

HITTITE ROCK RELIEFS WITH MORE THAN ONE INSCRIPTION*

ANA ARROYO

ana.arroyo@uclm.es

Universidad de Castilla la Mancha

Ciudad Real, España

Summary: Hittite Rock Reliefs with More than One Inscription

Hittite rock reliefs may or may not be accompanied by an inscription. When this occurs, the general rule is that the inscription refers to the figure and indicates both the name and position of the person depicted. Both, figure and inscription, constitute a single unit which refers to a specific individual. Furthermore, in these cases the person represented and the commissioner of the relief are (assumed to be) the same individual. But there are at least three Hittite rock reliefs with more than one inscription for a single figure. How should these binary inscriptions be understood and interpreted? What is their relation to the figure? Is it possible to find a general interpretation for these three cases? This article aims to analyze the relation between binary inscriptions and figure representation in Hittite rock reliefs in order to provide possible explanations for this phenomenon.

Keywords: Hittite rock reliefs – Multiple inscriptions – Iconography

Resumen: Relieves hititas sobre roca con más de una inscripción

Los relieves hititas sobre roca pueden o no estar acompañados por una inscripción. Cuando lo están, la norma general es que la inscripción refiera a la figura e indique el nombre y el cargo de la persona representada. Ambas, figura e inscripción, forman una unidad que refiere a un individuo específico. Es más, en estos casos la persona representada y el promotor de la obra son (o se asume que son) la misma persona. Pero hay al menos tres relieves hititas sobre roca que presentan más de una inscripción ligada a una única figura. ¿Cómo deben entenderse e interpretarse estas inscripciones dobles?, ¿cuál es su relación con la figura?, ¿es posible hallar una explicación general

Article received: July 22, 2020; approved: November 10, 2020.

* This article comes from a paper of the same title that I read at Broadening Horizons 6 (Berlin, 24th–28th July 2019). I would like to thank the scholars who gave me their valuable comments and reading suggestions on that occasion.

para estos tres casos? El presente artículo analiza la relación entre estas inscripciones binarias y la representación de una figura humana en los relieves hititas sobre roca para aportar una posible explicación a este fenómeno.

Palabras clave: Relieves hititas sobre roca – Inscripciones múltiples – Iconografía

Hittite anthropomorphic rock reliefs may represent humans, such as Karabel—or gods, like the gods carved in Yazılıkaya—or sometimes both are depicted together in the same composition, as in İmankulu. Most of these reliefs, of humans and/or gods, are associated with an inscription written in Anatolian hieroglyphs¹ which identifies the figure.

In human representations, the hieroglyph reading order follows the orientation of the figure. That is, if the figure is facing to the right, the inscription must be read from right to left; and on the contrary, if the figure is oriented towards the left, the hieroglyphs are to be read from left to right. This is a rule that can be observed in all reliefs no matter where the inscription is located. In normal cases the inscription appears in front of the figure, and thus the image functions as an apposition of the inscription. But when the inscription is located behind the figure, it is the inscription which functions as an apposition of the figure.²

In the case of gods, the inscription contains the name of the deity and sometimes also an epithet, while in the case of humans, the inscription includes name, title or position, and sometimes also a filiation.

¹ I prefer this designation instead of “Luwian hieroglyphs,” first because it is detached from any discussion about the application of modern ethnological or ethnolinguistic and/or political categories to Ancient Anatolia, and second because although this type of writing might have been created to render Luwian (see, among others, Hawkins 2000: 2, n. 17; Hawkins 2013: 29), most of the first inscriptions “though possibly attributable *to* a language, are not *in* a language” (see Hawkins 2003: 140 [author’s italics]) and it was certainly used to transcribe languages other than Luwian, such as Hurrian and Hittite. This is demonstrated by various examples of names, like Puduḫepa in Firaktın, Šuppiluliuma in seals and the SUDBURG inscription and phonetically written gods’ names in Yazılıkaya. Other authors who use this terminology are Waal 2012; Hawkins 2013; Weeden 2014; D’Alfonso and Payne 2016. Authors who prefer the term “Luwian hieroglyphs” are, among others, de Martino 2016: 43. There are also scholars who speak only of “Hieroglyphic” such as Hawkins 2015: 1. A discussion on the origins of this writing can be found in Yakubovich 2010: 285–299; Waal 2012; Hawkins 2013: 29; Oreshko 2013: 345–346, 400–409.

² Arroyo 2015–2016: 381–382.

However, some rock reliefs are not associated with any inscription, such as Gavûrkalesi or Keben; while three of them are linked to more than one name: Akpınar, Hanyeri and Taşçı A. These three reliefs are an extraordinary exception to the aforementioned rule which states that the inscription functions as apposition to the figure or viceversa. How can a second inscription connected to a single figure be interpreted and what is the relation between this additional inscription and the image? Is there a single explanation for these three cases? The present article focuses on these three rock reliefs that contain more than one inscription and uses both seals and cuneiform texts to make comparisons and draw some conclusions regarding the meaning and possible interpretation of the additional inscriptions and their relation to the figure.

AKPINAR

The relief of Akpınar is located at the Manisa Dağ, classical Mount Sipylon, facing the River Gediz and above several springs. It is carved in a deep recess in the rock and represents a frontal figure in a poor state of preservation, probably unfinished. It has been interpreted as either a mountain god or a seated goddess—in any case a deity.³ This interpretation is supported by all other known Hittite frontal representations which are clearly gods, such as the figures of Eflatun Pınar, the stele of Fasıllar and the female figure in the İmankulu relief.

To the right of this relief there are two inscriptions, one of them closer, in relief and inside a square panel, AKPINAR 1; the other inscribed in the rock below the first, AKPINAR 2. Neither of them exhibit the sign DEUS, which, together with the presence of some titles, excludes the possibility that either could refer directly to the figure.

³ See Ehringhaus 2005: 87–91; Salvini 2011; Arroyo 2014: 80–84, with references.

AKPINAR 1 reads:

EXERCITUS-*mu(wa)* REX.FILIUS
 Kuwalanamuwa, Prince

AKPINAR 2, which is badly damaged but of which the first column can still be read, also comprises a name and a title:

zu(wa)-wa/i-ni EUNUCHUS₂
 Zuwani LÚ SAG⁴

The reading of the second column of AKPINAR 2 is still doubtful due to its poor preservation state. Poetto suggests that there is a title, maybe FLUMEN.DOMINUS, followed by URBS;⁵ D'Alfonso accepts three of the proposed readings of the previous author, but indicates that this line points to the provenience of Zuwani (FLUMEN^{tara/i??} (URBS));⁶ and finally, Oreshko reads a title with a phonetic complement (FLUMEN.DOMINUS-*i(a)*).⁷

Kuwalanamuwa might be identified with a member of the army of Muršili II mentioned in his Complete Annals as a high-level military official⁸ and maybe also with the man featured in the figures on the Hanyeri and İmankulu reliefs.⁹ The assumption that these three reliefs cannot belong to the same man and that this man cannot be equated with the official of Muršili's army because the practice of engraving reliefs on rock began with Muwatalli II in the 13th century BC¹⁰ may be contested. It is mostly based on the argument that, from this king onwards, kingship needed new forms of legitimacy through visual

⁴ For the equivalence of EUNUCHUS₂ with LÚ SAG, see Hawkins 2005: 303, with references. For this title see Mora 2011, with references; Bilgin 2018: 324–325, 340–345, 431–436. Torri 2010: 390; Torri 2016: 42, translates this title as “court official;” Miller 2013: 296 and Bilgin 2018: 325, as “courtier;” D'Alfonso 2017: 54, as “attendant.”

⁵ Poetto 1988: 175–176.

⁶ D'Alfonso 2017: 54–55.

⁷ Oreshko 2013: 370.

⁸ KUB 14.16 i 10: KARAŠ-mu-u-wa-aš-ša GAL LÚ[MES].

⁹ For these reliefs see Ehringhaus 2005: 76–80, 70–76; Arroyo 2014: 101–105, 105–108, with references; Hawkins 2015: 3–4. See also below.

¹⁰ See Ehringhaus 2005: 73, 121; de Martino 2010: 92–93; Bilgin 2018: 87.

propaganda and that this new cultural praxis was later adopted by some high-ranking members of Hittite society. However, this explanation is based on assumptions that cannot be proved and has become a piece of circular reasoning.¹¹ Therefore, the possibility that the first Hittite rock reliefs can be dated under the reign of Muršili II cannot be totally excluded.¹² Still, the possibility that the Kuwalanamuwa of the reliefs and texts was the same man remains speculative.

Kuwalanamuwa could also have been the owner of two seals found in Nişantepe¹³ with the title REGIO.DOMINUS and maybe also of another one from Büyükkale without any title.¹⁴ Despite the fact that AKPINAR 1 is linked to the title REX.FILIUS (DUMU.LUGAL), the Kuwalanamuwa of the inscription and seals might have been the same person if he was promoted to REGIO.DOMINUS after the inscription was made, or if he chose not to include this title in the inscription. Concerning the first possibility, two Hittite officials, Aranḫapilizzzi and Ḫannutti, could have been promoted to the post of Governor at the end of their careers,¹⁵ and Ḫutupiyanza—who was a DUMU.LUGAL and also a contemporary of Nuwanza, who, for his part, is attested together with a Kuwalanamuwa in KUB 14.16¹⁶—might have been appointed as Governor in Pala and Tummana as a further step in his military career.¹⁷ Regarding the second option, a seal of Nerikkaili (Kat. 651-652) refers to the owner as REGIO.DOMINUS, while another called him REGIO.DOMINUS REX.FILIUS.¹⁸ If the owner of these seals was the same man, it may indicate that both titles were not always written

¹¹ Clearly reflected in de Martino 2010: 93: “since these noblemen’s practice of engraving [...] rock reliefs **might be explained** as a form of emulation of royal conventions [...], it is unlikely that the Hanyeri and Imankulu reliefs can be dated prior to the monumental representations of Muwatalli II” [my emphasis]. See a complete discussion of the topic in Arroyo 2014: 117–122.

¹² See, among others, Kohlmeyer 1983: 85–86, 90; Glatz and Plourde 2011: 35, 56–57.

¹³ See Herbordt 2005: 147, Kat. 192–193, Taf. 15 (Bo. 90/606 and Bo 90/648).

¹⁴ Güterbock 1942: 70, Taf. III (SBo II Nr. 87).

¹⁵ Bilgin 2018: 82.

¹⁶ For him, see Bilgin 2018: 126–127.

¹⁷ Bilgin 2018: 76–78.

¹⁸ See also Bilgin 2018: 85–87.

together. A further example might be the seals of a certain *461-**521-a*, who appears as REGIO.DOMINUS in one exemplar and as REX.FILIUS in two others.¹⁹ The match between the writing of the name Kuwalanamuwa in cuneiform (KARAŠ-*mu-u-wa*) and in hieroglyphs (EXERCITUS-*mu(wa)*) both in the inscription and in seals²⁰ might point to the same individual if the use of equivalent terms in cuneiform and hieroglyphic was a conscious choice. In that case, we might be dealing with the same man in AKPINAR 1 and the seals. In this sense, the Kulanamuwa (^m*Ku-la-na-mu-wa*) who sent a letter to a king of Ugarit should be identified with another Hittite official.²¹ If this identification of the man of AKPINAR 1 with an official of the Muršili's army is correct, Kuwalanamuwa might have been a Hittite military official based in Syria who was appointed as local governor.

For its part, the name Zuwani is attested in a tablet colophon as grandfather of a scribe²² and associated with the cities of Karkamiš and Ḫalpa in a very fragmentary letter.²³ Both texts exhibit a New Hittite script, which agrees with the probable date of the Kuwalanamuwa inscription, but as long as Zuwani is not associated with any title in any of these texts, it is doubtful that some or all of them could refer to the same individual. A seal from Nişantepe²⁴ bears the name Zuwani written identically to that in AKPINAR 2 but associated with the title AURIGA₂, so it is possible that they were different persons. The seal of Zuwanna with the title EUNUCHUS₂ does not pertain to the same individual as AKPINAR 2, because Zuwanna and Zuwani are different names.²⁵ Based on the paleography developed by D'Alfonso and Payne of the sign *439, *wa/i*—with the central element larger than the side ones and

¹⁹ See Bilgin 2018: 86.

²⁰ For KARAŠ = EXERCITUS see Hawkins 2005: 292.

²¹ See Bilgin 2018: 87, and n. 281, with references.

²² KUB 10.96 1'–3': ^mGUR-LUGAL-*ma* (²¹)^rDUMU' ^m*Ḫal-pa-LU* (³¹)DUMU.DUMU-ŠU ŠÁ ^m*Zu-wa-an-ni*. See also Waal 2015: 545; Bilgin 2018: 338, n. 1267.

²³ KBo 18.76 rev. 5, 7, 14. See Hagenbuchner 1989: 154–155; Gordin 2015: 218. The name in KBo 18.110 rev. 4' is most probably to be read *Ku-wa-an-n[a]* instead of *Ku-wa-an-n[i]*, see Hagenbuchner 1989: 476, and the photograph of the tablet in hethiter.net/: fotarch B1179e.

²⁴ Herbordt 2005: 211, 280, Kat. 544, Taf. 43. See also Gordin 2015: 218.

²⁵ Hawkins 2005: 280, 298–299, with references.

these latter in the shape of a circle,²⁶ D'Alfonso indicates that AKPINAR 2 should be dated after the collapse of the Hittite Empire, around 9th–8th cent B.C.²⁷ If the reading of the first two signs of the second line of this inscription is FLUMEN.DOMINUS (*212.*390), it would give further support to the proposal that AKPINAR 2 must be dated to post-Hittite times, for this title is attested nowhere in the Hittite period but is found in first millennium inscriptions.²⁸ However, this early date for AKPINAR 2 seems to be contradicted by the fact that EUNUCHUS₂ is not attested in Post-Hittite inscriptions.²⁹

Be that as it may, both names—Kuwalanamuwa and Zuwani—are exceptionally connected to a figure which does not represent either of them: the question is why these two men left their “signatures” next to this relief.

Considering that Zuwani's name is engraved and that all other known examples of inscribed names with titles can be safely interpreted as graffiti, such as those of SURATKAYA³⁰ and MALKAYA³¹ or even those documented in several places in the Hittite capital Ḫattuša,³² the most reasonable interpretation of this inscription is that it is also a graffito, as has been already pointed out.³³ Certainly, this one is much more difficult to engrave than any other known exemplar, but, however, it would still have been an engraving made on the spot, most probably by Zuwani himself.

²⁶ D'Alfonso and Payne 2016: esp. 124.

²⁷ D'Alfonso 2017: 55.

²⁸ See Oreshko 2013: 370 and n. 63. The reading of this title in the seal of Kaššu (Herbordt 2005: Kat. 158, Taf. 12) is only tentative for it is composed of two parallel straight lines, not of two parallel broken ones, see Hawkins 2005: 258.

²⁹ See Hawkins 2000; Payne 2012. In the first millennium is attested the Luwian word *wasi-nasi-/usinasi-* (sometimes preceded by the determinative *474, EUNUCHUS), which was equated by Hawkins with the Akkadian *ša rēši* and translated as “eunuch,” see Hawkins 2002: 229–232.

³⁰ For these, see Herbordt 2001; Peschlow-Bindokat 2002; Ehringhaus 2005: 91–94.

³¹ Ehringhaus 2005: 83.

³² See Arroyo 2014: 83, and n. 143; Marazzi 2016.

³³ André-Salvini and Salvini 1996: 7; Salvini 2011: 551; Hawkins 2015: 2.

On the other hand, Kuwalanamuwa's inscription is carved in relief and this prevents us from identifying it as a graffito *stricto sensu*. It was a planned action. But as long as Kuwalanamuwa is not identified with the figure, only two options are possible: either he was the author of both relief and inscription, or he was only the author of his own inscription. Without more information, neither can be proved. The first option is supported by textual sources on persons who ordered the creation of the image of another individual, such as the vow of Queen Puduhepa in her Prayer for the Goddess of Arinna (KUB 21.27 rev. iii 36'–42').³⁴ At least in one case it might be possible that the name of the promoter was linked to the figure of the person represented: in Šuppilulima II's inscription on the conquest of Alašiya (KBo 12.38 ii 4–14).³⁵ Therefore, the possibility that Kuwalanamuwa could have been the author of this relief cannot be totally excluded, although it is still very tentative. The second option, that Kuwalanamuwa made only his own inscription, is supported by Zuwani's inscription and possibly also by the second inscription of Hanyeri, which is discussed below.

As there is no indication of the bond between these two men their relation is unknown. Were they relatives? Was one of them, probably Zuwani, a subordinate of the other? Given the position of Zuwani's inscription below that of Kuwalanamuwa and its graffito character it is highly probable that it was engraved when the latter was already present on the rock, and is thus a later addition. And if AKPINAR 2 must be dated to the first millennium BC, then there was no relation between these men at all.

In any case, what can be inferred from these two inscriptions is that both men decided, independently of each other, to attach their names to a monumental figure, which, as such, and also because it was the image of a god, was considered culturally important. This was the basic reason why Kuwalanamuwa and Zuwani chose to link their names to the relief: its cultural significance. With a similar line of reasoning, but based on the assumption that Akpınar is a cult place,

³⁴ Daues and Rieken 2018: 438–439.

³⁵ Hoffner 2003; Bolatti, Guzzo and Marazzi 2004.

D'Alfonso interprets AKPINAR 1 as the connection of Kuwalanamuwa with "the production of cultic performance" and AKPINAR 2 as a *proskynema*,³⁶ an act of devotion toward a specific god.³⁷ The author considers that most of the Hittite rock reliefs were "clearly associated with the cult."³⁸ However, this assertion can only be proposed, and cautiously, for those reliefs that are associated with the so-called "cup-marks," for these concavities in the rock are most probably related to libations. Only the reliefs of Fıraktin, Sirkeli, Taşçı A and the cult place of Yazılıkaya are associated with "cup-marks," but even in these cases it is difficult to ascertain whether these holes were used for cultic purposes or for the performance of a magical ritual, which, obviously, was not necessarily connected to the cult. Springs and fountains were sacred places which had to be worshipped,³⁹ but this does not imply that Akpınar must have been a cult place, even if it is located above several springs, carved on a cliff and visible from afar.⁴⁰ The relief of Akpınar certainly *benefited* from this location, and most probably the presence of the springs determined its carving, but this does not mean that it was worshipped. In other words, the relief must not necessarily have been the object of a religious practice or worship,⁴¹ even in the sphere of personal religion, especially if it is considered that the figure is most probably unfinished—and thus that it was (and is) very difficult to ascertain which god it represented. Therefore, in my opinion, the evidence for considering AKPINAR 1 as the connection of Kuwalanamuwa with the cult and AKPINAR 2 as a *proskynema* is very weak. Instead, it seems to me more appropriate to understand these inscriptions as the form Kuwalanamuwa and Zuwani found to connected themselves with this significant cultural element. In this sense, and especially if AKPINAR 2 might be dated to Hittite times, a second pos-

³⁶ D'Alfonso 2017: 52, 54–55.

³⁷ Tallet 2012.

³⁸ D'Alfonso 2017: 52.

³⁹ Clearly stated in KUB 13.2 iii 4–7, Instructions of Arnuwanda I for the Frontier Post Governors, see Miller 2013: 228–229. On the topic of fountains and springs as deities see Arroyo 2014: 265–286.

⁴⁰ See Arroyo 2014: 219–221.

⁴¹ On this topic see Collins 2005: esp. 18–24.

sible reason for Zuwani's inscription could have been the prestige that the association of his name with that of Kuwalanamuwa would have given him.

HANYERI

Hanyeri is located at the Gezbel Pass facing the valley of the Yagnık Çay and is surrounded by several springs.⁴² It also contains two male names with titles associated with a figure, but here it is clear that at least one of these inscriptions refers to the image, that in front of the figure's face, whose position and orientation both fulfil the condition of being close to the figure and oriented in the same direction. The inscription is the same as that of AKPINAR 1, although here the title "prince" precedes the name:

REX.FILIUS EXERCITUS-*mu(wa)*
Prince Ku(wa)lanamuwa

The second inscription, located behind and separate from the figure and written symmetrically, reads

REX.FILIUS TONITRUS.MANUS-*mi*
Prince Tarḥuntami⁴³

As we have seen, Kuwalanamuwa was probably the same man as that of AKPINAR 1, the İmankulu relief—located on the other side of the Gezbel Pass, and a member of Muršili's army. The name Tarḥuntami appears in at least nine seal impressions, either without a title or with that of scribe. All of them can be dated to the 13th century BC,⁴⁴ but it is uncertain that any of them belonged to the Tarḥuntami of this relief. As said—and contrary to the case of AKPINAR 1—the

⁴² See Ehringhaus 2005: 76–80; Arroyo 2014: 101–105.

⁴³ Hawkins 2005: 273; Hawkins 2015: 4. The sign *59, MANUS, is very similar to *39, PUGNUS, in two seals from Boğazköy that also pertain to a Tarḥuntami, a scribe, see Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: 64, 67, Taf. 31.

⁴⁴ Dinçol and Dinçol 2008: Kat. 177, 274–277, 321–322, 327; Herbordt 2005: Kat. 413.

name Kuwalanamuwa refers without doubt to the figure, and both of them, figure and inscription, are related to the pair of gods in front of them, REX MONS (DEUS)*SARMA*, Mountain king Šarruma, and ENSIS(DEUS+MONS), Mountain god Nergal.⁴⁵ These figures and inscriptions are the core of the relief which was carved in this particular location because of its cultural significance: in a mountain pass, facing a river and close to some springs.⁴⁶

But the inscription of Tarḫuntami needs to be explained, for there is no known relationship between the two individuals and its symmetry makes its relation to the figure problematic. Leaving aside the cultural significance of the spot, the same two possible explanations given for AKPINAR 1 can be advanced here: either Tarḫuntami was the author of the whole composition or he only carved his name. And again, neither of them can be proved. The first option, that someone not only promoted the carving of the relief of another person but also left his/her name in it, would be a one-off case in the whole corpus of reliefs on rocks—and even on steles—and would be only supported, although partially, by the text in which Šuppiluliuma II seems to include his name in the inscription he attached to the statue he constructed for his father Tudḫaliya IV (see above). The second option, that Tarḫuntami attached his name to Kuwalanamuwa's relief, can be explained by supposing that Tarḫuntami wanted to link himself to a (possible) member of Muṣili's army, a wealthy and well known man who might also have carved the relief of Imankulu and could be supported by AKPINAR 2. Besides, it seems that the area prepared on the rock to provide a uniform surface in which the composition could be carved also includes Tarḫuntami's inscription. This would indicate that his name was engraved as part of the original design. If that were the case, it would support the first option, that Tarḫuntami was the author of the whole relief. But it would also open the door to a third possibility:

⁴⁵ Arroyo 2014: 102. See also Hawkins 2015: 4.

⁴⁶ Arroyo 2014: 104–105. Hawkins 2015: 1, 4 indicates the sanctity of this relief, but as has been argued before, it is hard to ascertain this characteristic only on the basis of the presence of the gods' figures.

that Tarḥuntami could have been the second name of Kuwalanamuwa.⁴⁷

Actually, ten seals found at Nişantepe seem to bear the names of two individuals.⁴⁸ As in the case of AKPINAR and HANYERİ, all of them belong to high dignitaries and none contains any reference to the kind of relationship that bonded the persons mentioned in them. Two of these seals (Kat. 200 and 631) bear a male and a female name, have been interpreted as belonging to couples and are of no use here. In two more exemplars (Kat. 270 and 604) the reading of a second name in the hieroglyphs associated with the main onomastic is doubtful. The last 6 seals seem to display two male names (Kat. 19, 10, 68, 404, 355, 441). Of these, only two exemplars (Kat. 19 and 404) also show a figure, a detail that links them to our rock reliefs. In one of these seals (Kat. 19), the name in the center (*nú-sà+US(?)*) could refer either to the goddess, Šauška, or to a second man, Šaḥurunu(wa). In both cases the reading is problematic.⁴⁹ In the second seal (Kat. 404) the figure of the man is accompanied by his name placed below his arm, but the figure of the stag could be either the first part (*CERVUS*₂) of the name Kuruntiya⁵⁰ or a depiction of the stag god.⁵¹ Considering the whole scene of the seal in which the man faces the stag, and the position of the human figure,⁵² the second option seems more reasonable to me. In conclusion, the reading of a second male name in both seals is uncertain. In addition, the fact that double names are only attested with certainty in royal seals, and that in them one name is always Hurrian, seems to preclude this hypothesis.⁵³ Therefore, the explanation that two names in seals or reliefs point to individuals related either by their roles or by family bonds seems more appropriate. However, the absence of any indication of the relationship that bonded these men avoids the clarifi-

⁴⁷ Hawkins 2005: 278. But see also Mora 1988: 165, n. 24.

⁴⁸ On this topic see Mora 1988; Herbordt 2005: 116–117, 125, 148, 161, 177, 186, 193, 220, 225 *sub* Kat. 10, 19, 68, 200, 270, 355, 404, 441, 604, 631; and Hawkins 2005 under these same catalog numbers.

⁴⁹ Hawkins 2005: 249.

⁵⁰ Hawkins 2005: 272

⁵¹ Herbordt 2005: 186.

⁵² Arroyo 2019: 37–39.

⁵³ See Hawkins 2011: 95; de Martino 2011: esp. 18.

cation of this phenomenon. Still, the comparison between seals and rock reliefs indicates that the presence of two names in the same composition was not so exceptional.

Summary of the Conclusions Reached for the First Two Reliefs

The two names next to the figure of Akpınar were certainly carved at different times; the name Zuwani is a graffito, while the one of Kuwalanamuwa might refer to the author of the relief. In both cases it was the cultural significance of the figure and the place in which it is located what led both men to inscribe their names on the rock. From the two names of Hanyeri, the name Kuwalanamuwa is directly related to the figure and was certainly part of the core relief, while Tarḫuntami might refer either to the author of the whole composition or to a second individual who wanted to link himself to a renowned man. In this case too, the cultural significance of the location of this relief was the basic reason behind its carving.

TAŞCI A

Taşcı A is located on a rock facing the River Döküksuyu, a tributary of the Zamantı, and is the most unusual rock relief of the whole corpus.⁵⁴ Unlike all the other exemplars except Taşcı B, it is engraved into the rock instead of being worked in relief. In addition, it comprises three figures, the inscriptions connected to these figures are located above them, and behind the third individual there are two male names with filiations and titles that are not related to any figure. However, and in contrast to Akpınar and Hanyeri, in this case the filiations allow us to connect these names with a figure. The two first male figures are linked to their names, which are unfortunately too damaged to be read. However, they do not represent any significant variation on the general model (see above). It is the third figure, the female one, and the inscrip-

⁵⁴ See Ehringhaus 2005: 65–68; Arroyo 2014: 92–96.

tion behind her that constitute an extraordinary exception. This odd inscription is currently not attested so far elsewhere in Hittite representations, whether on rock, orthostats or steles, or even in seals. It reads as follows:

ma-na-a-zi/a **FILIA** // *lu-pa-ki* EXERCITUS.SCRIBA **FILIUS** // VIR-
á HASTARIUS // MAGNUS.REX ḪATTI+*li* MAGNUS.REX HEROS
SERVUS

Manazi, daughter // (of) Lupakki, scribe of the army, son //
(of) Zida, *MEŠEDI*, // servant of the Great King, Ḫattušili,
Great King, Hero

Although the orientation of this inscription follows the general rule (that is, it corresponds to that of the figure) three features make it highly unusual: 1) the long filiation, 2) that this filiation belongs to a woman, and 3) that the position of “daughter” and “son” before the name of the father contradicts the normal position of the filiation in hieroglyphic inscriptions.⁵⁵ In them, terms such as “daughter” or “son” always follow the father’s name, like **SERVUS** here follows the name and title of the king Ḫattušili (III). Such is the case of all other known inscriptions like **KARABEL A**.⁵⁶

REX TARKASNA-*wa/i* REX *mi+ra/i-a* // AVIS/*zi₄-li* REX *mi+ra/i-a*
REGIO [**FILIUS**] // [...] *ra/i(?)* REX *mi+ra/i-a* REGIO **NEPOS**

King Tarkasnawa, King of Mira // [son of] AVIS/ *zi₄-li*, King of
Mira // grandson of [...] *ra(?)*, King of Mira

SIRKELI 1⁵⁷

mu(wa)-tà-li MAGNUS.REX HEROS URBS+MINUS-*li* MAGNUS.REX
HEROS **FILIUS**

Muwatalli, Great King, Hero, son of Muršili, Great King, Hero

⁵⁵ Meriggi 1975: 311; Kohlmeyer 1983: 77; and Hawkins 2005: 293 point to this unusual position of the filiation.

⁵⁶ See Ehringhaus 2005: 90; Arroyo 2014: 98.

⁵⁷ See Ehringhaus 2005: 98; Arroyo 2014: 111.

HATIP⁵⁸

CERVUS₂-*ti* MAGNUS.REX [HEROS] *mu(wa)-tà-li* MAGNUS.REX
HEROS **FILIUS**

Kurunti(ya), Great King [Hero], son of Mu(wa)talli, Great King, Hero

or HEMITE⁵⁹

á-TONITRUS REX.FILIUS // TONITRUS-*pt'/lī'*.VIR[?] REX.FILIUS **FILIUS**

á-Tarḫunta, prince // son of Tarḫuntapi/-li/ziti, prince

Only in two seals from Emar the filiation of the owner is clearly written in hieroglyphs. In them, the sign **FILIUS**, “son,” follows the name of the father, as it is usual in this type of writing.⁶⁰

Instead, when filiations are written in cuneiform, terms such as “son” always precede the father’s name; either in tablets, as for example in the so-called *Bronzetafel* (Bo 86/299) i 1–3:

(¹)*UM-MA ta-ba-ar-na* ^m*Tu-ut-ḫa-li-ya* LUGAL.GAL LUGAL
KUR ^{URU}*Ḫa-at-ti* UR.SAG (²)**DUMU** ^m*Ḫa-at-tu-ši-li*
LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Ḫa-at-ti* UR.SAG
(³)**DUMU.DUMU**-*ŠU ŠA* ^m*Mur-ur-ši-li* LUGAL.GAL
LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Ḫa-at-ti* UR.SAG⁶¹

(¹)Thus (speaks) the Labarna Tudḫaliya, Great King, King of the land of Ḫatti, Hero, (²)son of Ḫattušili, Great King, King of the land of Ḫatti, Hero, (³)grandson of Muršili, Great King, King of the land of Ḫatti, Hero;

Or in the outer rings of some seals, as in this one of Šuppiluliuma

⁵⁸ See Ehringhaus 2005: 102; Arroyo 2014: 77.

⁵⁹ See Ehringhaus 2005: 108; Arroyo 2014: 85.

⁶⁰ Ring seals B1 and round seal of Kuzi-Teššub—maybe also B55 and C4—, see Beyer 2001: 117–121, Pl. E (B1), 140, Pl. F, 25a (B55), 153 (Kuzzi-Teššub), 154, Pl. F (C4). See also Laroche 1983: 18; Mora 1998: 203, 207.

⁶¹ Otten 1988: 10.

I:

^mŠu-^rup-pí-lu¹-li-u-ma LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG / **DUMU** ^mDu-
ut-ḥa-li-ya LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG;⁶²

Šuppiluliuma; Great King, Hero / son of Tuthaliya, Great King, Hero.

These examples confirm that at present the inscription of Taşçı A is unique in this respect. The absence of any known parallel for a filiation written in hieroglyphs which precedes the name of the father clearly points to the cuneiform pattern. The position of these inscriptions above and behind the figure of Manazi and their reading order matching the orientation of her figure leave no doubt that they refer to her, but the reason why the normal writing order has been inverted is not clear, especially given that this anomaly is not found in any other example. The logical explanation is that the person who carved the inscription adapted the cuneiform pattern to the writing in hieroglyphs.

Concerning the term *SERVUS*, it is also odd that it has been placed in the normal position for hieroglyph inscriptions, after the name and titles of the person who is served, in this case the king Ḫattušili. This fact contrasts with the two previous filiations; how can this difference be explained? One interpretation is that *SERVUS* refers to Lupakki and not to Zida.⁶³ Its position at the end of the inscription and not attached to Zida's name prevents us from identifying Zida as servant of Ḫattušili instead of Lupakki. However, this proposal does not explain why both filiations are displaced, while *SERVUS* is located correctly. Moreover, if *SERVUS* refers to Lupakki, this filiation is an apposition, which is not attested anywhere. In my opinion, this interpretation poses more questions than it answers. Following a similar line of reasoning, the term *SERVUS* could refer to all three individuals referred to here,⁶⁴ but this would again be a one-off case and does not explain why *SERVUS* is correctly located while *FILIA* and *FILIUS* are not.

⁶² Herbordt, Bawanypeck and Hawkins 2011: 110, Kat. 8, Taf. 1.

⁶³ Hawkins 2005: 293.

⁶⁴ Implicitly suggested by Hawkins 2015: 3: "TAŞÇI with its procession of servants of Ḫattusili."

The position of the whole inscription on the rock could give us some clues for solving the question. The woman's name, Manazi, is placed in the same manner as the two men's names, in front and above her figure, thus following the layout of the composition. Her filiation, instead, occupies the space above and behind her figure, enclosing it and leaving no doubt that these two names with filiations should be related to her. But the position of both name and epithet of the king are totally dislocated. They do not follow the expected line behind the last filiation, but instead are located slightly above them. Furthermore, the title SERVUS is also displaced with respect to the king's name, placed below the title HEROS and not behind it. These unusual locations cannot be explained through limitations imposed by the rock surface—as has been done regarding other rock reliefs⁶⁵—because there is plenty of space available. In my opinion, it is a later addition, most probably not made by the same person who made the first part of this inscription. This would explain why SERVUS is correctly located at the end of the inscription. It could have been made either for the purpose of giving Manazi's filiation more prestige, or in reference to all the persons represented, also giving them a certain prestige by their relation to the king.

Summing up, Manazi's filiation follows the cuneiform pattern known from texts and outer ring seals belonging to the monarchy, while the link with the king Hattušili through the term SERVUS clearly follows the pattern of hieroglyphic inscriptions and seems to have been an addition referring to Zida, or to Lupakki or even to all those depicted, but in any case it was written with the intention of conferring more prestige on the relief.

CONCLUSIONS

The presence of more than one name in these three reliefs—as in seals—has no single explanation, and thus each case must be analyzed independently. In the reliefs of Akpınar and Hanyeri the names either

⁶⁵ Kohlmeyer 1983: 92–93.

belonged to different persons bonded by family or professional ties or there was no relation at all between these men. As long as there is no indication of the relationship between these persons, and unfortunately prosopography is of no help, there is no current possibility of establishing links between them with any reliability. The relief of Taşçı A is a case on its own, with both a filiation and a professional tie, but the terms “son” and “daughter” incorrectly located, following the cuneiform pattern, while the term “servant” is correctly written after the name of the king. In all these three reliefs, Akpınar, Hanyeri and Taşçı A, the possibility of a later addition must be considered.

Despite all these peculiarities and difficulties one conclusion can be reached: it was the cultural significance of the place in which the reliefs were located that motivated these individuals to inscribe their names on the rock and attached to a figure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDRÉ-SALVINI, B. and M. SALVINI. 1996. “Fixa cacumine montis. Nouvelles considérations sur le relief rupestre de la prétendue ‘Niobé’ du Mont Sipyle.” In: *Collectanea Orientalia* 3, pp. 7–20.
- ARROYO CAMBRONERO, A. 2014. *El agua dulce en la cultura hitita*. Ph.D. Thesis. Madrid, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid–Freie Universität Berlin.
- ARROYO CAMBRONERO, A. 2015–2016. “El significado simbólico del nombre en la cultura hitita y su relación con la figura a la que acompaña.” In: *Isimu* 18–19, pp. 379–390.
- ARROYO CAMBRONERO, A. 2019. “Sobre la iconografía de los relieves hititas.” In: J. GIL FUENSANTA and A. MEDEROS MARTÍN (eds.), *Orientalística en tiempos difíciles*. Actas del VII Congreso Nacional del Centro de Estudios del Próximo Oriente. Zaragoza, Libros Pórtico, pp. 33–50.
- BEYER, D. 2001. *Emar IV. Les sceaux*. Orbis Biblicum et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 20. Fribourg–Göttingen, Editions

- Universitaires Fribourg Suisse–Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen.
- BİLGİN, T. 2018. *Officials and Administration in Hittite World*. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 21. Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter.
- BOLATTI GUZZO, N. and M. MARAZZI. 2004. “Storiografia hittita e geroglifico anatolico: per una revisione di KBo 12.38.” In: D. GRODDEK and S. RÖSSLE (eds.), *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*. Dresden, Verlag der TU Dresden, pp. 155–185.
- COLLINS, B.J. 2005. “A Statue for the Deity: Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia.” In: N.H. WALLS (ed.), *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*. American Schools of Oriental Research Book Series 10, Boston, American Schools of Oriental Research, pp. 13–42.
- D’ALFONSO, L. 2017. “SUVASA and the Open-Air, Non-Royal Cultic Monuments of Hittite and Post-Hittite Anatolia.” In: S. ÖZKAN, H. HÜRYILMAZ and A. TÜRKER (eds.), *Samsat’tan Acemhöyük’e Eski Uygarlıkların İzinde Aliye Öztan’a Armağan / From Samosata to Acemhöyük Trailing the Ancient Civilizations. Studies Presented to Honour of Aliye Öztan*. İzmir, Ege Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp. 51–60.
- D’ALFONSO, L. and A. PAYNE. 2016. “The Paleography of Anatolian Hieroglyphic Stone Inscriptions.” In: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 68, pp. 107–127.
- DAUES, A. and E. RIEKEN. 2018. *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern. Eine textlinguistische Untersuchung*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 63. Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2010. “Symbols of Power in the Late Hittite Kingdom.” In: Y. COHEN, A. GILAN and J.L. MILLER (eds.), *Pax Hethitica. Studies in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 51. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrasowitz, pp. 87–98.
- DE MARTINO, S. 2011. *Hurrian Personal Names in the Kingdom of Hatti*. Eothen 18. Firenze, LoGisma Editore.

- DE MARTINO, S. 2016. *Da Kussara a Karkemish: storia del regno ittita*. Laboratorio di Vicino Oriente antico 1. Firenze, LoGisma Editore.
- DINÇOL, A. and B. DINÇOL. 2008. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy-Hattuša vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende der Grossreichszeit*. Boğazköy-Hattuša 22. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern.
- EHRINGHAUS, H. 2005. *Götter, Herrscher, Inschriften. Die Felsreliefs der hethitischen Grossreichszeit in der Türkei*. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern.
- GLATZ, C. and A.M. PLOURDE. 2011. "Landscape Monuments and Political Competition in Late Bronze Age Anatolia: An Investigation of Costly Signaling Theory." In: *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 361. New Haven, The University of Chicago Press, pp. 33–66.
- GORDIN, S. 2015. *Hittite Scribal Circles. Scholarly Tradition and Writing Habits*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 59. Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag.
- GÜTERBOCK, H.G. 1942. *Siegel aus Boğazköy* 2. Teil (SBo II). Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 7. Berlin, Ernst F. Weidner Verlag.
- HAGENBUCHNER, A. 1989. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2. Teil. Texte der Hethiter 16. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2002. "Eunuchus among the Hittites." In: S. PARPOLA and R.M. WHITING (eds.), *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East*. Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Helsinki, July 2–6, 2001, Part I. Helsinki, The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, pp. 217–233.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2003. "Scripts and Texts." In: H.C. MELCHERT (ed.), *The Luwians*. Handbuch der Orientalistik I/ 68. Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 128–169.

- HAWKINS, J.D. 2005. "VIII.3. Commentaries on the Readings." In: S. HERBORDT, *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 19*. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern, pp. 248–314.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2011. "The Seals and the Dynasty." In: S. HERBORDT, D. BAWANYPECK and J.D. HAWKINS, *Die Siegel der Grosskönige und Grosskönniginnen auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 23*. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern, pp. 85–102.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2013. "Luwians versus Hittites." In: A. MOUTON, I. RUTHERFORD and I. YAKUBOVICH (eds.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64. Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 25–40.
- HAWKINS, J.D. 2015. "Hittite Monuments and their Sanctity." In: A. D'AGOSTINO, V. ORSI and G. TORRI (eds.), *Sacred Landscapes of Hittite and Luwians*. Proceedings of the International Conference in Honour of Franca Pecchioli Daddi. Florence, February 6th–8th 2014, *Studia Asiana 9*. Florence, Florence University Press, pp. 1–9.
- HERBORDT, S. 2001. "Lesung der Inschrift", apud PESCHLOW-BINDOKAT, "Eine hethitische Grosssprinzeninschrift aus dem Latmos. Vorläufiger Bericht." In: *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, pp. 368–378.
- HERBORDT, S. 2005. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 19*. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern.
- HERBORDT, S., D. BAWANYPECK and J.D. HAWKINS. 2011. *Die Siegel der Grosskönige und Grosskönniginnen auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa. Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 23*. Mainz am Rhein, Philipp von Zabern.
- HOFFNER, H.A. 2003. "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus: Two Inscriptions of Suppiluliuma II (1.75)". In: W.W. HALLO (ed.), *The Context of Scripture*. Vol. I. Leiden-New York-Boston, Brill, pp. 192–193.

- KOHLMEYER, K. 1983. *Felsbilder der hethitischen Großreichszeit*. In: *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 15, Berlin.
- LAROCHE, E., 1983. “Les hiéroglyphes hittites de Meskéné-Emar: Un emprunt d’écriture.” In: *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l’année* 4, pp. 12–23.
- MARAZZI, M. 2016. “Die sogenannten “eingepunzten” Hieroglypheninschriften von Boğazköy: *Status quaestionis*.” In: Š. VELHARTICKÁ (ed.), *Audias fabulas veteres. Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 79. Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 194–209.
- MERIGGI, P. 1975. *Manuale di Eteo Geroglifico II: Testi - 2^a e 3^a Serie*, Collana Incunabula Graeca vol. XV. Roma, Edizioni dell’Ateneo.
- MILLER, J.L. 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 31. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature.
- MORA, C. 1988. “Halpaziti e Kukulana: indagine sui sigilli ittiti a doppia intestazione.” In: F. IMPARATI (ed.), *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carrateli*. Eothen 1. Firenze, Elite, pp. 159–167.
- MORA, C. 1998. “Osservazioni sull’uso del ‘geroglifico anatolico’ in Siria nel II millennio a.C.” In: M. MARAZZI (ed.), *Il Geroglifico Anatolico. Sviluppi della ricerca a venti anni dalla sua “ridecifrazione”*. Atti del Colloquio e della tavola rotonda. Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor 57. Napoli, Istituto Universitario Orientale, pp. 195–218.
- MORA, C. 2011 [2015]. “The LÚ^{MEŠ} SAG at the Hittite Court”. In: *ISIMU* 13, pp. 15–24.
- OTTEN, H. 1988. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrasowitz.
- ORESHKO, R. 2013. “Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)?” In: A.

- MOUTON, I. RUTHERFORD and I. YAKUBOVICH (eds.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolian and the Aegean*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64. Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 345–420.
- PAYNE, A. 2012. *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Writings from the Ancient World 29. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature.
- PESCHLOW-BINDOKAT, A. 2002. “Die Hethiter im Latmos. Eine hethitisch-luwische Hieroglyphen-Inschrift am Suratkaya (Beşparmak/Westtürkei).” In: *Antike Welt* 33, pp. 211–215.
- POETTO, M. 1988. “In margine alla seconda iscrizione luvio-geroglifica del monte Sipylos.” *Vicino Oriente* 7, pp. 171–176.
- SALVINI, M. 2011. “Sipylos.” In: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12, Band 7–8. Berlin, De Gruyter, pp. 550–551.
- TALLET, G. 2012. “Proskynema Formulas.” In: R.S. BAGNALL, K. BRODERSEN, C.B. CHAMPION, A. ERSKINE and S.R. HUBNER (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Boston-Oxford, Willey-Blackwell, pp. 5587–5588.
- TORRI, G. 2010. “The Scribal School of the Lower City of Hattuša and the Beginning of the Career of Anuwanza, Court Dignitary and Lord of Nerik.” In: M.G. BIGA and M. LIVERANI (eds.), *ana turri gimilli. Studi dedicati al Padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J. da amici e allievi*, *Vicino Oriente* 5, pp. 383–396.
- TORRI, G. 2016. “Landowners and Renters at Hattuša.” In: K. DROSS-KRÜPE, S. FÖLLINGER and K. RUFFING (eds.), *Antike Wirtschaft und ihre kulturelle Prägung / The Cultural Shaping of the Ancient Economy*. Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag, pp. 37–46.
- WAAL, W. 2012. “Writing in Anatolia: The Origins of the Anatolian Hieroglyphs and the Introductions of Cuneiform Script.” In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39/2, pp. 287–315.
- WAAL, W. 2015. *Hittite Diplomatics. Studies in Ancient Document Format and Record Management*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

57. Wiesbaden, Harrasowitz Verlag.

WEEDEN, M. 2014. "Anatolian Hieroglyphs: Logograms vs. Ideogram." In: S. GORDIN (ed.), *Visualizing Knowledge and Creating Meaning in Ancient Writing Systems*. Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 23. Gladbeck, PeWe-Verlag, pp. 81–100.