

FEDERICO GIUSFREDI

Sources for a Socio- Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States



Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg



TEXTE DER HETHITER
Philologische und historische Studien
zur Altanatolistik

Begründet von
Annelies Kammenhuber †

Fortgeführt von
Gernot Wilhelm

Neu herausgegeben von
Susanne Heinhold-Krahmer

in Zusammenarbeit
mit Daisuke Yoshida

Herausgeberbeirat

Gabriella Frantz-Szabó (München)
Suzanne Herbordt-von Wickede (Leipzig)
Stefano de Martino (Triest)
Walther Sallaberger (München)
Ahmet Ünal (München)

Heft 28



FEDERICO GIUSFREDI

Sources for a
Socio-Economic
History of the
Neo-Hittite States

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Umschlagbild
Sultanhan Inscription, Detail (courtesy of the
Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi, Ankara)

ISBN 978-3-8253-5810-5

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt ins-
besondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und
die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

© 2010 Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg
Imprimé en Allemagne · Printed in Germany
Druck: Memminger MedienCentrum, 87700 Memmingen
Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlorfrei gebleichtem
und alterungsbeständigem Papier

Den Verlag erreichen Sie im Internet unter:
www.winter-verlag-hd.de

Table of Contents

Foreword	xi
Philological Note	xiii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	17
1.1 Near Eastern and Neo-Hittite Societies	17
1.2 The Sources about Neo-Hittite Society	20
1.2.1 Archaeological Sources	20
1.2.2 Written Sources	23
1.3 Small States	26
1.3.1 The Problem of the Origin	26
1.3.2 The Semitic "Secondary" States	28
1.3.3 The Neo-Hittite States	29
1.4 Specific Sources about Society and Economy	32
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW	35
2.1 Definition of Neo-Hittite States	35
2.2 The Dark Age	37
2.3 The Neo-Hittite Era	44
2.3.1 The Rise of Karkemiš and the 10 th Century BCE	45
2.3.2 The 9 th Century BCE and the Campaigns of Salmanassar	52
2.3.3 The 8 th Century	56
2.3.4 The Sargonic Conquest and the Epilogue	60
CHAPTER 3: WHO RULED THE NEO HITTITE STATES	65
3.1 The Neo-Hittite Political Form	65
3.1.1 The Monarchic Structure	65
3.1.2 Extension and Political Homogeneity	70

3.2 The Attested Titles	72
3.3 Royal and Political Titles of the Dark Age	74
3.3.1 The Titles	75
3.4 Neo-Hittite Royal and Political Titles	78
3.4.1 MAGNUS.REX	78
3.4.2 REX (* <i>haⁿdawati-</i>) and Compounds	82
3.4.3 HEROS	88
3.4.4 <i>tarwani-</i> (IUDEX)	90
3.4.5 REGIO.DOMINUS	97
3.4.6 FLUMEN.DOMINUS	101
3.4.7 * <i>tapariyal(l)i-</i> (LEPUS + <i>ra/i-ia-li-</i>)	104
3.4.8 <i>warpal(l)i-</i>	107
3.5 Female Royal Titles	108
3.5.1 MAGNUS.DOMINA (<i>hasusara/i-</i>)	108
3.5.2 IUDEX FEMINA	111
3.5.3 BONUS FEMINA	112
3.5.4 TERRA.DEUS.DOMINA	114
CHAPTER 4. ROLES AND PROFESSIONS IN THE NEO-HITTITE STATES	117
4.1 Neo-Hittite Non-Royal Titles and Professional Nouns	117
4.1.1 Linguistic Note	117
4.2 Priests	119
4.2.1 <i>kumaza-</i>	119
4.2.2 MAGNUS.URCEUS	120
4.2.3 <i>putiti-</i>	121
4.2.4 SACERDOS (*355)	122
4.2.5 (CAELUM.*286.X) <i>s(a)paⁿtari-</i>	123
4.2.6 (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA) <i>taniti</i>	124
4.3 Lesser Titles	125
4.3.1 <i>an(n)a/i-</i> and <i>an(n)at(t)i-</i>	125
4.3.2 DOMINUS	126

4.3.3 EXERCITUS MAGNUS	130
4.3.4 MAGNUS- <i>r(a)iyaⁿzi</i> and the Adjective MAGNUS- <i>raz(z)a-</i>	131
4.3.5 ("LIGNUM") <i>sukala-</i>	132
4.3.6 * <i>tiwadami-</i> / <i>*tiwarami-</i> CAPUT- <i>ti-</i>	133
4.3.7 * <i>uriyal(l)i-</i> (MAGNUS + <i>ra/i-ia-li-</i>)	135
4.3.8 <i>warpasi</i> DOMINUS	136
4.3.9 ("*474") <i>w(a)sinas-</i>	138
4.3.10 * <i>ziti-</i> (VIR) and *74	139
4.4 Titles Borrowed from Akkadian	141
4.4.1 (LIGNUM) <i>hazani-</i>	141
4.4.2 (*474) <i>sariyasi-</i>	142
4.5 Nouns of Status and Subordination Titles	143
4.5.1 <i>arawan(n)i-</i>	143
4.5.2 POST- <i>ra/i-</i> CAPUT- <i>ti-</i>	144
4.5.3 SERVUS (* <i>hudarli-</i>)	145
4.5.4 SUB- <i>naⁿdawa/i-</i> and Verbal Phrase SUB- <i>nan izi(ya)-</i>	148
4.6 Nouns Indicating a Profession	149
4.6.1 <i>hur(a/i)nal(l)i-</i>	149
4.6.2 <i>kukisati-</i>	150
4.6.3 <i>kwananal(l)a-</i>	152
4.6.4 <i>mizinal(l)a-</i>	153
4.6.5 REL- <i>is</i> OVIS(ANIMAL)- <i>si-</i>	154
4.6.6 REL- <i>is</i> (PANIS) <i>tura/ipasi-</i>	155
4.6.7 <i>sarkunal(l)a-</i>	155
4.6.8 SCRIBA	157
4.6.9 <i>tarpal(l)a/i-</i>	159
4.6.10 <i>tunikal(l)a-/tunikara-</i>	160
4.7 Problematic Titles	161
4.7.1 *279- <i>la/i-</i>	161
4.7.2 <i>amuralura/i-</i>	162
4.7.3 a ^r <i>satar²¹-ura/i-</i>	162

4.7.4 <i>haturala-</i>	163
4.7.5 <i>huhurpari(ya)-</i>	163
4.7.6 <i>lah(i)nal(l)a/i-</i>	164
4.7.7 <i>s(u)wani-</i>	165
4.7.8 <i>uliyানা-</i>	167
4.7.9 <i>uwatara/i-</i>	168
4.7.10 <i>uzakal(l)i-</i>	169
4.7.11 <i>waralaz(z)a-</i>	169
CHAPTER 5 NEO-HITTITE ECONOMY	171
5.1 Between Syria and Anatolia	171
5.2 Neo-Hittite Economy	173
5.2.1 Date of the Documents	176
5.2.2 Territorial Features	176
5.2.3 Commodities and Prices	177
5.2.4 The Measures	180
CHAPTER 6. NEO-HITTITE ECONOMIC DOCUMENTS	185
6.1 The KULULU LEAD STRIPS	185
6.1.1 General	185
6.1.2 KULULU LEAD STRIP 1	189
6.1.3 KULULU LEAD STRIP 2	198
6.1.4 KULULU LEAD STRIP 3(+ frgm. 2)	202
6.1.5 KULULU LEAD FRAGMENT 1	205
6.1.6 KULULU LEAD FRAGMENT 3	207
6.2 The ASSUR LETTERS	208
6.2.1 General	208
6.2.2 ASSUR LETTER A	210
6.2.3 ASSUR LETTER B	213
6.2.4 ASSUR LETTER C	216
6.2.5 ASSUR LETTER D	217
6.2.6 ASSUR LETTER E	219
6.2.7 ASSUR LETTER F + G	225

6.3 The ALTINTEPE Pithoi	233
6.3.1 General	233
6.3.2 The Texts	234
6.4 The KİRŞEHİR LETTER	236
6.4.1 General	236
6.4.2 The Text	236
CHAPTER 7 ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS DISCUSSING ECONOMY	241
7.1 Northern Inscriptions	241
7.1.1 General	241
7.1.2 AKSARAY	243
7.1.3 BOR	245
7.1.4 SULTANHAN (excerptum §§10-29)	247
7.2 Southern Inscriptions	251
7.2.1 General	251
7.2.2 CEKKE	252
7.2.3 KARKEMIŞ A2 (excerptum §§6-8)	260
7.2.4 KARKEMIŞ A4A	261
7.2.5 KARKEMIS A11A (excerptum §§9-12)	263
7.2.6 TÜNP 1	264
APPENDIX A. AFTER THE ASSYRIAN CONQUEST	267
A.1 Neo-Assyrian Texts about the Former Neo-Hittite States	267
A.1.1 The Conquest of the Neo-Hittite States	267
A.1.2 The Documents	268
A.2 The so-called Karkemiş Tablet	271
APPENDIX B. TABLES	275
INDICES	285
Anthroponyms	285
Theonyms	288
Toponyms	289
Hieroglyphic Sources	293
GLOSSARY TO CHAPTERS 6 AND 7	299

REFERENCES	315
Abbreviations	332

Foreword

This volume constitutes a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, presented to the University of Pavia on 4th march 2010. The goal of the present work is to examine the data we possess about society and economy in the Neo-Hittite states of Anatolia and Syria during the first centuries of the Iron Age. Many aspects of the Iron Age Luwian cultures remain obscure: the origin of new political formations after the Near-Eastern Dark Age (12th to 11th centuries BCE), the exact mechanism by which the archaic ruling dynasties were replaced by new ones, the coexistence of Luwian peoples with Semitic ones (mainly Aramaeans) and the political structure itself. I will try to find an answer to some of these questions by examining the data available in the Luwian hieroglyphic written sources of the Iron Age, most of which were published by J.D. Hawkins in 2000.

After a first chapter dedicated to some introductory and methodological remarks, I will proceed to sketch the history of the Neo-Hittite states from the Dark Age to the conquests by Sargon II at the end of the 8th Century BCE. A study of the political titles and nouns used by professionals will occupy the Chapters 3 and 4: I have collected the occurrences the single titles, and I will proceed to discuss briefly the historical and geographical patterns of diffusion, as well as the linguistic features of the single words (where possible, I will attempt etymological interpretations).

Regarding the matter of economy, Chapter 5 is dedicated to a general examination of the main features (commodities, measures, prices), while the last two chapters will present the Luwian texts that actually contain the available data: economic registrations (Chapter 6) and royal inscriptions (Chapter 7). Even though all the texts, except the lead letter recently found in Kirşehir, have been quite recently published by Hawkins in his exhaustive and excellent *Corpus*, I have decided to include

transcriptions and translations of the sources, since in some cases I will try to propose interpretations of single words or entire sentences that slightly (but significantly) differ from the ones proposed so far (for further details, see below, Philological Note). Appendix A will offer a short summary of the situation of the former Neo-Hittite states after the Assyrian conquest at the end of the 8th Century BCE. I will also provide text and translation of the only Assyrian cuneiform document composed in a former Neo-Hittite capital city about 700 BCE: the so called Karkemiš Tablet from the House D. In this case, since the available pictures are impossible to use, I based my work on the copy published by R. Campbell Thompson in the *Carchemish II* excavation report and on the edition offered by N. Postgate in 1974. I decided to include the transcription and the translation of the document since I tried to push the interpretation of a couple of passages a little further. Appendix B contains the tables: a general chronology, geographical and thematic maps, a prosopography of the KULULU LEAD STRIP 1 and a paleographic comparison between significant signs occurring in the texts presented in the Chapters 6 and 7. Finally, in the last pages of this work I include indices for anthroponyms, theonyms and toponyms as well as a list of the hieroglyphic sources and a glossary to the texts presented in the Chapters 6 and 7.

Along with my supervisors at the Università degli Studi in Pavia, Prof. C. Mora and Prof. O. Carruba, and the members of the editorial council of the *Texte der Hethiter*, and the editor Dr. S. Heinhold-Krahmer, I wish to thank Prof. P. Cotticelli-Kurras, to whom I really owe much, and Dr. L. D'Alfonso, Prof. M. Giorgieri and Dr. A. Rizza, who provided me with many important suggestions. I am also indebted to the external committee members, Prof. G.B. Lanfranchi and Prof. M. Marazzi, for the precious remarks that were made during my doctoral defense.

Part of this work was written in the very stimulating library of the "Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie" of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, thanks to an Erasmus exchange from October 2008 to September 2009 and to a collaboration with the Hethitisches Wörterbuch Projekt. I wish to thank the editors of the HW²: Prof. Cotticelli-Kurras, Dr. A.

Hagenbuchner-Dresel, Prof. J. Hazenbos, Dr. I. Hoffmann, Prof. W. Sallaberger. I am also grateful to Dr. G. Frantz-Szabó, Prof. J.L. Miller and all the fellow students and colleagues. In particular Prof. Sallaberger attentively read my dissertation and provided me with several useful remarks. I am deeply indebted to Prof. J.D. Hawkins for reading and commenting the first drafts of my work, and to Prof. H.C. Melchert for discussing with me important matters of Anatolian linguistics. I am also indebted to Mr. A.A. Dornauer for his suggestions regarding some aspects of the Karkemiš Neo-Assyrian Tablet from the House D, and to Mr. P. De Ville for the linguistic revision of the text.

Finally, special thanks go to my parents, M. Bozzi and M. Giusfredi, for always believing in me, and to my life partner, L. Orlando, for encouraging me and for making life look better.

The publication of the present book was partly financed by the PRIN-Project "Formazione e modi di funzionamento dei sistemi di 'governo centrale' in Anatolia e nell'Egeo: dalle società pre- e protostatali allo Stato imperiale, e alla sua disgregazione. Analisi comparativa e degli aspetti evolutivi" (2008, co-financed by the Italian Ministero dell'Istruzione, Università e Ricerca). Grateful thanks go to the general director of the project, Prof. M. Frangipane (Università La Sapienza di Roma), and to the director of the Pavia research group, Prof. Giorgieri (Università degli Studi di Pavia).

Philological Note

In the main chapters of this work, Hieroglyphic Luwian texts will be offered both in transliteration and translation. The main source for the edition of the texts, where no different indication is provided, remains the *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume I, Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, published by Prof. J.D. Hawkins in 2000 (= CHLI). All the quoted passages, including paragraphs and whole inscriptions, have been collated from photographs or, in the cases of the Karkemiš texts and of

the SULTANHAN stele, autoptically by kind permission of the Direction of the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi of Ankara. Large poster-format pictures of the KULULU LEAD STRIPS were available in Pavia; for the remaining texts, I based my work on the published pictures available in Hawkins, CHLI (Volume I/3; in those cases, I will not consider the texts as properly "collated").

Standard diacritic notation for Hieroglyphic Luwian philology is employed:

- () indicate determinatives
- [] indicate integrated text
- ⌈⌋ indicate partially readable signs
- | is a word divider
- || represents line-end
- < > indicate an omitted sign
- < < > > indicate a sign to be expunged

The star (*) has a twofold function: before a number, it indicates the correspondent ideogram in the standard syllabary by E. Laroche (*Les Hiéroglyphes Hittites*, Paris, 1960); before a phonetically written word (or before the name of a language or of a family of languages), it has the usual function of signifying that the word (or language) is reconstructed/unattested. A question mark (?) simply underlines the fact that a reading or a translation is uncertain, while † is the *crux desperationis*. The paragraph sign (§) is employed to signal the beginning of a portion of text, while the numbers preceding § indicate the epigraphic line. In the case of the KULULU LEAD STRIPS, which are structurally different from the other texts and are not organized in epigraphic lines, but rather in squares, § will indicate the portion of register and a capital S will indicate the text contained by a single square.

Regarding transliterations, I use the standard principles presented by A. Morpurgo Davies – Hawkins – G. Neumann (1974) and updated by Hawkins (CHLI: 23ff.; Id., 2003: 135f.; cfr. also M. Marazzi, 1990); for signs, the values of which are still debated,

I will use Laroche's numbers. The so called "initial *a* final" is transcribed with an apostrophe (-'): I find this solution philologically convenient. Almost no significant differences exist between my readings and the readings of Hawkins; whenever such a difference occurs, it is marked and explained by a footnote. Translations pose a more complicated problem. I provide my own translations of the offered text, even though in some cases they do not differ from the standard ones by Hawkins. Simple *italics* and question marks in my translations will reflect problematic interpretations attempted either by Hawkins in his CHLI or by the author of this work. Non-Latin words in *CAPITAL ITALIC* script represent Luwian words included in the translations. In all the cases in which my interpretation of words, phrases or sentences differs from the former proposals, the explanations and the sources of my own choices and proposals are provided in footnotes.

I will not use the *ḫ* and *š* symbols in the transcription of Hieroglyphic Luwian words; these symbols will be used only to transcribe Cuneiform Luwian, Hittite and Hurrian words.

Finally, for the ancient languages I need to mention and discuss, I will use the following standard abbreviations: Akk. (Akkadian), Car. (Carian), Hurr. (Hurrian), Gr. (Ancient Greek), Etr. (Etruscan), Hbr. (Hebrew), Hitt. (Hittite), Lat. (Latin), Lyc. (Lycian A), Lyd. (Lydian), Luw. (Luwian; C.-Luw. for Cuneiform Luwian), Myc. (Mycenaean Greek), Phoen. (Phoenician), *PIE (Proto-Indo-European) and Sum. (Sumerian).

Chapter 1. Introductory Remarks

1.1 Near Eastern and Neo-Hittite Societies

Near Eastern human societies and political organizations are the first social entities in history that organized themselves as cities and left us written documents, or, at least, the first of which we know about¹. Being so strongly characterized by chronological pre-eminence and peculiar features, the ancient cultures of the Near East have been studied under many different aspects and the first and most evident elements of social information are the ones that regard the form of organization of power and the structure and functionalities of human hierarchies. Naturally, politics, society, and even the economy can be discussed by modern scholars with major or minor attention to either scientific evidence regarding the real facts of antiquity or to the ideological representation the ancient world gave of itself.

The opposition of real historical data and ideologically revised information is obviously only theoretically evident, since in most cases the distinction between the two is almost impossible to perceive when dealing with antiquity. This simple fact, known by everyone who deals with historical sources, has considerable weight when it comes to Ancient Near-Eastern society. An exception to the rule of the (normally) partial value of ancient sources is represented by the legal and administrative texts, either public or private ones: codes of laws, protocols and

¹ The question of the ancient Mesopotamian cities, their origins, chronologies and features is huge both in terms of importance and number of titles published in scientific literature. An outstanding synthesis can be found in M. Liverani, 1998: v-44.

acts of processes and sentences, historical edicts, public and private gifts, grants, subdivisions of land and commodities, contracts and sales or taxes registrations. Some cultures of the Near East, for instance Ur III, Hammurapi's Babilonia, and Iron Age Assyria, have been quite generous towards the modern scholar. For example we have a good idea about the subdivision of the social classes at the time of King Hammurapi² and know rather precisely who the beneficiaries of Neo-Assyrian grants were and how the connected protocol of assignment of lands and goods worked³. In other cases, and specifically in the case of the Anatolian cultures, the documents are poorer, often limited to inventory and "inventory-like" texts - by which I mean the still to be re-discussed corpus of administrative documents (CTH 241-250) collected by S. Koşak (1982) and J. Siegelová (1986)⁴ - and to a corpus of laws that, according to the palaeography of the older tablets, was redacted in an Old Hittite phase⁵.

² See for a synthesis Liverani, 2002: 407ff., and references to Chapter XIV.

³ Cfr. in general L. Kataja – R. Whiting, 1995.

⁴ I will mention some of these Bronze Age documents as matter of comparison while discussing the KULULU LEAD STRIPS in Chapter 6, 6.2, *passim*. Studies on the goods and commodities mentioned by the Hittite economic documents during the Bronze Age have been recently published by H. Klengel in the last numbers of AoF (Klengel 2005; 2006; 2007; 2008).

⁵ Texts A and aa (for Series 1 and 2 respectively) in H.A. Hoffner, 1996: 230ff.. Copies in imperial *ductus* are manuscripts B and PT (Series 1 and 2). The *karu-kinuna* sentences (Hoffner, 1996: 5f.), representing modifications of the laws in time, are already present in the Old Hittite redaction, which, among other conceptual problems, renders the study of diachronic evolution extremely difficult. Consider also that the actual normative function of the corpus of laws has been the object of a critical discussion, summarized by L. D'Alfonso, 2008: 325ff. and references (see also Archi, 2008). A relatively new acquisition regarding Hittite economy is the text CTH 269 (KUB 29, 39+, see Koşak, 1988; M. Marazzi, 1994, 2007; cfr also F. Pecchioli Daddi, 2005: 283; D. Groddek, 2008: 192 provides a new join), an Old Hittite fragmentary royal decree

Moreover, a second ideological problem, deriving from the poor state of some branches of Near Eastern documentation, also exists: it is the problem of the modern interpretative phase I would call "ideology of fragments". It is not only the ancient peoples who applied their own ideal dimension to the sources they left us; the modern historian as well can easily be tempted to hyper-interpret the available data in order to alter evidence to make it support a theory of his own. Let us consider for instance the idea M. Weber and his pupils had about the Near-Eastern city: little more than a huge palace, inhabited by a king and his servants⁶.

The consequences of such a position, justified by the always dangerous desire to make a general system work, are not only important for the history of urbanization; reconstructing a community entirely composed of palace-dwelling people strongly implies the assumption, which today we know to be false, that the structures and ideas of Near Eastern society were archaic. In my opinion, the correct attitude a modern historian should observe when dealing with the ancient world is to present the data he actually has at his disposal, and to limit the interpretative phase to the reconstruction of *internal, local* evidence. Any imposition of a historicist model would definitively compromise the meaning of the study.

In light of the above discussed methodological and heuristic considerations, in this work I will start by discussing the data that the Hieroglyphic Luwian written sources of the Iron Age provide about the specific matter of Neo-Hittite society. It seems necessary to me to start from a discussion of the nature of the sources, especially (but not only) the written ones, that will represent the very basis of my analysis but that, consisting almost exclusively of royal inscriptions, require a specific set of considerations that I will try to expound before proceeding.

concerning a reform of economic and social norms and prices.

⁶ For an exhaustive discussion of the Weberian theoretical model of ancient urbanizations, its derivation and its future developments, see Liverani, 1997, in particular 90ff.

1.2 The Sources about Neo-Hittite Society

A work on the Neo-Hittite society requires first of all a methodological discussion about the sources that are actually available, their meaning and their limits. Written sources from the Neo-Hittite states can be mostly ascribed to the problematic textual typology of the Royal Inscriptions. Royal Inscriptions are normally extremely exhaustive, yet not very reliable, as regards the records of historical events, wars, campaigns and public and religious buildings. In most cases the pattern of ideology and propaganda actually precludes any positive use to the modern historian. Still, within the corpus of Luwian texts from the 1st Millennium, consisting at the moment of more than 300 hieroglyphic texts, pieces of information about society (politics, economy) do appear. Data may come from the inscriptions themselves, since they carry a large number of royal, military and administrative titles, as well as from the interaction of linguistic analysis and archaeological or historical evidence, and, obviously, from the generous external sources such as the texts of the Assyrian Empire.

1.2.1 Archaeological Sources

Archaeological sources themselves are actually of little help. The excavations of Neo-Hittite sites experienced a long break from the end of the 1960s, when the excavations of Arslantepe were interrupted (to be restarted later by the Italian mission of the University of Rome, working above all on the prehistoric strata, even though since 2007 the Neo-Hittite strata have been reopened), to the 1990s. Seventy years after the end of the Siro-Hittite expedition of the Chicago Oriental Institute, the site of Tell Taynat, in the Amuq valley, is now being excavated again (see S. Batiuk et al., 2005; T.P. Harrison, 2009). New perspectives on the Bronze and Iron Age in southern Anatolia are

offered by the excavations in Kaman Kalehöyük, as well as by the Italian survey in the region of Niğde (possibly the Luw. Nahitiya; cfr. I.J. Gelb, 1935: 17f., Hawkins, CHLI: 515) and by the French expedition in Porsuk (cfr. D'Alfonso, 2010a; D. Beyer, 2010). Works on the material culture, and more precisely on ceramics and architecture, have been written by K. Matsumura (2005)⁷ and M. Pucci (2008)⁸. From a general point of view, the conclusions of these studies seem to oscillate between paradigms of interpretation that are oriented towards either continuity or discontinuity. The ancient conception of architectural space in the sites examined by Pucci seems to be very similar in northern Syria and southern Anatolia⁹, although it appears quite obvious that the geomorphic patterns of these different areas were certainly quite dissimilar.

The same alternating pattern of diffusion is shown by the work of Matsumura (2005) on the diffusion of ceramic cultures in Anatolia in the Iron Age. From a quadripartite situation at the end of the Bronze Age (Phase IId4-6 in Kaman Kalehöyük), including the four different areas of Alişar, Boğazköy, Porsuk, Kaman Kalehöyük - Gordion and Kilisetepe and the southern coast, as well as a huge oriental region including northern centres such as Kuşaklı and Syrian towns like Tell Halaf, we observe a gradual diffusion, during the whole Neo-Hittite parabola (Phases IId2-3 and IId4-6), of the Alişar-IV type, although with some internal differentiations (Matsumura, 2005: 506-529). These differentiations seem to reach a crucial point during the 9th Century BCE, when it still looks possible to distinguish two opposed "wings" of continuity in the Porsuk and Boğazköy sub-areas, as well as a still well-defined southern belt on the coast and a still independent regional ceramic culture in the east (Matsumura, 2005: 514-520).

Studies in Neo-Hittite art, iconography and iconology

⁷ On the Tabalite ceramic cultures see also Aro, 1998: 203ff.; U. Sievertsen, 2003.

⁸ On Luwian architecture see also Aro 1998: 160ff.; Id., 2003: 299ff.

⁹ In particular see Pucci, 2008: 1f., 163ff.

have been carried out by E. Akurgal (1961), W. Orthmann (1971), and recently S. Mazzone (1997, 2005) and S. Aro (1998, 2003)¹⁰. From a diachronic point of view, iconographical criteria led to the definition of a sequence of phases which was developed by Orthmann (1971) and is still employed today, although some specific problems, for instance the date of the Karatepe reliefs, remain unsolved¹¹. Regarding the geographic diffusion of styles and iconographic types and motives, besides the presence of Semitic (both Assyrian and Aramaean) characteristic traits, a specific and diversified Luwian (and Anatolian) cultural heritage seems to exist¹²: recent studies of the iconographies of the Storm God¹³ and the images of the sovereign (Aro, 2003: 328ff.) depict a complex scenario of internal tradition and intercultural exchange of themes and techniques.

Summing up the data, we notice that even the unification of the material cultures towards the forthcoming Phrygian Era (Phases from IId4-6 onwards) was no proper linear process. Of course, the reasons for such discontinuous behaviour should be sought in the historical information we obtain from the sources: during the 9th Century BCE the Assyrian expeditions of Salmanassar III clearly changed the social pattern of southern Anatolia, and towards the middle of the 8th Century the system of alliances and oppositions of the states of Tabal within the scenario of the Urartian wars probably opened the gates to a preferential channel of communication between the oriental regions (under the Urartian influence, as the ALTINTEPE pithoi clearly show; see below Chapter 6, 6.3) and Cilicia. Society not

¹⁰ Older works on specific aspects of Neo-Hittite art are also P. Matthiae, 1963, on the Karatepe reliefs; Mazzone, 1977, on the Karkemiš reliefs. See also A. Gilbert, 2003, on the interaction between the Neo-Hittite and the Neo-Assyrian monumental relief sculpture.

¹¹ Cfr. Aro, 2003: 295ff., with references.

¹² On the problem of cultural background cfr. Aro 1998: 202f.; Id., 2004: 297f.

¹³ G. Bunnens, 2006, 109-135; cfr. Aro, 2003: 317ff.

only always existed, but kept mutating as it interacted with historical factors.

1.2.2 Written Sources

When discussing written sources we have to distinguish between indigenous and external ones, the indigenous ones being above all the hieroglyphic inscriptions found in the ten (conventionally parted¹⁴) areas of the Neo-Hittite cluster (Aleppo, Amuq, Cilicia, Hama, Karkemiš, Kummuh, Malatya, Maraş, Tabal and Tell Ahmar). Most of these sources consist of long royal texts on stone support (natural rock support, stele, orthostats), but a division in sub-typologies is still possible.

1. Royal inscriptions coming from nearly all the states we know. They can be further divided into different categories, although many of them contain more than one or even all of the features listed below:
 - a. War inscriptions, about both internal struggles (Katuwas in KARKEMIŠ A11B + C, Ariyahinas's son in TELL AHMAR 1) and external campaigns¹⁵;
 - b. Religious inscriptions (Restoration of the cult of the goddess Kubaba by Katuwas in KARKEMIŠ A23);
 - c. Building/dedication inscriptions (Statue of the god Atri-Suha, KARKEMIŠ A4D), sometimes containing instruction for offerings and sacrifices.
2. Vassal texts, written by rulers bearing non-royal titles (for instance KARATEPE 1).

¹⁴ This conventional subdivision is the same as the one presented by Hawkins, CHLI.

¹⁵ For a discussion of the single episodes, see Chapter 2, 2.3.

3. Grave epigraphs (KARKEMIŞ A5A, A18H).
4. Economic texts, normally on a metal support (KULULU LEAD STRIPS, ASSUR LETTERS, KİRŞEHİR LETTER) or even on *ostraka* (ALTINTEPE).

External sources come above all from Assyria: annals (from Tiglatpileser I to Sargon II and his successors) and steles (for instance Pazarcık), as well as some letters to Assyrian governors (for instance the letter ND 2759 from Sargon to Assur-šarru-ušur about Phrygian prisoners, not completed, hence probably never sent¹⁶) and some administrative documents in the later phases, above all after the conquest of Syria at the time of Sargon II. Some sporadic data may also come from Aramaic inscriptions (some of them celebrating kings who bore Luwian names, as in the case of Panamuwas I; cfr. Chapter 2, 2.3.3: 58) and from the Urartian ones, in which the names of some Neo-Hittite states occasionally appear as tributaries.

Assyrian sources about the Neo-Hittite states should also be divided in different sub-corpora and phases, basing the subdivision on both chronological and content-oriented criteria.

1. Early phase (1100-830 ca. BCE): the sources are annalistic texts describing the campaigns of some Assyrian kings (Tiglatpileser I, Assurnasirpal II, and Salmanassar III; see below Chapter 2, 2.3.2).
2. Mature phase (830-720 ca. BCE). The sources may be:
 - a. Annalistic texts from the successors of king Salmanassar III up to Sargon II, see below Chapter 2, 2.3.3;
 - b. Steles discussing matters involving the Neo-Hittite States (for instance the Pazarcık stele);

¹⁶ For the text of the letter see S. Parpola, 1987: 4f., and cfr. below, Chapter 2, 2.3.4: 62.

- c. Records naming cities (e.g. Bit Adini) that were already ruled by Assyrian governors or that at least sporadically paid a tribute to Assyria.
3. Epilogue (720-613 BCE). The successors of Sargon II still dealt with former Neo-Hittite states in their texts:
- a. In annals some rare attestations of Luwian personal names appear until the reign of King Assurbanipal, see below Chapter 2, 2.3.4;
 - b. In administrative records towns, provinces and regions like Karkemiš or Hama are mentioned as tributaries or simply for being involved in bureaucratic or military routine¹⁷.

Assyrian sources, together with hieroglyphic ones, have of course been used to delineate the historical background of the Neo-Hittite parabola, and will be useful, as a matter of constraint while discussing social and economical features of the Neo-Hittite states. Still, since most of the administrative sources were obviously composed after the Assyrian conquest, they do not directly regard the subject matter I am discussing in this work. An appendix (Appendix A.1-2) will be dedicated to an overview on the Assyrian sources involving former Neo-Hittite states after the Sargonic conquest of Syria, and to the discussion of the sole cuneiform legal document found *in loco*, the so called Karkemiš Assyrian tablet from the "House D" (see below Appendix A.2), a contract between an Assyrian officer and the dwellers of the village Elumu, dated as from the end of the 8th Century BCE.

¹⁷ An overview of the Assyrian documents concerning the former Luwian states after the Sargonic conquest is offered in the Appendix A.1. Cfr. also K. Radner in RIA XI s.v. *Provinz*, in particular 58, 66. For a synthesis of the Assyrian history in the 10th to 8th Centuries BCE cfr. also E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, 2003: 59-74.

1.3 Small States

In order to investigate the socio-political and economic features of the Neo-Hittite states, it is important to contextualize these peculiar political formations in space and time. In the next chapter of this work I will present an overview on their historical parabola, from the first documented phases at the time of the Assyrian king Tiglatpileser I up to the collapse at the end of the 8th Century BCE. The periodization I will offer (the Dark Age, 10th Century, 9th and 8th centuries) is a schematic approximation which works perfectly for the subdivision of different historical circumstances once the Neo-Hittite States were already formed. It is, in other words, a descriptive periodization, useful only to frame and sketch the *histoire bataille* happenings that we need to employ as enclosing tools as long as we are dealing with historical research. Put simply, the social evolution, involution or circumvolution of these small kingdoms can quite easily be understood, explained and interpreted as long as we assume that we know why, how and when they were generated.

1.3.1 The Problem of the Origin

In a recent paper Liverani (2002) proposed a model for the the transition from the regional states¹⁸ of the Late Bronze Age (Mittani, Hatti, Assyria and Babylonia) to the system of small ethnic (Aramaean) and territorial (Luwian) kingdoms of the 11th - 8th centuries BCE. The Aramaean states, were, according to Liverani, quite vital entities which interacted economically with Assyria, Phoenicia and all their other neighbours. Liverani's

¹⁸ On the international structure of the Late Bronze age and the regional system see the good synthesis by Liverani, 1994, in particular 3-98.

analysis of the Semitic phenomena is very accurate; the scholar had at his disposal the studies concerning the Aramaic economic tablets by M. Fales (1986) and the royal inscriptions of the late kings of Sam'al (the family of Panamuwas I, 8th Century BCE¹⁹), as well as many documents such as the Assyrian/Aramaic bilingual of Fakhariyah and the texts from Guzana (Tell Halaf)²⁰.

Such claim for ethnicity is acritically extended to the Neo-Hittite states in the work A. H. Joffe (2002: 425ff.). Joffe considers the rise of the so-called "secondary states", including not only the Neo-Hittite and Aramaean states, but also the reigns of Phoenicia, Israel and the whole Levant, as a homogenous phenomenon. The paradigm Joffe follows is evolutionistic: the collapse of the larger states set the ethnic groups free to reorganize themselves in autonomous societies. Very significantly, few references are made to the proper Neo-Hittite states. The author simply observes that:

«The end of Ugarit permitted the independence of former vassals at large sites such as Karatepe and Carchemish, a wave of renewed urbanization, and the emergence of culturally hybrid 'Neo-Hittite' or 'Syro-Hittite' city-states across North Syria and south-eastern Anatolia.» (Joffe, 2002: 432)

This theory, deriving from an illicit generalization of the historical and archaeological observations about Iron Age geography presented in an article by Mazzoni (1995: 181ff.), is partially correct: without the fall of Ugarit, the southern Neo-Hittite states would have never existed. The explanation, however, regards only a part of the Neo-Hittite cluster, and we could as well assume that the decline of Tarhuntašša (whenever it took place, it is a matter of fact that no unitary kingdom

¹⁹ Sources in H. Sader, 1987, in particular 156ff. (cfr. *KAI* nos. 24-25, 214-218); P.E. Dion, 1997: 99ff., 253ff.; E. Lipiński 2000: 238ff. See also Hawkins in *RIA* XI s.v. *Sam'al* : 677ff.

²⁰ Dion, 1997: 40ff. On Guzana see also Lipiński, 2000: 119-133, 238ff.

existed in Iron Age Anatolia²¹) and the reduction of Bronze Age Karkemiš to a local kingdom had the same effect on the northern regions. The real problem is that such a paradigm is limited to the definition of a *condicio sine qua non*, and doesn't explain why the Neo-Hittite states reorganized themselves as a net of small monarchies.

1.3.2 The Semitic "Secondary" States

Ethnicity represents a good model for the Semitic world. Even though the hypothesis of a tribal phase for the peoples of Canaan, Phoenicia and Aram during the late Bronze Age is still to be discussed (Joffe, 2002: 428), the lexical analysis of social terms such as *bīt*, "house", being present in the very name of many Aramaean kingdoms, seems definitively to suggest that familiar lineage was at least one of the bases for the constitution of the Semitic "secondary states". Moreover, the Bible refers to a tribal phase before the age of the Kings²², and semi-nomadic tribes of outsiders are mentioned in Syrian sources from the beginning of the 2rd Millennium BCE (Liverani, 2000: 372ff.).

We may also consider that recent studies on the texts from the Hittite vice-realm Emar have shown that a self-management system based on the juridical status of *ah(h)u*, "brother", seemed to exist at least for the regulation of cession and ownership of land (N. Bellotto, 1995). This specific use of the word for "brother" did not simply refer to persons who were actually brothers or even relatives; still, the employment of such a metaphor for defining local powers and social roles is another sign of the reaction to the regional system by peoples perceiving

²¹ For a general discussion see Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, 3.1.

²² The problem of the historical value of the Bible as a source on the matter of tribal organization is discussed by Joffe, 2002: 431. Cfr. also Lipiński, 2000: 55ff. on the origin of Israel and its relationship with the Aramaic tribes and states of Syria and Palestine.

themselves as coherently sharing cultural features; peoples that we can, with some terminological prudence, even define as ethnic groups.

It comes as no surprise at all, then, if the secondary states that were born from a process of local evolution from tribes to small ethnic kingdoms actually interacted with each other and were able to express their own cultures, their own *abjads* and their own archives. The *trait d'union* of the similar Western Semitic dialects probably helped in depicting such a fragmented but coherent scenario.

1.3.3 The Neo-Hittite States

The question we have to answer is the following: did the Neo-Hittite rising really happen the same way as the Aramaean one? We know that the Dark Age crisis, leading to the (at least partial) decline of Ugarit, Emar, Karkemiš, Tarhuntašša and even Hatti, was a general phenomenon that involved Anatolia, Syria, Egypt and even archaic Greece. Nevertheless, the Luwians of northern Syria and southern Anatolia never showed any sign of ethnic organization of either general or local power: the Syrian Luwian states, in particular, probably had a mixed, partly (and sometimes mainly) Semitic population, and the coexistence of different ethnicities in centres such as Aleppo, Bit Adini, Hama but almost surely even Karkemiš seems to exclude any centrality of the ethnic element in the "genetic" structure of the societies. The whole history of the Luwians is marked by the interaction with the Hittites, the Hurrians and even the Assyrians²³; we know little about the Bronze Age Luwian kingdoms of Arzawa, Hapalla, Mira, the land of the Šeha-River and Wiluša²⁴. As far as the direct

²³ Cfr. T. Bryce, 2003, I. Yakubovich, 2009, in particular 75ff., 207f. 303ff.

²⁴ See Bryce, 2003, for a general history of the Bronze Age Luwian kingdoms.

genesis of the Neo-Hittite states is concerned, connections with the former western Luwian societies cannot but be mediated by the multi-ethnic filters of Kizzuwatna, Hatti and "Hittitized" Syria. In southern centres such as Emar the Luwians, and in general the Anatolians, must have represented the imperial administration rather than a local force, and they probably didn't take part in the institution of the LÚ.MEŠ *ahhia*²⁵. What kind of ethnicity were they to pursue, if their own "nation" had been, in the last centuries of the Bronze Age, diluted within a multi-ethnic regional state?

The Dark Age was the result of a set of different factors that diminished the capability of regional states to resist and survive. The military events might have been overestimated (Bryce, 2003: 367ff.): the invasion of the Sea People certainly took place, as the inscriptions of Merneptah in Karnak and by his successor Ramses III in Medinet Habu unequivocally register²⁶. Their threat must have limited the power of the coastal kingdoms of Egypt and Levant, but at the same time was unlikely to reach the cities and reigns of the Euphrates. Significantly, the first Neo-Hittite areas to flourish were the neighbourhood of Karkemiš and the Amuq valley (see below Chapter 2, 2.3.1), which could count on a river rather than a coastal economy. On the other hand, the demographic crisis, suggested by the frequent request for the restitution of prisoners in the Late Bronze Age treaties, and a climatic change, combined with the apparently positive factor of the new technologies, struck also the centres far from the coast, and Assyria itself.

Technological evolution, surely a step towards progress, may become a scourge for complex societies, especially if

²⁵ On the college of the "Brothers" see N. Bellotto, 1995. For an example of the survival of different juridical traditions in the "Hittitized" Semitic city of Emar see F. Di Filippo, 2008.

²⁶ Cfr. the inscription by Merneptah in the Karnak Temple and the Annals by Ramses III in the Medinet Habu Temple (especially the years from 5th to 8th); see Bryce, 2005: 333ff., and references.

coinciding with a general crisis²⁷. The rise of new classes of professionals requires a modification of the social *status quo*, and a revolution such as the diffusion of iron tools and weapons probably generated a crisis in the military art as well as in the definition of the social class of professionals of war (Liverani, 2002: 642-660). The same happened, for instance, at the end of the Middle Ages, with the diffusion of firearms and the gradual collapse of the socio-political and military elite class of knights.

The comparison with the European Middle Ages, and specifically the period between 800 and 1000 AD when feudal grants tended to become hereditary and the power of the emperor was weakened by regional dynasties of rulers, is also significant if we consider the evidence of the collapse of regional systems within the Hurrian region of Arrapha during the Bronze Age. Private archives of landowners such as Tehip-Tilla and Wullu²⁸ show how private local authorities were actually able to become so powerful that they were *de facto* independent from the central government. Even though we do not have similar archives from the Hittite Empire or from Assyria, there is no reason to assume that the system worked better in the North or in the South than it did in the kingdom of Mittani. In other words, the fragmentation on a macro-political layer interesting kingdoms such as Karkemiš, Tarhuntašša, Aleppo and probably Emar and Ugarit might not have been the sole fragmentation the regional system had to experience at the end of the Bronze Age.

Studies in paleoclimatology (A.S. Issar et al., 2007: 163-200) show that besides the desertification that gradually took place in Mesopotamia, a change towards a colder rainy climate affected southern Anatolia during the period we call the Dark Age. Such a change may have diminished the effectiveness of the communication and transportation networks of ancient roads,

²⁷ Cfr. in general S. Sherratt, 1998: 292ff.

²⁸ See K. Grosz, 1988, for the archive of Wullu, the prosopography of the characters mentioned in the documents, and the relationship with the Tehip-Tilla texts (in particular 15f.). The Nuzi documents are in general published in the series *Nuzi & the Hurrians* (1981ff.).

both external (connecting Anatolia to the South) and internal ones, since the roads connecting the Neo-Hittite states to the Southern areas had to be basically interface roads connecting mountains to alluvial plains.

Given such a complex scenario, we probably have to modify our previous model about the origin of the Neo-Hittite states. As already noted, we cannot consider them as the final reunion of a fragmented "national" group, as we probably could assume to be true for the Semitic "secondary states" of Aram, Israel and Phoenicia. We also cannot think of them as simple remains, as ruins of formerly stronger states: a wider spectrum of factors than a mere invasion or war influenced their own space and their own time. Neo-Hittite states were the adaptation of formerly local subsets of the southern kingdoms of the Hittite area of influence: Karkemiš, Tarhuntašša, Aleppo; they reduced their width and eliminated part of their internal and external (international) connections in order to survive the new circumstances of climate, the economy, international politics and, of course, but not only, to survive wars. In other words, they were simply a natural outcome of the southern part of Anatolian culture at the end of the Bronze Age.

1.4 Specific Sources about Society and Economy

As I have already mentioned, the Neo-Hittite corpus is almost entirely composed of texts redacted by kings for celebrative purposes. There are no proper legal texts and very few administrative documents containing substantial references to the very structure of the human consortium. Nevertheless, investigating some specific aspects of the Neo-Hittite states as economically active human societies is possible, starting with the pieces of information that are actually preserved in the available documentation. I have concentrated my research on two fields.

The first is the lexical analysis of titles and nouns describing occupations and social roles: as demonstrated by the specific studies on the Mesopotamian and Assyrian titles by W.W.

Hallo (1957) and B. Cifola (1995), political lexicon can be an important source of historical information. The Neo-Hittite corpus contains a large and rather confused number of words used in order to indicate kingship, status and professions, but so far no systematic analysis of their meaning and diffusion has been attempted. A misinterpretation of this lexicon, and specifically of the royal titles, may lead to incorrect, arbitrary conclusions about the very political homogeneity of the Neo-Hittite culture and its connection to the Bronze Age imperial era of Anatolian history²⁹. Through an exhaustive analysis of the titles, I will map a rather fragmented situation, which in my opinion demonstrates that, even if some specific problems persist, the derivation of the Neo-Hittite states from the Bronze Age geopolitical pattern passed through a process of strong social mutation that brought new families to power and eliminated most of the traditional features of the 2nd Millennium BCE. No unitary Neo-Hittite nation, no united Anatolian kingdom of Tabal and above all no Iron Age Hatti³⁰ ever existed, or at least no evidence from the sources points to such a conclusion.

The second object of study will be the corpus of Neo-Hittite economic inscriptions, consisting of two distinct types of texts: the proper economic records³¹ and the royal inscriptions that mention economy³². Some important points regarding the historical definition of the Neo-Hittite states will derive from these documents, for instance the use of two distinct systems of

²⁹ I will discuss this point in Chapter 3, 3.1.

³⁰ Even though, of course, the geographical name *Hatti*, or *Hattu*, is attested in the Assyrian sources (Hawkins in RIA IV s.v. *Ḫatti*) to refer to the Iron Age Luwian countries in general. This fact depends in my opinion on the good state of Assyrian cultural and historical tradition rather than on a real cultural continuity between the Neo-Hittite cultural cluster and the Bronze Age Anatolian Empire: in other words, the geographical name *Hatti* would have probably survived in the archives of Assyria even if it had not been used anymore for centuries.

³¹ The economic documents are presented in Chapter 6.

³² The group of texts I ascribe to this category is discussed in Chapter 7.