60 for late Luwian; Melchert 1994: 305f. [avoid ‘f.’ - please add precise page range] for Lycian; Melchert 2004 for Lydian; Adiego Lajara 2007: 260 for Carian; Schürr 2019 for a general discussion), but having the two renderings together in a single inscription is surprising. It seems inescapable to see both Kartapu and Hartapu in TKH 1 as referring to the same person. If Hartapu was an old name that over time changed its pronunciation according to the development just mentioned, one might think of the writing with /h/ as ‘etymological’ or ‘archaic’ in the aedicula under the winged sun-disk. Whatever the explanation, if the two names indeed belong to the same individual, the writing with initial /k/ would point to an Iron Age date. Even if one were to invoke a scribal or stone mason’s error for the Kartapu variant, such a mistake would only be plausible in the Iron Age when the phonological development had taken place.

[add first name] Schürr (forthcoming) argues for Hartapu as an Anatolian name in general (*pace* Oreshko 2017: 59–62), and provides further arguments for Hartapu as a Luwian name, even though he does not commit himself fully to a Luwian analysis. Because the Luwian change *h > k* is only attested in the eighth century or later (Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1993: 60), this implies that TKH 1 is an eighth-century text as well.

§1 *sa* (*415): the sign *sa*, which only occurs in the relief section of the inscription, shows the archaic shape. In the Iron Age inscriptions of Anatolia this shape otherwise only occurs in the Hartapu inscriptions KIZILDAĞ 1, 2, 3, 4, BURUNKAYA and KARADAĞ 1 and 2, in the Wassusarma inscriptions TOPADA (Wassusarma of Tabal), SUVASA (servants of Wassusarma), KAYSERİ (servant of Wassusarma) and GEMEREK (where it competes with the linear form and also with forms that otherwise resemble several in TOPADA: Hawkins, Akdoğan 2011: 314), and in ÇİNEKOY (Waraika of Hiyawa).

The 12th- to 11th-century Malatya inscriptions mainly show late *sa*, and so do the early Karkamish inscriptions. The same applies to the 11th- to 10th-century inscriptions from Palistin (ALEPPO 6 and 7, ARSUZ 1 and 2). The use of late *sa* continues until suddenly, in a few eighth-century Karkamish inscriptions, archaic *sa* shows up again (KARKAMIŞ A5a, KARKAMIŞ bowl [Yariri], CEKKE [Kamani] and KARKAMIŞ A21+20b [Pisiri?]).

In Karkamish and Cilicia, then, the use of archaic *sa* is an eighth-century phenomenon. Because this might be the case for the rest of Anatolia as well, the presence of archaic *sa* in the Anatolian inscriptions cannot be taken as evidence for an early date.

§1 FILIUS/INFANS (*45): the shape of the FILIUS/INFANS sign with the lower part of the ‘wrist’ curving sharply back to the right seems specific to TKH 1. The only inscriptions with a similar but decidedly more moderate curve are SULTANHAN (mid- to late eighth century), SUVASA, ASSUR letters e and f, and compare also BABYLON 1, BOR (mid-eighth century), EĞREK (mid-eighth century), KULULU 2 (mid-eighth century) and TOPADA. Except for the Babylon inscription and the Assur letters, whose origins cannot be determined, all date to the eighth century and come from south-central Anatolia (but note that D’Alfonso 2019 proposes a tenth- to early ninth-century date for TOPADA, and then presumably for SUVASA as well). For BABYLON 1, David Hawkins (2000: 392) gives a ‘late tenth-early ninth century’ date but on ‘sculptural stylistic grounds only’.

§1 URBS-*li-si-sa*: nominative singular of the genitival adjective of URBS-*li-*. It is remarkable that K/Hartapu’s father Mursili is not further qualified by a title. In the other Hartapu inscriptions the name Mursili is always accompanied by MAGNUS.REX HEROS (KIZILDAĞ 3, 4 and BURUNKAYA). Throughout the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus, if an author has a title himself, his father also has one. Exceptions to this rule occur in HAMA 1–3 and 6–7, where king Uradami, son of king Urhilina, never provides a title for his father.

As noted by one of the reviewers, the use of the inflected genitival adjective *-assi-* to express patronyms is a relatively late phenomenon. Thus far the oldest texts in which this type of patronym is found are KARKAMIŞ A2+3 §1 (late tenth to early ninth century), MARAŞ 4 §1 and TELL AHMAR 1 §1 (both ninth century).

§1 *mu-sà-ka*(REGIO): the sign sequence *mu-sà-ka*(REGIO) is clear and prompts us to reconsider the reading of KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c. Initially, [add first name] Meriggi (1965: 314) read *ma-sà-ka²-na*(REGIO) there, linking it to *mu-sà-ka-za*(URBS) in KARKAMIŞ A6 §6,

usually interpreted as referring to the Muški or Phrygians (see Hawkins 2000: 124, 126). Later, he changed his reading to *mu*²- (Meriggi 1975: 271). In his edition of the KIZILDAĞ group of inscriptions, however, Hawkins (1995: 106) considered the latter reading by Meriggi ‘incorrectly changed’ and reverted to *ma*-. In a next stage and inspired by the country or region of *ma-sa*₅ in SUDBURG §§1b and 4b, [add first name] Poetto (1998) proposed to recognise the same country in KIZILDAĞ 4. He reinterpreted the *ka* sign as ‘the protome of an eagle’. This then resulted in a new reading *ma-sà*(REGIO) *ara/i-na*, followed by Hawkins (2000: 438) and now generally accepted.

The *ka* sign (fig. 2a) that Poetto reinterpreted as an eagle’s protome and hence read as *ara/i* is essentially the same sign as the *ka* in relief in TKH 1 (fig. 2b), although with a less elongated protrusion at the upper-left side of the sign. This protrusion does not represent feathers of the eagle’s head (so Poetto 1998: 470), but seems to be an ear; compare the protrusion at the upper-left side of the incised *ka* in TKH 1 (for further discussion of *ka*, see below).

We prefer the reading *mu* (*107) over *ma* in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c. While the overall shape of *ma* and *mu* may be similar both in second-millennium and in the later first-millennium texts, the internal structure of the signs is always quite different. The sign *ma* must have the curl inside, representing the ram’s horn, while the *mu* sign may have the four internal strokes, though this is not a necessary feature, especially not in the second millennium. Not only is the curl absent from the sign in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c, we are also convinced the four strokes are present (fig. 3).

Given the close parallelism between TKH 1 and KIZILDAĞ 4, and the apparent uncertainties surrounding the sign readings in the latter inscription that have now been resolved, we return to Meriggi’s 1975 reading of these signs as *mu*²-*sà-ka-na* (REGIO) in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c, minus the question mark. For a discussion of the historical consequences of this reading, see further below.

The more natural rendering of the ox head in both TKH 1 and KIZILDAĞ 4 instead of the highly abstracted forms of *mu* and *u* is a feature these inscriptions share with older texts. In both inscriptions the animal head has a clearly visible mouth, but only TKH 1 clearly shows the ear, eye and horn. The less naturalistic form in KIZILDAĞ 4 is more similar to *mu* in YALBURT and EMIRGAZI.

§ 1 *ka* (*434): as just discussed, the sign *ka* in relief is a clear animal head with elongated ear with a line in the middle, a neck and an ‘eye’, with a vertical line through the middle of the eye (fig. 2b). This shape is both very different from the Empire form, which is far more abstract (see fig. 4a), and from the other attestations of *ka* in Iron

Age Anatolia, which have neither a neck nor an ‘eye’, but regularly show one or two verticals at the base of the ear (for example KULULU 2 §4; fig. 4b). And while early Iron Age inscriptions from Malatya and Karkamish often show the neck, there never seems to be an ‘eye’. The only *ka* that can be compared is the attestation in KARKAMIŞ A25b (Kamani, mid-eighth century; fig. 4c). The incised *ka* of TKH 1 §1 (in *mu-sà-ka*) with the horizontal line in the head is unique.

§1 REL (*329): for a general development of the REL sign (although not explicitly used as such), see Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies 1993: 55. The shape of the REL sign found here (fig. 5a), with a rounded top instead of the more common pointed spade-like shape with sloping sides, can be seen also in BABYLON 1, ANDAVAL (late ninth to early eighth century; fig. 5b), KULULU 1 (mid-eighth century) and KULULU lead strip 1 (mid- to late eighth century) and KULULU fragment 1 (mid- to late eighth century), KARABURUN (eighth century; fig. 5c), ERKILET 1 and 2 (late eighth century), GEMEREK (eighth century) and AKSARAY (end of the eighth century). A marked difference, however, is that the top is not drawn as a single lined semicircle but as the contour of the sign in relief, as it were. In this sense, the sign is shaped more like REL with rounded top in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c (fig. 5d). REL in KIZILDAĞ 4 itself is again more similar to Empire REL (for example YALBURT; fig. 5e) with respect to the circle at the bottom of the handle and to REL in KARAKUYU line 2 with both the circle at the bottom and the rounded top (fig. 5f).

Leaving aside BABYLON 1, all are dated to the eighth century, and most to the mid- to late eighth century. Only ANDAVAL is earlier; [add first name] Balatti (2012: 160) puts the inscription ‘between the ninth-early eighth century’ based on ‘iconographical and palaeographic considerations’. For BABYLON 1, Hawkins (2000: 392) gives a ‘late tenth-early ninth century’ date but on ‘sculptural stylistic grounds only’.

The absence of a case ending on REL allows for two readings. Either REL is the conjunction ‘when’ or it is the subject, in which case we should translate ‘who conquered Muska-land’ as in KARADAĞ 1 §2 (REGIO OMNIS₂ REL-*sa* (*273)FORTIS-*tá*; ‘who conquered all the lands’). If we take REL as the relative pronoun ‘who’, it needs to serve as the subject of a relative clause with its antecedent in the preceding discourse. There are now two options, the first one of which is more likely: (1) the relative clause is postposed or (2) it is embedded, leading to the following translations:

(1) MAGNUS.REX *ka+ra/i-tá-pu-sa* HEROS URBS-*li-si-sa* FILIUS *mu-sà-ka* (REGIO) REL *mu(wa)-tá*; ‘Great King Kartapu, Hero, son of Mursili, who conquered

the land of Muška’

(2) MAGNUS.REX *ka+ra/i-tá-pu-sa* HEROS URBS-*li-si-sa* FILIUS *mu-sà-ka* (REGIO) REL *mu(wa)-tá ara/i-ni* TERRA INFRA-*tá-a* | PES.a; ‘Great King Kartapu, Hero, son of Mursili, who conquered the land of Muška, came down ...’.

The syntax is highly unusual, with an embedded relative clause instead of the usual preposed or less common postposed position. Additionally, Kartapu as the subject of ‘come down’ leads to less coherent discourse than option (1) or REL ‘when’ (see immediately below).

REL as ‘when’ introducing the first clause of the inscription is syntactically as likely as REL ‘who’ in a postposed relative clause. For another case of REL ‘when’ at the beginning of an inscription, see SÜDBURG §1. Translating REL as ‘when’ leads to a historically more marked event, the enemy attack in the back, a *topos* that is well known from Hittite historical narratives.

§1: *mu(wa)-tá*: The verb *mu(wa)-*, ‘attack, conquer’ vel sim. (see *ACLT s.v.*), seems to be attested relatively rarely and is restricted to south-central Anatolia (second-millennium YALBURT and KÖYLÜTOLU, and first-millennium KAYSERİ, SULTANHAN, KARADAĞ 1 and KIZILDAĞ 4); the one attestation listed in JISR EL HADID fragment 1 (Hawkins 2000: 379 FORTIS(-)[*m*]u?-*ta*) is doubtful, given the shape of *mu* in JISR EL HADID fragment 2.2. The stem is found written with *mu-* or *mu-wa/i-*, by itself or preceded by FORTIS and/or *273. The separate sign transliterated as *mu(wa)* appears only in KIZILDAĞ 4; KARADAĞ 1 §2 has (*273)FORTIS-*tá*. The difference in shape between the regular *mu* sign of *mu(-sà-ka)* and *mu(wa)* is no doubt intentional. Strictly taken, the standard *mu* sign is differentiated from *u*, a plain ox head, by the four strokes in the head showing it to be a ligature with the sign *mi*, resulting in the sound value *mu* (*u x mi > mu*). These four strokes are eminently visible in the country name in TKH 1, but are clearly missing from the verb form *mu(wa)-tá*, ‘he conquered’. In KIZILDAĞ 4 the contrast between the two sign shapes is evident in the orientation of the ox head. In both inscriptions the *mu* ox head in the geographical name looks straight and neutral – or even friendly looking in TKH 1 – but the head of the bovine in the verb is tilted downwards in both TKH 1 and KIZILDAĞ 4, sticking out its tongue, and the animal has a decidedly aggressive countenance in TKH 1. This is not an innocent ox but a charging bull, appropriate for what the author of the inscription wishes to express, which is conquest.

Recently, [add first name] Oreshko suggested translating *muwa-* not as ‘conquer’ but as ‘hold sway over, rule over’ (2017: 53–55). His argument is partially based on the reading of *ara/i-na* as *arin/*, ‘forever’, in KIZILDAĞ

4 §2c (but note that *arin* means ‘for a time’; see Melchert 2018: 236) and the unlikelihood that an accusative of extent like *arin* combines with a telic verb such as ‘conquer’. However, since we now reject the reading *ara/i-na* in favour of Meriggi’s original proposal, this aspect of Oreshko’s argument no longer holds.

More importantly, a crucial element of Oreshko’s argumentation seems to be that one would expect a reference to the king’s own polity: ‘It seems strange that the king preferred to mention some conquest, “forgetting” to disclose the name of his own land’ (2016: 51) and ‘What one expects is not the name of the land Harpatu (*sic*) ever managed to conquer, but that of the land he now rules over’ (2016: 53). Thus REL *mu-sà-ka-na* (REGIO) *mu(wa)-tá* in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c needs to express ‘rule over Muška’, with Muška as Harpatu’s core land – but note that Oreshko of course still reads *ma-sà*(REGIO). This should then also apply to TKH 1. But this lack of disclosure is standard for Great Kings in both the Bronze and the Iron Age. Regarding the latter, if the polity of a Great King is included in the titlature, it never accompanies MAGNUS.REX: one only finds a geographical name in connection with subordinate titles such as REX (for example KARKAMIŞ A4b §1) or HEROS (GÜRÜN §1b). The area that the only other Great King from Tabal, Wassusarma, controls is never made explicit (see TOPADA, SUVASA B and C; also see SULTANHAN and KAYSERİ). As a result, we do not even know the Luwian name of the kingdom of Wassusarma and his father Tuwatti (D’Alfonso 2012). We also do not know what country or city King Sipi governed (KARABURUN), and if it were not for BOR, we would not know from indigenous sources that Warpalawa (Assyrian Urballa) ruled the kingdom of Tuwanuwa. In other words, there is a clear tendency not to mention the area one governs. Instead, if a region is mentioned, it is because special events involving the region are commemorated in the inscription, and not because someone is simply Great King or king over that region.

It is not clear whether Oreshko completely rejects the meaning ‘to conquer’, but we maintain that this meaning still fits all cases in Hieroglyphic and Cuneiform Luwian where *muwa-* co-occurs with the reflexive *mi/iti* (and is the equivalent of Hittite *za tarh-*; see Hawkins 1992: 262 [add to bibliography]). For example, the sequence of (a) the gods running before the king in the attack, (b) *muwa-* the hostile troops and (c) destruction of the hostile city in YALBURT Block 12–13 shows that *muwa-* cannot mean anything else than ‘conquer’, especially given that we now need to translate (VIR₂) *li_x-wa/i-ni-sa* as ‘troops, army, infantry’ (Melchert 2018):

YALBURT Blocks 12 §4 + 13 §1–2

§4 *a-wa/i-mu* (DEUS)TONITRUS DOMINUS-*na*
PRAE *hwi/a-i(a)-tá*

§1 *a-wa/i-mi* (VIR₂) *li_x-wa/i-ni-sa mu-wa/i-ha*

§2 *pi-na-li_x*(URBS) *ARHA DELERE*

§4 The Stormgod, my Lord, ran before me.

§1 I conquered/overwhelmed/*ruled the (enemy) troops,

§2 (and) destroy(ed) the city Pinali.

But also without the reflexive, *muwa-* may denote a hostile or violent action. In SULTANHAN §32 (similarly KAYSERÍ §11) the *muwa-* deed is flanked by violent actions (only in SULTANHAN §44 does *muwa-* seem to mean ‘to strengthen’):

§31 |‘LUNA’-*ma-sá-pa-wa/i-na* |*ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ni-sá* ||
|*á-pa-sá* |(‘UNGULA’)*ki-pu-tá-*^a |*a-ta* |*tu-wa/i-i-*’

§32 |REL-*i-pa-wa/i-na* |*ka+ra/i-mi-si-za-sa* |(DEUS)*ku-*
AVIS-*pa-pa-sa* |*á-pa-na* |*mu-wa/i-i*

§33 |*á-ta-ha-si-zi-pa-wa/i-na* |DEUS-*ni-i-zi* |ARHA |*á-tá-*
tu-u ||

The Moongod of Harran shall put his hooves on him.
Indeed, after that Kubaba of Karkamiš shall
conquer/overwhelm/*rule him.

May the *attaha*-gods devour him.

^aFor this reading and interpretation, see Yakubovich 2002: 207.

In this context, the meaning ‘to rule, control’ would be very unexpected. Instead, the sequence of events mirrors the events in YALBURT discussed above: (a) attack, (b) conquest and (c) destruction.

Finally, the interpretation above of the bull’s head as aggressive fits *mu(wa)-* ‘conquer’ better than ‘rule over.’

§2 *ara/i* (AVIS₂) (*132): AVIS₂ or *ara/i*, the eagle-man with its wings stretched out in front (fig. 6a), is very similar in shape to *ara/i* in SUVASA (fig. 6b) and to *ara/i* in YALBURT Block 14, §3 (fig. 6c; in *a-wa/i* MAGNUS.REX DOMINUS *ara/i* THRONUS PES₂.PES₂, ‘(I), the Great King, marched to the throne as the rightful lord’; see Goedegebuure 2012: 433, n. 82). This shape of *132 is also attested on Empire seals (Herbordt 2005, Taf. 5, Kat. 71; for further discussion, see Hawkins in Herbordt 2005: 250, nos 71–74). Slightly less similar but still close is *ara/i* in TOPADA §8 (fig. 6d; in *zi/a-ara/i*).

§2 *ni* (*214): the standard form of *ni* is angular and stepped. The more curved version in line 2 is also attested

in KIZILDAĞ 4 §3. Curved *ni* also occurs in YALBURT Blocks 12 and 13.

§2 *ara/i-ni*: the only certain case endings occur in §1. All other words that are not purely logographic show the stem form as required by the case ending. With common gender nouns we expect *i* mutation in the nominative and accusative, and the original stem vowel in the other cases (for this argument, see Hawkins 2000: 440). This applies to the other Hartapu inscriptions as well. Thus, we find DEUS-*na*, which is the appropriate stem form for the possessive adjective on *-assa/i-*, in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2a, but DEUS-*ni* in KARADAĞ 1 §1 for the accusative plural and DEUS-*ni* for the nominative plural here in TKH 1 §3. This has consequences for the analysis of *ara/i-ni*. If the underlying lexeme is an *i* stem, *ara/i-ni* could represent any case, but if it is anything else, then the only options are the nominative or accusative.

To start with the latter possibility, under the assumption that PES.*a* is the verb and not INFRA-*tá-a*, and, moreover, is a verb of motion (more on which, see below), the clause is intransitive and *ara/i-ni* is a nominative. The sentence should involve hostile or at least military actions for the next sentence (§3) to make sense. Thus, we propose that *ara/i-ni* is the rhotacised form of **a-la/i-n(i)-*, ‘enemy’, attested with this spelling in inscriptions from Karkamish (**a-la/i-ni-zi* KARKAMIŠ A 23 §4; **a-la/i-na-za* KARKAMIŠ A 23 §5) and Tell Ahmar (**a-la/i-ni-zi* TELL AHMAR 6 §5, 21), and as *á-ru-ni-i-zi* in SULTANHAN §9. The translation of §2 is then ‘The enemy came down (here) (to) the land’.

We do not have any suggestions for *aran(n)i-* as an *i* stem unless it is considered an adjective and contains the morpheme *-iya- > -i-*. In that case, *aran(n)i-* could assume any syntactic role. As an adjective it should modify TERRA, ‘land, territory’ – so ‘enemy territory’. Lands themselves are not typically on the move, so the enemy territory is either the source or the goal of ‘come down (here)’. The translation should then be ‘came down (here) from/to enemy territory’. Since we analyse INFRA-*tá-a* PES.*a* as ‘come down toward the deictic center’, that is toward Türkmen Karahöyük, the sentence either means ‘he came down (here) from enemy territory’ or ‘he came down (here) to enemy territory’. The latter option would mean that this site and its surrounding land would be the enemy territory if we take *aran(n)i-* as an adjective. This is extremely unlikely, hence we opt for our first solution. The option ‘he came down (here) from enemy territory’ is not problematic when read out of context, but from a discourse perspective one expects the 13 kings to be delivered to Hartapu before his return home while still in enemy territory, not after.

Another theoretical possibility would be to link *ara/i-*

ni to a known Hittite toponym. The only candidate would be Alana (^{URU}*A-la-na-aš*, *KBo* 4.10 obv. 24–25), a town on the Tarhuntassa-Hulaya Riverland border, and therefore geographically fitting. While likewise supposing rhotacism of the *-l-* it would insert another explicit case ending: ‘he came down (here) into the Aranean country’. The form *ara/i-ni* would be a dative-locative of the adjective in *-iya-*: **ariniyi* > *arini*. Alternatively, it could again represent the stem without case ending, thus *aranī*. For the absence of a postposed determinative URBS, compare similar adjectival formations in REX *ha+ra/i-na-wa/i-ni-sa*, ‘the Haranean King’, KARABURUN §12, or *pa+ra/i-za₅-ta_x-si₆-x-wa/i-mu-ta_x*, ‘the Parza(n)tassean’, TOPADA §7. The first three clauses would then translate as ‘When Kartapu ... conquered the Muska, he came down (here) into the Aranean country. The Stormgod of Heaven (and) all the gods delivered (its) 13 kings (to) His Majesty, Great King Hartapu’. We would have to introduce a new large polity to the north of the territory controlled by Türkmen-Karahöyük that consisted of at least 13 kingdoms and centred on Alana, an obscure border town of Hittite period Tarhuntassa. As a capital of a Neo-Hittite kingdom it would have been located on or close to the border of Hartapu’s kingdom. This seems hardly likely, and therefore we take *ara/i-ni* as ‘enemy’.

§2 INFRA (SUB) (*56): the INFRA sign in INFRA-*tá-a*, ‘down’, betrays its origins: it represents an extended arm with an exaggerated curved thumb pointing downwards (fig. 7a). Given that TKH 1 clearly exhibits Empire-like sign forms (see *ara/i-* / AVIS₂ above or OMNIS₂ below), a comparison with Empire *41 (CAPERE, *tà*) is warranted. First millennium monumental forms of CAPERE always show drooped fingers, which are also always longer than the thumb. Empire *41, however, does not show the drooping of the fingers (see Herboldt 2005: 400): the position of the fingers is similar to our sign. What made us decide against CAPERE in TKH 1 is both the curvature of the thumb and the fact that the thumb is much longer than the fingers. Similar hand-shaped SUB/INFRA occur on numerous Hittite period seals, where they are read as *ká*, in the 13th-century inscriptions EMİRGAZİ, YALBURT and SÜDBURG, in inscriptions from Suhi II (tenth-century KARKAMIŠ A1a) and from Katuwa (tenth- to ninth-century KARKAMIŠ A13d; fig. 7b). Similarly shaped CUM (*58), cousin of INFRA/SUB, occurs in inscriptions from IZGIN (11th tenth century), Suhi II (tenth-century KARKAMIŠ A1b), Katuwa (tenth- to ninth-century KARKAMIŠ A13d, A11b [fig. 7c], A2) and Yariri (ninth- to eighth-century KARKAMIŠ A6, A15b). As usual, TOPADA presents its own version (fig. 7e). Closest in shape to INFRA in THK 1 is KARKAMIŠ A6, with the ‘cuffed’ wrist and open-ended arm (fig. 7d). The

other inscriptions of south-central Anatolia show only the cursive form (*57; see fig. 7f).

§2 INFRA-*tá-a* PES.*a*: the spelling INFRA-*tá-a* is attested in MALPINAR §28. The writing of the verb of motion as PES followed by *a* is not easily explained. There are no verbal endings on *-a*, so the *a* should be part of the stem. It could represent the final syllable of the stem – compare DEUS-*ni* – but to our knowledge there is no verb with final syllable *-a*. Alternatively, *a* could be the first syllable. This convention is also used for IUDEX+*la* = Labarna (in YALBURT, EMİRGAZİ), MONS+*tu* = Tudhaliya (YALBURT, EMİRGAZİ), POST+*a* = *āpan* (YALBURT) and AVIS (DEUS)*ku* = Kubaba (GULBENKIAN seal). If this is the correct analysis, PES.*a* should represent *awi-*, ‘come’, and INFRA-*tá-a* PES.*a* = *zanta awi-* means ‘come down’.

While the combination of PES ‘come’ with INFRA ‘down’ is well attested (ALEPPO 2 §15, AKSARAY §2, SULTANHAN §14, KARABURÇLU line 4), in each case ‘come down’ occurs in the context of benefits descending from heaven. Going to a country, on the other hand, is expressed with verbs that are marked with the logogram PES₂, for example the verb *pa-*, ‘go’. Assuming that *pa-* and *awi-* function like Hittite *pai-*, ‘go’, and *uwa-*, ‘come’, respectively, PES.*a* = *awi-* represents motion towards the deictic centre, in this case Türkmen Karahöyük, with the subject coming from somewhere else.

§3 13 REX: large numbers of Tabalian kings are regularly mentioned in Assyrian sources. For example, in his 22nd year (837 BC), Shalmaneser III received tribute from 20 kings of Tabal (*RIMA* 3 A.0.102.16, lines 170–72). It is perhaps significant that TOPADA lists three allies for Wassusarma and nine enemies, a total of 13 kings if one includes Wassusarma.

§3 *há+ra/i-tá-pú*: the use of OMNIS₂ (*430) as a syllable with the value *pú* (acrophonically derived from *punati*, ‘all, every’) is otherwise only attested in KIZILDAĞ 3 in the name *há+ra/i-tá-pú-sa* and perhaps in SUVASA inscription A in the place name *ti-pú-wa/i*(URBS), if that name is not to be read as PES.OMNIS₂-*wa/i*(URBS) (D’Alfonso 2017: 54).

The logogram OMNIS₂, ‘all’, itself is only attested in Empire inscriptions, the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ group and perhaps in TOPADA §22 (OMNIS₂-*PA-zi/a*; see D’Alfonso 2019: 138, 143 for this tentative reading).

§3 DARE-*ta₆*: the syllabic use of CRUS (*82) as *ta₆* otherwise only occurs in TELL AHMAR 1 (late tenth to early ninth century) in (*314’) *ha-ta₆-sá-tara/i-ti* (§12) and *ta₆-ni-mi-i-sa* (§ 17), and in a passage describing a

similar *topos* as TKH 1 §3, employing the same verb DARE-*ta*₂:

TELL AHMAR 1 §26:

[*a-]wa/i-mu |DAR[E]-t[a₆] *a-mi-i-n[a] |(*314')ka-pi-la-li-i-na

(This Celestial Storm God heard me,) and he delivered my enemy to me.

The delivery of the enemy by the gods finds exact parallels in Hittite annalistic literature; see, for example, *nu=wa ū namma apūn=ma=ttta* LÚ.KÚR URU^{URU}Ḫayašan dU BELI=YA karū paiš, ‘Go, at last! The Stormgod, my lord, has already given you that Ḫayašan enemy’ (KBo 4.4 ii 56–57 [NH]), with Hittite *pai-*, ‘give’, the cognate of Luwian *piya-* (DARE).

§4 LEO^{??}: as one of the reviewers notes, the reading of this sign as LEO (*97) = *hwisara/hwitara*, ‘wild beasts’, is uncertain. While the open mouth resembles *97, the eye is missing. Overall, the sign is less angular than all other instances of LEO; compare, for example, ALEPPO 2 §5, TELL AHMAR 6 §31 and BOHÇA §5. ‘Wild beasts’ seem hardly appropriate in the context if one assumes that they are part of the conquered armies of the 13 defeated kings. However, if the wild beasts are the result of hunting expeditions they could represent Hartapu’s prowess as hunter (compare Hawkins 2006), a theme that is explicitly addressed in KIZILDAĞ 4 §3: (TERRA)ta-sà-R[EL+ra/i] OMNIS₂ MAGNUS.REX VIR li_x-wa/i-ni CERVUS₄.IACULUM-tà †(DEUS)TONITRUS¹. CAELUM, ‘A Great King, a (real) man, he regularly hunted all the land(s) (with the help of) the Storm God of Heaven’ (combining Melchert’s interpretation of this passage [2018: 237] with several of Poetto’s readings [1998: 471]).

§4 MAGNUS.SCALPRUM+*ra/i*: because of the phonetic complement *-ra/i-* the lexeme behind MAGNUS.SCALPRUM should have an /r/ in the final stem syllable. Of the words written with SCALPRUM, only two qualify: *kuttassar(i)-*, ‘orthostat (designed to bear inscriptions)’, and *iri(ya)-*, ‘portrait’ (Van den Hout 2002: 173, 185–86). With CASTRUM.FORTIS, ‘strong fortress’, immediately following, *kuttassar(i)-*, ‘orthostat’, is the most logical choice.

The only possible functions for MAGNUS.SCALPRUM+*ra/i* are as an adjective in locative case, a locative proper or a genitive, leading to the following three translations, respectively: (1) strong ‘orthostated’ fortresses = ten strong-walled fortresses; (2) strong fortresses in the orthostat(s); (3) strong fortresses of the orthostat(s). Only the first option makes sense.

MAGNUS.SCALPRUM+*ra/i* therefore needs to be analysed as an adjective in locative case. Comparison with KARKAMIŞ A11a § 16 *a-wa/i za-ia* ‘PORTA’-na SCALPRUM-*sa*₆+*ra/i-ha*, ‘and I “orthostated” these gates’ = ‘and I provided these gates with orthostats’, suggests that our form functions as a participle in locative case, though without the participial morpheme *-ma/i-* and without case ending.

§4 10 CASTRUM.FORTIS: there are many fortresses attested on the Konya plain (see Massa et al. 2020, this volume). It is quite tempting to understand our passage in reference to ten of those fortresses.

§4 SUB PONERE: the hand *ign* could be read either as CAPERE or as PONERE. INFRA CAPERE occurs in MARAŞ 4 §4, 12, ARSUZ 1 and 2 §10 and KIRŞEHİR §10. Given the position of the hand in TKH 1, which is unlike the CAPERE hands in the attestations just cited, a reading PONERE, ‘put under (someone’s authority), submit’, as in BOROWSKI 3 §6, might be easier.

The verb ‘place, put’ requires an animate agent. The 13 kings, the gods (from the preceding sentence) and Hartapu all qualify, but since the gods have delivered the 13 kings to Hartapu, the kings have most likely been stripped of their agency, and within a historical narrative divine action is usually restricted to running before the king in battle, delivering the enemy and more generally being good to and protective of the king. Hartapu is therefore the only logical subject. The object consists certainly of the weapons (= troops?) and wild beasts, but did Hartapu take the weapons of the 13 kings or are the 13 kings led to the fortresses in submission? While it cannot be excluded that 13 REX is a genitive, it perhaps makes more sense to place both people and their possessions under someone’s authority than just stuff. Thus, we translate ‘and in a single year he placed the 13 kings, the weapons (= troops?) and wild beasts(?) (under the authority of) ten strong-walled fortresses’.

§5 *wa/i* (*439): the sign *439 = *wa/i* consists of a vertical with a hook on top and rectangular side elements (shape 3Aa-r; D’Alfonso, Payne 2016: 110). This particular form is unique among the 1,969 occurrences of post- and Neo-Hittite *wa/i* in that it combines the archaic rectangular shape of the side elements with an eighth-century hook on top of the central element. The sign shape closest to our form, 3Aa-s, with square side elements, only occurs in eighth-century texts and is attested in inscriptions from Karkamish, Mazuwari, Gurgum, Kummuh, Amuq, Tuwana and Tabal (D’Alfonso, Payne 2016). Because of the presence of a sign element that is firmly and exclusively connected with the eighth century, *wa/i* in TKH 1

dates the inscription to the eighth century.

§5: the understanding of the final paragraph of the inscription is seriously hampered by three signs of unknown or uncertain reading and the fact that the bottom of the line is broken off. The signs in question are *326, *520 and the sign immediately preceding the Sun deity at the end. *326 can either be *tù* or SCRIBA (in its traditional reading), or SELLA under the new reading (van den Hout forthcoming), indicating a high official related to the ruling dynasty. Because the top of a sign is visible below and to the left of *a-wa/i-*, *tù* as the third-person dative clitic is excluded. *326 should therefore be taken as SELLA and goes with *520.

*520 is attested only in KARAHÖYÜK §15 (see Hawkins 2000: 24, 290, 294; followed by van Quickelberghe 2013: 254, 256) and seems to denote a countable (1 *520) commodity of some kind, for which Hawkins suggests a cereal.

The third dubious sign could be *pa+ra/i*, which together with the preceding *a-* could result in *apari*, rhotacised form of *apadi*, ‘there’. The possibility of a personal name, *a-pa+ra/i*-(DEUS)SOL = Aparitiwati, seems unlikely because of a lack of names starting with *Apari-* (for the alleged name *Apari-ura in KULULU lead strip fragment 1 i 2, see Hawkins 2000: 511; 2004: 364). Although SCRIBA/SELLA might suggest a so-called ‘scribal signature’ or, better, an addition to the text mentioning the person commissioning the inscription, the absence of a clear personal name renders this unlikely. Also, the role of *520 would be unclear.

The presence of (DEUS)SOL is incontestable, but it is exceptional to find the Sun deity unaccompanied by other deities. In most Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions any deity mentioned alone would be the Storm God; compare KIZILDAĞ 4 §3. This brings us to (DEUS)SOL as representing *tiwadāmi-*. This adjective, an *-āmi-* derivation of *tiwad-*, ‘sun’, with literal meaning ‘pertaining to the sun’, is only used as a non-religious title for high-ranking or ruling officials who are regents (Azatiwada, KARATEPE 1), ‘first servants’ (Sastura, CEKKE 2) or major domos (Ruwa, KULULU 4). [add first name] Hutter (2001: 176–78) already suggests a connection between *tiwadāmi-* zidi- and Hittite ^dUTU-ŠI, ‘Majesty’. We therefore translate *tiwadāmi-* as ‘pertaining to His Majesty, His Majesty’s’ (see further Goedegebuure forthcoming [add to bibliography - or should be ‘in preparation’, as in bibliography?]). The adjective *tiwadāma/i-* is mainly used as modifier of CAPUT, ‘(noble) man’, but also occurs as an independent epithet; compare KULULU 4 §1 with *tiwadāma/i-*, likewise in clause final position: EGO-*wa/i-mi ru-wa/i-sa*₄ IUDEX-*ní-sa á-sá-ha* SOL-*wa/i+ra/i-mi-sas*, ‘I was Ruwa, Ruler, i.e., His Majesty’s’ (also see HİSARCIK 1

§1 and BOYBEYPINARI 2 IIIB 1 §5).

The sign that should follow *a-wa/i-* is limited to representing third-person enclitic pronouns (thus *sa*, *tà*, *tu*) or sentence particles (*ta* or *tá*). Given the curved top of the sign, *tu* (and the other signs representing /tu/), *ta* and *tá* are excluded. Although one cannot be certain, it seems that the curvature of the sign fits *tà* better than *sa*, which might require a more bent curve. Since *tà* would extend further to the left than *sa*, it would explain that *520 is placed to the left of SELLA, together forming a title. Taken together, this would mean that *a-wa/i-tà* represents *a=wa=ada*, with *-ada* referring to the 13 kings, either as nominative or accusative, while SELLA *520 would be something like ‘Chief(s)-of-the-Grain (??)’. With all due caution, given the fact that many of the steps of the argument outlined above depend on each other, we suggest reading and translating as follows, with *apari* as a nominal predicate ‘be there’ in reference to the fortresses of the previous clause: *a-wa/i-t[á?]* SELLA *520 *a-pa²+ra/i[-i?]* (DEUS)SO[L-^{o?}], ‘And the[y] (are) there (as) His Majesty’s Chiefs-of-the-Grain (??)’.

Under this interpretation, the 13 conquered kings or local rulers, who might originally have been vassal kings of Great King Hartapu, were distributed among the ten fortresses, stripped of their commanding roles and installed as subordinates in a non-military function, though still in some supervisory position.

Date of the inscription

The palaeography of TKH 1 strongly suggests an eighth-century date. The following signs were used for this determination (each sign has been discussed in depth above).

sa (*415): in its archaic form, *sa* belongs to the Hittite and immediately post-Hittite periods, then reappears in several eighth-century inscriptions from Karkamish and Cilicia after a hiatus of at least three centuries. The archaic shape of *sa* in TKH 1 (and the other Hartapu inscriptions) cannot be used to argue for an earlier date. Instead, it could signal an eighth-century date.

FILIUS/INFANS (*45): its shape seems specific for TKH 1. Similar forms are only attested in mid- to late eighth-century inscriptions from south-central Anatolia (except older BABYLON 1 and the ASSUR letters), though note that [add first name] D’Alfonso (2019) proposes a tenth- to early ninth-century date for TOPADA.

ka (*434): within Anatolia its shape seems specific for TKH 1. The only *ka* that can be compared is the attestation in KARKAMIŞ A25b (Kamani, mid-eighth century).

REL (*329): REL with rounded chisel is mostly attested in the mid- to late eighth century in south-central Anatolia (except older BABYLON 1).

wa/i (*439): though the rectangular side elements are typical for older inscriptions, the hook at the top of the

middle element conclusively points at an eighth-century or later date.

Phonological evidence likewise supports an Iron Age date for the inscription. The development of /k/ < /h/ in the name Kartapu is only an Iron Age phenomenon. Assuming we have read §5 correctly, support for an eighth-century date is provided by the presence of rhotacism in *apari* < *apadi*. Though rhotacism needs to be further investigated, we maintain that *d/r* rhotacism is essentially a phenomenon that starts in the late ninth century in general and in the eighth century in Anatolia (Goedegebuure 2010: 76–78). We do not expect to find rhotacism in tenth- or ninth-century Tabal (in TOPADA as redated by D’Alfonso 2019), then for it to disappear from there in the mid-eighth century during the reign of Tuwati (KULULU 1, no rhotacism). Other texts that date with certainty to the reign of Tuwati start showing *d* rhotacism (ÇİFTLİK, KIRŞEHİR (+) YASSIHÖYÜK). The co-occurrence of texts with and without rhotacism during the time of Tuwati suggests that in Tabal proper the phenomenon started in the mid-eighth century. The earliest texts from Tuwana, which date to the ninth to the very early eighth century (ANDAVAL, NİĞDE 1) and are therefore older than the Tuwati texts, do not show rhotacism.

The use of the genitival adjective *-assi-* in the nominative to express patronyms is first attested in a late tenth- to early ninth-century text [which text? add reference?] and therefore supports a later Iron Age date.

Yet other features of the inscription pattern with Hittite period inscriptions: the highly logographic writing, the lack of the sentence initial chain with the exception of §5, the use of the aedicula, the shape of *ara/i* (*132), the use of the logogram OMNIS₂, the archaic aspects of the sign *wa/i* (*439) and the more natural rendering of the ox head *mu* (*107). Several of these features are shared with the other Hartapu inscriptions and the TOPADA-SUVADA-GÖSTESİN cluster.

To sum up, both palaeography and language point at an eighth-century date for TKH 1, perhaps even at the mid- to late eighth century. At the same time, the inscription contains archaic features, which either point to archaisation or perhaps to a local scribal tradition that more than other Anatolian Hieroglyphic traditions adhered to the style established during the Hittite Empire. Only the recovery of more inscriptions from the Konya plain will allow us decide in favour of one option or the other.

Historical assessment and consequences for the date of the other Hartapu inscriptions

The other Hartapu inscriptions (KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ, BURUNKAYA) are dated to either the Hittite period under the assumption that his father Mursili is Mursili III = Urhi-Tessub (see Oreshko 2017: 49 n. 11 for a list of the

substantial number of scholars supporting such a date) or not long after the fall of the Empire in the 12th or 11th century (Hawkins 2000: 434, 439; Oreshko 2017: 48–50, with references to further literature). An Empire period date for KIZILDAĞ 4 can no longer be upheld given the mention of the land *Muska*, that is the Phrygians instead of the land of *Masa* (see above). While a reference to *Masa* could be reconciled with such a high date (but see already Oreshko’s arguments against such a high dating), a Phrygian state simply did not exist in Hittite times.

The eighth-century date of TKH 1 now leads to a quandary. Do we accept two different Hartapus, both sons of a Mursili, who both conquered the Phrygians, one ruling in the immediately post-Hittite period and the other in the eighth century? Of all his conquests, Hartapu of KIZILDAĞ 4 only highlights the conquest of *Muska* (§ (DEUS)TONITRUS.CAELUM DEUS-*na* OMNIS₂ (BONUS₂)*wa/i-sà-ti* REGIO OMNIS₂ || (*273)*mu(wa)-tá* § REL *mu-sà-ka-na*(REGIO) *mu(wa)-tá-*’, ‘(Hartapu) conquered all the lands through the goodness of the Storm God of Heaven (and) all the gods. Indeed, he conquered the country of *Muska*’; with REL as ‘indeed’ as suggested by Yakubovich 2008: 11 n. 14), which means that the *Muska* must have been quite important during the reign of Hartapu of KIZILDAĞ 4. But do we accept a powerful Phrygian polity already in the 12th or 11th century bordering on the Konya plain, when there is archaeological evidence of a rising political and economic power at Gordion only in the early ninth century (Voigt 2009: 325)?

Several of the Hartapu inscriptions are certainly late. The existence of an eighth-century Hartapu in TKH 1 now fully supports that the throne relief and inscription of KIZILDAĞ 1 are not only contemporaneous (see Oreshko 2017: 48) but also date to the eighth century (Osborne forthcoming). The rhotacism attested in *tu-pi+ra/i*, ‘he will smite/he smote’, in BURUNKAYA is also fully consistent with an eighth-century date. The remaining Hartapu inscriptions now need to be reassessed, most crucially KIZILDAĞ 4 with its mention of the conquest of the Phrygians and the similarities in general with TKH 1. The issue that needs to be resolved is whether TKH 1 used much older KIZILDAĞ 4 as a model, explaining its archaic features (which forces the existence of an early Phrygian kingdom), or if TKH 1 and KIZILDAĞ 4 are closer in time or even contemporaneous.

While KIZILDAĞ 4 undeniably looks immediately post-Empire or early Iron Age, there are some clues that connect it with the late aspects of TKH 1 and a few eighth-century Karkamish inscriptions. (1) The sign *sa* in its archaic use is not attested in the early texts from Malatya and Karkamish, but shows up again in inscriptions there from the late ninth to eighth century. Its presence in KIZILDAĞ 4 is therefore not evidence for an early date.

(2) The same applies to the shape of FILIUS without upper ‘crampon’. Discussing the sign FILIUS in general, one reviewer notes that the absence of the upper ‘crampon’ in FILIUS, while the usual shape in second-millennium texts, is only a late phenomenon in first-millennium texts: it is omitted from archaizing KARKAMIŠ A 21b+a §11, TOPADA §1 and KIZILDAĞ 3. We would like to add that the appearance of this version of FILIUS in KIZILDAĞ 4 is therefore either pre-11th century or it points to an eighth-century date. What separates the shape of FILIUS in KIZILDAĞ 4 from the Empire inscriptions is the placement of the ‘crampon’ vis-à-vis the hand-shaped sign element. In second-millennium texts the ‘crampon’ is always attached to the hand, while almost all early post-Empire texts already show the ‘crampon’ separated from the hand (for example GÜRÜN, DARENDE, KARKAMIŠ A4b and perhaps KÖTÜKALE; but with ‘crampon’ attached: KARKAMIŠ A14b). In our view, the separated ‘crampon’ combined with the omission of the upper ‘crampon’ from KIZILDAĞ 4 should be considered archaizing and not archaic. (3) The particular shape of *ka* in TKH 1, so different from Empire *ka*, is otherwise only found in KIZILDAĞ 4, and again in an eighth-century inscription from Karkamish (KARKAMIŠ A25b). (4) And finally, the rounded top of REL in KIZILDAĞ 4 is mainly a late phenomenon, though the circle at the bottom is mainly second millennium. This too could imply that REL is archaizing and not archaic.

This list of three potentially archaizing sign uses (*sa*, FILIUS, REL) and one eighth-century use (*ka*) does not provide enough support for a down-dating of KIZILDAĞ 4, but the fact that both KIZILDAĞ 4 and TKH 1 belong to a Hartapu, son of Mursili, who conquered the Phrygians, should give us pause and makes it imperative that all sign forms of KIZILDAĞ 4 are reassessed against the complete Anatolian Hieroglyphic corpus.

Our eighth-century Hartapu is not known from other eighth-century sources, either indigenous or Assyrian. This might mean that Hartapu was simply beyond the purview of the Assyrians, being too far west and not a tributary king. Indigenous sources are often not historical in nature, so we would not expect any references to Hartapu unless the author of such an inscription was his servant or an antagonist of his. In Phrygia, Mida [Midas?] ruled during the second half of the eighth century. Given the latter’s continuing importance and international stature it does not seem likely that an Anatolian Great King would have conquered his territory at any time. On the other hand, the conquest of Phrygia in TKH 1 does not necessarily point at a full defeat but might refer to raids into Phrygian territory, allowing Hartapu as contemporaneous with Mida. Propaganda with exaggeration should never be excluded. But if we assume that a Great King Hartapu

should have been mentioned in Assyrian sources, as for example Wassusarma (Assyrian Wassurme) or Warpalawa (Assyrian Urballa), then another explanation offers itself: Hartapu ruled in the first half of the eighth century. The eighth-century Assyrian references to Tabal only start with Tiglathpileser III, so an early eighth-century date would explain Hartapu’s total absence from Assyrian sources. It would also resolve the issue identified above, that it might be difficult to claim that Hartapu conquered parts of Phrygia during the reign of Mida. He would simply have operated before the reign of Mida.

While raiding or conquering Phrygian territory, Hartapu’s country was attacked by 13 kings. It is tempting to understand these kings as representing a coalition of subordinate Tabalian states to the east of Hartapu’s country. They were quite unsuccessful: not only were they defeated, they were also stripped of their royal power and absorbed into Hartapu’s society in a much lower position. This defeat, or another one, of Tabalian kings is probably celebrated in the BURUNKAYA inscription, which unfortunately is broken exactly where the defeated country or countries are mentioned. Only [... REGI]O/[U]RBS *tu-pi+ra/i* is preserved at the end (for the reading URBS or REGIO, see Oreshko 2016: 10).

Irrespective of the outcome of future debates about the date of the remaining Hartapu inscriptions and a more precise date for TKH 1, out of nowhere we now have an eighth-century Great King Hartapu, son of Mursili, ruler of a previously unattested Iron Age kingdom with its capital at Türkmen Karahöyük.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the two reviewers for their comments and suggestions, to Dieter Schürr for sending us drafts of a forthcoming article, and to Tayfun Bilgin for sending us the high-quality images of KIZILDAĞ 4.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

ACLT = *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/index.php?interface_language=en

Hittite Monuments = Hittite Monuments. <http://www.hittitemonuments.com/>

KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. Leipzig/Berlin/Mainz 1916–

RIMA 3 = Kirk Grayson, A. 1996: *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)* (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Period 3). Toronto, University of Toronto Press

- Adiego Lajara, I.J. 2007: *The Carian Language*. Leiden/Boston, Brill
- Balatti, S. 2012: ‘Some remarks on the dating of the ANDAVAL stela: palaeographic and iconographic analysis’ *Anatolica* 38: 149–68
- D’Alfonso, L. 2012: ‘Tabal, an “out-group” definition in the first millennium BCE’ in G.B. Lanfranchi, D. Morandi Bonacossi, C. Pappi, S. Ponchia (eds), *Leggo! Studies Presented to Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 173–94
- 2017: ‘Suvasa and the open-air, non-royal cultic monuments of Hittite and post-Hittite Anatolia’ in S. Özkan, H. Hüryılmaz, A. Türker (eds), *Samsat’tan Acemhöyük’e Eski Uygarlıkların izinde Aliye Öztan’a Armağan/From Samosata to Acemhöyük Trailing the Ancient Civilizations: Studies Presented to Honour of Aliye Öztan*. Izmir, Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi: 55–66
- 2019: ‘War in Anatolia in the post-Hittite period: the Anatolian Hieroglyphic inscription of Topada revised’ *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71: 133–52. <https://doi.org/10.1086/703857>
- D’Alfonso, L., Payne, A. 2016: ‘The paleography of Anatolian Hieroglyphic stone inscriptions’ *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 68: 107–27. <https://doi.org/10.5615/jcunestud.68.2016.0107>
- Goedegebuure, P. 2010: ‘The Luwian demonstratives of place and manner’ in I. Singer (ed.), *ipatami kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Tel Aviv, Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University: 76–94
- 2012: ‘Hittite iconoclasm: disconnecting the icon, disempowering the referent’ in N.N. May (ed.), *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*. Chicago, Oriental Institute: 407–05
- in preparation: ‘*tiwadāmis zidis*: his Majesty’s man’ (preliminary title) **[still in preparation? Or now forthcoming or published?]**
- Hawkins, J.D. 1995: *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG), With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz
- 2000: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York, De Gruyter
- 2004: ‘The Stag-God of the Countryside and related problems’ in J.H.W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 355–69
- 2006: ‘Tudhaliya the Hunter’ in T.P.J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*. Leiden, NINO: 49–76
- 2010: ‘The usage of the Hieroglyphic Luwian sign “Crampon” (L.386)’ *Kadmos* 49: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos.2010.001>
- Hawkins, J.D., Akdoğan, R. 2011: ‘A stela from Gemerek/Gemerek’de bulunan bir stel’ *TÜBA-AR* 14: 313–15
- Hawkins, J.D., Morpurgo Davies, A. 1993: ‘Running and relatives in Luwian’ *Kadmos* 32: 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kadm.1993.32.1.50>
- Herbordt, S. 2005: *Die Prinzen- und Beamtsiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*. Mainz, von Zabern
- Hutter, M. 2001: ‘Luwische Sprache und Kultur in der Eisenzeit: zum Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions’ *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 91: 161–81
- Massa, M., Bachhuber, C., Şahin, F., Erpehlivan, H., Osborne, J., Lauricella, A.J. 2020: ‘A landscape-oriented approach to urbanisation and early state formation on the Konya and Karaman plains, Turkey’ *Anatolian Studies* 70
- Melchert, H.C. 1994: *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Atlanta, Rodopi
- 2004: ‘Second thoughts on PIE *y and *h₂ in Lydian’ in M. Mazoyer, O. Casabonne (eds), *Studia Anatolica et Varia: mélanges offerts à Professeur René Lebrun 2*. Paris, L’Harmattan: 139–50
- 2018: ‘Empire Luvian *416-wa/i-ni and related problems’ in D. Gunkel, S.W. Jamison, A.O. Mercado, K. Yoshida (eds), *Vina Diem Celebrent: Studies in Linguistics and Philology in Honor of Brent Vine*. Ann Arbor/New York, Beech Stave Press: 231–41
- Meriggi, P. 1965: ‘Quarto viaggio anatolico’ *Oriens Antiquus* 4: 263–315
- 1975: *Manuale di eteo geroglifico parte II: testi – 2a e 3a serie*. Rome, Edizioni dell’Ateneo
- Oreshko, R. 2016: ‘New readings in the Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscriptions of BURUNKAYA and KIZILDAĞ 4’ *Kadmos* 55.1/2: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kadmos-2016-0001>
- 2017: ‘Hartapu and the Land of Maša’ *Altorientalische Forschungen* 44: 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1515/aof-2017-0007>
- Osborne, J. forthcoming: *The Syro-Anatolian City-States: An Iron Age Culture*. Oxford, Oxford University Press **[still forthcoming?]**
- Osborne, J., Massa, M., Şahin, F., Erpehlivan, H., Bachhuber, C. 2020: ‘The city of Hartapu: results of the Türkmen-Karahöyük Intensive Survey Project’ *Anatolian Studies* 70
- Poetto, M. 1998: ‘Traces of geography in Hieroglyphic Luwian documents of the late Empire and early post-

- Empire period (Boğazkoy-Südburg and Kızıldağ IV): the case of Masa' in S. Alp, A. Süel (eds), *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri/Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*. Ankara, Uyum Ajans: 469–79
- Schürr, D. 2019: 'Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Karischen' in O. Henry, K. Konuk (eds), *KARLA ARKHAIÁ: la Carie, des origines à la période pré-hékatomnide*. Istanbul, Institut français d'études anatoliennes – Georges Dumézil: 1–22
- forthcoming: 'Annäherungen an Hartapus' [still forthcoming? Where? Or should be 'in preparation?']
- van den Hout, T. 2002: 'Self, soul and portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian' in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw, Agade: 171–86
- forthcoming: *A History of Hittite Literacy: Writing and Reading in Late Bronze Age Anatolia*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press [still forthcoming?]
- van Quickenberghe, É. 2013: 'Réflexions autour de la stèle de Karahöyük (Elbistan)' *Le Muséon* 126: 253–56
- Voigt, M. 2009: 'The chronology of Phrygian Gordion' in S. Manning, M.J. Bruce (eds), *Tree Rings, Kings and Old World Archaeology*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press: 319–27
- Yakubovich, I. 2002: 'Nugae Luvicae' in V.V. Shevoroshin, P. Sidwell (eds), *Anatolian Languages*. Canberra: Association for the History of Language: 189–209
- 2008: 'The Luvian enemy' *Kadmos* 47: 1–19




Fig. 1. TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1 (drawing by Fadime Arslan and James Osborne).




Fig. 2. (a) ka in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c (photograph Cüneyt Süer 2011); (b) ka(+ra/i) in TKH 1 §1. [b is below print quality - please resupply at 600dpi at 81mm wide]




Fig. 3. (a) mu in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c; (b) outlined mu in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c (photographs Cüneyt Süer 2011).




Fig. 4. (a) ka in YALBURT Block 9 (photograph Cüneyt Süer 2011; Hittite Monuments); (b) ka in KULULU 2 §4 (photograph Cüneyt Süer 2011; Hittite Monuments); (c) ka in KARKAMIŞ A25b §3 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin; Hittite Monuments).




Fig. 5. (a) REL in TKH 1 §1; (b) REL in ANDAVAL §3 (photograph Bora Bilgin 2017; Hittite Monuments); (c) REL in KARABURUN §11 (photograph Bora Bilgin 2009; Hittite Monuments); (d) REL in KIZILDAĞ 4 §2c (photograph Cüneyt Süer 2011); (e) REL in YALBURT Block 4 (photograph Horst Ehringhaus 2005; Hittite Monuments); (f) REL in KARAKUYU line 2 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2006; Hittite Monuments).




Fig. 4. (a) ara/i in TKH 1 §2 (specular enhancement); (b) ara/i in SUVASA inscription D (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2009; Hittite Monuments); (c) ara/i in YALBURT Block 14 (photograph Cüneyt Süer 2011; Hittite Monuments); (d) ara/i in TOPADA §8 (photograph Ingeborg Simon; CC BY-SA 3.0, 2015).




Fig. 7. (a) INFRA in TKH 1 §2 (specular enhancement); (b) INFRA in KARKAMIŠ A13d §3 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2014; Hittite Monuments); (c) CUM in KARKAMIŠ A11b §4 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2006; Hittite Monuments); (d) CUM in KARKAMIŠ A6 §13 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2014; Hittite Monuments); (e) INFRA in TOPADA §23 (photograph Ertuğrul Anıl 2019; Hittite Monuments); (f) INFRA in SULTANHAN §14 (photograph Tayfun Bilgin 2006; Hittite Monuments).